

Chairing the English Faculty

This is an opportunity to preen and to moan, so let me begin with the latter. Several black words sent shudders down my spine during my four years as Chair but the blackest was ‘impact’. About this time last year the Faculty was invited (a euphemism) to take part in a pilot scheme for assessing the impact of research in English ‘on the economy, society, public policy or services, culture, the environment or quality of life’. I have spent a fair amount of time in routine drudgery but this was something else. Anyone innocent of such developments over the last two decades should know that ‘research’ has become an increasingly important element in the funding arrangements for all Universities; that this research undergoes elaborate assessment at intervals slightly longer than those between the Olympics or the World Cup, but subject to a similarly endless cycle of speculation, expectation, hysteria and recrimination; and that preparations for the next one, a mere four years away but already absorbing vast quantities of time, energy and anxiety, entail a new requirement to prove the beneficial ‘impact’ of (a proportion of) our research on the world outside the academy.

For those eager to gauge the enthusiasm with which this last has been greeted by those of us working on new editions or interpretations of Euripides, Spinoza, William Blake or Christina Rossetti, such as we expect to provide ‘Book at Bedtime’ listening if not actual reading for top business executives and government ministers, I refer you to the already classic essay in the *TLS* (13 November 2009) by my Faculty colleague Stefan Collini. Not

that reaching an audience outside the academy seems to count as ‘impact’; we have to provide evidence that we have changed people’s lives, or as it is now called, ‘behaviours’. It is particularly disheartening to find the argument rejected that the greatest impact we in English have on the world beyond the academy is through the students we teach, and that this teaching is vitally nourished (or ‘underpinned’, to use the jargon) by our research. That doesn’t count, we are told. To say that we feel out of kilter with the ethos, principles and public policies that increasingly dominate treatment of the arts and humanities would be an understatement. And we are the lucky ones (probably) — in English, in Cambridge — compared to smaller outfits and subjects such as our unique Department of Anglo-Saxon, Norse, and Celtic, because of the (current) popularity of our subject amongst benighted young school-leavers not yet ready to devote themselves to subjects more obviously conducive to ‘economic benefits’. But of course there are ways of getting *that* changed.

A more minor moan. Of the lesser injuries inflicted by the office of Chair nowadays, the most lowering is the effect on your own writing, and perhaps even thinking, of the language of modern bureaucracy, all the prioritizing, operational implications, outcome indicators, impact beneficiaries, incremental significance, and levels of robustness. I have become particularly allergic to the vacuous phrase ‘going forward’, particularly in a climate where we are resisting pressures to go backward down a dark alley with a firing squad at the end of it. It has been a lifeline

during the past four years, and a relief now that they are over, to return to Sophocles, Shakespeare and Henry James, to talk about them with sharp-minded students, to let great writing re-tune one’s sense of language and its capacities. And clean out the garbage.

On some brighter notes: there is nothing like being Chair for learning who all your colleagues actually are, all 80 or more of those active in teaching for the Faculty, what they do, where their expertise and passions lie. The new Faculty building has made a difference, to be sure. It is harder than it was in the old days to go for years without ever meeting the notorious Professor X or the legendary Dr Y. It has been particularly heartening — with no disrespect to more senior and familiar figures — to see the arrival and the development of many younger colleagues; by comparison with most others, the Faculty’s age-profile is happily youthful. It would be invidious to name names but I will say that there has been a welcome readiness to get involved in Faculty outreach activities, to contribute to the University’s Festival of Ideas, to create the Cambridge Authors’ web-site (www.english.cam.ac.uk/cambridgeauthors/), and so on. Finally, the past four years have certainly been made more bearable, and at times even fun, by our wonderfully experienced, long-serving (I was going to say long-suffering) assistant staff, our dynamic new(ish) Librarian and *her* staff, and the two wise, patient Administrators with whom I have cordially wept — with grief, chagrin, relief and occasional joy.

