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*Prophecy, Piety, and the Problem of Historicity* is a rarity in this day of ideologically inflected cultural history, a lucid fusion of textual, intellectual, theological, and literary history that confirms Jan Stievermann’s place among the very best historians of early America on both sides of the Atlantic. In the hands of someone less talented than Stievermann, a description of how Cotton Mather developed his commentaries on the books of Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Canticles (Song of Solomon), Isaiah, and Jeremiah for the “Biblia Americana” he spent so much of his life preparing could easily become unreadable. Here, instead, we have a book that is informative, interesting, and astute at every turn.

Stievermann’s purpose in this book is three-fold: first, to identify the writers on whom Cotton Mather drew in developing his commentary; second, to identify the challenges—exegetical, historical, theological, and the like—Mather was facing and how, in the context of those challenges, he juggled his sources; and third, to place Mather in the “evidentialist” turn of the seventeenth century, that is, the moment when orthodox Protestants began to rely on external (historical) evidence to validate the singularity of the Bible as divine revelation. Not that Mather ever doubted the principle that the Bible was perceived and understood through a spiritual sense or that he questioned the orthodoxy he inherited from the Reformed tradition. But the times demanded something else by way of proof, a transition Stievermann sees through the lens of Hans Frei’s *The Eclipse of Biblical Narrative* (1974). Each of these tasks required not only close attention to the manuscript commentaries, which Stievermann has published separately, but also to the many writers on whom Mather depended—some more than others, for like Calvin before him, he borrowed source material from compilations or commentaries that his contemporaries had assembled. What emerges from all this work is an excitingly astute survey of pan-European exegetical and historical scholarship on ancient Israel, biblical geography, philology (before there was such a field), natural history, and the like, scholarship in the service of reaffirming or, as in the case of Grotius, challenging the singular authority of Scripture.

But for Stievermann, all of this information is prolegomena to his real purpose, namely, to establish Cotton Mather’s modernity—or proto-modernity—as someone who began to practice a “representational-factualist model of biblical realism” even as he remained a thoroughly traditional exegete who took for granted “the absolute veracity and infallibility of biblical narratives” and a Christianized reading of the Hebrew Bible (7). Moreover, Mather continued to affirm and practice a “mystical” or “spiritual” hermeneutics. Stievermann is quite honest about the “tensions” that Mather experienced as exegete, and honest, too, about Mather’s conservatism. It may seem paradoxical that the emphasis ultimately falls on Mather as a link between the old and the new, the Puritanism of his forbears and the Enlightenment that was beginning to emerge. Confusing may be the *mot juste*, for our grand narratives of continuity and change do not allocate much space for those who are neither one nor the other—and from my vantage, Mather seems more old than new in his thinking and, as Stievermann and others show, someone astonishingly deaf to what he was encountering by way of the new. The speed with which he worked as a compiler and the manner in which he assembled a mélange of quotations and evidence in the commentaries challenges our picture of intellectual work—nothing here comes close to matching the quality of Jonathan Edwards’s “Miscellanies,” to cite one obvious example. And, as I remarked in the context of a conference session some years ago celebrating the publication of the *Genesis* commentary (a feat of scholarship by Reiner Smolinski), Mather had no direct heirs: never cited by Edwards, ignored in the 1740s when booksellers were reprinting older spiritual narratives, and excluded from all of the major twentieth-century histories of the “American” Enlightenment. Hence Stievermann’s insistence (despite his yielding to the language of “firsts”) that Mather must properly be located within a European context if he is to be appreciated as someone alert to new developments in the understanding of biblical texts.

I also recommend this book for another reason. It includes an exquisite review of the arguments and errors of the “early Americanist” scholarship of the 1970s as these were used to validate the existence of a singularly
“American” literary tradition. It has not been easy for early Americanists to renounce that framework, which continues to figure in recent monographs and in misconceptions of a Puritan “plain style.” No antidote has the aura of the “plain style” and its typological adjuncts, much less the aura of the wholly misplaced “millennialism” that became embedded in readings of so many early American texts. Aura notwithstanding, Stievermann provides a truly remarkable account of what went wrong and what should be said about Puritan stylistics. This review leaves out other achievements that, for a lesser scholar, would suffice. Exemplary in its command of the secondary literature and astonishingly comprehensive in its coverage of Mather’s own sources, Prophecy, Piety, and the Problem of Historicity is a genuine masterpiece.

Harvard Divinity School

David D. Hall

Anyone who picks up a copy of *Sympathetic Puritans* might wince at what purports to be something of an oxymoron: “Sympathetic Puritans”? Are you kidding me? Whatever happened to H. L. Menken’s old gibe, “A Puritan is one who is afraid that someone, somewhere, is having fun,” or: when the Puritans arrived on New England’s shore, they first “fell on their knees and then on the Indians,”? Clichés about witch-crazed Puritan killjoys and hard-nosed Indian haters are more popular than ever, and Professor van Engen’s fine book, I am afraid, is not going to change anyone’s mind reared on Jonathan Edwards’s *Sinners in the Hands of an Angry God*, let alone Hawthorne’s obligatory high-school read, “Young Goodman Brown” or his classic *The Scarlet Letter* (A+). If anything, Adam Simon’s and Brannan Braga’s serialized TV drama *Salem* (2014), now in its third season, will only boost our national obsession with dour superstitious Puritan zealots who gave us Cotton Mather, Salem witchcraft and, yes, Thanksgiving! To be sure, van Engen’s *Sympathetic Puritans* is about none of the above. Quite to the contrary, it posits that a “Calvinist theology of sympathy shaped the politics, religion, and literature of seventeenth-century New England” and that the manifestation of “fellow feeling and mutual affections” among the elect served as visible markers to distinguish the community of saints from carnal hypocrites (2). As is well known, the early seminal conflict between John Cotton’s sudden Pauline conversion and Thomas Shepard’s preparational theology constituted the stone of stumbling in the formative Antinomian Controversy. It pitted the followers of John Cotton and Anne Hutchinson with their emphasis on a rapturous conversion (like that of Paul on the road to Damascus) against those who embraced a gradualist conversion morphology as codified in the “preparationism” of Shepard and his father-in-law Thomas Hooker. The latter defined the *ordo salutis* as a drawn-out process of successive stages—contrition, humiliation, vocation (grace), justification, adoption, sanctification, and glorification—which became normative in New England. They knew that undergoing conversion could be an emotional rollercoaster of the first order. For instance, the posthumously published account of Joanna Drake’s harrowing experience, in *The Firebrand Taken Out of the Fire* (1647, 1654), testifies to the agony of one caught in the maelstrom of self-condemnation engulfing the rock of assurance. Those familiar with Thomas Hooker’s oft-reprinted vademecum *Poor Doubting Christian Drawn unto Christ* (1628) or with John Bunyan’s popular allegory *Pilgrim’s Progress* (1678) can testify to Christian’s doleful encounter with Giant Despair and the Slough of Despond; if only the disciples of the New England Way could have attained faith and assurance of salvation more easily and firmly. Alas, did not Arthur Hildersam remind his New English confreres in his *Lectures Upon the Fourth of John* (1629) that while assurance of salvation is a comfortable thing, certainty is the primrose path to damnation? It would therefore be much better to be wrecked with doubt and never attain certainty of salvation than to be lulled asleep in false security. The best one could do then was to examine one’s Self and look for signs of grace in one’s daily conduct and in the realm of emotions: a burning desire for Christ, and (so van Engen) love and fellow feeling for the community of saints. That being said, van Engen cautions that the vital concepts of fellow feeling underwent significant changes; sympathy or affections for the members of one’s tightly bound cohort of the elect became more and more exclusive and narrow over time. To complicate matters, there was no consensus among Puritan divines from the start, either about the meaning, extent, and value of affections or about sympathy as a sign of election. These disagreements became all the more pronounced as theological controversies, migration, Indian conversions and wars, the revocation of the Charter (1684), and the Act of Toleration (1689) destabilized the cohesion of Puritan society and, ultimately, terminated Congregationalism as the de facto state church in New England. “In the crucible of these contingent events,” van Engen argues, “the requirement of fellow feeling and the necessity of demonstrating sincerity turned Puritan writers to literary techniques that would later be found at the heart of sentimental literature” (24). In short, the persistent emphasis on sympathy became a genetic factor in the rise of sentimental literature in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries in America. The evolving cult of sensibility (sentimentalism), van Engen avers, therefore
should no longer be viewed as the offspring of the Scottish Enlightenment or as a visceral reaction to corpse-cold Calvinism. With this matrix in place, Professor van Engen traces in chapter 1 the concept of sympathy from its roots in ancient Greek science and medicine to its entrance into English theological vocabulary via Erasmus and Calvin. Following in their steps, English Reformed theologians such as William Perkins, Richard Sibbes, and William Ames made self-examination, the affections of the heart, and the vicarious experience of fellow feeling among the elect, central markers of the conversion process; and if John Winthrop’s Model of Christian Charity is still allowed as waterproof evidence, the bonds of brotherly affections between rich and poor, and the practice of charity through kindness and forbearance, became the rock upon which Puritan New England reared its City upon the Hill. It is perhaps a bit curious that—against our better judgment—Winthrop’s Model continues to serve as Urtext of American exceptionalism and the origin of American literature. True, thanks to Perry Miller, Winthrop’s lay sermon is perhaps the most anthologized document in all American literature, at least since Miller published his Errand into the Wilderness (1956). Yet it is also well known by now (as van Engen acknowledges in a footnote) that Winthrop himself never mentions his Model in any of his extant papers (not even in his Journal), nor do any of his fellow travelers on the Arbel la comment they heard him deliver it, nor do any of New England’s historians from Edward Johnson, to Thomas Morton, William Hubbard, Cotton Mather, Thomas Hutchinson, all the way to the illustrious George Bancroft in his early nineteenth-century editions of his multivolume history, show any awareness of its existence, let alone its seminal importance as a foundational text. In fact, Winthrop’s Model was completely unknown among his contemporaries and his intellectual descendants; the only extant fragment of the text (not in Winthrop’s hand) was rediscovered in the early nineteenth century among the papers of an English correspondent and subsequently published in 1838. For these reasons, I am not comfortable accepting the use to which Professor van Engen puts Winthrop’s Model in his reexamination of the Antinomian Controversy as in fact throughout his entire work. Perhaps, my cavils are nothing but academic nitpicking? Reservations aside, van Engen’s tightly argued thesis in chapters two through four elucidates the Antinomian Controversy in fresh ways. In fact, his discussion of the conflict between the Hutchinsonian followers of John Cotton (the party of free grace) and the preparationist disciples of Shepard, Hooker, and Winthrop (dubbed preachers of works), is among the most intriguing aspects of the book, for it also provides side glances at Edward Johnson’s history, Anne Bradstreet’s poetry, and Mary Rowlandson’s captivity narrative in subsequent chapters. The differences between the Antinomians and the orthodox were primarily grounded in “pastoral, not political” matters, van Engen insists: “they debated assurance and salvation, not authority and stability” in the community of saints (59). Their disagreements centered on 1 John 3:14-19, the link between love of brethren, eternal life as markers of operative grace, and assurance of salvation as inward testimony of the Holy Spirit. The bone of contention, then, was their diverging conceptions of what counted as inward evidence of grace or, more generally, what precisely constituted orthodoxy. To the Hutchinsonians the infusion of saving grace manifested itself in “immediate assurance,” an intuitive, transcendent, rapturous joy, which the Holy Spirit bestowed on his chosen as evidence of their election. This joyful mystical experience, they insisted, henceforth guided their every motion in life and thought, and stood in stark contrast, so they argued, to that among their opponents who sought for evidence of gracious assurance in an interminable process of sanctification in their workaday lives. From the perspective of the Antinomians, the preparationists appeared to preach Works at the expense of Grace. In other words, the Hutchinsonians (as is traditionally argued) stood for rapturous feeling and spiritual freedom, whereas their opponents, the so-called orthodox, for logic, reason, and obedience to moral law. Conversely, to Shepard, Hooker, and Winthrop, the Hutchinsonians were dangerous enthusiasts prone to direct revelations and excesses similar to those among the English Levelers and the lunatic fringe who turned the world upside down. At least, this is the time-honored explication of the Antinomian Controversy as it has come down to us in nineteenth-century histories. According to van Engen and his peers, this argument no longer holds up to scrutiny.
It is too simplistic to argue that the orthodox stressed good works as signs of election, van Engen insists. To the orthodox, good works in themselves were not meritorious, let alone efficacious; in fact, what mattered most were not outward acts by themselves, but the frame of the heart, the elect's gracious motivations behind their acts of brotherly love and affections. That is why the narratives of conversion in Shepard's congregation focus on the motions of the heart—not external behavior. It is also why Winthrop's Model of Christian Charity, according to van Engen, plays such a prominent part: Winthrop does extol acts of charity and compassion for the poor as the fruits of the spirit. Thus, deeds of brotherly love among fellow saints, though not efficacious by any means, could stand in for what the doubting Thomases needed most of all: assurance of salvation. John Cotton, Hutchinson, and her brother-in-law, John Wheelwright, vehemently denied this because it amounted to deriving saving merits from good works. To Cotton and his followers, love of brethren or deeds of charity could never ground assurance of grace. Modern readers unfamiliar with the intricacies of Puritan soteriology may rightly be dismayed; such precisionist arguments eminently typify the casuistic hairsplitting to which our venerable forefathers seemed prone. Let anyone who can limn the lines of demarcation between the primary colors and their spectral cousins in the panoply of the rainbow.

Be that as it may, the traditional explanation of the Hutchinsonian crisis as it has come down to our times in nineteenth-century histories does not get to the heart of the matter. “The theological debate of the Antinomian Controversy,” van Engen contends, “did not set up inner spiritual emotions against outer moral behavior. It was not a contest between discipline and feeling as countless scholars have suggested; rather, it opposed one view of religious experience to another” (75). Thus, the debate per se did not center on works versus grace, as is commonly argued, but on the value of fellow feeling as signs of grace. It could serve the weak in faith as comforting evidence of their regeneration. In fact, as van Engen demonstrates throughout his book, it can be discerned in the spiritual autobiographies and memoirs of Winthrop, Shepard, and Roger Clap, just as much as in Anne Bradstreet, Edward Johnson, and Mary Rowlandson. Most of all, it occupies a prominent place in the Eliot tracts on Indian conversions, in which the profusion of Indian tears could take the deed for the word.

Professor van Engen's analysis of John Eliot’s missionary tracts of Indian conversion (chapter five) perhaps best illustrates his argument that the literary techniques deployed in Puritan homiletic discourse grandfathered the rise of sentimental novels in America. To be sure, the Eliot tracts are invaluable documents testifying to Native American acculturation, conversion, and adaptation of English mores. They also reveal the nearly insurmountable linguistic challenges missionaries faced in conveying abstract concepts of the Judeo-Christian religion completely foreign to New England's indigenous peoples. If the Antinomians and orthodox among the Puritan settlers were unable to see eye to eye on the precise nature of work and grace, let alone the meaning and efficacy of assurance, regeneration, and sanctification, how could John Eliot and his fellow missionaries expect his Indian charges to fathom theological abstractions for which no linguistic and conceptual equivalents existed in the Algonquian language? Yet more problematic: since Indian oratory privileged the display of emotions, especially groaning and weeping, how could Puritan missionaries distinguish expressions of culturally predicated emotions in Indian hortatory discourse from signs of authentic conversion, manifestations of regenerate feelings from transitory emotions—or worse, hypocrisy—if sincerity was to be adjudged by the profusion of tears and gushing emotions? Add to this the problematic demand for accurate and trustworthy Indian conversion narratives to garner financial support from English sponsors. Van Engen is right on target when he draws our attention to the complex challenges Eliot and his fellow missionaries encountered, and the literary techniques they employed in their evangelizing work.

Truth to tell, the accounts of Indian conversion (Eliot tracts) are awash in tears. Tearful emotions became the principal signifiers of Indian conversion; everyone could observe the spectacle of lachrymose penitence, few if any could understand the words employed to render them authentic. Perhaps the surest way to ascertain their truthfulness was to study their “contagious” effects on their fellow converts: “The repeated evidence of contagious emotions,” van Engen points out, “highlights an underlying component of true conversion:
love of brethren [...] The Praying Indians, in their mutual joy for one another, verified their membership in the Body of Christ. The emotional community of saints comprised a worldwide spiritual brotherhood—a fraternity that was supposed to extend beyond kindship and race” (157, 158). Given their circulation and promotion in English parishes, Indian conversion narratives also worked in the opposite direction: they not only testified to the progress of the Gospel among America’s indigene, but also served as evangelical instrument to lead the unregenerate among English readers to repentance and sympathy. A well-known example of this type is Laurence Harlow’s Conversion of an Indian, in a Letter to a Friend (1774), which Olaudah Equiano acknowledges in his Interesting Narrative (ch. 10), as a great influence on his own conversion. Thus, literary productions of conversion narratives—like the Eliot tracts and their semi-fictionalized descendants in eighteenth-century England—attained a great measure of popularity, precisely because they aroused strong feelings of sympathy among their target audience. They devised the kind of affective didacticism that, a century and a half later, became unmistakable in sentimental fiction.

Abram van Engen’s Sympathetic Puritans, then, is a major contribution to the ongoing revisionist scholarship engaged in putting Puritans and their contributions to American culture back onto an even keel. In drawing our attention to the “genealogical links” between the power of emotions in Puritan soteriology and their latter-day descendants in sentimental fiction, van Engen points us in the right direction. His re-examination of the affective dimensions at the heart of the New England Way, indeed, helps to “overturn the caricatured idea that sentimentalists turned to sympathy as an antidote to their intellectual, doctrinal, stern, and rigorous Puritan past” (169). In this and in many other aspects, van Engen’s first book establishes him as a promising new light in the discipline.

