

From the Grove to the World

PATRICIA DEMERS

Academic self-analyses and autobiographies are a growth industry. It is small wonder that professors in the Humanities, and particularly in English, would train their skills on themselves and, by refraction, the discipline in which they live and think. Clearly they are their best-known texts. Such professional rhetors batten on the challenge of "trap[ping] Homo Academicus, supreme classifier among classifiers, in the net of his own classifications" (Bourdieu xi). But they do not offer detached scrutiny. Career frustrations, anxieties of influence, perceptions of a depleted reservoir of truth, ironizing and Menippean dispositions, which all of us in the academy share in varying intensities, reach an exceptional pitch in current examinations from within. Moreover, instead of harping on the rhetoric of "crisis," many analyses are concerned to underline the Humanities' central and informing contributions in a post-Enlightenment, post-structuralist, post-aesthetic, post-materialist moment. With a critical valence that is not alarm and not unalloyed celebration either, the Humanities have become hot. The sense of our importance and the need to proclaim it, through differing amounts of disaffection and evangelism, characterize contemporary re-positionings and re-appraisals. This essay will discuss six of these studies: James Axtell's *The Pleasures of Academe: A Celebration and Defense of Higher Education*, William Bowen and Harold Shapiro's edited essay collection, *Universities and Their Leadership*, Alvin Kernan's *In Plato's Cave*, Robert Scholes's *The Rise and Fall of English: Reconstructing English as a Discipline*, Jane Tompkins' *A Life in School: What the Teacher Learned*, and James Anderson Winn's *The Pale of Words: Reflections on the Humanities and Performance*.

In fact, a remarkable feature of these texts is the amount of resonances and nods of agreement they create. Given a largely academic readership, such a claim, I realize, may not seem so surprising. But the breadth of this common ground is worth emphasizing before entering the theoretical tilyards of individual studies. Few would disagree that in the modern university (or Clark Kerr's multiversity, or Alvin Kernan's demoversity), "characterized by a more rigorous, speculative probing, . . . it is critical for the president and any allies he or she can mobilize within the academic community to be able to convey to others the notion that for universities, the future is of great ethical significance" (Shapiro 93-94). Whatever positioning universities strive for and whatever shapes they may assume, the pivot or core of academic life remains the

classroom, or cognate areas like labs, libraries, and offices, where "the intellectual and imaginative synapse between professors and students" (Axtell xvi) animates and affirms all that we do. The vision of a university which I believe many of us share transcends the particularities of systems or institutions; although any mention of transcendence triggers the radar of suspicion and skepticism, I think most academics strive to make learning "not just task-oriented but always looking over its shoulder at everything that is going on around" (Tompkins xiii). Of course part of what is going on around us has transformed whom and what we teach and how we investigate our created human world. Old assumptions about absolute values have been thoroughly and rightly pummelled. In their place we examine social constructions, alert to contradictions, gaps, contingencies and the shifting norms of class, race and gender. But some constants — and not mere vestiges of an outworn creed — continue. The lure of libraries, "the ziggurats of old universities," still entices us under the sensuous spell of "the varied colors of the faded bindings, the order of the shelving system, the smell of old paper, glue, leather, and ink" (Kernan 290). Whether through administrative fiat, or the affirmation of granting council support, or the pull of individual temperaments and backgrounds, we are also attracted to hybrids and collaborations. From voluminous, international editorial projects to proposals to our own university press for an interdisciplinary series, from the filters of peer-reviewed collaborative ventures to the origins of a suggestion for a team-taught course over a cup of coffee, we enjoy company and extend our grasp through lateral inquiries. Our sense of understanding as prismatic can highlight colour and shade. Every twist of the kaleidoscope brings a new image. Sometimes we see ourselves in contrast; we need to assess if "the flexibility of performers, their willingness to adjust to the changing demands of audiences, contrasts strongly with the inflexibility of academics" (Winn 104). At others it's cocksureness not stodginess that requires tempering, in the recognition that "we need the sense of a shared enterprise to which we may contribute something" (Scholes 54).