Adrian Poole

MPhil in Screen, Media, and Cultures

The University's MPhil in Screen Media and Cultures began as a collaboration among researchers in disciplines across the arts, humanities, and social and historical sciences who discovered that they had an interest in common: the saturation of cultures around the world by screen media of all kinds, from film through television and video to the gameboy console and the internet chat-room. What might careful historical and theoretical enquiry, drawing upon a variety of methods and forms of knowledge, have to tell us about life today in the middle of that saturation? Based since 2006 in the Faculty of Modern and Medieval Languages, and taking advantage of expertise from as far afield as Sociology, Social Anthropology, and the Judge Business School, the programme is interdisciplinary not only in ambition, but in its very structure.

The MPhil has proved as stimulating and productive an academic experience as I've had in more than thirty years' teaching at universities in Britain and the United States. From the outset, it became apparent that successful applicants (from China, Russia, Serbia, France, and the West Indies, as well as the US and the UK) had chosen the course because it offered them, through its combination of interdisciplinary breadth and intensive one-to-one supervision, something they could not find anywhere else in the world. That sense of taking part in a new intellectual adventure has consistently generated, in their research and writing, approaches to screen media that would not have been possible under more traditional 'film studies' or 'media studies' disciplinary models. Each year around 40% of those graduating from the programme have continued to the PhD, either in Cambridge or elsewhere. Professor Colin MacCabe, External Examiner during its first four years, said in his

concluding report that in his opinion it is now 'the best one-year postgraduate degree on audio-visual media in the country'.

Students are admitted to the programme from a variety of academic backgrounds. Some have already studied the history and theory of media, most haven't. The Michaelmas Term core course on 'Critical Approaches' provides an introduction to the basic ideas, methods, and historiographical concerns which have shaped the interdisciplinary study of screen media as it is today. The focus throughout is at once on the medium-specific 'language' of the filmic, televisual, or new media 'text', and on

in a range of faculties and departments across the arts, humanities, and social and historical sciences. The English Faculty currently provides two modules, both concerned, evidently, with literature and media: one on 'Sacrifice in Film and Literature since World War Two', taught by Alex Houen, and one, which I teach, on 'Naturalism in Literature and Film'. Both arise out of the recognition that it doesn't make sense to teach the literature of the last hundred years or so in isolation from those media which have most decisively shaped the 'sandscape' we all now variously inhabit, poets included.

'Sacrifice' examines how writers and



a broader understanding of the cultures in which that language has become embedded, and which it has done its part to shape. The organization of classes reflects this emphasis on ideas and methods; but students have none the less to develop a broad knowledge of the history of screen media from 1895 to the present.

Lent term involves something of a Diaspora, as students choose two optional modules from what's on offer

film-makers have drawn on notions of sacrifice when depicting political conflict, particularly the Vietnam War, the Cold War, the 'Troubles' in Northern Ireland, and the so-called War on Terror. Much has been written about substitution and exchange as being at the heart of sacrifice – whether in terms of a victim standing for a community, or of mortals giving life to the immortal. One of the main aims of the course is to consider how such exchanges bear on particular

aspects of literary and filmic figuration (including realism, lyric, symbolism, and the sublime). This raises another question: if a documentary can play a role in turning a person into a martyr; if an poetic elegy can be instrumental in wrapping mortalities in political idealism, do we need to see these kinds of aesthetic works as *performing* something of the labour of sacrifice? If so, in what ways does that labour vary according to medium and genre? Classes generally involve close comparison: Seamus Heaney's *North* with Steve McQueen's *Hunger*; Amos Oz's *Elsewhere, Perhaps* with James Miller's *Death in Gaza*; Don DeLillo's novel *Falling Man* with Paul Greengrass's *United 93*. Students have written essays for the module on topics ranging from British WWII propaganda through Vietnam War films to Palestinian martyrs' videos.

In Easter Term, everyone hurries 'home' to MML to research and write a 15,000-word dissertation which draws together and builds upon the critical approaches developed on the Michaelmas Term core course, and the sorts of specialist interdisciplinary enquiry undertaken during the Lent Term modules. The programme lasts for nine months in total.