Atlanta (USA) Reiner Smolinski

“Uppon the first sight of New-England, June 29, 1638”

Hayle holy-land wherein our holy lord
Hath planted his most true and holy word
Hayle happye people who have disposed
Your selves of friends, and means, to find some rest
For your poore wearied soules, opprest of late
For Jesus-sake

... Come my deare little flocke, who for my sake
Have lefte your Country, dearest friends, and goods
And hazarded your lives o’th raginge floods
Posses this Country; free from all anoye
Heare I’le bee with you, hear you shall Injoye
My Sabbaths, sacraments, my minestrye
And ordinances in their puritty.

Thomas Tillam

Escaped from the house of bondage, Israel of old did not follow after the ways of the Egyptians. To her was given an express dispensation; to her were given new things under the sun. And we Americans are the peculiar, chosen people—the Israel of our time; we bear the ark of the liberties of the world. Seventy years ago we escaped from thrall; and, besides our first birthright—embracing one continent of earth—God has given to us, for a future inheritance, the broad domains of the political pagans, that shall yet come and lie down under the shade of our ark, without bloody hands being lifted. God has predestinated, mankind expects, great things from our race; and great things we feel in our souls. The rest of the nations must soon be in our rear. We are the pioneers of the world; the advance-guard, sent on through the wilderness of untried things, to break a new path in the New World that is ours. ... Long enough, have we been skeptics with regard to ourselves, and doubted whether, indeed, the political Messiah had come. But he has come in us, if we would but give utterance to his promptings. And let us always remember that with ourselves, almost for the first time in the history of earth, national selfishness is unbounded philanthropy; for we can not do a good to America but we give alms to the world.

Herman Melville, White-Jacket (1850)

Intellectuals wince at the jingoistic rhetoric prevalent in American oratory, especially when unctuous politicians running for high office invoke lofty metaphors of the “Citty upon a Hill”: We Americans are a chosen people on an errand to bring freedom and democracy to the world. Thomas Tillam and Herman Melville—each in their own way and for different reasons—are no exception to this rule. In fact, their versions of manifest destiny embody these matters perfectly.¹

Much has been written on the topic in academic journals and monographs—at least since the Puritan “Errand into the Wilderness” (1956) was made famous in Perry Miller’s eponymous thesis. It has governed much of the historical discourse in the second half of the twentieth century before revisionist historians questioned its soundness.² Briefly, in his essay on the Puritan “errand,” the doyen of early American intellectual history postulated a fundamental difference between the Pilgrims’ exodus to New Plymouth and the migration of John Winthrop’s Puritans to the Massachusetts Bay Colony. The Pilgrims under William Bradford, Miller claims, “were reluctant voyagers; they had never wanted to leave England, but had been obliged to depart because the authorities made life impossible for Separatists. ... [T]hey did not go to Holland as though on an errand; neither can

¹ Thomas Tillam (d. c. 1674), a Baptist preacher and Fifth Monarchist, did not stay long in New England and eventually settled a community of fellow Saturday sabbatarians in Heidelberg (Germany).

we extract the notion of a mission out of the reason which, as Bradford tells us, persuaded them to leave Leyden for ‘Virginia.’” Conversely, the great migration of the Puritans under John Winthrop, Miller continues, is a horse of a different color: The Massachusetts Bay colonists were not just adventurers questing for economic opportunities in the New World, but “an organization of immigrants” with “a positive sense of mission”; they were either “sent on an errand or it had its own intention, but in either case the deed was deliberate. It was an act of will, perhaps of willfulness. These Puritans were not driven out of England,” Miller insists, because “thousands of their fellows” remained behind and opposed Charles I; those who went to America left “on their own accord.”

As is well known, Miller grounds his thesis on John Winthrop’s lay-sermon “Modell of Christian Charity” ostensibly preached aboard his flagship Arbella upon the fleet’s departure from Southampton in 1630. It has become the “Ur-text" for American exceptionalism and the much-touted “City upon a Hill”—patriotic tropes perennially summoned at Presidential inaugurations and political rallies. Ironically, if Winthrop’s “Modell" is indeed such a foundational document in the Puritan exodus to America, none of his contemporaries—not even those on board the Arbella—mention they heard him deliver the sermon nor refer to it in their private or public communications, but once. As Winthrop’s distinguished biographer, Francis Bremer, points out, the only extant reference to the sermon is that by the English nonconformist minister Henry Jacie, or Jessey (1603-63), who in a letter to John Winthrop, Jr., (c. Feb. 1635), requested “copies of a number of papers relating to the colony, including ‘the Model of Charity.’” More telling, Winthrop, Sen., himself does not mention this document or speech in his own Journal (1630-1649) or correspondence—neither does John White, in his Planters Plea or the Grounds of Plantations

Examin (1630), nor Edward Johnson (both passengers on Winthrop’s flagship Arbella), in his Wonder-Working Providence (1654), nor William Hubbard, in his General History (wr. 1682; publ. 1815), nor Cotton Mather, either in his famous biography of Winthrop or anywhere else in his Magnalia Christi Americana (1702) for that matter, nor Daniel Neal, in his History of New-England (1720), nor Thomas Prince, in his Chronological History (1736), nor Thomas Hutchinson, in his History of the Colony of Massachusetts (1764). In fact, the only extant copy of Winthrop’s “Modell" is a manuscript fragment (not in his own hand) apparently circulated in England before his departure to New England. However, the documents that were cited (and reprinted) several times in Winthrop’s time and thereafter are John Cotton’s Gods Promise to His Plantation (London, 1630) and The Humble Request (London, 1630); the former, a farewell sermon preached in Southampton to Winthrop’s departing fleet; the latter, an apologia (attributed to Rev. John White), addressed “To the rest of their Brethren, in and of the Church of England,” dated “From Yarmouth aboard the Arbella, April 7, 1630,” and signed by Gov. John Winthrop and several other Puritan leaders. Arguably, then, Perry Miller’s grand...
thesis founded on Winthrop’s “Modell” bears little resemblance to the regard (or rather disregard) Winthrop or his contemporaries were paying to this document. In fact, the manuscript fragment was completely forgotten and was not printed until more than two hundred years later.7

Much the same objection has been raised against Winthrop’s trope “a Citty upon a hill,”8 a biblical metaphor adapted from the Sermon on the Mount (Matth. 5:14) and frequently associated with the celestial “New Jerusalem” (Rev. 21:2) in Puritan eschatology. Come the millennium (so the argument goes), this shining city of God would come down from heaven, and Christ would govern his saints for a thousand years from his base in America, most likely from Puritan Boston.9 After all, did not Cotton Mather explicitly say so in his Magnalia Christi (1702) and in his Theopolis Americana (1710)? As a matter of fact, he did not. By now versions of this pious myth proliferated in the scholarship since the 1970s are so entrenched in our national mythology that no matter how carefully historians have contextualized evidence to the contrary, this venerable legend remains as American as apple pie. Ironically, these biblical metaphors were hardly unique in the homiletic literature of the time. Francis Bremer and several of his predecessors have shown that “Matthew’s images of a city on a hill, lights, and candlesticks were widely employed in Winthrop’s England.”10

These metaphors were, indeed, so commonplace in Elizabethan and Jacobean sermons that even John Cotton’s closing admonition reminded those en route to Massachusetts, “be not unmindfull of our Ierusalem at home, whether you leave us, or stay at home with us.”11 In short, when Winthrop invoked in his “Modell” the (by now) famous comparison, “wee must Consider that wee shall be as a Citty upon a Hill” (295), he intended no more than his clerical colleagues did in the Church of England who warned their parishioners that the church, like “a city that is set on a hill cannot be hid” (Matth. 5:14, KJV), stands exposed to God’s wrath. That Winthrop employed this reference in the same, essentially negative, context as it appears in Matthew’s gospel is fortuitously forgotten.

To be fair, why should such metaphoric niceties matter? It is perhaps one of those ironies frequently encountered in history that horizons of expectations which reverberate among one generation and in one age accrue radically different meanings in another but are projected back in time as so-called foundational myths. After all, it is a truism by now that we reinvent the past in our own image when old answers become trite and lose their potency, or when new conditions demand revisions of old myths to justify a present expediency.12 Such, then, is the topic of Heike Brandt’s Invented Traditions, a 2011 doctoral disserta-

7 It was first published in the Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society. Third series (Boston, 1838) 7:33-48, and since then more often anthologized than most other documents in American literature.
8 Winthrop’s “Modell” (Winthrop Papers 2:295).
12 See, for instance, Bruce Tucker, “The Reinterpretation of Puritan History in Provincial New England,” New England Quarterly 54.4 (1981): 481-98, who demonstrates that when the Act of Toleration (1689) and Massachusetts’ Second Charter (1691) irrevocably established religious toleration as the new imperial policy, New England’s divines rewrote the history of their conflict between Puritans and Anglicans as a divinely ordained plan not only to establish a refuge for dissenters in the New World at the beginning of the seventeenth century but also to promote “an Anglo-American Protestant union” at centuries end (482).
tion under the direction of Prof. Dr. Klaus P. Hansen (Universität Passau) published in the series *Schriften der Forschungsstelle Grundlagen Kulturwissenschaft*. Brandt’s *Invented Traditions* explores the changing fortunes of well-known religio-political tropes in American primary and secondary literature over a period of 300 years.

In six chapters carefully crafted and amply documented, Brandt traces the biblical concepts of “Spiritual Israel” as a “covenanted people” under God on a westward “errand” to bring the light of Christian civilization into North America’s wilderness. As is well known, this medieval theme of *translato studii et imperii*—celebrated in George Herbert’s poem “The Church Militant” (1633)—attained new life in the homiletic literature of Elizabethan and Jacobean England. It became a pervasive trope in American sermons, histories, political speeches, and epics from the colonial period to the present. In fact, its adaptations reverberate in Tillam’s doggerel and Melville’s antebellum novel just as much as it does in the post-Obama era, when star-struck voters once again are to make up their minds about which candidates’ hyperboles are best suited for the White House. To be sure, Heike Brandt’s monograph is not concerned with the validity of America’s founding myths nor their historical accuracy as much as she surveys how they were rewritten and adapted over time. Moreover, Brandt also provides a running commentary on these issues based on the prevalent historiography since the 1950s. *Invented Traditions*, then, is not a contribution to revisionist scholarship in as much as it provides a useful foundation for those unfamiliar with the debate.

In her first two chapters, Dr. Brandt delineates the concepts of Calvinist “Auserwähltheit und Sendung” as they were applied to the Church of England as a whole on the eve of the great migration to North America. The Reformed among the Protestant churches, as is well known, allegorized the “Israel-Paradigm,” God’s covenant with literal Israel, and transferred it to themselves as God’s “Spiritual Israel.” Both Separatist and Puritan Non-conformists seeking refuge in New England identified their cause with that of the apocalyptic “woman fleeing into the wilderness,” the latter-day remnant of “Visible Saints,” for whom God had prepared a hiding place (Rev. 12:6) in the New World. Yet contrary to modern adaptations of this prophecy, neither group envisioned a permanent settlement in America, let alone claimed that New England (or America) would be the locale of Christ’s New Jerusalem (Rev. 21:2), his capital and seat of judgment during his thousand-year reign on earth. At best, they aimed at setting up a “primitive church” on the model of the pure teachings of the first-century Christian church to set an example for the churches of Europe. Besides, seventeenth-century millenarians looked toward Jerusalem in Palestine—not America—for the unfolding of Christ’s terrestrial reign.

Chapter three “Entstehung einer protestantischen Geschichtsphilosophie und ihr Einfluss auf Konzepte der Auserwähltheit und Sendung bei den Puritanern” is an excursion into the history and evolution of the doctrine of millennialism, the belief in the Second Coming of Jesus Christ and his thousand-year reign, from St. Augustine’s “a-millennialism” (Christ’s spiritual indwelling in the heart of the faithful) to the eighteenth-century idea of “post-millennialism” (Christ’s return at the end of a progressively improving earthly society). More to the point, Brandt also covers in this chapter the controversial exclusion of the American hemisphere from the blessings of Christ’s reign. An influential English millenarian, Joseph Mede had conjectured that Christ’s kingdom would be confined to the boundaries of the ancient Roman Empire in the Old World, whereas America would be the apocalyptic locale of outer darkness, the place of the devil and the damned. How this rejection of the New World rankled American Puritans and their millenarian descendants until the Second Great Awakening is sketched in this chapter just as much as the arguments of the principal combatants in this erstwhile debate.

“Die heilsgeschichtliche Verortung Neu­englands,” “das Israel-Paradigma,” and “Republicanismus” as formulas of collective identity in the political homilies of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries are the focus of the fourth through sixth chapters—the showpieces of the book. Here Brandt elucidates how New England’s clerics responded to the tide of Puritan reverse migration during Cromwell’s Interregnum by redefining the avowed purpose of their errand in terms of missionizing Native Americans. When the introduction of the Half-Way Covenant (1662) failed to adequately address the declining admissions to full church membership, the ministers touted
the piety of the first generation as the gold standard from which the rising generation had fallen. The devastations of King Philip’s War (1675/76) were hailed as God’s punishment for communal backsliding, and the clergy countered with an avalanche of interminable jeremiads (the time-honored “carrot-and-stick” approach) to redress New England’s deprivations. The Glorious Revolution (1688) and the Toleration Act (1689) both strengthened the bonds of New England’s identity even as it curbed the power of the de facto state church. When itinerant preachers triggered massive revivals and impromptu conversions during the First Great Awakening (1735-43), Arminian New Lights battled with conservative Old Lights and expanded the covenant to include members on the sole bases of pious conduct and moral behavior. The turmoil of the French and Indian War (1756-63) triggered yet another widening of the church doors: God’s covenanted people and their errand into the wilderness were stretched to their limits by including all faithful and morally upright Americans in all colonies as long as they were Protestants and prepared to rise against the Roman Catholic Antichrist in French Canada. If God’s original covenant excluded all but his Visible Saints on their errand to worship him in liberty of conscience, then the Stamp-Act crisis (1765/66) leading up to the American Revolution prompted yet another redefinition: the intrinsic rights of the American colonists to freedom, liberty, and property were safeguarded by nothing less than the Magna Carta, and the English Parliament’s endeavor to curtail these civil liberties was tantamount to a breach of contract between George III and his erstwhile American subjects. In short, the tropes of God’s New English Israel and their errand into the wilderness proved concepts pliable enough to be reconfigured and reinvented as the need arose. In the filiopietistic rhetoric of America’s civic and ecclesiastical leaders, they still resonate when citizens are called upon to go to the polls.

Aside from the missing index and inconsistent collation of footnote references and bibliography, Heike Brandt’s *Invented Traditions: Die Puritaner und das amerikanische Sendungsbewusstsein* is a lucidly written and well-documented survey on identity formation in American homiletic literature. If its contribution to this by now dated debate is diminished by the want of an original thesis, *Invented Traditions* is, nonetheless, a reliable guide to the scholarship on the Puritan errand since the 1960s.

Atlanta (USA)  Reiner Smolinski
The history of empire and religion in the Americas remains as politically relevant as ever. Pope Francis, as the first Latin American pope, was reminded of this last year when he first apologized for the “grave sins committed against the native people of America in the name of God” during his tour of Latin America, and then generated protests a few months later when he canonized Junípero Serra, the controversial eighteen-century Franciscan friar and missionary in California loved by some and accused by others of suppressing Amerindian culture and imposing Christianity by force.

Over the past 30 years, scholars have sought to understand the history of religion in the Americas in increasingly nuanced ways that move beyond mere accusations, apologies or apologetics. One of the most recent contributions to this scholarship is the new essay collection Religious Transformations, which considers not just how European Christianity shaped the peoples and cultures of the Americas, but how their experiences in the Americas reshaped European religious traditions and practice.

In Religious Transformations, editors Stephanie Kirk (Spanish Dept., Washington University of St Louis) and Sarah Rivett (English Dept., Princeton University) have brought together renowned scholars to analyze and compare the histories of Ibero-Catholic and Anglo-Protestant empires through what they call the “provocative” lens of religion. The comparative colonial context is uniquely suited to this task. The essays in this cross-disciplinary volume reflect on the complexity and variety of the colonial world in its intimate relationship to Christian belief and practice, “while also maintaining nuanced attention to the particularities of a diverse range of communities and experiences” (20). Through case studies examining cartography, demonology, or missiology among others, each of the essays examines how “Christianity changed as a result of Atlantic transit into new forms of faith, ecclesiology, and theology” (1).

One of the main interests of the collection is to problematize the common assumption that Anglo-Protestantism alone brought modernity to the New World—a part of the exceptionalist paradigm reinforced by the “Black Legend,” according to which the Spanish regime was particularly brutal and cruel towards Native peoples while the English were more benign. The articles in the book seek to present new connections across what has been seen as “an Anglo-Protestant versus an Iberian-Catholic paradigm,” emphasizing how they were parallel endeavors, linking “religious ideas and legal government to the organization and maintenance of a colonial community that also sought to extend its boundaries through missionary projects” (21). For communities seeking new beginnings in New Spain or New England, the motivations for religious journeys “challenged long-standing structures of authority and religious as well as secular traditions” (3). The fractured hierarchy of authority in New Spain and New England also shaped the possibilities for religious reinvention. Other factors also shaped new religious identities such as “a particular confluence of interaction with foreign landscapes, native tribes and complex indigenous civilizations, and new models of community and social interaction” (6). Moving beyond missionary encounters alone, the diverse essays also look at other ways religion was transmitted, translated but also transformed as it was circulated and recirculated within a dynamic Atlantic world.

