

account of Cromwell's "apprenticeship," his activities as one of the more radical members of the Long Parliament. Gentles presents Cromwell as "one of a small group of radical MPs and peers who not only saw the inevitability of armed conflict with the King, but welcomed it from an early stage" (18). In a later chapter, he gives a well-argued, convincing account of Cromwell's evolving attitude toward the trial and execution of Charles I, treating Cromwell here and elsewhere as consistent, rather than wishing at first to reach some accommodation with the King. He tells the story of the formation of the New Model Army under Fairfax and Cromwell effectively—the ruthless supplanting of the ineffective noblemen Manchester and Essex as generals, the political as well as military implications of Cromwell's creation of crack troops united by being "religious men," often of humble backgrounds. As Cromwell said, in a passage often quoted, "I had rather have a plain russet-coated captain that knows what he fights for, and loves what he knows, than that which you call a gentleman, and is nothing else" (24). In his discussions of the battles of Marston Moor, Naseby, Dunbar, Preston, and Worcester, Gentles pays tribute to Cromwell's great skill as a military strategist and in "fashioning a military instrument that was fit to carry out" his aims (134). Though the shortness of his extraordinary military career could not rank him with Napoleon or Julius Caesar, Gentles presents him as an outstanding soldier and statesman.

An interesting chapter on Cromwell and money, the product of original research previously unpublished, is followed by two chapters on Cromwell as political leader, under the Commonwealth and Protectorate. These chapters devote particular attention to Cromwell's role in the expulsion of the Rump Parliament and the Nominated (Barebones) Parliament, and include well-balanced, sympathetic discussion of the nature of the Protectorate government, and of proposals that Cromwell should become King. Here as elsewhere, Gentles makes judicious use of recent scholarship. The one weak chapter, on Cromwell and the arts (encompassing patronage, poetry, and horsemanship, among other things), is followed by an account of his death and legacy. Cromwell's reputation,

posthumous and in his lifetime, is treated in a rather cursory fashion, with nothing equivalent to the final chapter of Christopher Hill's *God's Englishman: Oliver Cromwell and the English Revolution* (Penguin, 1972), or to John Morrill's superb "Cromwell and His Contemporaries" in the fine collection of essays edited by Morrill, *Oliver Cromwell and the English Revolution* (Longman, 1990).

As their titles suggest, Hill and Gentles cover much of the same ground, though they differ in approach. Hill, deeply sympathetic to Levellers and religious heterodoxy, presents Cromwell as a lost leader, ambivalent in his social conservatism and religious radicalism, who, though longing for a permanent settlement and the transformation of the state into something like the "the Nation of Prophets, of Sages, and of Worthies" envisioned in Milton's *Areopagitica*, left nothing lasting behind him. Gentles treats the Levellers more briefly, as obstacles in Cromwell's path before he could get on with the work of subjugating Ireland. Like Hill and like John Morrill and Blair Worden, he sees liberty of conscience as Cromwell's overriding aim, though he makes somewhat less than they do of the problematical aspects of Cromwell's religious and political principles. Steering clear both of extreme revisionism and of the Whig version of history, Gentles gives a coherent account of Cromwell as "one of the half dozen great figures of English history"—and yet he concludes on a slightly sour note, "in the end, as with most revolutionaries, his accomplishments were chiefly destructive" (101–2). The Cromwell who emerges from Gentles's book is a more complex figure than this final sentence would suggest.

WARREN CHERNAIK

King's College, London, UK

warren.chernaik@kcl.ac.uk

© 2014, Warren Chernaik

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10848770.2014.965510>

The Total Work of Art in European Modernism. By David Roberts (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2011), ix + 292 pp. \$37.50 paper.

The "total work of art," from the German *Gesamtkunstwerk*, is associated with Wagner's

desire for artworks to unify the various modes of artistic expression and form an integral part of the cultural and political life of a community. This conception of art was inspired by Greek drama, which brought together dance, music and poetry, and which seemed to later romantic and post-romantic artists and thinkers to have emerged organically in a manner that would suggest there was no strict demarcation between life and art. This much is commonly known, but there is a surprising dearth of scholarship devoted to exploring the idea of the total work of art more deeply. Not only does David Roberts's *The Total Work of Art* set out to do just this, he also makes a case for the total work of art as being an important idea in aesthetic modernism—quite a provocative move, since modernism is so frequently characterised as upholding the separation and autonomy of the arts. Roberts's opening statement—"this is the first book in English to treat the total work of art as a key concept in aesthetic modernism, and, as far as I can see, the first to attempt an overview of the theory and history of the total work in European art since the French Revolution" (1)—indicates the extraordinary ambition and scope of his undertaking. His book is an impressively scholarly work, but its real achievement is that it manages to fulfil its sweeping ambition without unduly compromising its attention to local and specific issues. It strikes a successful balance between an often exhilarating narrative that traces from the French Revolution up to the Second World War the idea of the total work of art and its aesthetic, political and spiritual functions, and a series of finely nuanced discussions of artworks and aesthetic projects ranging from the Republican festivals of Jacques-Louis David to the artistic manifestos of Wagner and to d'Annunzio's *Il fuoco*, with many other stops along the way. What is perhaps more remarkable still is that *The Total Work of Art* "forms the third part of a trilogy on European modernism that drew its original impulse from dissatisfaction with Theodor Adorno's reading of cultural modernity" (ix). The other two works, *Art and Enlightenment: Aesthetic Theory after Adorno* (1992) and *Dialectic of Romanticism: A Critique of Modernism* (2004) are similarly impressive achievements.