For some time now, the state has proved increasingly reluctant to fund graduate studies in the arts, humanities, and social and historical sciences. Our primary fund-raising aim is therefore the provision of studentships for those wishing to enter the programme. But the programme itself can claim to have changed the face of the University, not least by means of the fortnightly research seminar it now sponsors, which brings scholars, filmmakers, and even the odd executive to Cambridge to tell us what they know, and has become a focus for all those in the University with an interest in and passion for screen media. When it comes to walls and notice-boards, at least, we have made our mark.

David Trotter

Photo courtesy of Daniel Wolpert

Remembering Frank Kermode

Frank Kermode (who died in Cambridge on August 17, 2010) was one of the most well-known and highly-respected literary critics of our times. He was King Edward VII professor of English Literature at Cambridge from 1974-82, and Fellow of King's College 1974-88. Before coming to Cambridge, he held professorships at Harvard (where he was Charles Eliot Norton Professor of Poetry in 1977-8), UCL, Bristol, and Manchester Universities. Some of his earliest publications established him as a formidable academic, including *The Romantic Image* (1957) and the Arden edition of Shakespeare's *The Tempest* (1954). During his prolific early years, he published widely, for example on Donne, Milton, and Wallace Stevens, and was a frequent contributor to the *New Statesman* and *Spectator*. Later, in 1973 with John Hollander, he edited *The Oxford Anthology of English Literature*. Kermode was also editor of several series, such as the *Modern Masters* and *Fontana Masterguides*. He was one of the founders (with Karl Miller) of the *London Review of Books* in 1979. He published books on contemporary literary theory as well as on 'classics', his final publication being a book entitled, *Concerning E.M. Forster* (2009).

The following appreciation of Frank Kermode by Stefan Collini first appeared in *The London Review of Books*, 23 September 2010.

Stefan Collini writes: 'Yes, I'd like that very much. That really would be something to look forward to.' Frank was already weakened and wasted by throat cancer, but my suggestion that we go to watch some cricket at Fenner's did seem genuinely to appeal to him. There wasn't much to look forward to by this point. On the appointed day the weather was kind, and after only a little too much fussing on my part we were finally installed

on seats in front of the pavilion, the soothing sight of green and white displayed before us. Although hardly an enthusiast by temperament, Frank was a cricket-lover, always reading the scores in the sports pages and watching the TV highlights. He had played regularly while a lecturer at Reading in the 1950s ('I was never any good'), and one of the times his hangdog look would hang most doggishly was when we talked about the fact that I still played and he didn't ('Of course, you're young...'; 90 could say that to 62).

We talked a bit about cricket when I would go round in the evenings ('Yes, come round: I can still drink'), but mostly we talked about literature, which is to say mostly I tried to get him to talk. I was, am, too ill-read to be rewarding company for him on many of these occasions, which I always regretted, though there are worse failings than not being as well read as Frank Kermode. His range was astonishing, across genres and languages, and some favourites (Donne, Stevens, Roth) were very vivid in his memory right up to the end. He gracefully concealed his shock at the extent of my unreading, part of a deep courtesy that somehow enabled rather than obstructed playfulness and teasing. We would chat about the current review he was always writing ('Mary-Kay keeps me under the lash'), and I could feel what a desolating defeat it was when, late in his illness, he had to acknowledge that he wasn't going to be able to review the last book he had been sent. It was a selection of the letters of Louis MacNeice, and of course one immediately thinks how good it would have been to have had one of his quietly perceptive, deftly modulated assessments of a writer whom he had read when he was an undergraduate at Liverpool in the late 1930s and still partly admired. For decades Frank had set the benchmark for the review-essayist's trade: it will be a long time before we stop wondering, faced with a new book, how he would have handled it.