A crucial question is the relationship between early modern religious change shaped by the American encounter and modernity. In the first essay, Oxford professor emeritus John Elliott, a major figure in the historiography of Spain and the Spanish Empire, also examines the relationship between modernity, religion, and colonization. He concludes that Protestant (British) America had a greater range of resources than Ibero-Catholics in confronting the challenges that came with winning independence from Europe, better facilitating the transition to democratic and egalitarian forms of government and civil society.

Notre Dame’s Sandra Gustafson gives this argument further substance in her essay comparing the different kinds of republican rhetoric, imagery and beliefs—inspired by either Cicero or Augustine—which were deployed in British North America and the Spanish Empire. She deftly sketches various histories of discourse and practice shaping the modern republic, from Simón Bolívar and John Smith to Puritan missionary John Eliot and Benjamin Franklin. In particular, Gustafson...
undermines the idea that the modern republic was entirely a product of Anglo Protestantism, detailing instead how the language and ideals of republicanism had long been popular in Spanish America. Interestingly, she also notes the reception of indigenous forms of governance and statecraft, showing how they were discussed and interpreted by colonial North American authors in light of European ideals of the commonwealth or republic. Yet while the ideal of the “republican” Indian was increasing in British North America, it was disappearing fast in Spanish America for political and religious reasons. Ultimately, republicanism took quite different forms in that context.

The influence of the American encounter on modernity and vice-versa is also the topic of the article by Ralph Bauer on demonology, in which he looks closely at the relationship between the distinctively early modern (not medieval) preoccupation with demons and the creation of the modern subject. Bauer traces how colonial ethnography unwittingly participated in rhetorical battles over Reformation and Counter-Reformation conceptions of human nature and natural reason, arguing that changing concepts of human nature were reflected in how Amerindian peoples and their religions were represented in early modern European publications about the New World. In particular, he shows how English writings move from a merely “pagan” portrayal of Amerindian religions to a Satanic one. The demonization of Native religions helped shape the modern subject in European Christianity.

David Hall’s examination of the Reformed tradition and the politics of writing takes a different approach as he considers the shaping of the modern European subject through encounters and challenges in the New English context. Hall here brings his pioneering work on Puritanism and lived religion together to examine transformations and continuities in theological traditions and religious practice by way of the politics of seventeenth century texts. Along similar lines, Teresa Toulouse analyzes Cotton Mather’s changing concept of providence due to political events in New England as reflected in his work Piatas in Patriam. She challenges oversimplified secularization theses by underscoring how political realities of life post-charter altered—but did not eliminate—the idea of providence in Puritan thought.

What neither of these otherwise fascinating accounts do, however, is integrate insights from Native American studies or social history about cultural and linguistic exchange in British North America. Their focus is predominately on the textual and political relationship between New England and England and the context of New England as geographically apart from England, of course, but I had expected the Native context to play a greater role in their analysis. This very challenge is clearly laid out in the essay by Matt Cohen. Cohen highlights what he calls “stumbling blocks to thinking interculturally” about religion in Puritan studies examining early colonial New England. Cohen asks whether Native and Western forms of spirituality are not only not as different as assumed, but whether both religious traditions were being changed simultaneously as a result of forces of social change both experienced: “What if the settlers were becoming more like Indians were becoming, with respect to religious feeling?” (162) That is, what if the advent of Western modernity was not “the end of it all” but involved a future with Indians?

The case studies from New Spain, by contrast, pay closer attention to the European missionary encounter with Native peoples and how each shaped the other. Asuncion Lavrin, for example, examines the appeal of martyrdom “for Christ” in the context of Mexico and how discourses of martyrdom in Spanish America were situated within the spiritual cause of the Counter-Reformation. A particular view of the idolatrous or even demonic “other” emerged as a result of the American encounter (157). Art historian Carmen Fernández-Salvador discusses the mission encounter in New Spain through the lens of Jesuit cartography, arguing that map making and ethnographic description were employed as tools in territorial reconnaissance and definition. David Boruchoff, after providing an overview of saintly models in Reformation and Counter-Reformation history generally, considers missionary authors in New Spain. Júnia Ferreira Furtado includes the Portuguese colonial experience in her provocative Atlantic narrative about two Brazilian “mulatto” Catholic priests who “return” to Africa for the purposes of missionizing in Benin. Religious transformation in New France, on the other hand, is not part of this collection—nor is its exclusion explained on a methodological basis.
The essays individually are excellent, each one densely researched and well-written, reflecting recent methodological and theoretical questions about religion in the Americas. The heterogeneity of the collection, however, may present some challenges for readers familiar with either the Anglo-Protestant or Ibero-Catholic empires but not both. Scholars and graduate students studying early America, regardless of their regional focus, will find the book’s comparative approach enriching, however, and find preconceptions about the differences between religious projects in the Spanish and British empires (still shaped by the “Black Legend” in particular) called into question.

Given the stated interest of the editors in how missionary encounters “defined faith, theology and pious practices, reshaping Christianity into new forms that reentered a pattern of Atlantic circulation” (3), I had also expected even more of the essays to examine in-depth the nature of missionary encounters or Native American Christianity. Instead, European religious transformations and reinvention as a result of American encounters is the main though not exclusive focus. Nevertheless, scholars and students of early modern European history, American history (North and South America), religious history, Atlantic history, and students of early English or Spanish literature will all find their understanding of the religion and politics in the early Americas greatly enriched. Those interested in uncovering the many roles played by religion in the development of modernity in early modern Europe and the Americas will do well to pick up this excellent book.

Heidelberg Jennifer Adams-Massmann

Im Zentrum der anregenden Studie des an der Brown University lehrenden Historikers Linford Fisher stehen die unterschiedlichen und facettenreichen Modi, mit denen Nati-
ve Americans im südöstlichen Neuengland zwischen 1700 und 1820 dem christlichen Glauben begegneten, ihn ablehnten oder annahmen und auf ihre ganz eigene Art modi-
fizierten. Dabei stellt Fisher die Selbstbestim-
mung (“agency”) der Native Americans ganz
den Mittelpunkt seiner Analyse, die auf einer beeindruckend breiten und vielfältigen Quellengrundlage basiert.

Die ersten beiden Kapitel konturieren die historischen Hintergründe und Rahmen-
bedingungen, vor denen die Interaktionen
zwischen Native Americans und den christli-
chen Kolonisten zu sehen sind. In Kapitel 1, Rainmaking, rekonstruiert Fisher die euro-
päischen Bemühungen, das Christentum unter den Native Americans zu verbreiten, wobei er insbesondere John Eliot in den Blick nimmt. Es sei ihnen noch bis in die ersten Dekaden des 18. Jahrhunderts gelungen, ihre traditionelle Lebensweise beizubehalten, ehe dann in diesem Zeitraum die evangelistischen Bemühungen nochmals erheblich intensiviert worden seien. Eben diese Evangelisierungs-
bemühungen stehen im Zentrum des zweiten Kapitels. Es gelingt Fisher auf überzeugen-
Weise, die Komplexität dieses Prozesses der Auswahl, Aneignung und Ablehnung christ-
lischer Glaubensinhalte darzustellen, die in hohem Maße durch den spezifischen sozio-
kulturellen Kontext in Neuengland bedingt
waren. In Übereinstimmung mit anderen For-
schungsergebnissen der jüngeren Zeit—hier
ist etwa an die Arbeiten von Felicity Jensz
oder Rachel Wheeler zu denken—war es vor allem der Zugang zu Bildung, der den Über-
tritt zum Christentum attraktiv werden ließ.

Im dritten Kapitel steht dann die Er-
wachsenheit von Indian Great Awaken-
ing als das Resultat eines Zusammenwirkens von einerseits über dreißig Jahren Missions- und Evangelisierungsbemühun-
gen und andererseits der wachsenden An-
strengungen der indianischen Gemeinschaf-
ten, “education, literacy, and acceptance”
(67) innerhalb der kolonialen Gesellschaft
zu erwerben. Die eigentlichen Aneignungs-
prozesse werden von Fisher nuanciert und
gründlich dargestellt, wobei er zu höchst au-
ßerschallreichen Beobachtungen gelangt. So
zeigt er etwa, dass die Interaktionen zwischen
den christlichen Geistlichen und den indi-
nischen Stammesgemeinschaften zu durch-
aus innovativen Glaubenspraktiken führten, wie z.B. zu lebhaftem Gesang oder anderen individuellen Ausdrucksformen während des Gottesdienstes.

Linford Fisher plädiert im vierten Kapitel für den Begriff “affiliation”, um die vielfäl-
tigen Erweckungserfahrungen von Native Americans, zu beschreiben. Im Gegensatz zur reliigiösen Bekehrung (“religious conversion”) sei “affiliation” nämlich besser geeignet, die ganze Handlungspalette der Reaktionen im Kontext des Indian Great Awakening ab-
zubilden, zumal man ungeachtet eines ins-
gesamt gewachsenen Interesses am Christen-
tum zwischen verschiedenen Funktionen der Erweckung unterscheiden müsse: “For some individuals, the change was tangible and long lasting. For others, it was rather an experi-
mentation with strategies for colonial survi-
val.” (106)

Im fünften Kapitel Separation behandelt
Fisher die Gründung eigenständiger Ge-
meinden. Diese Abspaltungen ermöglichten es den American Indians, ihren Platz in der kolonialen Gesellschaft eigenständig zu be-
stimmen, dabei die Bindungen untereinander zu stärken und nicht zuletzt ihre religiöse Praxis selbst zu gestalten und sich somit vor einer Vereinnahmung durch die anglo-ame-
rikanischen Geistlichen zu verwahren.

Die letzten beiden Kapitel untersuchen zugleich die in den 1750er Jahren begin-
nende Migration in den Westen Nordame-
rikas, zum anderen aber auch die Motive und Schicksale derjenigen, die sich entschieden hatten, in Neuengland zu bleiben. Wie stark Fisher dabei den Aspekt der “agency” betont, wird am Ende des letzten Kapitels deutlich, wenn er hervorhebt, dass “the varying paths of the Native individuals and communities that made up the New England Indian landscapes in the early nineteenth century repre-
sent the diversity of decisions that Indians had been making for two centuries.” (211)

Insgesamt ist Fishers Studie eine überaus lohnende Lektüre, die vielfältige Anregungen, gerade auch in methodischer Hinsicht, bietet. So ist vor allem die Frage nach der religiösen Praxis der Native Americans, die sich zum Teil nur recht mühevoll aus den unterschiedlichen Quellen herauspräparieren lässt, durchaus nachahmenswert. Man hätte sich an einigen Stellen jedoch einen Blick auf weitere indianische Stämme in Neuengland gewünscht, um die hier gezeigten Ergebnisse besser vergleichen, beziehungsweise noch stärker kontextualisieren zu können.


Bonn
Benedikt Brunner


Den meisten Raum in Teil II “Von der Religion in der Öffentlichkeit zur öffentlichen Theologie der Revolutionszeit” nimmt die


3. Die Amerikanische Revolution wird zugunsten des Einflusses kirchlicher Gruppen als Ereignis und Prozess dargestellt, die vollkommen einmalig, ohne Verankerung in der atlantischen Welt dastünden und somit indirekt den ebenso häufig wie fälschlich deklara-


Insgesamt gewinnt man Einblicke in kleine Facetten religiös verbrämter Propaganda zugunsten frühneuzeitlicher Vorstellungen von Wenden und vom Widerstand beruflicher Eliten, Politiker, Pamphletisten und Prediger, und hofft auf Erweiterungen, die auch andere, nicht minder einflussreiche Kirchen und religiöse Gemeinschaften innerhalb Nordamerikas/der USA der Zeit in den Blick nehmen, die nicht ganz so simpel und missverständlich verortbar sind, wie auf S. 49 geschehen. Die religiöse Topographie war deutlich differenzierter und das religiös-politische Leben in den USA war ungeachtet späterer Mystifizierungen nicht vom neuenglischen Puritanismus dominiert.

Hamburg Claudia Schnurmann


As Gary Nash writes in the final chapter of Quakers and Abolition, “The story of Quaker leadership in the abolition movement has been known and proudly recounted by Friends and friends of Friends for two centuries [...] yet public consciousness [about their activism] remains largely as it was in the days of our grandparents” (209). While Nash intends this quote to introduce his own exploration of the memory of Quaker antislavery, it also serves as a fitting conclusion to this volume, highlighting one of the chief accomplishments of the work as a whole.

To those scholars unfamiliar with the Religious Society of Friends or with its work on behalf of antislavery, Quakers and Abolition provides an excellent introduction. Each chapter illuminates important aspects of the history and theology of Quakerism, deftly navigating the reader through the at times perplexing features of Quaker faith and practice. At the same time, this volume proves much more than a primer or summary, and scholars well versed in the history of abolitionism will learn much from its contents. Editors Brycchan Carey and Geoffrey Plank bring together an impressive set of scholars whose contributions offer a richer and more complex portrait of Friends’ involvement in and leadership of the transatlantic antislavery movement than we have to date.

Too often, as in the 2006 film, “Amazing Grace,” Friends have been reduced to a mere presence in more mainstream scholarship regarding abolition. Silent, stoic, (and somewhat stodgy), they remain stock characters in the drama of antislavery. They are witnesses to the action but rarely its protagonists; as a result, they often linger at the margins and in the shadows of the narrative. What’s more, even those authors who highlight the Society’s involvement with antislavery tend toward an overly simplistic understanding of Friends: too often, these Quakers are good, moral, unyielding—the voice and conscience of a people. While appealing in its positivity, this portrayal is equally as distortive and erases the wide range of actions (and inaction) by Society members. There are, of course, notable exceptions—scholars such as David Bryon Davis and Christopher Brown, both often cited by the volume’s contributors, highlight the complex political, economic, and social terrain navigated by worldly Friends—but by and large, two-dimensional caricatures have prevailed.

Quakers and Abolition seeks to correct these reductive analyses. Each of the essays grew out of presentations from the stimulating and productive “Quakers and Slavery, 1657-1865” conference organized by Carey and Plank held in Philadelphia in 2010. Taking place over three days and involving scholars from both sides of the Atlantic, the exchange was dynamic and fruitful. This volume brings together fourteen of the strongest and most constructive pieces, contextualized with a valuable introduction by the editors.

The monograph is divided into three discrete thematic sections. Part I, Freedom within Quaker Discipline: Arguments among Friends, examines the varying positions held by Quakers regarding slavery from the seventeenth century to the American Civil War (8). Five essays address the range of political positions held by both better- and lesser-known Friends, a project perhaps best encapsulated by the subtitle to and argument of Jerry Frost’s essay, “Why not more Quakers?” Here, Frost calls on us to recognize the diversity of Friends across time, space, and the political spectrum, an appeal ably answered by his fellow contributors. Ellen Ross argues for the radical nature of reformer Joshua Evans’s opposition to “an interconnected market system that perpetuated war,” using Evans’s transformation as a persuasive means of understanding how “the cultivation of personal transformation is prescribed as the most critical strategy for promoting social transformation” (15). In contrast, Thomas Hamm examines the ministry of George White, who—despite his personal opposition to slavery—demanded that his fellow Hicksites abstain from participating in any political or social movements and condemned the ecumenical and reforming spirit of the Second Great Awakening as a threat to religious liberty (45). Perhaps as evidence of White’s fears, Nancy Hewitt’s essay demonstrates how Amy Kirby Post’s political convictions led her not only through a series of religious affiliations—beginning with Hicksite, Congregational, and then Progressive Friends, before embracing Unitarianism—but also inspired her to collaborate with scores of non-Quakers. Finally, in one of the more innovative pieces in the volume, Anna Vaughan Kett deploys a
sophisticated reading of material culture to illustrate how the free-labor cotton clothes embraced by Quaker families (women especially) “embedded antislavery consumption practice into everyday life, as an embodiment of individual political belief” (57).

Part II, The Scarcity of African Americans in the Meetinghouse: Racial Issues among the Quakers, also consists of five chapters that “examin[e] the predominantly white Quaker meetings and the ways white Quaker slaveholders and opponents of slavery understood race and interacted with blacks” (9). Several essays address the racial prejudice of Friends, even those inclined toward antislavery, as well as their reluctance to embrace the radical tactics of immediate abolitionism. Kristen Block’s piece importantly pivots our attention to the Caribbean, resourcefully using sparse evidence (as well as creatively interpreting the lack of evidence itself) to imagine everyday spiritual encounters between seventeenth-century Barbadian Friends and the enslaved people with whom they interacted. Andrew Diemer expands our focus to the African continent and the nineteenth-century project of colonization, drawing on a debate between Moses Sheppard, a white Quaker colonizationist, and Samuel Ford McGill, a black emigrant to Liberia, regarding the morality of slavery, the American Colonization Society, and the U.S. Constitution. James Emmett Ryan uses the diary of Charles Edward Pancoast, an ambitious young Quaker apothecary heading west to seek his fortune, to illustrate how at least one “ordinary” Friend held a lukewarm position toward antislavery and retained deeply troubling ideas about the character and intellectual capacity of African Americans. In marked contrast, Maurice Jackson argues for the role of Anthony Benezet—a “good Quaker” if ever there was one—as a “catalyst” for the transatlantic anti-slavery movement, illuminating his far-reaching impact through an exploration of his religious and political convictions, his relationship with his family and friends, and his career as an educator and activist (106). Finally, in one of the volume’s more interesting and important pieces, Christopher Densmore elucidates the complex relationship between the Quaker and free black communities in Chester County, Pennsylvania and Greenwich Township, Cumberland County, New Jersey, arguing that while some Friends protected their black neighbors from the snares of slave catchers at great personal risk and while many Friends promoted the education and advancement of the local free black community, African Americans still acutely felt Friends’ condescension and pity and resented the ways in which Quakers kept them at arm’s length.