In addition to the wide expanses of commonality, another noteworthy feature of these diverse studies is their anchorage in the postmodern world. Whether looking back at careers of 30 and 40 years, or surveying the field from a president's office or an institute's directorship, their finely grained analyses of academic life are all embedded in a wider reality. As I argued in the first installment of this essay, "In, Around and About the Olive Grove" (Vol. 25. 3-4), preoccupations with "integrationist and separatist concepts of learning, value and goodness" and "the contingent, complex responsibility of living in community" have been "perennial" subjects of an education in the Humanities. However, reflecting on the current sextet and the particular prominence of the intellectual life as an organic response to its surrounding circumstances, I want to re-consider and open up the Miltonic "Olive

Grove of *Academe*" (*Paradise Regained*, IV. 262). How fitting is the image? Could it pinpoint mere exclusivity and self-satisfaction? What connections might exist, I wondered as I worked through the texts under review, between the pieties of the academic grove and the idolatries associated with biblical groves? Though prohibited by Deuteronomistic injunction (26.21), worship of the groves is central to the stories and calamities of Joash (Judges 6.25-32), King Asa (I Kings 15.13), King Ahab, fluctuating in his desires for Jezebel and JHWH (I Kings 16.32-3), and the last of the Kings of Israel, Hoshea, who "made a grove" (I Kings 17.16). Christopher Hill reminds us that "in the grove Faustus raises Mephistophilis" (Hill 392). Of course such transgressions and challenges may simply appeal to postmodern disaffection. But I introduce this excursus on the grove to point to the perils of narrowness and in-turned preoccupations, about which dangers all the authors under consideration signal varying kinds of warnings.

Illuminating Gloom

It would be simplistic and misleading to dismiss the studies by Alvin Kernan, Robert Scholes and Jane Tompkins as *de profundis* cries. Certainly they are laments and their tone is often dyspeptic. Representing collectively over a century of experience of learning in the Humanities, they mourn the passing of different realities. For Kernan, a self-styled "tory-radical" (191), the change from the German-inspired research university, on the "positivistic, elitist, meritocratic model" (xiv), to the new demography entails "loss as well as gain" (xvii). Yet someone who pictures literary study as "the Northern Ireland and Bosnia of the great culture war" (xix) also has felt wounds which, in a non-Coriolanian mode, he itemizes. Resigned to a democratized higher education with its "rough edges" and "strident ideology," Kernan predicts the need of "considerable smoothing against the grindstone of accumulated knowledge from the past and the real, present needs of an effective educational system" (300). Scholes stakes out a "militant middle position" (ix) in his historical survey stretching from rhetorical and philological studies to a post-deconstructionist present. Tracing the development from connections between preaching and teaching and the New Criticism's canon of non-cognitive texts resisting "*doxa* or dogma" (25) to the deconstructionist mantra "in which the concept of 'difference' becomes a universal signifier in a negative theology with a Calvinist coloration" (27), he concludes morosely that "we are confused about what we should be teaching" (44). Although Scholes openly confesses his own loss of faith in the religion of literature, his is the lament not of an agnostic but of a believer manqué: "in the humanities we have largely given up on research as a progress toward truth" (47). Tompkins begins her autobiography with the similar-sounding declaration that she no longer has "much use for the things ...

learned in school" (xi). Though she insists that her book is not a repudiation but an examination of an educational system and its attention to students' inner lives, Tompkins chronicles her own experiences to deliver a forceful indictment of education. "When I look at my undergraduate students," she observes, "I see how their schooling is forcing them into the same patterns I have struggled to overcome: a divided state of consciousness, a hypertrophy of the intellect and will, an undernourished heart" (212).