Eliot famously said that in literary criticism the only method was to be very intelligent. Frank had none of

Eliot's chilly hauteur, nor his taste for provocation for its own sake, but he was, in his attentive, conversable prose, a wonderful illustration of Eliot's *mot*. A Kermode essay seems somehow to set up camp inside the work he is discussing, to be at ease with its quiddity, often appreciative, yet also noticing where the handiwork had been ill-judged or botched. Reading him, one's attention is directed to the subject matter not the critical performance, but it is impossible not to be aware of the presence of a responsive, deep-feeling man who is remarkably learned and constantly alert to all the ways literature can mean. Although in conversation he would talk about the particular book he had under review, he said little about his own writing or about the process by which his camped-up groaning over the difficulty of the task was invariably succeeded by the appearance a week or two later of a shapely piece of limpid thoughtfulness.

He would sometimes talk about his own past, reticently, sardonically. Key moments in his life would be elided with a deliberately restrained or oblique phrase ('My private life was becoming disorderly'), and terms like 'disaster' and 'fiasco' peppered all reminiscence. I teased him about having been a serial professor, having held half the named chairs of English in the country, sometimes in quick succession ('There were reasons; I don't say *good* reasons'). He looked back with particular nostalgia to his time as the Lord Northcliffe Professor at University College London in the late 1960s and early 1970s. So why did he then move to Cambridge? 'Vanity, I expect; ignorance. Terrible mistake, obviously.' He was an accomplished moaner, or mock-moaner, and his time as professor at Cambridge was practised ground ('Some of those people on the Faculty board were *unspeakable*'). He would also recur to some of the celebrated critical spats he had been involved in, unyielding about the iniquities of Helen Gardner, generous about Empson though still irritated ('Later in his life he made a great to-do about "matters of fact" in literature, but he so often got things *wrong*'). He had the usual nominal aphasia that comes with age, but

uncannily sharp recall when it came to a line of poetry that had been in contention 40 or 50 years ago.

I was by no means one of Frank's closest or oldest friends; ours was a late-blooming relationship, and all the dearer to me for that – there's an inescapable poignancy and sense of lost opportunity in establishing a close friendship with someone already in their eighties. I could occasionally see traces of the iron and the acid that opponents had complained of decades ago, but overwhelmingly I encountered a quality it sounds too anodyne to describe as sweetness, and too gullible to see as a winning diffidence, but which communicated a reticent warmth I was very drawn to. I'm sorry now that we allowed English male shyness to stop us speaking more freely about some of the things that mattered to us most (not that he, ambivalent Manxman, would easily submit to the indignity of being lumped with 'the English'), but that courtesy of his could sometimes make too much directness seem intrusive.

Our afternoon at the cricket was not a complete success. The batting became dull as the game headed for a draw; Frank could follow the flight of the ball less well than either of us had anticipated; and his body started to become too uncomfortable, so we decided to leave early. He got to his feet rather unsteadily, and as we began to head for the exit (how he would have twinkled at the ambiguities of that phrase) he slipped his arm in mine – for support, but easily and affectionately, so we processed round the boundary like a stately Italian couple out for their *passeggiata*. He knew he would never again go to a cricket match; he was doing most things for the last time now, silently grieving about transience and loss. I still find it hard to say what I felt as he companionably slipped his arm through mine: 'pleased' seems feeble, 'proud' seems absurdly self-important. Perhaps simply 'moved'? Whatever it was it proved too strong for me quite to cope with, because after delivering him back at his flat I found that, even before I got home, I had started to cry.

Talking in the Library? Surely not!

While great care is taken in the Library to ensure that the right atmosphere for serious study is promoted, it is true to say that there have been a number of changes in the last few years. The dynamically changing information environment we live in has an impact on the library service and we need to respond to it in such a way that we bring added value and enhanced support for students and academics alike.



Many librarians are conscious of the need to engage with students early on and to speed up the transition process from school to university. The introduction in the Faculty Library of an IT Training Suite with interactive technologies allows us to train relatively small groups of students, encourage hands-on searching, allow them to 'try out' resources and services and to discuss their findings with us and each other, as well as giving them time to adjust to the hybrid print and electronic information world. On the other side of the coin it also reduces the many queries that we might otherwise have resulting in a more confident student body. This very

English Faculty Library's
*New
Cambridge
Writers*

An evening performance by some of
our brightest student writers.