Part III, Did the Rest of the World Notice? The Quakers’ Reputation, is composed of four essays that consider the “legacies left by the Quaker abolitionists in the wider antislavery movement and in historical memory” (10). Marie-Jeanne Rossignol crucially expands our perspective to France, exploring the friendship between J. Hector St. John de Crèvecoeur and Jacques-Pierre Brissot de Warville—forged in part as a result of their shared admiration of the Society—and the impact of their writings on the antislavery cause before, during, and after the French Revolution. Dee Andrews and Emma Jones Lapsansky-Werner cast fresh light on Thomas Clarkson (also an important friend of Brissot), persuasively arguing that his “Quaker trilogy” (A Portrait of Quakerism [1806], The History of the Abolition of the African Slave Trade [1808], and The Memoirs of William Penn [1813]) introduced a new kind of “transformative history” that both “combine[d] the empirical drive of social science with the passion of social reform” (195) and “legitimiz[ed] radical—and internationally relevant—reform” (203). James Walvin’s essay pairs nicely with Andrews’s and Lapsansky-Werner’s, as it illuminates the decisive role of Friends in moving abolitionism toward becoming a “public,” “popular” and, indeed, “national” cause (166, 173). Gary Nash offers a valuable and fitting final essay that explains how textbooks erased the leadership of Quakers for two reasons: first, the authors (mostly from New England) remained disapproving of Friends’ theology, particularly their pacifism and stance regarding women’s equality, and second, the racist stereotypes of African Americans and Native Americans deployed by these authors made it impossible to include Quakers’ different attitudes toward and actions on behalf of either group. Lastly, it is worth noting that the volume concludes with a cumulative (and exhaustive) bibliography. This resource is a welcome and invaluable tool for scholars interested in deepening or broadening their knowledge about the role of the Religious Society of Friends in the anti-slavery movement.

The essays contained within Quakers and Abolition, both individually and taken
together, present a nuanced portrait of the Society and its members. Most chapters focus on particular individuals (an understandable approach given their origins as conference papers), and this orientation is both a strength and a weakness of the volume. The discrete pieces work quite well together and the reader will undoubtedly come away with an appreciation for the diversity of Society members, the variety of political stances held by them, and the divergent paths that led them to these conclusions. At times, however, the reliance on individual stories distracts slightly from the larger story that Quakers and Abolition seeks to convey about the role of the Society of Friends in the transatlantic anti-slavery movement, focusing our attention instead on the efforts of a small set of distinct individuals. The editors strive to provide a more comprehensive argument regarding the Society as a whole in their introduction, but more of this kind of approach could have been helpful in a few more of the essays.

Quakers and Abolition is an important and timely volume. Carey and Plank, along with the fourteen authors contained therein, present thorough and judicious analyses of both Quakers and abolitionism. The book is remarkably transatlantic (in its contributors and its subjects) and will serve to expand and enrich our analyses of the British and American antislavery movement(s). The authors collectively contribute much to our understanding of Quaker history, the history of slavery, and the history of abolition. Perhaps even more importantly, the volume achieves that which it set out to accomplish: to “raise as many questions as [it] answer[s] and encourage further research into the relationship between Quakers and slavery in the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries” (10).

San Francisco
Sarah Crabtree

Steve Longenecker’s micro-historical study attempts to carve out the significance of Gettysburg beyond its role as the site of a three-day Civil War battle, or its place in the name of Lincoln’s address as he dedicated the Soldier’s National Cemetery. Longenecker seeks to uncover Gettysburg by shifting the focus away from the stifling legacy of the war and to the town as representing small-town America in the antebellum Border North (1). Longenecker’s project is to read Gettysburg through the lens of three key terms—refinement, diversity, and race—in order to demonstrate that this small town was indicative of antebellum trends and tendencies in the larger Border North as well as on the national level (1). In so doing, Gettysburg hovers between the special and the ordinary: while it was “typically American” in subscribing to a “pursuit of material gain and improvement” (i.e., refinement), Longenecker calls Gettysburg “unusually diverse and modern” (33) for its rural setting. Relating the key terms to their significance for and within religion and religious practices in this “intriguing” (33) town of Gettysburg is supposedly the core of Longenecker’s study. As the chapters progress, however, one might argue that what he calls once “race,” “diversity,” or “war” might actually be at the heart of the matter.

Longenecker’s outline is straightforward. He first introduces Gettysburg and its inhabitants, its history and development, and, most importantly, its various religious congregations. He then moves on to highlight the different characteristics of refinement, diversity, and war “in theory” and “in practice” (chs. 2 and 3), as well as their interplay with lived religious practices in Gettysburg: refinement as “the quest for improvement” (1) among the middle-class touched, for example, the church buildings as well as “polished worship” (2); diversity in Gettysburg, for Longenecker, comprises not only denominational but also doctrinal, educational, and ethnic diversity (3). The war’s impact on religion in town, so Longenecker’s conclusion, was only “moderate” (5), in the sense that most congregations recovered rather quickly and resumed their “routine” after July, 1863 (5). Therefore, the actual battle only figures in the last chapter, and although there is a factual account of the lead-up and its course of action, the focus is put on its aftermath and direct impact on the inhabitants and religious communities. This is part of Longenecker’s strategy to de-nationalize the Battle of Gettysburg and to contradict the superlatives of historiography that have contributed to turning it into an American lieu de mémoire.

The book chapters are interspersed with so-called “divertimentos”—the actual methodological coup of the author. In these brief introductions of select Gettysburg families and individuals—the Steenburgen Schmuckers, Sallie Myers, the Codoris, the Briens, the Sherfys, and Thaddeus Stevens—Longenecker achieves introducing the reader to the personal composition of the town’s microhistory and establishes a direct link between readers and the local community. The title is misleading, however. Despite Longenecker’s definition, the divertimentos are not “light” entertainment (8), as one would expect from what was originally a musical piece. Rather, they are “serious” (8) short biographies in line with the author’s bottom-up approach to his study and offer an alternative history of Gettysburg and the battle of 1863.

Indeed, the divertimentos engage the reader and, eventually, are at the heart of a substantial reevaluation of the battle not just as an event of national significance, but as having an impact on the level of a small town and its inhabitants. By the time the actual battle figures in the book, the Gettysburg cosmos has unfolded before the reader, who is now equally taken in by the drama and “surreal” character (151) of the war. We are able to identify the farms of the Briens, the Sherfys, and the Codoris on Emmitsburg Road where the two armies face off, with Union troops occupying the Sherfy’s peach orchard (146). The reappearance of these characters throughout the different chapters underlines an interconnectedness between micro and macro that reaches a climax during the battle. As representatives of the Gettysburg community and its religious congregations, ethnicities, and races, these individuals show that Longenecker’s key terms are the effects of the people who shape them. Longenecker seems to have understood this well, for the Coda follows up on the individual fates and stories of the families—post-Civil War.

Eventually, the narratological choice of the divertimentos creates an effect which weighs
more heavily, perhaps, than the portrait of Gettysburg religion in its shapes and forms, and foregrounds the ambivalent key term of “race/war.” For example, the portrait of Samuel Schmucker, otherwise an important Lutheran theologian in town (9), shows that race was as crucial in his life as religion, refinement, and education. Longenecker focuses notably on his marriage to Mary Steenbergen, daughter of a Southern slaveholder, who brings slaves—Longenecker also likes to call them “servants” repeatedly (11,12)—into the marriage and into Gettysburg (10). Also, although Longenecker claims that the Civil War impact on religion was but moderate in Gettysburg, one of the two congregations which suffered dramatically is AME Zion (6; next to the German Lutherans), the African American Methodists with whom Abraham and Elizabeth Brien are worshipping. The example makes Longenecker’s statement that the Civil War left “intact refinement, diversity, and race” (6) somewhat incoherent.

The most obvious problem with Longenecker’s study is the inconsistent use of “race” and “war” throughout the chapters, with race appearing on the book cover, for example, while in other instances, it seems to indicate another layer of diversity (ch. 5), whereas “war” is identified as one of the “trends” (1) in the antebellum Border North. It appears to be an underlying assumption that “race” and “war” were mutually influential, but it remains unclear why Longenecker uses the terms in specific instances. Also, the author identifies the setting of the Border North for the purposes of his study objectively as “Gettysburg and the southern Pennsylvania region along the border with Maryland” (6), but shifts meaning at the end of his introduction as “the borderline between freedom and slavery” (8), which leaves a different impression altogether, suggesting a much stronger emphasis on “race” to be expected in the book.

In sum, Longenecker’s reconsideration of Gettysburg and the impact of the Civil War on one of its most famous sites are well taken. He puts it back on the map under a different set of parameters, appreciating the micro-level of community and religious practices that the weight of the July, 1863 battle has tended to ignore. However, the three lenses of refinement, diversity, and race (or, war?), while important aspects of antebellum Gettysburg life, are used inconsistently. Longenecker underlines again and again, almost tediously, how “diverse” Gettysburg’s religious landscape had been, and how it had almost been left unshaken by the War, whereas his assertion that tolerance in the area was “imperfect” (4) is an important statement on the “numerous trials” for the local African American community, both religious and secular.

Mainz

Nele Sawallisch

For many people, the name “Mark Twain” is synonymous with American humor. Therefore, it is worth noting that this book says very little about humor, in fact the term’s entry in the index is shorter than that on “hell.” Berkove and Csicsila regard Twain’s gift of narrative and humor as simply a surface feature that served to establish and maintain his popular appeal, but does not have enough weight to justify Twain’s status as “one of literature’s most accomplished writers” (xiv). Similarly, the authors pay virtually no attention to the regional and historical dimensions of Twain’s work that are a mainstay of traditional scholarship. Instead, it is their ambition to identify the fundamental values, convictions, and the literary strategies which establish the unifying bond that connects all of Twain’s writings and thus provides a consistency to his work that is the true hallmark of the literary artist. In this endeavor, entertaining episodes of life in the West, adventures along the Mississippi River, the pranks of Tom Sawyer and Huck Finn, and imaginary excursions into the world of King Arthur are nothing more than means to an end. Twain’s main purpose, the authors contend, is to “expose life as a cruel hoax” (136) and to identify “an ingénious, deceptive, and malevolent” (11) God as its cause.

To substantiate their ideas, Berkove and Csicsila take on the task of explaining how religion, and more specifically Calvinism, served as a powerful, if painful, catalyst for Twain’s literary imagination. The authors’ approach is plausible and promising. In his noteworthy observation about the role of religion in the United States, Tocqueville stated that “there is no country in the world where the Christian religion retains a greater influence over the souls of men than in America.”1 The statement appeared in the American translation of Tocqueville’s book in 1838, three years after the birth of Mark Twain, or rather Samuel Langhorne Clemens, and may serve as a reminder that nineteenth-century American culture in general, and American literature in particular, unfolded under the influence of a powerful belief system.

In view of this situation it may be surprising to see that, as Berkove and Csicsila note in their introductory chapter, the topic of religion has been “mentioned in Tocqueville’s book in 1838, three years after the birth of Mark Twain, or rather Samuel Langhorne Clemens, and may serve as a reminder that nineteenth-century American culture in general, and American literature in particular, unfolded under the influence of a powerful belief system.

The list of in-depth studies of the role of religion in the works of Mark Twain includes the following titles: Harold K. Bush, Mark Twain and the Spiritual Crisis of His Age (Tuscaloosa: U of Alabama P, 2007); Cyril Clemen, Mark Twain’s Religion (Webster Groves Mo: International Mark Twain Society, 1935); Allison Ensor, Mark Twain & the Bible (Lexington: U of Kentucky P, 1969); Joe B. Fulton, The Reverend Mark Twain: Theological Burlesque, Form, and Content (Columbus: Ohio State UP, 2006); John Q. Hays, Mark Twain and Religion: A Mirror of American Eclecticism (New York: P. Lang, 1989); William C.S. Pellowe, Mark Twain, Pilgrim from Hannibal (Philadelphia: R. West, 1945); William E. Phipps, Mark Twain’s Religion (Macon GA: Mercer UP, 2003).

Their endeavor is further motivated by a situation which they experience as unsatisfac-

tory: In the history of Twain scholarship, critics have given divided testimony on the merits of Twain's books. Although some of his works have received praise for their narrative power and topical relevance, they have also been criticized for supposed technical defects. Secondly, Berkove and Csicsila take issue with the fragmentary and contradictory nature of Twain criticism. The existence of multiple interpretations means that “they cannot all be true” and they also make it impossible to see that “Twain’s artistry was somehow more sophisticated and integrated than the constantly changing state of biography suggested” (xiv). Based on the contention that “religion was a main concern of Twain’s during his entire life” (1), they proceed to reveal to the reader that there is “unity of purpose and consistency in Twain’s literature” (xv). This unity, they claim, is provided by a “sense of the ultimate relationship of humanity and God to each other.” According to the two authors, this is “the common theme of all his literature” (2). More specifically, the keystone to Twain’s writings is his conviction “that because of God’s malice life is deceitful and humans are not meant to achieve in it their dearest goals of freedom, happiness, and fulfillment” (2). It is the essence of what the two authors call his “countertheology” (a term they borrow from Stanley Brodwin), the personal creed that emerged from Twain’s antagonism to the theology which had dominated his life since his boyhood days.

To argue their case, Berkove and Csicsila first lay out their premises, define their terms, and supply the necessary background information for an understanding of the Calvinism that was the driving force for Twain’s intellectual and moral struggle. In chapter one, the reader learns that Calvinist dogma was imposed on him during his childhood in Hannibal, Missouri, and that it stayed with him throughout his entire life. “The religious folly you are born in you will die in.” Twain explained in an 1884 letter to William Dean Howells (9). Nevertheless, Twain resented Calvinism—he regarded its rules as unfair, deceptive, and cruel. He could never understand why and how a supposedly benevolent God would punish his creation for committing acts which resulted not from free will, but were preordained. Despite his resentment of Calvinist thought, he was never able to free himself from its impact and it manifested itself in the following tenets of his countertheology:

1. God exists, but He is malevolent;
2. human existence is an evanescent phenomenon, a dream;
3. the “Moral Sense” is an agent of human degradation;
4. the human race is inherently corrupt;
5. virtue is impossible, therefore humans cannot be saved;
6. predestination makes human freedom impossible;
7. most humans are so depraved that they deserve to go to hell;
8. there is no escape from predestination, God will never change His mind; and
9. human conscience serves only as a device to create inner turmoil and suffering.

In the following six chapters, Heretical Fictions turns to the texts which the authors selected as their primary sources to support and illustrate their ambitious claims. Berkove and Csicsila focus on Twain’s major fiction; they leave travel books and minor writings aside (6-7).

Chapter two, on Roughing It (1872), makes the case that the book has been misunderstood and underestimated as an entertaining but insufficiently organized travel book. In reality, the authors argue, it is an “artful work of fiction” (35) whose intricate structure, intellectual power, and central theme justify calling it a “novel” (38). In their intensive analysis of the book, the authors identify and draw attention to previously overlooked literary techniques such as the use of “detached sketches” (29), the misleading past tense” (31), the “layered style” (55) and the “diverted target” (56). Most importantly, under the influence of the “Sagebrush School” Twain becomes a master of the literary hoax and develops it to a new level of artistry (28). As a matter of fact, the hoax constitutes the central element in Roughing It because it also serves to trick his readers into accepting the illusory attractions of travel and life in the Far West. In the final analysis, the book is revealed to be “a work which bleakly surveys life as rigged by predestination and the vain dream of evading God’s doom” (30). As such, it can be regarded as the early entry point into the distinctive thematic pattern that became characteristic for the fiction of Twain’s most creative period.

The chapter devoted to The Adventures of Tom Sawyer (1876) continues and advances

---

previous critical attempts to move the book away from its reputation as simply an entertaining boys book and to establish it as a serious work of fiction. This is achieved by an intensive and detailed analysis of illustrative textual examples which highlight patterns of violence, horror, and despair, culminating in a portrait of life in a repressive small town. In contrast to the predominant readings of The Adventures of Tom Sawyer as a nostalgic depiction of a boyhood idyll, the present interpretation suggests an unsettling vision of human life that is brought about by a religious creed that denies the possibility of escape from a hopeless destiny (79).

Like its two preceding chapters, the chapter on Adventures of Huckleberry Finn (1884) seeks to distance itself from most of the traditional readings of the novel. While Berkove and Csicsila acknowledge that the book is concerned with freedom, they reject the notion, originally advanced by Leo Marx, that it affirms freedom and claim that the last ten chapters fail to adequately sustain the main theme (83). By way of a systematic and cogent argumentation the two authors explain why, at the end of the book, neither Huck nor Jim are truly free. Their reading shows that Huck is “steadily debased and forced to relinquish the maturity, humanity, and independent personality he had begun to achieve” (103). “Lighting out for the Territory,” that is, escaping to the American West to find freedom, was a romantic idea but definitely not a solution that could provide a convincing conclusion to the problems and dilemmas Huck had encountered throughout the narrative. The section that explains why the idea of Jim’s freedom was equally misleading is perhaps even more important for contradicting the claim that the book illustrates a road to freedom. With reference to the historical facts, the authors point out that Jim was not a free man, but a free man of color—an important distinction which meant that Jim was still vulnerable to all kinds of white aggression (103). As a consequence, Berkove and Csicsila propose that the book “is best read as a novel which depicts the impossibility of any meaningful measure of freedom for any of its characters” (84). Once this realization has sunk in, the supposed thematic inconsistencies are resolved and reveal themselves as features of a coherent, if tragic vision of human existence. Like in previous examples, the authors insist that Twain, through his use of humor and entertaining de-
That Corrupted Hadleyburg" as “the high water-mark for Twain antipathy for humankind” (196), they also notice that the writer’s view of humanity now made room for a slightly more compassionate attitude. As “Letters from the Earth” dwells upon the actions of an unjust and cruel God, humans appeared as helpless victims who deserved pity and sympathy.