The Total Work of Art is divided into three parts. The first part, "The Artwork of the

Future," includes four chapters. Chapter 1 looks at how the idea of the total work of art arose in response to the perceived need to motivate political commitment and a sense of social identity following the collapse of political and religious authority in the French Revolution. Chapter 2 offers brief but illuminating discussions of the aesthetic speculations of Quatremère de Quincy, Schiller, Hölderlin and Hegel on the contemporary and future role of art. Chapter 3 focuses on the ways in which French writers and artists were thinking about the total work of art in the years 1830 to 1848. Of particular importance here is Saint-Simon's distinction between *organic* and *critical* epochs and his advocacy of a priestly role for artists and intellectuals in guiding society on the basis of the insights afforded by art. This allows us to glimpse a central paradox that recurs throughout, namely, that if the total work of art were to be successfully instantiated it would be at the cost of art as a distinct aesthetic category, since art would be integrated into society, forming part of the daily life of the community. This idea is taken up again in Chapter 4, which looks at how Heidegger, Nietzsche and Mallarmé, understanding 'aesthetics' to signal a certain distance between a community and the products of its artistic expression, envisaged a 'non-aesthetic' absolute role for art.

The second part, "The Spiritual in Art," is again made up of four chapters. Chapter 5 focuses on religion and art, using Wagner's *Parsifal* as the paradigmatic attempt to re-instantiate an all-encompassing, mythically and religiously potent festive theatre, which Hans-Georg Gadamer defines in contradistinction to the modern professional theatre. Chapter 6 looks at the ways in which the idea of the total work of art is taken up by European symbolism, particularly in the work of Mallarmé and Scriabin. Chapter 7 uncovers parallels between the notion of the *Gesamtkunstwerk* and the early-twentieth-century avant-garde by arguing for the totalising—as well as iconoclastic—tendencies of the latter. Chapter 8 explores deindividuating tendencies in modern theatre, specifically in the work of Hofmannsthal, Claudel, Brecht, and Artaud.

The third part, "The Sublime in Politics," includes three chapters. Chapter 9 discusses how the political sublime that emerged

in the wake of the French Revolution was reflected in artistic attempts to stimulate national regeneration. Chapter 10 looks at art and revolution in the Soviet Union, focusing on festivals, the avant-garde, Stalinism's version of the total work of art, and the show trials. Chapter 11 turns, perhaps inevitably, to the aestheticisation of politics in the shadow of the Third Reich. The Conclusion offers a very useful summary of the arguments developed and ideas explored in the book.

The Total Work of Art is a significant addition to modern aesthetics. It is elegantly written, clearly argued and painstakingly researched (with the single, unfortunate exception of Wikipedia being offered as a source for a reference to Robert Wistrich). For anybody with an interest in modern aesthetics, art history and, indeed, the history of ideas, this volume will prove an invaluable companion.

JAMES CORBY

University of Malta, Malta

james.corby@um.edu.mt

© 2014, James Corby

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10848770.2014.965511>

War Trauma and English Modernism: T. S. Eliot and D. H. Lawrence. By Carl Krockel (Hampshire, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), xii + 241 pp. \$85.00/£50.00 cloth.

The outpouring of poetry composed in Britain between 1914 and 1915 opened up a tension between two very different schools. On the one hand were the British Modernists, poets and writers not only weaned on late-nineteenth-century European Modernism but also vividly aware of the changes, including political changes, brought about by the rise of Germany's industrial muscle. On the other were the Georgian war poets who struggled to find a medium adequate to express the shock brought about by the reality of war. The former were interested in formal experimentation, the impossibility of autobiography, and the dissociation of sensibility. The latter were intent on trying to convey the horror of immediate personal experience. While D. H. Lawrence, in *England, My England* (1915), describes battlefield experience as "a small,

unimportant action" (4), for the war poets, battlefield experience was the defining symbol of the age. Neither school had any patience with the other. Following the Great War, Siegfried Sassoon "consistently rejected Modernist poetry as exclusively cerebral, singling out Eliot as his *bête noire*," while Yeats "famously excluded" Owen from his 1935 edition of the *Oxford Book of Modern Verse* (1, 2).

Criticism offers different explanations for this antipathy. Bernard Bergonzi anatomises the different attitudes of the war poets toward death and sees their endeavour as essentially demythologizing. In contrast, Paul Fussell sees their major concern as a movement toward myth, toward fiction. Vincent Sherry sees more in common between the two schools than most. He suggests that "the language of Anglo-American Modernism in the Twenties formed a critique of the rhetoric of liberalism during the war" (6). In this study, Carl Krockel picks up on Sherry's interest in the nature and implications of war trauma. He chooses to focus on Eliot and Lawrence because they represent very different aspects of the modernist experiment, arguing that these differences make it easier for him to draw more general inferences about the relation of Modernism to trauma. Building on the work of Samuel Hynes, who argues that the Modernists and war poets have a similar interest in an aesthetic that "communicates direct experience" (8), his study compares works by Eliot and Lawrence to a broad range of war writers in the light of contemporary and more recent trauma theory.

Krockel's application of trauma theory to the works of Eliot and Lawrence is appropriate. As he points out, by 1916 it was recognised that trauma was not always the result of physical shock, but very often arose from psychic stress. He lets himself down, however, by anchoring his argument to the experience of Baudelaire as interpreted by Walter Benjamin. The latter's claim that Baudelaire "battled the crowd" is tenuous at best, and under no circumstances can Baudelaire's personal trauma/modernist sensibility be attributed to anything akin to war trauma. The brief references to trauma theory of the period, and even briefer to more recent trauma theory, provide an insufficient lever