Saturday 23rd October 7.00pm
Drama Studio, English Faculty Building,
9 West Road, Cambridge
FREE and open to all.

Poster design by Geoff Shipp

new IT suite has also been used by academics in their own teaching, some noting that it 'helpfully emphasizes the close integration between book-based learning and IT resources' as well as being 'part of the well-established learning environment that is the Faculty Library'. (Quotes from anonymous survey responses)

In Cambridge the Faculty Libraries have a real advantage in being able to focus their library services on one main area of academic study. This permits the personalization of the library service which, in turn, encourages better use of the facilities. Selling Faculty Library bags, pens, paper and so on is, in one sense, a marketing gimmick, but it is also providing a useful service. Tea@three for students in the Librarian's office during Lent and Easter Terms seems to sit easily with English students (the cake is nice!), but also reaps enormous benefits for library staff/student

relations and peer support. 'Poem of the Week' allows for promotion of resources; as do displays on Cambridge or Shakespeare or study skills. The Faculty Library has a Facebook page which brings relevant, sometimes light-hearted information to those interested enough to join the site. The plasma screen above the issue desk with amusing quotes, amongst other useful titbits of information, strikes a chord with many as they wait to have their books returned. All of these things, small in themselves, encourages interaction and vibrancy and together creates a friendly, supportive environment.

Traditionally the Faculty Library has focused on providing resources and services for undergraduates, but we now also focus some of our attention on postgraduates and academics. Now becoming an annual event, 'Food for Thought' brings publishers, service providers, subject specialists, librarians

and local bookshops, public libraries and so on together in the Library for one afternoon a year. The object of the event is to promote the 'wares' of those present along with a programme of presentations, all of which are focused on enhancing the research experience of the local academic community. Drawing in 70-80 postgraduates, academic visitors and academics from the Faculty, the occasion is marked by plenty of talking, interaction and demonstrations. It seems obvious to me that the Library space can be used for such activities, and ultimately the aim is to encourage better use of the magnificent array of print and electronic resources that are available within the University.

Is there talking in the Library? Yes!

Elizabeth Tilley
Faculty Librarian
November 2010



International Conference

International Conference of the Faculty
of English, University of Cambridge --
Kolleg Friedrich Nietzsche, Weimar --
Institut für Philosophie, Friedrich-
Schiller-Universität Jena

SHANDYAN HUMOUR IN ANGLO- GERMAN LITERATURE AND PHILOSOPHY

Faculty of English,
University of Cambridge
2-4 September, 2010

Begin: Thursday 2 September, 16:00.
End: Saturday 4 September, 13:00.

“Democritus, who laughed ten times
more than I...” - Laurence Sterne,
Tristram Shandy

Speakers:

Christoph Bode (Munich)
Bärbel Frischmann (Erfurt)
Duncan Large (Swansea)
Wolfgang G. Müller (Jena)
Javier Pardo (Salamanca)
Tommaso Pierini (Pisa)
Julian Roberts (Munich)
Claus-Artur Scheier (Braunschweig)
Rüdiger Schmidt-Grépály (Weimar)
Klaus Vieweg (Jena)
James Vigus (Munich)
Kathleen Wheeler (Cambridge)
Prof. Klaus Vieweg
(Friedrich-Schiller-Universität Jena),
klaus.vieweg@uni-jena.de
Dr. James Vigus
(Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität
Munich), vigus.james@gmail.com
Dr. Kathleen M. Wheeler
(Darwin College, Cambridge),
kmw1001@cam.ac.uk