In their final paragraph, the authors conclude that Twain was neither an atheist nor a misanthrope. They see him as an individual entrapped by a powerful religious creed, one that had terrible implications for the notions of human freedom and happiness. As he witnessed the clash between human hopes and ideals, on the one hand, and a reality dominated by injustice and undeserved suffering caused by a pitiless divine scheme on the other, Twain felt compelled to “describe reality as he saw it in practice” (213). It was a desperate attempt to “[bring] light to humankind” (214) and relieve his fellow humans from their mistaken notions of what life was about. It is here that Berkove and Csicsila locate the central key for an understanding of Twain’s work and an adequate appreciation of his art.

Based on the most thorough acquaintance with a large body of primary material, supported by a deep familiarity with the significant scholarship in the field, aware of the relevant contextual factors, and sustained by solid evidence and convincing arguments, Heretical Fictions is a major addition to Mark Twain studies. Students will appreciate the rigorous textual work and the jargon-free language; scholars will be rewarded by the challenging insights and the ambitious claims set forth by two experts with an impeccable reputation in their field. Although the chapters are designed to build up and support the overarching argument of the book, they will also provide illuminating insights and supplement more traditional readings when they are read individually. As one of the rare attempts to undertake the ambitious endeavor to reveal the intellectual and ideological core that lends unity and substance to Mark Twain’s writings, Heretical Fictions clearly deserves a place on the shelves of academic and private libraries alike.

Magdeburg Holger Kersten


Nach einer knappen Einleitung, der er freilich an einer präzisen Definition, ja sogar überhaupt an einer Diskussion der beiden zentralen analytischen Termini „Culture“ und „Catholicism“ gebricht, beginnt der Band mit einem ausführlichen Überblicksartikel aus der Feder von Fr. Gerald P. Fogarty, SJ, einem der besten Kirchenhistoriker der USA. Kenntnisreich, souverän und nuanciert führt der Jesuit in die Zeitgeschichte des amerikanischen Katholizismus von den ausgehenden 1950er Jahren bis zur Gegenwart ein. Er geht auf den sozialen Wandel innerhalb des Katholizismus, insbesondere auf die Suburbanisierung und ihre Folgen für das katholische Milieu ein. Vollkommen zu Recht hebt Fogarty die problematischen Folgen hervor, welche der Wegzug der Mittelklasse in die Vororte der Großstädte für das interne Gefüge der überkommenen ethnischen Pfarreien, insbesondere der Iren, Hispanics, Polen, Italiener und Deutschen, hatte. Die—mitunter triumphal und überhöhte eine Bindung von Laien und Klerus verlor sich; der klerikale Nachwuchs blieb zunehmend aus. Hatte man um 1960 noch damit gerechnet, binnen weniger Jahrzehnte rund 100.000 Seminaristen in der Vorbereitung für das priesterliche Amt gewinnen zu können, so meldeten die Priesterseminare 2004 gerade einmal rund 4.300 Kandidaten, denen Fogarty etwas boshaft unterstellte, schlechter ausgebildet und weniger an intellektuellen Debatten interessiert zu sein als ihre Vorgänger, die gleichfalls...


Stärker theoriegeleitet ist demgegenüber der Artikel von Thomas Schulte-Umberg, der sich eingehend mit interkulturellen Prozessen innerhalb migrantischer Milieus im amerika- nischen Katholizismus beschäftigt, wobei er das Verhältnis zwischen Deutschen und Iren

Im Anschluß an die historische Sektion folgen einige Beiträge zum Themenfeld Katholizismus und Medien, die von Ferdinand Oertels materialreichem Aufsatz zur Geschichte und Funktion der katholischen Presse eingeleitet werden. Dabei greift er weit in das 19. Jahrhundert zurück, um sich dann erst der Blütephase der katholischen Presse vor dem Zweiten Vatikanischen Konzil und schließlich der Gegenwart zu widmen. Insbesondere verweist der erfahrene Journalist Oertel auf die apologetische Funktion der Kirchenpresse in einem teilweise gewalttätig antikatholischen Umfeld im 19. und frühen 20. Jahrhundert. Zu Recht hebt er – gegen Lukens und Comp-
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staatlich-katholischen Beitrags zur amerikanischen Literatur, zu der wohl auch noch Julien Green zu rechnen wäre, liegen könnte.

wäre es, sich die Frage zu stellen, was man unter “katholisch” in der Gegenwart normativ und qualitativ zu verstehen hat.  

München Michael Hochgeschwender

On March 30, 1981, President Ronald Reagan was shot by a deranged man, John Hinckley, Jr. This well-known tidbit of US-American history is one of the examples Felix Krämer uses to illustrate the production of what he calls “moral leadership” in the televised evening news. He locates this figure at the intersection of media production, white hegemonic masculinity, and the new religious politics in the 1970s and 1980s. In contrast to earlier Presidents, like Richard Nixon who, after his resignation, had become so ill he was sent to the hospital and was portrayed in the news as a frail, sickly, and defeated body (119), Reagan “proved” his virility by walking upright into the hospital (159-63, 176-78). There, he was “born again,” not only by surviving a punctured lung and heavy blood loss, but also as an exemplary leader who bested the erratic attack of a madman and showed the magnanimity to forgive him (180). Hinckley, the shooter, who inspired by the movie Taxi Driver had sought to impress actress Jodi Foster through his action, was declared legally insane. In the media coverage, Hinckley and Reagan came to symbolize violent, immoral anomy and decisive, moral leadership respectively, inscribing the dichotomy between good and evil into the public discourse (163-67). In the figure of Reagan, the combination of virility and virtue crystalized, making his blood a relic, the bartering of which made the evening news in 2012 (385).

Felix Krämer is a historian focusing on North America, discourse analysis, and gender studies. The reviewed book, written in German and published in 2015, was adapted from his dissertation submitted to the Westfälische-Whilhelms University, Münster in 2012. In Moral Leaders, Krämer undertook the herculean task of analyzing two decades of evening news of the three major US-American TV stations ABC, CBS, and NBC, translating the audio-visual discourse not only into text but also into German. Critical of an apparent crisis of masculinity during the 1970s and startled by the emergence of the New Christian Right at the end of that decade (386, 387), Krämer studiously examined the evening news to figure out how the media facilitated the enjoining of religious virtue and virility and produced a dispositive of (male, white, heterosexual) moral leadership, cumulating in the figure of the President as pastor.

The first three chapters of the book follow a loosely chronological order, moving from the media portrayal of various insurgent movements and related topics in the 1970s to the emergence of the new Christian Right in the late 1970s, and the coalescence of religion and politics at the time of Reagan’s election as US-President at the turn of the decade. The following two chapters investigate the media production of two distinct clusters—knowledge, church service, space; and pastor, medium, man—and the last chapter assembles a collage of the 1980s, the “decade of destiny.” In his quest to “reorganize messages and media for the contemporary U.S. history” (book jacket blurb), Krämer analyzed the complex field of interconnected discourses, researched along a multitude of variegated search terms, including “abortion, crisis, disease, evil, evangelical, homosexuals, leadership, masculinity, moral values, sexuality, weakness” (29). He not only investigated the portrayal and production of these notions in the medium of televised evening news, he also theorized “the evangelical university,” “the church service,” and “the figure of the pastor” as forms of media and included an analysis of their construction in the evening news (11). He showed how religious television shows adopted the format of news shows and how pastors styled themselves as news anchors, and especially how the pastor and the church became newsworthy and then normalized into the repertoire of evening news. Krämer’s conclusion that the supposedly distinct spheres of religion and politics could no longer be differentiated in the 1980s evening news (388) concur with the findings of sociologists of religion like Allan Wolfe or Jeremy Stolow who observe trends of the integration of religion like Allan Wolfe, The Transformation of American Religion: How We Actually Live Our Faith (New York, NY: Free Press, 2003); Jeremy Stolow, “Religion, Media, and Globalization,” in: Bryan S. Turner (ed.), The New Blackwell Companion to the Sociology of Religion (Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), pp. 544-62.
of the enjoining of religion and politics in the 1980s is told. Krämer talks of “genealogically following the traces of the figure of moral leadership backwards into the tele-visualization of the emancipation movement between 1969 and 1975” (paraphrased, 31). Even when critically reporting on the reactions of religio-political leaders like Jerry Falwell to a liberal-emancipatory agenda, mainstream TV stations thus provided them with a platform to popularize their ideas and establish them amongst the inventory of “utterable” notions. For the purpose of showing the free exchange of terminology and liberal borrowing of religious notions, Krämer integrates an analysis of the Moral Majority Report, the newsletter of the most prominent New Christian Right organization Moral Majority (especially 184-190), into his narrative of the 1980s. In this first part of the book, Krämer elaborates that “religion was communication and mainstream-journalism was part of this communication and not an investigative outside” (190). TV made religious leaders’ utterances news and thus facilitated the introduction of the figure of the pastor into politics, the most prominent example being Falwell, the Moral Majority leader and head of a religious imperium complete with a TV station and university.

The second part of the book traces the “channels” through which religious knowledge was transferred into the public (255), focusing on the knowledge production of the “media” of 1) the religious university and 2) the church service in chapter four and 3) the figure of the pastor in chapter five. Using Pat Robertson’s CBN University and Falwell’s Lynchburg Baptist/ Liberty College as examples, Krämer describes the New Christian Right’s knowledge production and transmission as based on religious empires of university and church grouped around one leader (198, 199). Pastors used these spaces but also the public space of television, creating new formats like the religious entertainment show and the religious news show (200). Secular news anchors helped them become public and political figures by reporting on televangelism as news (230) and through their perpetual attempt to inform and warn their audiences about these religious figures (260). By reporting their “overreaching critique, ABC, CBS, and NBC,” according to Krämer, “inscribed pastors with political relevance” (284). Televised evening news thus produced the pastor as “individual star, as TV redeemer” (300), linking masculine virility with religious virtue in the figure of the white moral leader (305, 315). While televangelists played an important role in creating this figure, it existed independently, and actually was most effectively used not by TV-pastors (Pat Robertson failed in his race for the Presidency, 310-18) but by a politician. While Krämer argues that the figure existed independently of particular persons, he nonetheless insists that it was best embodied by Ronald Reagan.

The last chapter is dedicated to an overview of the mediatized body-politics of the 1980s, discussing topics like AIDS, gender, father’s day, and ethnic minorities. It serves to illustrate that the norm body in the evening news was conceived of as white, Christian, heterosexual, and male, all attributes Krämer ascribes to the figure of moral leadership.

The overall argument of Moral Leaders is plausible and the source work impressive. Occasionally, however, one feels that in-depth arguments were foreshortened in favor of breadth, and discussions of literature were forsaken in favor of readability. Accordingly, an analysis of the Moral Majority Report as well as subchapters like the interlude introducing two religious institutions of higher learning, Liberty College and Regent University (212-22), would have deserved their own study. Also, the sheer breadth of topics covered in the book often left the reader breathless and wondering whether any comprehensive insights could follow from jumping, for example, from feminism (46), to abortion (50), to church (59), to homosexuality (63), to blacks (74), to black Muslims (81) in a matter of pages, especially when the argument was exclusively derived from the sources without any reference to literature to facilitate social and historical contextualization. Furthermore, one would have wished for greater clarity in the use of terminology, especially the main terms. One gets the impression that “moral leadership” was simply the label attached to a discursive formation, and another pair of words aligning religion and politics, like “religious politics” might have served as well. The study would have profited from an engagement with findings and theses from the history and sociology of religion. This would have helped to explain and substantiate claims like the one that the transmission of religion into TV-scapes during the 1980s was “more than civil religious adoration” (245), especially when sociologists
like Robert Wuthnow have described public forms of evangelicalism precisely as civil religion.\(^2\) Moreover, the uncritical use of the term “evangelical” for all Protestant actors appearing in the public arena of televised evening news ran afoul at the latest when Krämer classified Mark Noll, one of the foremost evangelical thinkers, as “left or liberal” (199). As sociologist Christian Smith has argued, journalists played a part in obliterating the discriminatory power of the term “evangelical” by using it indiscriminately for various Protestant movements like Fundamentalism, Evangelicalism, and Pentecostalism and applying it also to the religiously inspired activists of the New Christian Right.\(^3\) In regards to religion, Krämer thus reproduced in parts a journalistic discourse he sought to analyze.

*Moral Leaders* is a pioneering study opening up the genre of television evening news to discourse analysis. In his ambitious study, Krämer roamed widely across the fields of gender-, race-, and media-studies and studies of the New Christian Right. He succeeded in presenting a readable account of the coalescence of religion and politics in TV-scapes of the 1970s and 1980s and convincingly argued that this new figure of what he called “moral leadership” culminated and was embodied in President Ronald Reagan.

Mainz

Anja-Maria Bassimir
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SEBASTIAN EMLING and KATJA RAKOW, Moderne religiöse Erlebniswelten in den USA. “Have Fun and Prepare to Believe!” (Berlin: Reimer Verlag, 2014), 266 pp.

Can spirituality be expressed through “modern religious experience worlds?” The answer is in the affirmative. Are religions, when marketed to appeal to broad audiences, inevitably watered down? Not necessarily. The volume documents the outcomes of the DFG-funded project “Moderne religiöse Erlebnisgesellschaften” at the Institute for Religious Studies at the University of Heidelberg and is the first publication in the new book series Transformierte Religionen. The authors, Katja Rakow and Sebastian Emling, present their field research of two key evangelical organizations in the U.S.: the Lakewood Church in Houston, Texas, and the Creationism Museum in Petersburg, Kentucky.

Lakewood is currently the biggest neo-pentecostal megachurch in the U.S., attracting over 43,000 people to its seven services each week. In 2005 it moved into a former basketball arena with 9,000 parking spaces, an auditorium featuring 16,000 seats and a huge stage framed by two artificial waterfalls, providing space for a choir, orchestra, and three big screens. Aided by over 4,000 volunteers, the church is headed by Pastor Joel Osteen—the so-called “Smiling Preacher” (Washington Post, January 2005) and “a religious specialist and entrepreneur on the American market of religion” (10)—which also makes the church the site of his eponymous and (inter)nationaly broadcasted TV-show. In turn, Lakewood serves both the local and the (inter)national community (96-103). As Rakow comments, the structure and atmosphere of the building is deliberately left neutral and reminds her more of a conference venue than a church (11). A similar observation about the lack of resemblance to a church is made by Emling, who compares the Creationism Museum to a shopping mall (15). Within the first five years since its opening in 2007, the museum has attracted over five million visitors and is led and financed by Answers in Genesis (AiG) with Ken Ham serving as its president. AiG is the most influential and successful Young Earth-Creationism organization, a Christian-apologetic body with over 300 employees, its own monthly magazine (Answers), and over 900 international radio stations (121). The 6,200m² complex located at Interstate 275 features not only the museum, a cafeteria, and book and souvenir store but also outdoor facilities such as a lake and a petting zoo.

Taken together, the authors make three crucial claims and thereby revise scientific and common preconceptions of evangelicalism especially held by Europeans: First, against the tendency to portray them as hard-liner, conservative fundamentalists who denounce modern technology¹, both authors present evangelical organizations as heterogeneous, complex, adaptive, and innovative religious providers on the competitive American religious marketplace. Second, by positioning themselves against the “text-only” religious scientists (49-67), Rakow and Emling convincingly argue that religions bind their members through an effective interplay of cognitive, affective, and sensual impulses. Both institutions are described in detail (location, facilities, design, worship services, exhibits, workshops, media used) as “modern religious experience worlds” which compete on the market and deliberately use medial, material, and aesthetic forms of presentation as strategies to both recruit and bind (new) members as well as to convey their religious doctrines. Third, the authors contend that by presenting religion as a multi-media, multi-sensual experience it is not—as some scholars such as Mara Einstein, Richard Cimino and Don Lattin suggest—“watered down” depriving it of its ability to empower.² Hence, providing German readers with a survey on contemporary US-Evangelicalism is both timely and warranted.³


³ See also Rahel Gersch, Frommer Individualismus: Die Lakewood Church und die
After a short introduction (9-29) the study is divided into four parts: part I synthesizes the scholarship on the economics (30-48) and praxeological-aesthetics of religion (49-67), especially the studies on the religious use of modern technologies in constructing “brand narratives” (a field that is currently cultivated by many scholars across the academic disciplines), and theoretically situates the study in relation to previous research on megachurches, televangelism, and creationism (69-84; 114-22). In particular, as their terminology throughout the book reveals, the authors draw upon the works of James Twitchell who views the rise of megachurches as the epitome of branding in religion. The main body of the study (parts II and III) offers an in-depth analysis of the branding strategies (economics) and the material dimension (aesthetics) of religion of both organizations.

The findings are based on the two authors’ field observations through participatory observation and interviews with responsible employees and visitors. Unfortunately, it remains unclear which guidelines the collected data follow (e.g. amount, length, standardized questionnaire, undercover research). Moreover, since interviews with worshippers in the case of Lakewood are mostly missing, it falls short of analyzing the “consumer’s” take on the offered religious “product” which, in this case, leaves the third crucial point of the study (religion is not “watered down”) open for discussion. In a similar vein, while following Clifford Geertz’s model of “thick description” allows a detailed microanalysis of these organizations, the analysis at times remains too descriptive. Especially with regard to a German audience, more context would have been helpful. For example, while the emergence and development of the religious marketplace in the U.S. is explained (43-48), the German readership might struggle with situating the discussed megachurches on the current religious marketplace. Additionally, this has led to some redundancies in each chapter which is at times tiring for the reader when, for example, the central message of the Creationism Museum—“the history in the Bible (beginning in Genesis) is true, thus the gospel (the message of salvation in Jesus Christ) based in this history is true” (Ken Ham)—is quoted three times in one chapter (on pages 186, 190, 210).

