

remains to some extent in abeyance, against an absent background of any working-class body defined as such by a working-class epistemology. Logan instead details policy documents, architectural regulation and the new regulation of cities, dwellings and domestic space, and thereby attends to a social working-class body rendered immune from the conundrums of individuality (read subjectivity) so intricately spelt out in earlier chapters.

Chadwick opposes reproduction to production (more of one leads to less of the other) in order to create a historical narrative of decline from rural, healthy, farm worker to idle, lazy, diseased, over-sexualised, over-populated urban slum dweller and Logan notes the gendered nature of this historical narrative, in a manner similar to Trotter's. Logan's discussion provokes interesting questions about the connections among excessive sensuality, inadequate sensibility and the concurrent institutional formations of working-class femininity, without attending to them explicitly, but at the same time a specific formulation of the gender issues of reproduction as a problematic in this history of hysteria is a somewhat neglected aspect of his project as a whole. Conceptual challenges to medical and social definitions of the maternal body are noticeably minimal in the discussion of Eliot's *Middlemarch* which constitutes the final chapter. Logan emphasises the importance of "penetration" as an epistemological model for new and good science (a shift that Foucault has noted in *The Order of Things*), analysing the import of the occasions on which Lydgate physically pierces the boundary of the body, the skin, in *Middlemarch*. "The shell of the body preserves its biological life by keeping the interior hidden, inaccessible and safe from the external world. In *Middlemarch*, the sentient body cannot be physically opened without destroying the life that resides inside it" (178). The maternal body, or specifically the pregnant and birthing body is distinctly full of this outside (an alien outside that somehow got in, to become an inside that must get out), and the ambiguity of the maternal body's boundaries stands as an opposite paradigm of hysterical corporeal identity neglected by most analyses of this model. Fear of the corruption of a body's integrity is unquestioned here as distinctly masculine and phallic, as it is in medicine's story of the body and indeed of the location of "life." Ultimately, I'd have liked this kind of analysis—of the distinct ways in which disease and hysterical narrative have delimited and (de)legitimated certain kinds of corporeal knowledge, certain kinds of bodies and not others—to have been more precise and more important to Logan's otherwise intensely rich review of the cultural feeling of feeling.

**Nicole Moore**

---

***Empire Building: Orientalism and Victorian Architecture*, by Mark Crinson.  
London: Routledge, 1996.**

Orientalist discourse in the literature and scholarship of the Victorian period is (since Said) routinely thought of as having had some sort of political effectivity. The image of the other whether abject, or interesting, or picturesque (something of a combination of the first two) has a well documented role in the traduction of the specific histories and cultures of colonised people. Colonialism was enacted through such representations, and

through the institutionalisation of authorised discourse on them. However, cultural imperialism seems to have been routinely failed by its architects. Putting down an early English pointed church in the dusty market of some tropical city seemed a ludicrous and self-deluding obsession with the “same” even at the time. The more progressive architects, aware of this problem, instead indulged a taste for eclecticism. Such a strategy (while still nominally racist) is, at an operative level, quite like the hybridicity so valued in post-colonialist discourse.

In this excellent book Mark Crinson gives an overview of nineteenth-century architectural theory as it bears on orientalist materials and proceeds to four case studies of British buildings in the Near East; in Istanbul, Jerusalem and of two in Alexandria. The survey of nineteenth-century theory which Crinson offers is exceptionally sound and well judged. It not only gives a context by which to understand British interest in the Oriental, but shows that orientalism is crucial to several aspects of nineteenth century architectural culture. The racialist theory of the origins and development of architecture is the most obvious of these and at a simple level the Islamic architecture of the Eastern Mediterranean served to demonstrate the superiority of northern European nations and their special access to the architectural spirit. But the exact mechanism of this putative superiority is more interesting. European architecture alone was held capable of development, but it was not progressing. Instead British architecture was suffering a crisis of confidence, apparently being unable to achieve the organic social expression of the medieval period under modern conditions. While Oriental cultures lacked historical determinations, the timelessness and the still vibrant medievalism of Islamic building was held to be a lesson by some British architects. One crucial issue was the debate over ornament. Henry Cole and Owen Jones argued that history demanded that ornament should be understood conventionally and that it be taught through a process of abstraction which would fit it to the modern world. Islamic art and architecture provided the example of such conventionalised ornament, and its source in script held the promise that such a conventionalised art might be directly communicative. John Ruskin argued that, on the contrary, ornament ought to be based on naturalistic principles of the individual’s meditation on the facts of natural forms. The arts of India or the Islamic world, for Ruskin, might have achieved high formal perfection but they lacked the vital principle and the ethical foundation of Western art in its constant return to natural beauty by individuals each remaking the contract between art and the world.

Crinson clearly shows the functionality of orientalist materials in both lending coherence and in opening issues in the conceptualisation of western architecture. However, his project undertakes to go somewhat further than this and to examine the colonialist architecture in the colonies. In building churches in Ottoman cities British colonialists clearly imagined a kind of dialogue between cultures, as well as their own self-presentation. St Mark’s Alexandria of 1846 was designed by James Wild, a talented English architect who had spent some years in the East and made studies of the picturesque aspects of Egyptian life. Wild’s design is an eclectic interpretation of an early Christian plan form with elements derived from Cairene architecture. The most explicit moments of synthesis are the detached campanile (unbuilt) which very successfully blurs between medieval Italian and Islamic prototypes, and the decoration of the church with carved English script. The scriptural ornament does not so much

represent Islamic art as make a claim of aesthetic and doctrinal fellowship between English Protestantism and Islam in opposition to the idolatry of other Christian sects.