This September, as can be seen from the poster above, the Cambridge English Faculty hosted (and to a large degree funded) a conference on the ways in which Laurence Sterne’s humorous strategies in *Tristram Shandy* had been taken up by later writers – of both philosophy and literature – in Germany, England and America. The invited speakers included academics from Italy, Spain, England, and (the largest number being from) Germany. The idea for a conference in Cambridge arose during October, 2007, when a group of scholars met at Jena (funded by Jena and Weimar Universities), and considered trying to set up a regular meeting every three years, alternating between Jena and Cambridge, with substantially the same participants, but always with a couple of new speakers. We wanted to continue addressing the relationship between philosophy and literature in the German and English languages. That year of 2007, our focus had been on Friedrich Schlegel and Friedrich Nietzsche, but at our next meeting we decided to do something focussed in English literature. One of the organisers suggested Sterne’s *Tristram Shandy*, since it had quite an enthusiastic reception, not only in Germany, but in France and in other parts of Europe in the 1760s. The speakers addressed themselves to the subject as described in the following paragraphs.

The term ‘Shandyan humour’ was coined by the German Romantic novelist and literary theorist Jean Paul Richter. Like many thinkers in England, Germany, and elsewhere on the European continent, Jean Paul drew inspiration from Laurence Sterne’s *Tristram Shandy* – a work whose huge impact on subsequent literature and philosophy has yet to be fully explored.

Sterne’s imitators, translators, admirers, and critics often noted the mildness of Shandyan humour, in contrast to the satirical corrosiveness of (Romantic) irony. Yet this form of humour also appeared attractively (to some, repulsively) subversive – whether through the ‘devilish’ spirit of contradiction that Coleridge discerned in Sterne, or through an amusingly

open-minded approach to bodies and sexual experience. Throughout the long eighteenth century, ‘humour’ remains in part a biological category and an essential but problematic and comic part of human life.

If Shandyan humour is alternately whimsical and concrete, generalizing and pointed, this flexibility often makes it a vehicle for sceptical insight. No dogmatic perspective is safe from the smile – which may develop into uncontrollable laughter – of Shandyan humour. *Tristram Shandy*’s readers could interpret it as a *philosophical* novel, for Walter Shandy’s stubborn rationalism, like Tristram’s rambling associations, reveals more about *human nature* (as the title of one German Sterne-translation suggested) than many a systematic thesis. With its witty portrayal of human hobby-horses, Sterne’s novel even invites comparison with David Hume’s overtly sceptical *Treatise of Human Nature*.

The conference aims to analyse the forms of humour pioneered by Laurence Sterne, to pursue those forms in their full range in subsequent writing, and to enquire whether the European ‘Sterne-Manie’ enriched or attenuated its model. And we will ask, does (Shandyan) humour still teach and delight? Can it function as a *Grenzgänger* between philosophical and literary discourse today?

The talks ranged widely, some of them delivered in English, some in German. The titles of the English talks were “Style and Syntax as Catalysts of Sterne’s Humour”, “—And who are you? said he.— Don’t puzzle me; said I: The incongruity of personal identity in Sterne and Hume”, “Karl Marx’s Shandyan Humour: *Skorpion und Felix* and its Aftermath”, “’tis impossible for you to guess”: Narrating the Past, Narrating Futures—Random Reflections on When and Why the Unpredictable Can be Funny”, “The Crafty Art of Textual Pirating: Melville and Sterne”, and “Sentiment, Reflection and Freedom”. The German talks included “*Tristram Shandy* und die Methode von Hegels *Phänomenologie des Geistes*”, “Humor am Vorabend und am

Morgen der industriellen Revolution. Von Sterne zu De Quincey”, and “Rückwärtsflug zum Himmel” - Sternes Über-Humor und der Shandyismus bei Jean Paul und T. G. von Hippel”.

A conference dinner on the first evening at the home of one of the organisers worked wonders for putting everyone at ease and making sure acquaintance would begin to ripen into friendship. By the end of the meeting, it was felt to have gone so well that, before we broke up, we made plans for our next meeting, either in 2012 or 2013, depending on funding. We also discussed various topics for that occasion, one of the most likely being “Literature as Philosophy and Philosophy as Literature”, which would fit in well with the period most of us work in, namely German, English and American Romanticism.