However, leaving these criticisms aside, the study presents a wealth of findings and offers an eloquent account with an innovative approach. The authors skillfully paint the picture of both organizations as market-oriented, multi-media institutions. Conceptualized as a “Full Service Church” (Lakewood Church) and as an “All-Inclusive Provider” (Creationism Museum), both offer various services beyond their customary functions like concerts, child care, workshops such as “Snakes Alive” (139-40) and adventure tours like “Dinosaur Digs” (136) (both offers of the Creationism Museum) as well as advisory ser-

\[\text{Phänomene Megachurch, prosperity gospel und charismatische Pastorenschaft (Berlin: WeißenseeVerlag, 2013). So far, no German book on the Creationism Museum has been published.}\]


\[\text{8 Twitchell, 81.}\]
vices such as Lakewood’s “Women’s Ministry Workshop” (176-80). In turn, religion becomes a transsectoral element touching upon every aspect of life (127, 185, 253). These so-called “seeker-friendly” services are designed to target the “unchurched” (74), i.e. the religiously disaffected, and form a core part of the organization’s respective brand narratives in order to position themselves on the market as independent and attractive “faith brands” with a unique profile.9 For instance, while Lakewood is one of over 35 megachurches in the Houston area alone as well as part of the “World of Faith” movement and the broader self-help discourse (68-84), it presents itself as a distinctive institution: Its history is presented in line with the prosperity gospel as the epitome of the American Dream beginning with a small community of Christians in a poor neighborhood which has within 50 years risen to be the greatest megachurch in the U.S. led by two generations of pastors of the Osteen family (84, 95). Its slogan “Oasis of Love in a Troubled World” (88) presents Lakewood as the center of healing which stands out against Houston’s Second Baptist Church’s central message as the “Fellowship of Excitement” (243-45). Moreover, unlike the Second Baptist Church, Lakewood has no denominational marker in its name and has few exterior and interior Christian markers. In a similar vein, though its church service includes religious elements, its “seeker church liturgy”10 with its high share of contemporary Christian Rock & Pop music and a so-called “message” of hope (instead of the traditional sermon) increases its entertainment value (152-65). Thus, Lakewood leaves Christian semantics and theological dogmas as a backdrop (not “watered down” but as a kind of “reduced theology”)11 making its religious reading optional in order to attract new visitors. In this gradual process of missionizing, the degree of involvement of new visitors gets more intense once they decide to participate in the various workshops and bible study groups (100, 110-11, 182).

At first glance a seemingly different, and yet at a closer look quite similar, picture emerges when compared to the Creationism Museum which takes a Biblical literalism to the Genesis creation narrative and rejects scientific theories of evolution. In contrast to Lakewood, the museum is decidedly Christian-creationistic in its brand narrative and presents the universe and life as originating from divine acts of creation. Its mission is to religiously educate the public (which according to AiG is in a state of moral crisis (133)) in order to return to a Christian foundation because only a literal study of the bible will stop young adults from turning away from churches which currently fail to convey the Christian message (124-33).

Yet, while portraying itself as a unique Christian company which offers the intellectual foundation for Christian missions of churches and other organizations, AiG is non-denominational. Moreover, like Lakewood, it employs a gradual rapprochement to convey its message in order to win over new members, especially families, through its official motto “Have Fun and Prepare to Believe” (see the sub-title of this volume), as well as through the combination of learning and entertainment. In particular, by blending cognitive and sensual impulses, AiG uses sensory contrasts of aesthetics for visitors to experience the “absence of God” (195-97) and to make the “Bible come alive” (Ham, 221). For example, the first station of its core exhibition, the “Seven C’s of History” (Creation, Corruption, Catastrophy, Confusion, Christ, Cross, Consummation), is the tranquil and comforting atmosphere of Garden Eden (200-04) which among other things features a five-meter-high waterfall with Adam and Eve presenting the beauty and perfection of God’s work. Animal sounds, artificial wind, Bible quotes through speakers, and information boards complement the scenery creating an impressive design which stimulates the visitor’s auditory, visual, haptic, and cognitive perceptions. Afterwards, the visitor is led to the “Cave of Sorrows,” a dark, small, and sound-filled room showing the “sin of Adam” which is intentionally designed as an inversion to the harmony of Garden Eden and is experienced, as Emling’s visitor interviews attest, as the most hostile place of the museum (204-07).

Both institutions, the Lakewood Church and the Creationism Museum, combine cogni-

---

9 Twitchell, 25; Einstein, 86-92, 122.
tive and “sensational forms”\textsuperscript{12} to present their teachings as multi-sensoric experiences. Their respective architectures, the components of the worship services and exhibitions, the use of music, light, and video turn both into “modern religious experience worlds.” However, while similar in their overall structure, they differ in their Christian semantics as well as their stance on the use of modern technologies: Lakewood affirms its use as a desired means to convey its religious message (239) whereas AiG views this as a necessary but undesirable means needed for evangelization but not as part of the religious experience itself (130, 137-39, 219-22). Interestingly though, as Emling’s interviews attest, the museum’s self-portrayal does not match its actual perception since its visitors view their sensual experiences not as a preliminary step but as a core part of the religious transformation (205).

Overall, this is a multifaceted study which raises the issue of how much we overlook when looking at religion only through text. The book demonstrates the importance of theories of economics and aesthetics of religion for the analysis of religious organizations and communities—though, especially with regard to the more general title, the question of how other U.S. religious traditions face the challenge of maintaining loyalties on the competitive religious market would have been well worth a discussion. This being said, the authors conclusively demonstrate that the mediation and marketing strategies of contemporary evangelical organizations sell religion as multi-sensual mass events addressing both the faithful and unchurched. While remaining “conservative” in their doctrines they use innovative techniques of communication and organization to popularize evangelicalism—having fun and believing certainly does not contradict itself.

Münster

Jana Weiß

\textsuperscript{12} Meyer, 707.

Anthologies are by nature provocative: the chosen selections will always impress some and dismay others, and, by prioritizing certain writers and values, editors make literary and political statements. There is nothing hidden, however, about the agenda behind Worlding America. Rather than aiming to create or revise a pedagogical canon (in the mode of the Norton, Heath or Bedford anthologies), this slim collection is designed to make and illustrate a critical statement about the untapped abundance of short narratives that fall within the broad category of early American writing. It is therefore an invaluable resource for two overlapping areas of scholarly interest: the evolution of the American short story and new perspectives on early American writing. Because of the sheer diversity and the plot-driven designs of the narratives, the anthology is also a great read.

The thirty selected narratives, which range from two to fifteen pages in length, are grouped into five categories: Life Writing, Female Agency, The Circum-Atlantic World, Cultures of Print, and Ghost Stories. These overlapping and eclectic subheadings reflect the anthology’s aim of being suggestive rather than exhaustive. Like boxes containing boxes, each category is divided into smaller subgroups, so that, for instance, what is meant by ‘Cultures of Print’ becomes clarified by the section’s further division into Orientalism, Migrant Fictions and Sensationalism, each of which is represented by two texts. Under Sensationalism, for example, we find a fictionalized account of a man who murdered his family because he believed God commanded it, and a revenant love story set in Italy, pirated from a French collection, and published anonymously in an American periodical. For those familiar with Brockden Brown’s Wieland and the stories of Edgar Allan Poe, the connections are appealing, and despite the editors’ assertion that this anthology is not simply an Ur-context for the emergence of the American short story, the material certainly could be used to that end. The critical headnotes mostly skirt such teleological goals and focus instead on the peculiarities of early American literary culture, including the importance of eighteenth-century periodicals in shaping these brief, plot-driven narratives, and the prevalence of literary piracy and other forms of recycling that complicate the notion of authorship.

Within the subdivided structure of the anthology we find some predictable themes and genres: captivity narrative and slavery are there, for instance. But accounts from different locales, times, and cultures are thoughtfully juxtaposed so that adjacent to the dramatic account of New England’s Hannah Duston, who scalped her captors, is the narrative of Marie Le Roy and Barbara Leininger, who were German-speaking inhabitants of eighteenth-century Pennsylvania, and whose story became as legendary as Duston’s within their community. Yoked with these captivity narratives under the joint heading Female Agency are two examples of such agency exerted through “Authorship,” a sketch entitled “Inhuman Treatment to a Negro Slave” and the “Story of Henry and Anne: Founded on Fact,” both published in 1791. We are invited to ponder what might be comparable between pursuing empowerment through surviving and writing about a captivity experience and authoring a sentimental love story or anti-slavery sketch. In the case of the story and the sketch, a generational comparison is possible since they were written at different times by a mother and daughter (Ann Eliza Bleecker and Margaretta V. Faugeres), though both published in 1791.

By highlighting texts that have been overlooked in literary historical accounts and anthologies, for reasons that we are now in a position to reverse, this collection demonstrates the valuable role that an anthology can play in post-canonical scholarship. Most of the texts gathered in Scheiding’s and Seidl’s anthology became marginalized partly because of their brevity. Because they predated the emergence of the “short story” as an aesthetic masterpiece, their shortness has perhaps been mistaken for slowness—the sketch, the circulated letter, the personal account, the plagiarized story, such even seem to present themselves sometimes as diversionary material, designed to be quickly read and then stored, passed on or laid aside. Some of the narratives were published in ephemeral journals or pamphlets, others were circulated, or in the case of Taylor’s journal, simply kept as a personal record. Worlding America does not consist of newly unearthed discoveries: specialists in the various subfields of early American studies
will be familiar with certain texts that relate to their own areas of interest. What is new is the notion that the literary qualities of being a narrative and being short offer a sufficient basis for kinship and comparative analysis.

Re-reading the handful of Puritan texts that I recognized, placed alongside narratives from eighteenth-century coffee-table periodicals, Indian legends, criminal confessions, a Jesuit relation, and a Pennsylvanian German ghost story, was very illuminating. Such comparative reading effortlessly repels the cozy exceptionalism that is generated not only by a blinkered and proleptic focus on the USA, but also by the academic tendency to fragment literary materials into cultural, geographic and linguistic subfields in order to make our critical task more manageable. *Worlding America* shows that dissolving such boundaries needn’t lead to a white-out in which all landmarks are lost and all scholars buried under an avalanche of sources. It demonstrates that with the help of careful selection, the “worlding” process will enable new connections to emerge, and the editors’ framing of their chosen texts through critical categories is an object lesson in how it can be done.

Like recent work that puts early America in an Atlantic or hemispheric context, *Worlding America* carries its readers across linguistic barriers by including narratives translated from German, Spanish and French, and some from Native American sources. Pennsylvania German culture, represented by the aforementioned captivity narrative, plus two texts by Christopher Sauer, is a particularly welcome addition. Perhaps least satisfactory is the engagement with Spanish sources, the sole representative being the first chapter of Góngora’s *The Misfortunes of Alonso Ramírez*. Although the courtly manners of this text pose a wonderful counterpoint to that of the Anglophone confessions and journals in the anthology, it appears as a token representative of Spanish colonial writing and is extracted from a longer narrative. On the other hand, “hemispheric” comparisons are now easily found elsewhere, and this collection aims instead to identify multiple crisscrossing threads in early American narrative prose that is drawn from diverse cultures and contexts. My other minor quibble is that the category “Ghost Stories” feels like a rather uncomfortable and culturally biased backwards projection when used to group together stories from Washington Irving and Christopher Sauer with origin myths involving the underworld from Maya and Penobscot traditions.

Besides using “worlding” to evoke the “transnational,” the editors also wish to accentuate the relation of early American texts to their material environments. The absence of a proto-national framework of “American literature” will, the editors propose, encourage closer attention to local material circumstances, including the circulation of texts like Duston’s story, or the shipwreck narrative by Anthony Thacher, which became embedded in books by two generations of Mathers. As Scheiding and Seidl point out, narratives published in eighteenth-century periodicals often belonged to more than one nation: some were lifted verbatim from a European publication, while others were rewritten or repackaged, and others, including Sauer’s ghost story, were spirited to a New World location to reflect the surroundings of their colonial readers. The footnotes explaining the sources of some of these narratives read like picaresque narratives in themselves and provide a fascinating demonstration of the complexity of identifying the literary origins of any story, not to mention the story of a national literature.

Speaking of literary origins, *Worlding America* offers intriguing (and corrective) reading for those interested in the evolution of the American short story by anticipating many of the features that might be assumed to arise from nineteenth-century circumstances. Points of continuity include adaptation of European folklore, concern for unity of plot, the spatial requirements of periodical publication and, in the confessions of criminals and adventurers, the forging of a connection between a reader and a rogue that is facilitated by the brevity of the text. Indeed, I would have enjoyed more discussion of the manifold uses of shortness as represented by the chosen texts. Though not a genre, brevity is the shared feature that unites these varied texts, and so the anthology implicitly invites further critical exploration of the literary dynamics of short narrative while in the introductions focusing on explaining the external pressures that shaped it. Close reading would of course be more difficult for the texts that appear in translation, but this is only to highlight the benefits of pursuing multilingualism in American Studies. The editors’ preference of foregrounding material conditions rather than aesthetic outcomes in the shaping of...
these narratives allows them to offer an excellent overview of recent trends in early American literary scholarship, including the influence of global economics, printing and distribution networks, and scribal circulation, in their headnotes and introduction. The appended bibliography is impressively wide ranging and up-to-date, and I look forward to scouring it in my own research and teaching. At the end of each section, the editors have also provided concise lists of related primary sources for further reading, thereby making the anthology easily expandable into a textbook for a semester-length course.

Cambridge
Amy Morris

The front cover of this outstanding collection shows a beadwork turtle designed by Anette Brauer with Canada’s national symbol, the maple leaf, on its back. The animal here echoes Turtle Island, a term used by many native tribes such as the Anishinaabe and Iroquois to denote North America, and by extension texts such as Thomas King’s The Back of the Turtle, and, more generally, well-known creation stories such as Beth Brant’s Mohawk version “This is History,” in which the earth is always shaped and built on the back of a turtle. The cover of Contemporary Achievements thus hints at the “Canadian cultural mosaic” and at the “Indigenous inhabitants on whose ancestral lands, Turtle Island, the beautiful mosaic was […] based” (23). As such, this book does not exclusively study Canadian and Canadian Aboriginal histories and their relations. It also examines the role of the people and peoples who populate(d) Turtle Island and had an impact on its politics, cultures, literatures, academia, and knowledge in the context of Canada’s multiculturalism policies, transnational relations and interactions with Europe and the United States. Most importantly, the “process of recognition and assertion of the Aboriginal presence in Canadian culture” (10). Celebrating these processes and achievements is Hartmut Lutz, whose expertise in American and Canadian Studies, and especially in Native American and First Nations scholarship, is reflected in the excellent compilation that is Contemporary Achievements. As a professor and guest professor at many distinguished universities in Germany, Canada, the United States, Poland, and Finland, among others, and with an extensive list of awards and publications, longstanding Indigenous Studies scholar and expert Hartmut Lutz delivers a major contribution not only to the SALC (Studies in Anglophone Literatures and Cultures) series, but to the interdisciplinary and challenging field of Indigenous Studies as a whole. The essays in this collection have all originally been published in a diverse range of internationally highly acclaimed journals and edited volumes. They have now been compiled into the edition at hand and have been organized into five thematic clusters all striving towards one major aim, namely to survey, contextualize, and give credit and voice to Canadian Aboriginal authors and texts.

Lutz’s introduction, entitled “About this book,” addresses the history of the manuscript, gives thanks to colleagues and friends who have contributed in one way or another to the making of this volume, and provides a brief overview of the contents of the book.

“Surveys of Canadian Native Literatures,” the first section of the volume, opens with an essay entitled “The Beginnings of Contemporary Aboriginal Literature in Canada 1967-72,” which, at almost 50 pages, stands as the most extensive of all essays in this collection. The author acknowledges in his introduction the length and “pedestrian enumeration of […] many little known texts” in this first chapter and advises those who may not be interested in this detailed account to skip to the next section (13). However overwhelming or dense this account may at times seem, Lutz introduces the reader to an important overview of the literary and cultural landscape of Canada from the 1960s onwards, acknowledging that the “morally repressive 1960s” (28) did “not grant Aboriginals” in Canada “the status of human subjects and contemporary citizens but define[d] and functionalisé[d] them as usable objects” (26). Texts by Aboriginals as ways of “self-expression and autonomous articulation,” denoted “[l]iterary [a]wakenings” (36-37), prominently form part of “Canadian Multicultural Literatures” ever since the late 1960s when First Nations people officially became Canadian citizens (87). Lutz argues that following the development of First Nations literatures until today, one realizes that today these texts “have moved far beyond the earlier accusations and laments written back to the colonizers” and are “reaching out to the world from a Fourth World perspective that is ‘grounded’ in Canada like no other” (104).

The second thematic cluster, “Peoples, Stories, and Places” discusses race, place, and space in Western Canadian Fiction; the relationship between land and people on several levels, going as far as the connection between geographic location and (ethnic or national) identity; and the Columbian Exchange, focusing on issues such as environmentalism and (neo)colonial ethics in historic and contemporary North America. Lutz negotiates the desire to belong to a certain place and the inability of many (Aboriginal) groups to achieve this goal. To illustrate his point, the author analyzes works by Laura Goodman.
Salverson and Margaret Laurence, who both include “place and history as agents of identity formation” (113) in their novels. Moving even further, this section explores contemporary First Nations writing and the inevitable and inextricable link between, for example, Okanagan people and their soil, as demonstrated in the writing of Jeannette Armstrong. Land is dealt with as “a historical treasure and record” (118) and is tied to the stories that come from it in a way the author so fittingly titles “Land-Locked Indigeneity” (128).