Egypt was not a British colony in the 1840s. The British were rather vying with other European powers to effect political capture and control of Muhammad Ali and his campaign to industrialise Egypt and disengage it from the Ottoman Empire. In this process the British government's aim was to maintain Ottoman power and keep Egypt as an agricultural supplier and market for British manufacturing. However, such a policy was to a large extent at odds with the interests of the industrialists and bankers of the British colony in Alexandria. St Mark's, intended as a symbol of British power, a church for the British community, and as a mission to the heathen, sits at a complex intersection of British, colonial and Egyptian interests. Its synthetic style could be understood either as a chauvinist appropriation of Christian origins and ultimate triumph, or as a betrayal of the European race in impure religious and political compromises. Crinson makes clear that the undoubted confusion of such circumstances is at least partly the result of the value that Victorians put on stylistic eclecticism. In eclecticism the will and genius of the architect was expressed in a calculus of appropriations and recombinations as a kind of built historiography. In the colonial circumstance such an attitude could only bring architecture into the kind of hybridicity which both fascinated and repelled the Victorian mind.

Wild's Alexandrian church is the most aesthetically interesting building in *Empire Building*. Its genuine formal innovations symptomatise the tensions of architectural theory about the orient, and its building and reception are a clear account of the fractured interests and far from inevitable process of actual colonialisation. Of equal interest, but unbuilt, is William Burges's design for the Crimean Memorial Church in Istanbul. The church was eventually built to an undistinguished design by G.E. Street from 1864-68. In the process of the competition, different designs and final construction, Crinson shows the interplay of various divergent factors, each with their own historical pace. The most immediate of these is the dynamic of the Turco-British Alliance. The second is the development of the ideology of the high Church faction from simple nationalistic medievalism to an internationalist evangelicalism which emphasised local conditions. This architectural ideology bears on, but is ineffective with regard to the difficulties of construction in a British manner in Istanbul. The Crimea chapel and the other buildings can be taken to explicate what Crinson takes from Nicholas Thomas to be a general characteristic that "colonial intentions are frequently deflected, or re-enacted farcically or incompletely" (qtd 165).<sup>1</sup>

The strength of Crinson's book lies in its thorough research of specific cases of inherent interest while working continually against simplistic accounts of the monolithic nature of colonialism. Colonialism emerges here as a specific set of practices both inside metropolitan British culture as well as at its edge; a set of practices which were as much opportunistic appropriations and real confusion of interests as any systematic traducing of local cultures. However, the weakness of the book is also in its case-study structure. Crinson's examples are within the "informal" empire of the Eastern Mediterranean, while both his methodological precepts and the implications of his work are much broader. India looms large immediately beyond the space of the book. Although Crinson implies that the architecture of colonialism in India is also to best understood as

<sup>1</sup> See Nicholas Thomas, *Colonialism's Culture*. Cambridge: Polity, 1995.

contingent, the “deflection” of colonial projects there occurs within a much more coherent architectural expression of domination. Crinson has nothing to say about the building of Empire in North America, Australia, and New Zealand, although I imagine that this might provide interesting parallels with the orientalist moment. For instance the climatic determinations claimed by Bishop Webber as significant in the choice of style for the Crimea Memorial Church were also crucial in the same Bishop’s brief for St John’s Cathedral in Brisbane. Though it would be unfair to blame Crinson for not extending his book, the absence of a contextualising chapter on other colonial spheres leaves the reader with some uncertainty. Is Crinson claiming particular conceptual importance for the colonial architecture of the Near East on account of Islam’s rival patrimony of the classical origins of architecture in the Mediterranean? Similarly, is he implying that the “informal” imperialism of Eastern Mediterranean through banking and trade concessions is a more convenient site to examine architectural ideology, or is it rather that this is a form of colonialism more like the problems which confront us in the twentieth century? Answers to such questions are beyond simple clarification. We must wait on further studies able to match and extend Crinson’s exemplary grasp of historical detail and his verve for argument.

**John Macarthur**

---

***The Gothic Body: Sexuality, Materialism and Degeneration at the Fin de Siècle*, by Kelly Hurley. Cambridge Studies in Nineteenth-Century Literature and Culture 8. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1996.**

The revival of the Gothic novel in late nineteenth-century Britain is a well-known datum of literary history, generally represented in critical accounts by reference to a handful of fictions such as *The Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde*, *The Picture of Dorian Gray* and *Dracula*. Kelly Hurley’s *The Gothic Body* makes clear the hitherto largely ignored extensiveness and popularity of the Gothic revival, bringing under serious critical consideration an impressive number of fascinating-sounding texts from the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries by such relatively unfamiliar names as Arthur Machen, Richard Marsh and William Hope Hodgson, as well as treating the fictions of better known writers like Stevenson, Wells, Conan Doyle and Le Fanu. Hurley contends that the resurgence and modification of the Gothic after its virtual disappearance in the middle of the nineteenth century is explained by the genre’s capacity to negotiate anxieties about the nature of human identity generated by *fin-de-siècle* scientific discourses. Her organising principle for her investigations of these texts is “the abhuman,” a term she borrows from the horror writer William Hope Hodgson to denote the possibilities of “the ruination of traditional constructs of human identity” as autonomous and discrete and “the modeling of new ones” made available by developments in the biomedical and biological sciences (5). More graphic and visceral in its representations than before, the *fin-de-siècle* Gothic “manifests a new set of generic strategies . . . which function maximally to enact the defamiliarisation and