KM Wheeler

Events 2010

Special Faculty lectures and other literary events, include the following:

4 Clark Lectures by Prof Clive Scott: “Translation and the Resurrection of Reading” (January-February 2010).

Graham Storey Lecture by Anne Enright (March 1, 2010).

Reading by award-winning Zimbabwean Author: Brian Chikwava, from his first novel *Harare North* (March 3, 2010).

Two performances of ‘Unfolding King Lear’, in the Judith E Wilson Drama Studio (March 8, 2010).

4th annual Miscellaneous Theatre Festival, in the Judith E Wilson Drama studio (March 11-12, 2010).

Prof Tracy Davis: ‘Acting Black, 1824’, performed in the Judith E Wilson Drama Studio (April 25, 2010).

Festival of Ideas: How to Read Poems (October 20-29, 2010).

Location, Evocation, Inspiration: Dr Paul Chirico. An illustrated talk on the life and legacy of the early 19th century poet, John Clare. The lecture will discuss Clare’s extraordinary life in the context of the recent establishment of an educational, environmental and cultural centre at his birthplace in the village of Helpston, Peterborough. (October 23, 2010).

New Cambridge Writers – an evening performance by some of our brightest student writers, arranged by the English Library for the Festival of Ideas (October 23, 2010).

All-day Wordsworth Reading for the Festival of Ideas (October 26, 2010).

Rotten English: Dr Christopher Warnes. Read and discuss short extracts from texts from Africa, the Caribbean and South Asia which do things with English you might never have heard before. Hear dub poetry from Jamaica by Mutabaruka, ‘English as she is, spoke and wrote’ from India, part of ‘A Novel in Rotton English’ from Nigeria and much more, with Dr Chris Warnes. (October 27, 2010).

Leslie Stephen Lecture by Colm Tóibín, Princeton University: *The Dark Sixteenth Century* (November 1, 2010).

Appointments

Dr Ildiko Csengei was appointed to a College Lectureship at Newnham with effect from 1 October 2010.

Dr Joe Moshenska was appointed to a College Lectureship at Trinity with effect from 1 January 2011

Dr Peter Gizzi was appointed to a Judith E. Wilson Poetry Fellowship for six months with effect from 10 January 2011.

Dr Oliver Wort was appointed to a British Academy Postdoctoral Fellowship for three years with effect from 1 January 2011.

Alumnae/i News

The following reports of news have been received. Information for inclusion in next year's edition is always welcome, and should be addressed to The Editor, 9 West Road, Faculty of English, 9 West Road, Cambridge CB3 9DP.
Email: english-faculty@lists.cam.ac.uk

Will Adams (Fitzwilliam 1971) has recently published *The Illustrated Railway Children*, a centenary edition with contemporary Edwardian Photos.

Catherine Arnold (Girton 1979) reports on her latest book, *City of Sin, London and its Vices* (Simon and Shuster).

Malcom Ballin (Selwyn 1954) published, in 2008, *Irish Periodical Culture: 1937-72: Genre in Ireland, Wales and Scotland* (Palgrave).

Adrian Bristow (Queens 1944) wrote of his recent book, *Adventures on a Narrow Boat* (Imogen).

Norman Buller (St Catherine's 1950) brought out three poetry collections with Waterloo Press (Hove) in 2005, 2007, and 2009.

Susan Chappell (Clare 1977) had a number of poems published with the Forward Press, won a prize in the Bedford Open (National) Poetry Competition, and is working now on song-settings of Shakespeare's songs.

Robert Cockcroft (St John's 1958) reports on his book *Persuading People: An Introduction to Rhetoric* (2nd edition, Palgrave); he was also affiliated to a Royal Navy warship, *HMS Nottingham*, as ship's poet from 1986 until this year, and has a series of poems coming out in *The Naval Review*.

Will Eaves (King's 1986) has published several books since 2001; he also has two books of poetry, *Small Hours* (2006) and *Sound Houses* (2011).