Section three, “Indians and Germans,” opens with a fascinating essay about an already well-known concept, or phenomenon, coined by the author, namely “German Indianthusiasm,” and its relation to “anti-Semitism, aggressive ethnocentrism, [and] explicit racism” (157). German Indianthusiasm, or, the German obsession with and romanticizing of the “Indian,” has been a central idea in Lutz’s scholarship for many years, mostly due to the irony that lies behind the German “yearning for all things Indian” (159) and the simultaneous “demonizing, […] dispossessing and relocating” of Indigenous peoples (160). Lutz convincingly argues that Indianthusiasm in Germany stems from a desire to “identify with the victims of history, rather than with […] historical victimizers” (161); he explores and negotiates why this phenomenon is so much more prominent in Germany than in other European countries, given the history and development of the German Reich, the (first) Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation, the Second World War and German nationalism, Germania and the Nibelungenlied as “founding fiction” of a “German(ic) ideology” with “national character” (166-67), and Karl May’s novels as “ideological props for German imperialism” (168). More recent decades have shown that Aboriginal texts from Canada are being incorporated more and more into German scholarship, addressing the German obsession with and identification with and marketing of the “iconographical construct” of the “Indian” (191). Following the first visits of Indigenous North Americans to Germany, Indianthusiasm took off, stereotyping in the process the “Indian” as the noble savage (194), the “ideal icon” (198) for marketing and advertising (e.g. Sylvester Long/Buffalo Child, Helmut Walking Eagle [198-200]), and a commodity that “satisfies escapist and narcissist dreams,” a sort of “Ersatzbefriedigung” (203-04).

Section four then deals with “Métis and Others,” and opens with an essay that, in comparison to the rest of the texts, is widely interspersed with long footnotes on terminology and background information about Métis histories and literatures. While this at times makes for a slightly choppy read, the importance of this chapter is undeniable and shows the reader just how much Métis people have moved “From Invisibility to International Interaction” (207). Only during the late twentieth century were Métis artists and activists able to make themselves heard (again) on both sides of the Atlantic (219); since then, several works (many of them dealing with Métis leader Louis Riel and his influence) have made it into German scholarship, and Lutz expects many more in the future which will “eventually help us in Europe to overcome the inadequate inventions of the past and grow more aware of the contemporary Métis as our cousins across the sea” (221).

The following two essays in this section center on Howard Adams and Sandra Cisneros, providing for an excellent transnational account and reading of both authors and their respective Métis and Chicana “autobiographic[s],” which open up a “trans-ethnic historical and literary dimension, focusing on [two groups] who are both Turtle Islanders and Europeans, both Indigenous and colonial at the same time” (241). Lutz explores the liminality of these two groups, the parallels and differences that arise in their colonial histories, terminologies, languages, geographies, demographics, religions, and nationalisms, and specifically analyzes works by Adams and Cisneros to show the dimensions of “el otro lado” or “the other side” (253)—the US and Canadian borders in Adams, and the US and Mexican borders in Cisneros. Lutz offers an important reading of the “dialogism[s]” (259) in both authors’ works, stressing the border-life struggle of not being able to be “both, and more,” but rather having to resort to “neither-nor” (259).

The last and shortest of Lutz’s sections, entitled “Inuit and Others,” tells the story of a group of eight Inuit travelers from Labrador who came to Europe but died of smallpox within a short period of time. While not much else is known about their stay, one of them, Abraham, left a diary which was later translated from his native language into English, providing us with a largely overlooked but intriguing and important source of and for
Inuit histories. As is common for Indigenous tribes in North America, the primary source of literatures are autobiographies, and while “Inuit people share a particularly rich, albeit comparatively recent autobiographical tradition” (278), Abraham’s diary and the story of the Labrador travelers was ahead of its time as it was written decades before autobiographies started being published in Canada. As such, it stands out among the few works Lutz discusses in the context of Inuit people.

With Contemporary Achievements: Contextualizing Canadian Aboriginal Literatures, Hartmut Lutz has added a major contribution to the field of Indigenous Studies which, for its variety of topics and approaches to important concerns in the context of Canadian Aboriginal literatures, makes for an indispensable read for both experts and beginners of the field. The collection could have benefitted from a comprehensive conclusion, some final remarks, or a short outlook, which would have provided even more depth to what is already a rich and impressive volume. Hartmut Lutz bears witness to both historic and ongoing struggles for Aboriginal Canadian peoples and their literatures and cultures, and opens the reader’s eyes to the transnational dimensions of Indigenous Studies and the contexts of their (neo)colonial situations, which will hopefully continue to move “From Challenges to Achievements” (9).

Wien
Alexandra Hauke
Reviews ★ Amerikastudien / American Studies 61.2


The late 2000s and early 2010s saw a considerable number of monographs and edited collections reconsidering the nexus of transnational and global American studies. Coming out of a discipline that tries to move beyond the exceptionalist legacy of Cold War American studies, transnational American studies questions established and new directions in the discipline alike, including frequently its own project and the legacy it builds on. The articles collected in Re-Framing the Transnational Turn in American Studies exemplify this trend by bringing together methodologically and thematically diverse articles that self-critically position themselves within a field in transition. The book is the result of a series of conferences that were financed through a research grant procured by scholars at the Humboldt University of Berlin, the Free University of Berlin, and the University of Potsdam, and collaboratively organized with John Carlos Rowe at USC and Donald Pease at Dartmouth College. Consequently, the list of contributors reads like a “who is who” of American studies in and around Berlin circa 2007 with a few international contributors including Rowe and Pease, as well as Nancy Fraser, Macarena Goméz-Barris, Peter D. O’Neill, and William Arce. As suggested by the reputation of the editors and the contributors who include many major forces in the reshaping of American studies, the book contains a number of excellent contributions to the field that will be essential reading for anyone seeking to enter it, and will add new perspectives to those already invested in it.

The book is divided into four sections consisting of four (and in one case five) chapters each and an almost fifty page introduction by Donald Pease, in which Pease reviews the state of transnational and global American studies with remarkable lucidity, offering an overview over a diverse field that reveals both Pease’s profound knowledge and his investment in a more political direction for American studies. Although the first sentence proclaiming the “transnational turn” to be “the most significant reimagining of the field of American studies since its inception” (1) might signal otherwise, Pease is nevertheless careful to not be overly celebratory of transnational studies as the final step to get away from American Exceptionalism. Instead, he reviews work done over the past two decades, examining it from a range of different perspectives in order to illuminate its many different agendas, as well as the historical forces that shaped and continue to shape transnational approaches in American studies. While positioning the transnational project as part of a historical moment of global socioeconomic transition, Pease stresses that the term is actually “a volatile transfer point” (4) that is imbued with different, sometimes contradictory meaning for different people with diverse and sometimes contradictory political agendas ranging from expanding to delimiting U.S. American global power. It is a concept that, while it oscillates between describing a reality and creating it through its discursive power, is nevertheless able to confront the current political order with its own omnipresent contradictions.

While it is impossible to do justice to the extremely dense meta-analysis Pease provides in the short space of this review (and interested readers are well-advised to go to Pease’s introduction directly), it seems worthwhile to at least mention the various angles from which he approaches the topic. In the subsection “The Geopolitical Context,” Pease points to supranational organizations and the ways in which they challenge our state-based understandings of sovereignty. Pease maintains that the concepts of sovereignty for Americanists, as well as for U.S. citizens, alternate between understandings of the United States as “a global state regulatory apparatus responsible for securing and maintaining the rule of law across the planet and as a territorially bound nation” (11). Establishing three phases in the transnationalization of the field, from countercultural, via multicultural to transnational American studies, Pease examines the stage of multicultural American studies and its displacement by transnationalism through its integration of “questions posed by diasporas.” Pease then goes on to describe the redefinition of the disparate field as being formulated to address the common enemy of American exceptionalism; an exceptionalism which, as Pease has also argued elsewhere, needs to be understood as formed from “incompatible elements” (21) and linked to very particular historical formations. However, as Pease warns, the “wholesale dismantling of American exceptionalism” in the field of transnational American studies can also be
read as a response to a real geo-political state of exception that “produce[s] the version of American exceptionalism without exception-alists that the transnational state of exception require[s]” (23) to continue a global domination by U.S. capital over a world in which the borders of the nation have become porous.

Pease follows up on this in the next section “Rethinking the Postexceptionalist Turn” in which he reexamines the Cold War as a period of global reordering in which transnational institutions such as the IMF, the World Bank and the WHO “deflected the state away from identification with the prerogatives and obliga-
tions of the territorially bound nation to an identification with the deterritorializing prov-
enance of the state of exception” (25), thus laying the groundwork for the transnational neoliberalism that has dominated the period after the end of the Cold War. This leads Pease to suggest a remapping of what he calls the “Transnational Field Imaginary” (26-30) that takes geography more strongly into account to argue against vague notions of deterritorial-
ization and pays more attention to the except-
ed, e.g. the internally colonized, in American exceptionism. The result according to Pease is “an unstable combination of anti-imperial triumph and transnational melancholia” (28), a notion he more fully explores in the final section of his overview “Transnational-Diaspora Complex” (30-32), before he turns to the customary summary of the organization and contributions to the volume.

The book’s first main section begins with an analysis of the works of Philip Roth, par-
ticularly his Operation Shylock, by Ulla Haselstein. She explores the doppelgänger motif in the novel and the novel’s intertextual reference to Shakespeare’s Merchant of Venice that Roth employs to comment on the Holocaust and the Palestinian conflict. Despite engaging these political issues, the novel, which Haselstein calls a “convoluted self-reflexive allegory of split authorial identity and of the conflict between artistic autonomy and political ac-
countability” (69), in the end evades a clear statement of Roth’s allegiance with Israel, even though Haselstein argues that such a commitment is definitely implied. Haselstein’s interpretive strategy allows her to navigate between questions of cultural / transcultural myths of identity and individual subjectivity that are focused on Roth’s—and by implica-
tion others’—postmodern games of authorial identity.

Andrew S. Gross’s contribution is a good example of the self-questioning stance adapted by many of the contributors to Re-Framing the Transnational Turn. Gross critically examines the often self-congratulatory rhetoric of novel-
ty that a self-proclaimed post-exceptionalism takes towards the supposedly naïve, exception-
alist past of American studies. By re-examining the writing of internationally and trans-
ationally oriented Americanists after the Second World War, Gross uncovers a legacy of “dissident internationalism” that is, despite not being transnational in the current sense, nevertheless “compatible with the situational approach called for by Rowe” (75). As Gross argues in his examination, this “forgotten his-
tory of internationalism” throws into question the radical break supposedly taking place with transnational American studies. At the same time, the blind spot to Cold War ideology of earlier Americanists can make us aware that we are quite likely as “susceptible to the forces of globalization [as] our precursors were to the dictates of the Cold War” (90-91).

William Arce’s contribution turns its gaze towards a reading of Alfredo Vea’s novel Gods Go Begging (1999). Through the lens of trau-
ma studies, Arce shows how the novel’s depiction of Chicano soldiers in Vietnam draws a connection between the internally colonized Chicano/a population in the U.S. and the “transnational colonialism” (116) of the U.S. in Vietnam. He addresses topics about trauma and its impact on minority culture that draw out connections between Chicana/o studies to the field of transnational American studies, and make good on the field’s promise to learn from its diasporic predecessors without appropriating them.

Drawing on Carl Schmitt’s concept of no-
omos, which in comparison to Gramsci’s he-
gemony he sees as always transnational, and connecting it with Agamben’s theoretical con-
struct of the “homo sacer,” Peter D. O’Neill casts a light on the transatlantic history of racialization and the Irish emigration to the U.S. after the Irish famine. As O’Neill shows, the inclusion of Irish immigrants into the US-American state apparatuses, especially in po-
ce and fire departments and the low ranks of civil service, as well as their inclusion into the Democratic Party and trade unions “dramat-
ically transformed their relationship to the state, from the status of the ‘excluded’ to that of the ‘excluders’” (121). Adding a new facet to the well-known story of how, in Noel Ignat
Reiss’s “artistic ‘plea for color’” (164). In his and Randolph Bourne in order to establish U.S., including W. E. B. Du Bois, Alain Locke, other prominent thinkers about a multi-ethnic

Mehring puts Winfried Fluck’s article explores Emanuel Leutze’s famous 1851 painting Washington Crossing the Delaware. In an opening section, Fluck delineates his approach, which he describes as cultural studies transnationalism, from the dominant traditions of “aesthetic transnationalism” that he sees in both Fishkin’s ASA address and Randolph Bourne’s 1916 multicultural transnationalism on the one hand, and a “transnational radicalism” that is most interested in forging political alliances across national borders (144-45). Fluck’s perspective links Leutze both to the Hegelian vision of history as manifestation of the Weltgeist and to the revolutionary spirit of 1848 in Germany. Fluck sees both visions as being more influential on the formation of an American exceptionalism in American art (and art history) than a supposed awakening of American nationalist sentiment in Leutze or other nineteenth-century American artists such as those of the Hudson River school that critics have often proclaimed. Instead, as Fluck argues in his conclusion, “without the help of European conventions, there could not have been any constructs of American exceptionalism in American art” (157). Coming back to his initial thoughts about transnationalism as a critical concept, Fluck argues that while aesthetic and political transnationalism merely repeat a circularity inherent in scholar’s search for distinct expressions of national sentiment, the type of transnationalism sketched out by Fluck “may pose a challenge” to both the nation-state and the lingering Hegelian legacy in the work of cultural critics “in a much more radical sense than is envisioned by current transnational studies” (158).

In his contribution, Frank Mehring examines how through their migration and the transfer from a Nomos Britannicus to a Nomos Americanus and the different definitions of race these implied, the Irish “no longer held bare life status” (132).

Opening the second section “Re-Disciplining Transnational American Studies,” Winfried Fluck’s article explores Emanuel Leutze’s famous 1851 painting Washington Crossing the Delaware. In an opening section, Fluck delineates his approach, which he describes as cultural studies transnationalism, from the dominant traditions of “aesthetic transnationalism” that he sees in both Fishkin’s ASA address and Randolph Bourne’s 1916 multicultural transnationalism on the one hand, and a “transnational radicalism” that is most interested in forging political alliances across national borders (144-45). Fluck’s perspective links Leutze both to the Hegelian vision of history as manifestation of the Weltgeist and to the revolutionary spirit of 1848 in Germany. Fluck sees both visions as being more influential on the formation of an American exceptionalism in American art (and art history) than a supposed awakening of American nationalist sentiment in Leutze or other nineteenth-century American artists such as those of the Hudson River school that critics have often proclaimed. Instead, as Fluck argues in his conclusion, “without the help of European conventions, there could not have been any constructs of American exceptionalism in American art” (157). Coming back to his initial thoughts about transnationalism as a critical concept, Fluck argues that while aesthetic and political transnationalism merely repeat a circularity inherent in scholar’s search for distinct expressions of national sentiment, the type of transnationalism sketched out by Fluck “may pose a challenge” to both the nation-state and the lingering Hegelian legacy in the work of cultural critics “in a much more radical sense than is envisioned by current transnational studies” (158).

In his contribution, Frank Mehring examines how through their migration and the transfer from a Nomos Britannicus to a Nomos Americanus and the different definitions of race these implied, the Irish “no longer held bare life status” (132).

Uncovering a host of fascinating and sometimes amusing historical incidents and accidents, Sieglinde Lemke’s “Liberty: A Transnational Icon” examines the transformation of the Statue of Liberty as it traveled from France to the U.S. to eventually become an icon on a global stage. As Lemke shows, Miss Liberty started as a project by two Frenchmen: Bartholdi, a struggling artist with an interest in statues and monuments of gigantic proportions, and Edouard-René Lefebvre de Laboulaye, a professor specializing in American law and political history who was disillusioned by the political direction his country was taking under Napoleon III, the French defeat in the Franco-Prussian War, and the bloody suppression of the Paris Commune in 1871. While drawing heavily on Delacroix’s famous 1830 painting La Liberté guidant le peuple, the statue was imagined as an icon that would “radiate the light of liberty […] back to France” (195). Because of its somewhat unenthusiastic reception by New York political leaders due to its high installment cost, the statue was Americanized in a special way: After officials were unable to come up with the money to pay for the base of the statue, Joseph Pulitzer launched a fundraising campaign in his papers directed at working-class Americans and soon convinced 120,000 people to donate an average of 83 cents each (199). Despite such investments by different people, as Lemke examines in the following pages, Miss Liberty nevertheless never held a consistent, unchanging meaning, being open both to the iconicity of a nationalist and exceptionalist U.S. and a counter-tradition of transnationalist challenges, which, in recent years, opened it as a target for “outsiders” who use its metonymic dimensions for their critiques against the U.S. For Lemke, the statue therefore functions as “a mirror that reflects both America’s aspirations and her tragic flaws” (212).

In the last chapter of section two, Laura Bieger turns from visual arts, and like Hasel-stein and Arce in section one, examines a narrative text, Richard Power’s 2006 novel The
Echo Maker. Shifting the focus once again, Bieger’s contribution argues for belonging as a central category that we should take into account in our transnational examinations. As Bieger claims “questions of where and how one belongs have gained enormous currency” in an increasingly fluid globalized modernity, and it is particularly the affective dimension of belonging—“what belonging does” (219; emphasis in original)—that interest her. Understanding belonging as “a practice of narrativization” that “constitutes the frames in which questions and desires for a ‘known world’ can be felt, articulated, and negotiated” and building upon Vikki Bell’s work, she highlights how the affective dimension of belonging connects “be-ing” with “longing” (220). According to Bieger, this is a trend in contemporary U.S. literature that can be found in works by DeLillo, Foer, Franzen, Hustvedt, Krauss, O’Neill, Roth, and Senna. In her article, Bieger shows this trend exemplarily in Powers’s The Echo Maker, which uses the refracting echo to undermine its readers’ longing for be-longing.

Opening part three of this collection, “Transnational Pedagogies,” is Rüdiger Kunow’s article “American Studies as Mobility Studies: Some Terms and Constellations” in which he argues for mobility to “become part […] of our critical lexicon” and offers an entry into this lexicon by reading some instances of such mobility in recent fiction (245). Taking his cue from Stephen Greenblatt and John Urry, as well as from Althusser’s concept of expressive causality, Kunow examines various forms of mobility from people, via objects, non-human entities to ideas in individual sections dealing with representations of airplanes and airports, arrivals, the practice of citations, contagion, copyright, religious mission, as well as panic and risk. This incomplete list of mobilities (Kunow adds language, recognition, marketplace, and hospitality as other sites that need examination) “mark a move from area to site, […] from the vastness of the trans to a number of local, concrete, constellational sites where the inside and outside of ‘America’ and other cultural domains are intertwined” (260; emphasis in original). In this fashion, Kunow hopes to shift the discipline to a relational view of mobility that recognizes the process rather than its endpoints; an approach that pays attention “to the micrological level” which does not privilege human agency and rather “privileges the meeting over the mixing” (261).

Drawing on Gloria Anzaldúa’s Borderlands/La Frontera and notions of a queer Aztlan, Marc Prieve’s essay reads Guillermo Gómez-Peña’s performance art as part of a larger trend in Chicano/o cultural production “of oscillating between resistance and co-optation, between opposition to and partial complicity with U.S.-American culture” (275-76). As Prieve argues, what New Americanists can learn from the “shift from ‘place-based’ to ‘place-less’” that he recognizes in the post-movimiento authors he discusses is “that under current conditions of globalization, resistance has to be rethought and retooled, because the terrains of power have begun to shift away from the nation as both the target and source of counter-hegemony” (277).

The final two contributions of the “transnational pedagogies” section by Reinhard Isensee and Matthias Oppermann look at the new digital media. Isensee examines social media practices and sites, particularly Myspace, YouTube, and Facebook. He reads the Web 2.0 as a site of transnational community building, identity construction or, as he puts it, an “identity performance ‘in the open’” that has replaced earlier promises of online anonymity (292). Isensee views this shift as being related to technological changes that have not only made the web accessible to more users, but have also transformed the modes of expression and “sharing” information about oneself—transforming social media sites into “cosmopolitical contact zones” in James Clifford’s sense (293). Oppermann, in contrast, is more interested in the ways in which new media offer possibilities to employ digital storytelling by students as a novel means of teaching transnationalism in a university setting. He sees new pedagogical approaches as a necessity in line with “American studies as a project of transnational cultural critique” that “requires a substantially reconfigured teaching situation in which students can actively confront the transnational and multicultural dynamics of their social realities” (296). Since the products of such collaborative digital stories will not look like classic scholarly writing, however, these new media necessitate a learning process that involves not only students but also their instructors.

The final section, “Transnational Governmentalities,” opens with an essay by John Carlos Rowe in which the author turns the focus to area studies as an approach that to a large extent has not yet influenced the trans-
national debate in American studies. Reviewing current debates within area studies, Rowe highlights in particular Walter Mignolo’s contributions to “border thinking,” which Rowe argues can be made productive for American studies, e.g. by deconstructing “the ‘differences’ between European imperial powers and Creole national powers […] to expose the shared history of the ‘modern/colonial world system’ worked out systematically for the first time in the Western Hemisphere” (333). The goal, as Rowe argues, is ultimately to work against “ourselves,” to become “Anti-Americans” (334).

Macarena Gómez-Barris’s contribution, like Rowe’s, extends the volume’s mostly U.S.-American geographical focus by looking at a Peruvian spiritual healing retreat, albeit one run by a white middle-class American woman, and with it the politics of spiritual self-healing projects in an age of neoliberal globalization. Gómez-Barris’s essay is one half theoretical exploration of the neo-colonial and racist dimensions of new age narratives, particularly the retreat’s owner Dianne Dunn’s, and the other ethnography at a gathering to learn “ancient traditions of healing” and “to reclaim ‘the sacred feminine’” (348). Bringing together her experience at the retreat with her theoretical observations, Gómez-Barris highlights how “all versions [of the Andean ceremonies] operated within a tourist industry that mediates the practices of ritual through globalization,” and eventually for reasons of economic distribution as well as cultural hegemony expresses her skepticism “about the possibility that these practices of the spirit will translate into benefit for the indigenous communities” (352). In a final section, she focuses on the female of the two indigenous guides, Juana. The author puzzles over Juana’s almost complete silence during the week-long ceremonies, suggesting different readings from a form of embodied resistance to Dunn’s narrative to a silencing of the subaltern female as total Otherness, but—wisely—resists the urge to speak for her (and thus repeat the epistemic violence she at least implicitly accuses Dunn of). Instead she ends with a range of possible interpretations phrased as open questions.

Johannes Voelz in his contribution argues for an approach to transnationalism that considers cultural transnationalism in line with neoliberal globalization. He makes a case for a critical stance that distances itself from the history of American studies of “investigating possibilities of resistance” (357), claiming that this tradition goes back to the German idealist longing for autonomy, a longing expressed among other places in romantic nationalism as an expression of organism. In organicist transnationalism, a temporal longing merely shifts to a spatial one, but one that likewise promises to overcome “the distinction between inside and outside” (360). What such a critique of the nation and nationalism misses, however, is that it “is in danger of overlooking the extent to which it actually interacts with economic globalization” (367). Building on Richard Sennett’s *The Culture of the New Capitalism*, Voelz, in a final section, comes back to the idealist notion of autonomy, claiming that the appeal of neoliberalist offers of endless consumption is one of access or “potentialities,” such as the potentiality of movement. This is where Voelz sees a link to the transnational disavowal of the nation state and borders, asking “whether this organicism does not also follow a model of consumption based on access and potentiality.” For Voelz, American studies therefore “needs to reflect to which degree—and how—it has itself fallen under the spell of the consumption of access” (370).

Seeming at first much less transnational in the strict sense, Nancy Fraser’s contribution by bringing in a feminist perspective adds a crucial set of gender-related questions that the volume, except for Goméz-Barris’s contribution, would have otherwise missed. Benefiting from Voelz’s previous more explicit critique of transnationalism to draw out the implicit global and transnational dimension in her essay, Fraser’s contribution provides an example of the type of reframing the mode of inquiry into one that includes politico-economic terms. In what clearly constitutes a form of auto-critique by a second wave feminist, Fraser reexamines the history of feminist thought in the West. Reading feminist positions against a history of capitalism, which she divides into three stages (state-organized capitalism, the rise of neoliberalism, and the capitalist crisis of the late 2000s), Fraser examines the paradox of how feminists seem to have “won” by bringing their positions to the mainstream, but how feminist positions have in fact been coopted and compromised by neoliberal capitalism. Even worse, feminist positions “have served to legitimate a structural transformation of capitalist society that runs directly counter to feminist vision of a just society.”
(375). Conceptualizing feminism as directed against four main targets—economism, androcentrism, paternalistic étatism, and Westphalianism—towards which feminism had an ambivalent attitude, Fraser discusses each target in each of the three phases to show how a political project that combined the economic, the cultural, and the political was coopted into one of identity politics in which, for instance, the feminist critique of the paternal family structure could be transformed into neoliberalism’s integration of more low (or lower) wage earners (i.e. women) into the work force, thus keeping economic inequality while selling this as a victory for emancipation. In a final step, Fraser offers some suggestions for reinvigorating the feminist project in light of the crisis of capitalism to redirect the movement and counteract “the neoliberal onslaught [that has] instrumentalized our best ideas” (389).

In the final article in the collection, Günter Lenz’s (†) call for a transcultural (as opposed to a transnational) American studies works well as a final balance to Donald Pease’s initial review of the field’s past two decades. Adding a culturalist approach to Pease’s more materialist review of neoliberalism, globalization, and the Americanist field imaginary, Lenz reverts to Wolfgang Welsch’s concept of transculturalism. In his claim for a more dialogic view of American studies that builds on and learns from diaspora studies, Lenz reexamines the contributions of a wide range of thinkers in political philosophy, including Ulrich Beck, Paul Gilroy, Seyla Benhabib, Nancy Fraser, Iris Marion Young, Kwame A. Appiah, and Walter Mignolo, who have developed “concepts and strategies of dealing with cultural or social differences, cultures of difference, and transcultural studies” that can be made productive for a transcultural Americanist project (400). Drawing on their work, Lenz argues we should give up our age-old dream of finding the “right” theory of American studies and instead revel in a more dialogic, more transcultural, and more interdisciplinary approach to the discipline.

As this brief outline of the many angles and diverse perspectives the contributors take on the transnational suggests, transnational American studies as it is promoted by the current volume is indeed “a field in formation that defies efforts at stabilization,” but one that has “a shared opponent,” i.e. American exceptionalism, as Pease claims in his introduction (16-17). As many of the contributors stress, in light of the recent crises in a neoliberal, globalized world, it is a field that will make significant contributions to our understanding of America’s position in the world for years to come, at least if it does not overlook the material and economic inequalities inside North America as well as globally in favor of a purely culturalist narrative of a transnational utopia. Not despite, but because of its many, and in some cases contradictory takes and suggestions on which direction the field should take, the collection offers valuable contributions for those interested in transnational American studies, and will offer every reader food for thought and a range of points of contact with their own teaching and research.

Mannheim
Johannes Fehrle
Laura Bieger, Ramón Saldívar and Johannes Voelz, eds., The Imaginary and its Worlds: American Studies after the Transnational Turn (Hanover, NH: Dartmouth College P, 2013), 312 pp.

The collection of papers in The Imaginary and its Worlds was developed out of a conference hosted at the John-F-Kennedy-Institut of the Freie Universität Berlin in the summer of 2009 to honor the scholarly career of Winfried Fluck. Fittingly, the contributors here consider ways in which conceptions of the “imaginary” have shaped American studies both during and after the “transnational turn,” as that idea became institutionalized during the first decade of the twenty-first century. About half the contributors here are from Germany and half from elsewhere, and one of the most valuable aspects of this critical anthology involves its illumination of different ways in which the term “social imaginary” has been used and the different intellectual traditions it evokes. As Fluck himself observes, whereas for Cornelius Castoriadis the “radical instituting imaginary” was “the source of the self-creation of society ex nihilo,” for other scholars, such as Charles Taylor, the notion of a social imaginary has tended in the direction of “interpellation and subjection” (259), particularly in its more recent uses. In their introduction, Laura Bieger, Ramón Saldívar and Johannes Voelz observe that whereas the Lacanian imaginary has worked through mis-representation, the genealogy of the imaginary in Germany has been influenced more by Wolf­gang Iser’s reception theory, and indeed it is that exploration of “the imaginary through the lens of reception aesthetics” that constitutes Fluck’s major contribution to this field (xxv). Saldívar’s own essay emphasizes Fluck’s debt to Iser (12), while Fluck himself in his “coda” lays stress on how literary texts are above all “aesthetic objects” (238). The fact that they “continue to provide an aesthetic experience,” even though the “historical situation” framing their conditions of production may have changed, has the effect of ensuring in Fluck’s eyes that the Fredric Jameson maxim “‘always historicize […] cannot solve the problem of interpretive conflict’ (238). For Fluck, such “interpretative disagreement and conflict” is not “an irritating problem but, quite the contrary, an indispensable resource” (257), one that locates the value of cultural texts in relation to their transhistorical afterlife.

The German tradition of American studies that Fluck espouses, as we see here, has tended always to be intertwined with the shifting horizons of reception theory. This has lent it a vestige of philosophical idealism that has served to differentiate it from more popular Marxist approaches, grounded as they are in social and economic contexts. Herwig Friedl’s essay in this collection, “William James versus Charles Taylor,” establishes an opposition between James’s philosophy of religion and Taylor’s understanding of a circumscribed social imaginary, while also drawing on Heidegger’s readings of Existenziale to adumbrate a “radical empiricist” understanding of religious phenomena (76). Heinz Ickstadt similarly notes how the “pervasive desire for organic coherence” associated with an older “web of imaginaries” (58) linked to more traditional understandings of American modernism has recently been interrogated by a “deconstructive onslaught” (43), characterized for Ickstadt by Michael North’s Dialect of Modernism and Walter Benn Michaels’s Our America (43), that has effectively redefined modernism as a field fluctuating between contradictory desires. In another German contribution, Christa Buschendorf describes how W.E.B. Du Bois’s “perspective of figurational sociology on the cultural imaginary” (84) was shaped by his work with “the renowned Professor Gustav Schmoller” in Berlin (104), where, as Du Bois acknowledges in Dusk of Dawn, he “began to see the race problem in America, the problem of the peoples of Africa and Asia, and the development of Europe as one” (98). Buschendorf adds here an intellectual analogy between “genuinely interdisciplinary research based on statistics, economics, (eco­ nomic) history, and sociology” and Du Bois’s own theoretical development of a “transnational, global perspective” (98). Such connections are interesting, although they seem inevitably to carry the freight of a reflexive national alleg­ory, through which Du Bois’s own crossing of intellectual boundaries becomes a mirror image of the interdisciplinary intellectual enterprise underwriting German versions of American studies. Fluck himself aligns the reading process with “transfer” (242), the creation of “other, more expressive versions of ourselves” (243), and elements of this “transfer process” (246) writ large are evident in this imaginary German model of American studies, which reflects back, as in a crazy mirror, the assumptions and predispositions of its interlocutors.

All of this is different in kind from the relentlessly demystifying perspective pursued here by the U.S. contributors. Walter Benn Michaels
writes compellingly of how neoliberalism over the past thirty years “has played almost no visible role in our cultural imaginary” (177), even though “we have been living in a historical period rather than a state of nature” (178); Donald E. Pease follows “Žižek’s Lacanian reading of state fantasy” to indict Obama’s “failure to realize the transformative change he promised” (232); Mark Seltzer describes how computer games contributed to “an aesthetic of cold war modernism” (146). Lawrence Buell’s essay salutes Fluck for his skepticism about transnationalism and his recognition that an “analysis of the cultural sources of American power [...] continues to be as urgent as ever” (38), while Christopher Newfield has an intriguing piece on how Obama presents to the public an image of “nonideological” maturity grounded in ambivalence” (1989), in a carefully calibrated attempt to appeal to the swing voter. Obama, argues Newfield, “says that compromise is the nature of American democracy and the nature of American politics,” and the third president of the twenty-first century has deliberately held up the icon of Abraham Lincoln to rebut the idea “that the Emancipation ‘compromise’ meant that Lincoln had sold out his antislavery principles” (206).

Is it possible, I wonder, to construct an “imaginary,” a force field of collective projection, based around the idea of compromise? Certainly the tradition of philosophical pragmatism had a long life in twentieth-century United States culture, from John Dewey to John F. Kennedy, and Pease’s observation that “Obama has not displaced but presupposed Bush’s homeland state of exception” (215), though acute enough in its forensic analysis, seems pessimistically to undervalue the points at which Obama is different from (rather than the same as) his predecessor. As we see from key films of the Obama era such as Steven Spielberg’s Lincoln (2012), the mythology of this presidency was constructed not so much around utopian vision but around the longueurs and frustrations of political wheeling and dealing. In fact, one interesting aspect of Obama’s post-exceptionalist persona has been the way he has chosen explicitly to position himself as immersed within the legalistic possibilities of politics, rather than seeking continually to transcend them. There has been a long line of recent U.S. presidents attempting to present themselves as moral agents emerging from outside the Washington beltway to regenerate the American body politic, whether that has operated symbolically (as for Jimmy Carter), rhetorically (for George H.W. Bush, who tried to pass himself off as a down-home Texan) or as a focal point for the purifications of religious apocalypse (as in the case of George W. Bush). Newfield, however, puts his finger on something that seems qualitatively different about the Obama regime, its willingness to acknowledge how the political system of the United States limits its legislators, like those in any other country, to acts of the possible. In this sense, the Obama presidency has not been readily conducive either to the traditional mythologies of American studies in Europe, where the “land of the free” has been institutionally positioned as a beacon of exemplary regeneration, or to the subject’s condition within the United States, where the grubby deals enacted on political committees necessarily fail to measure up to the lofty ideals of social activism.

This collection of essays is a fine tribute to Fluck’s significant career as a pioneer of international American studies, but it also raises broader questions about ways in which non-U.S. perspectives on American cultural politics can provide an important check and balance system within the field. If the German angle on America tends at times here towards a traditional romanticism, the U.S. approach sometimes lapses into an ascetic realpolitik, within which the lapse from a state of grace or promise becomes its own Manichaean reward. Transnationalism, like the imaginary, situates itself methodologically in an in-between state, where categories are neither quite one thing nor the other. Bieger, Saldívar and Voelz point out in their introduction how humanities scholars “have been trained, and compelled, to search for spaces of resistance” (x), but their volume of essays usefully complicates this paradigm by suggesting ways in which resistance and immersion, like the national and the transnational, tend to be symbiotically intertwined. Given that Fluck has long expressed reservations about ways in which transnationalism might seek refuge in an imaginary space outside the circuits of American power, it is especially appropriate that this tribute volume to an eminence grise should help to demystify such illusions by opening up new ways of understanding area studies within a twenty-first-century global environment.

Sydney

Paul Giles