Paul Foster (Christ's 1956) has edited one of the Otter Memorial Papers on William Collins (2009), which includes a long review of early biographical data, several critical essays, and the text of Collins' poems from Langhorne (1765).

Sue Gerhardt (Newnham 1971, nee Aspinall) has recently brought out a

new book, *The Selfish Society: How We Forgot to Love One Another and Made Money Instead* (Simon and Shuster).

Anthony Haynes (Trinity 1979) has been appointed Visiting Professor at Hiroshima University, and just published *Writing Successful Academic Books* (CUP).

Margaret Heffernan (n/a) has published several books since 2004, including, most recently, *Wilful Blindness* and *Women on Top*.

Bridget Ann Henisch (Newnham 1950, nee Wilsher) has recently brought out *The Medieval Cook* (Boydell), only the latest of a number of books on food.

Nicholas Herbert (Lord Hemingford, Clare 1953) reported his book, *Successive Journeys: A Family in Four Continents*.

Anthony Hirst (Emmanuel 1963) edited an edition of C.P. Cavafy's poetry in Greek for Oxford World's Classics, and has publications in Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies.

David Jasper (Jesus 1969) has been appointed to a Professorship at Ronmin University of China in Beijing and has just published *The Sacred Body: Asceticism in Religion, Literature, Art and Culture* (Baylor University Press).

Gerald MacLean (Jesus 1970) has published many books, most recently *Looking East: English Writing and the Ottoman Empire before 1800* (Palgrave), and *The Rise of Oriental Travel: English Visitors to the Ottoman Empire 1580-1720* (Palgrave).

John Mitchell (Queens' 1946) published his *Selected Poems* last year, and was president of the Chartered Institute of Linguists, 2004-07.

Peter Molloy (Magdalene 1974) has published *The Lost World of Communism* (Random House) and has produced a number of award-winning television documentaries for the BBC.

Hilary Neal (Clare 1978) has been running a second-hand bookshop for seventeen years, and recently brought out *Dorothy Holman—A Life* (Topsham Museum Society).

Nigel Newton (Selwyn 1973) reports that Bloomsbury Publishing (which he founded in 1986) began, in 2008,

an academic list in the humanities and social sciences.

David Nobbs (St John's 1958) has many novels out, the most recent being *Obstacles to Young Love* (Harper Collins); he has co-written the TV series 'Reggie Perrin' for BBC1.

David Punter (Fitzwilliam 1967) reports his 2009 book *Rapture: Literature, Addiction, Secrecy* (Sussex Academic Press).

Francis Quinn (King's 1982) has written *Law for Journalists* (Pearson).

Tessa Romnon (Clare 1992) reports on an anthology of theoretical and critical essays she co-edited, *African Athena: New Agendas* (OUP).

Adrian Runswick (Jesus 1945) completed his PhD on "Suffering in Tragedy" at age 82!

R.A.L. Roper (St John's 1939) reports publications by Studio Music of "Sonata for Euphonium and Piano" and "A String of Tones" for Tuba Quartet.

Paul Smith (Queens' 1975) reports that he is now director of the British Consul in Afghanistan.

Jonathan Smith (St John's 1960) writes of numerous novels published since 1976, and twenty radio plays for the BBC, as well as a memoir. He was head of English at Tonbridge School in 2002.

Margaret M. Smith (Clare Hall 1978) is associate editor of the *Oxford Companion to the Book* (OUP).

Mark Thompson (Corpus Christi 1978) has published *The White War. Life and Death on the Italian Front, 1915-19* (Faber & Faber).

D.R. Thorpe (Selwyn 1962) writes of numerous publications, his latest being *Supermac: The Life of Harold Macmillan*, out this year.

John Ure (Magdalene 1953) says his twelfth non-fiction book, *Shooting Leave: Spying out Central Asia in the Great Game*, was published last year (Constable).

Donald Wesling (Trinity Hall 1960) had his *Joys and Sorrows of Imaginary Persons* (on literary emotions) published in 2008 (Rodopi).