Each has a different view of the cultural wars of the last few decades, views coloured by age, appointments and dispositions. A GI who attended Williams College, coloured at Oxford on a Moody Fellowship for two years and then Yale Graduate School before being hired in the Yale English Department in 1954, Kernan served as Provost at Yale in the early seventies and Dean of the School of Graduate Studies at Princeton for a term in the mid-seventies, thereby experiencing the administrator's side of student unrest and faculty truculence. Looking back wistfully at such graduate professors as M. H. Abrams at Cornell, Scholes supplies less of a career summary and sidesteps accounts of Department politics at Brown University. He concentrates instead on the vogues on disciplinary rhetoric, from belletristic origins to his registered disagreements with the Yale school of deconstruction. He conducts extensive discourses of opposition to Richard Rorty's "neopragmatist views" (51) because of their abandonment of "the 'love of truth' that Nietzsche considered so essential for philosophy" (52) and to Stanley Fish, whose defense of "professional correctness" involves "a very narrow definition of literature [that] ... completely ignores the teaching of writing as a potential disciplinary core" (179). Tompkins's account is the most vulnerably personal. Spotlighting neither the woes of administration nor the strategies of theoretical thrust and parry, she tells the story of her own emotional and intellectual progress throughout the sixties and beyond. Through deeply revealing probes and attempts to come back into possession of her feelings, she pursues "an inchoate yearning for integration" (212).

These studies also reveal a lot about their authors — at times inadvertently. Curiously the biggest disclosures come from Kernan and Tompkins, and not from the conversationally agile Scholes. Although he purposely keeps his family in the background, Kernan is not shy with details of his depression, followed by a heart attack, his elder son's hallucinations and his younger son's dyslexia. In the style of an accomplished academic gossip, he apparently suffers few qualms in telling sad non-fictional stories. About his "great" undergraduate teacher of Renaissance poetry, Clay Hunt, he notes: "A Kentuckian with a Ph.D. from Johns Hopkins, he was a manic-depressive, and a closet homosexual, who taught with frantic enthusiasm and broad learning" (17). Of his colleague and friend, Harold Bloom, Kernan records:

For all his romanticism, Harold was a careerist of unusual abilities. His book *The Western Canon* earned him a \$600,000 advance in the 1990s, an unheard-of sum for literary criticism. In the matter of appointments he also pulled off the unthinkable, managing to hold simultaneously two of the most distinguished chairs in the academic world, Sterling Professor of Humanities at Yale and Berg Professor of English at New York University. (71)

Fittingly it is Bloom who, as Kernan lies intubated in Intensive Care after his heart attack, comes "rushing in to give [him] an advance copy of his *Anxiety of Influence*." Kernan's ironic question, "Can I read it next week?" goes unheeded in Bloom's "Oh yes, dear boy, that will be plenty of time" (185). Beyond the punctilious rapportage about Robert Lane's *The Liberties of Wit* letting off "the accumulated steam of many a domestic argument" (111), the coincidence of Howard Felperin's failed tenure and marriage, the sad family histories of Harry Berger and Richard Sylvester, the sexual harassment scandal involving Thomas McFarland and the Princeton settlement scheme, which "looked like lining McFarland's jockstrap with chinchilla" (254), and more than "a pinch of reverse schandenfreude" (285) in Kernan's views of his former student, Stephen Greenblatt, the most unforgettable — and, surprisingly, anonymous — titbit of gossip is his matter-of-fact account of a pathetic, bullied "faculty wife." Only his second adjective hints at sympathy, as he recalls that "one poor woman with a tyrannical husband who was determined to make her act in a way that would further his career — it did not — regularly wet herself at parties, leaving a large stain whenever she got up from the sofa or chair on which she had sat unmoving all evening" (93-94).

A sensitive, solitary middle-class child, who proceeded to education at Bryn Mawr and Yale, Tompkins never lets the reader forget that she is bright and has a Yale Ph.D., which statements serve as both refrain and rationale in her candid but ultimately dispiriting autobiography. *A Life in School* is riddled with inconsistencies — perhaps not so surprising in a text that probes emotional depths and shallows. However, despite the curative emphasis on "a holistic approach to education... [which] would not leave us alone to wander the world armed with plenty of knowledge but lacking the skills to handle the things that are coming up in our lives" (xvi), Tompkins is tireless (or, endlessly performative) in presenting herself as a lesson by negative example. Her attitude toward her first two husbands is cavalier, at best casual. Though she admits finding relief for her own unhappiness through reading her students' assignments in her course Sex and Self in Autobiography, getting "to know [her] students at a deeper level and feel[ing] more connected to them" (95), students less at ease with this confessional mode are not part of the therapy. She also stays absorbed in her own battles with despair:

The early seventies were hard years for me. I was going through a divorce and living alone in a large city. I was on my third psychiatrist, having affairs that didn't turn out, fighting to get on the tenure track, struggling to stay afloat emotionally. Summers were the hardest. When the demands of teaching three courses a semester let up, depression took hold. (95)

Her retrospective look at her own education leaches joy, exuberance, or zaniness and concentrates doggedly on the mindgames of authority and classroom codes. In Tompkins's calculation:

Learning too well the lessons of the classroom exacts a price. Its exclusive emphasis on the purely intellectual and informational aspects of learning, on learning as individualistic and competitive, can create a lopsided person: a person who can process information efficiently, summarize accurately, articulate ideas, and make telling points; a person who is hardworking, knows how to please those in authority, and who values high performance on the job above all things. (211)

Her judgement on the stacking of the educational deck is extreme and caricatured, leaving little or no room for the countermoves of liberated, collaborative, decentred, shared learning. In fact, her dismissive, wholesale, generalizing view of teachers who do not resist "the destructive effects" of their schooling and who become authoritarian somnambulists — "Many of those who do not wake up to their condition remain in school as teachers, pleased with the rewards of having performed well, so the codes of the classroom are passed on" (212) — is simplifying and grossly ungenerous.

The views of this trio about the discipline itself and the academy are disquieting. Kernan's are the most bleak. The Provost who hired Paul de Man at Yale and who lived through the trial of Bobby Seale, "the gangster drug lord and leader of the Black Panther Party," tried in New Haven "for the torture and murder of one of his local followers" (167), Kernan extrapolates from his own admittedly harrowing, toughening experience to pass judgement on the failure of universities:

The feeling of great achievement is gone now, almost without a trace, disappearing into its own impossibility. Relativism and politicization did not destroy it; they filled the vacuum where the old dreams of absolute truth and great learning failed, and the universities they now govern are fragmented, nervous, uncertain, demoralized. (272)

Whether commenting cynically on the vogue of the public intellectual, as "every American college professor suddenly seemed to have found a prophet's rod in his book bag" (258), or, more sardonically, on the ways of getting around the fact that his students "had not read the texts" (240) in an undergraduate Shakespeare course,

Kernan's outlook — on radical democratization of universities, Humanities curricula, deconstructive philosophies and digitized communication technology — is that of a satiric elegist. "Now, as the printed book gives way to electronic media as the most efficient and attractive source of entertainment and information," he laments, "literature increasingly seems located in the intellectual rustbelt" (233).

Scholes is more concerned to point the way to disoriented troops. "What we need," he insists, "is a way of taking responsibility for the dialectic ourselves, ... find[ing] our way to truthfulness" (151). However, Scholes's direction has a deliberately limited historical compass. "The historical knowledge that students of the discipline of English need the most," in his argument, "is an understanding of the cultural changes that have taken place during the past two centuries" (158). Effectively excluding the advent of movable type, profound shift from manuscript to print culture, growth of religious pluralism, and cultures of contact and colonization from his announced scheme, Scholes is equally (and, disablingly) adamant in the contention that many English departments have "too many faculty in the earlier periods of English literature and not enough in American literature and the emerging subfields of Anglophone literatures, both postcolonial and ethnic American" (178).

Tompkins's interest is not politics; it is the psyche. Her own journey to the interior, bravely related, influences, motivates, underpins every judgement about the university, that "has no center and no soul," and the discipline, that can be controlled by "the old unmet demons — anger, fear, self-hatred, envy, you name it" (222). Tompkins's torment and delayed discoveries impart an undeniable poignancy. But her ominous warning about "the voyage out," especially to those of us who still love love it and sense its excitement many years after being an undergraduate, runs the risk itself of being either inhibiting or prosaic. She confides in the reader at the same time as she loads, or overloads, each line with the ore of emotional imbalance:

I am not advocating a curriculum devoted exclusively to the pursuit of self-knowledge. I too well remember the rapture of my undergraduate days in the east wing of the Bryn Mawr library reading the thirteenth-century Italian poets. I loved the voyage out. It was full of wonder and excitement. But in order to have a balanced, nonobsessive relation to the world outside yourself, some inner balance and self-understanding are needed. Otherwise, your engagement with the world sooner or later becomes captive to the claims of obscure actors to whom you are paying hush money behind your own back. (221-22)

Kernan, Scholes and Tompkins have produced studies full of professionally polished, fashionably skeptical aperçus about their discipline, their colleagues and themselves. Yet I must register fundamental disagreement with the tenor of each text. Though my own experience of academic administration (primarily as a Department Chair) has been

more limited than Kernan's, it has not left me as jaundiced. I find myself buoyed rather than depressed by the adaptive, responsive, and at times admittedly grudging transformations of the academy; the new demographics of university enrolments, the growth of transdisciplinary fora and linkages, the critically inflected contributions of humanists to civil (and civic) discourse, the bonanza of electronic media, the seismic changes effected by cyberspace and the challenges of informed filtering they present fill me with the sense of a transfigured discipline — its lineage as traceable as a genetic fingerprint, its voice and face part of a wider human community. As an early modernist I am alarmed by Scholes's *dirigisme* and selective historicization; his mountain-top rhetoric about the pursuit of truth is really quite limited. Though temperamentally less inclined than Tompkins to public confessions, I would hope that I am also less prodigal of privilege.

Critical Sunshine

Along with an entirely agreeable decrease in the complaint quotient, the most remarkable shared feature of James Axtell's *The Pleasures of Academe* and James Anderson Winn's *The Pale of Words* is the ways different disciplines have enlarged their understanding of the Humanities. Whimsically self-deprecating in choosing "to cannibalize [his] own lean experience as a scholar-jock" (117), Axtell explains how basketball, track and long jump at Yale and Cambridge prepared him for and enriched his scholarship. Winn's career as a concert flutist, informing his comments about the performer "always operating without clear rules, playing in a field without a well-defined center," highlights the reality check of his contention that "performers knew that they were operating in this uncertain and subjective world long before Derrida — indeed, long before Saussure" (98).

In addition to his recognition "that in track [he] had plenty of room for improvement, whereas in basketball most of [his] potential had already been realized" (127), Axtell acknowledges that "the daily discipline of time budgeting off the track reinforced the evolution of efficient routines on it" (128). While he put away his track spikes at the tender age of twenty-three and threw his "whole self into making a scholarly career" (129), he does not deride or dismiss this past. Instead he fastens on the valuable connections. In track, "one's contributions to the team is usually made in lone competition against a handful of opponents and teammates," and in research, "while scholars work for the cumulative, long-range good of their international community by advancing knowledge and understanding, they do so largely alone, teaching students and publishing books and articles under a single name" (130). Although he admits that the athlete's experience of losing publicly and often has given him "the kamikaze courage to commit [himself] to print, to stick [his] neck out before

the judgment of peers and superiors" (134), the William R. Kenan, Jr. Professor of Humanities at the College of William and Mary is not taken in by the superficial resemblances between endowed chairs and athletic trophies. "In scholarship," Axtell observes, "how you play the game" is everything; "who wins" is meaningless in a communal sense except as public awards serve sporadically to inspire the toilers in the vineyard, all searching for the perfect vintage, but knowing full well that the annual round of digging, nurturing and pruning is and must be its own reward" (132).

Winn's knowledge of the concert stage lends a passion to his defense of musical, theatrical, choreographed and visual performance in the face of long-standing Western prejudice. Speaking from the inside, in the published form of the inaugural series of James Murray Brown lectures at the University of Aberdeen, he submits that "living performers have a more visceral understanding" of the fragmentariness of interpretation "than intellectuals, who have much to learn from them" (98). Chair of the Department of English at Boston University and former director of the University of Michigan Institute for the Humanities, Winn makes effective use of one of Barthes' last essays, "Loving Schumann," to argue for the almost-lost, genuinely amateur pleasure "of what we might call performative listening," letting the music be fully heard by someone who has played it, even badly. As transposed to Winn's argument, Barthes makes this *eureka*-moment discovery about the performers' synaesthetic sense of recognition:

Schumann's music goes much further than the ear; it goes into the body, into the muscles by the beats of its rhythm, and somehow into the viscera by the voluptuous pleasure of its *melos*: as if on each occasion the piece was written only for one person, the one who plays it; the true Schumann pianist — *c'est moi*. (99)

The amount of good sense in these studies is also reassuring. As an historian whose focus has moved from the educational theories of John Locke to North American ethnohistory and the examination of slavery, colonization and exploration, Axtell presents and exemplifies a cogent argument for scholarship. His "Twenty-five Reasons to Publish" should be mandatory reading — for entering Ph.D. students, mid-career faculty and old duffers alike. His twenty-fifth reason is a resonating one: the knowledge of "a well-conceived, well-written, well-distributed book ... is diffused geometrically through other professors' lectures and through course adoptions to thousands of students all over the country and perhaps the world, not just to the students who happen to enroll in the writer's local classes" (66). Axtell's practical bi-weekly brown bag symposia, with "exhibits on 'The History of a Conference,' ... an Article,' and ... a Book" aim "to demystify the process, to render it more manageable and less threatening, and to suggest that the process itself is as important as the results" (162).

Perhaps because his field is not English but History, where the tradition of the lone scholar in the archives is more pervasive, his observation that humanists "will probably remain restrained users of the Web" (39) does not reflect adequately the rise of media studies, cyber-criticism and Web-based pedagogy.

In his dedication to the "moral imperative" (125) of performance, Winn draws some very sensible lines of contrast and filiation between linguistic theorists and performers. He points out that "Saussure himself, articulating the rules of a verbal language-system, could afford to bracket parole, declaring individual variations of speech irrelevant to the workings of the system, but in the performing arts, the situation is reversed" (81). He draws an equally illuminating parallel between Lévi-Strauss's structuralism, deriving "an entire system from one arbitrarily chosen myth," and Schoenberg's twelve-tone-row, "one particular sequence of the twelve chromatic pitches" from which "the composer can immediately derive many other rows" (88). Occasionally, however, Winn's zeal for the ethos of performance leads him to demonize selected and not entirely representative excerpts from sources critical of performance, as in his treatment of Augustine, who, he attests, "can hardly mention pleasure without linking it to sin, most often imagined as sexual sin" (52). It seems to me that Augustine, that highly performative sinner and saint, often invoked and declared the sustaining power of music, albeit Christocentric, eternal melodies. At the time of Monica's death, Augustine relates the comfort experienced through the recollection of an Ambrosian hymn (*Confessions*, Book IX, 12); when he contemplates the reality of his "positive and certain" love of God, he admits that "the sweet melody of harmony and song" is not the object but a conducive means to his end, since "when I love him, it is true that I love a light of a certain kind, a voice, ... when my soul is bathed in light that is not bound by space, when it listens to sound that never dies away" (*Confessions*, Book X, 6). Consequently, I find Winn's invocation of Augustine distorting and his including him in a trio of prurient opponents of performance ahistorical. When Winn declares that "this narrow and prurient view of performance, often invoking explicit misogyny, is an unfortunate tradition linking Augustine, the English Puritans, and Senator Jesse Helms" (53), his reach exceeds his grasp.

Shapes and Directions for the University

William Bowen and Harold Shapiro's essay collection, *Universities and Their Leadership*, emerging from the conference on higher education marking the 250th anniversary of Princeton University, explores a range of topics, from accountability, the teaching of professional conduct and ethics to the future of science policy. While these subjects may not be explicitly Humanities-oriented, they are part of the discursive milieu and context within which the Humanities function in universities. Their style is matter-of-

fact, without a trace of flamboyance. Yet the earnestness is sobering. The approaches are not theorized, or hypothetical, or speculative. Reflecting determination, clear-sightedness and resilience, they also affirm the creedal importance of the academy's governing itself and responding to wider constituencies. Professor of History at and President emeritus of the University of Chicago, Hanna H. Gray, surveys and distills academic leadership as "enabling." As she glosses, "such enabling, at its best, will rest on a foundation of collegial respect, disciplined restraint, constancy of purpose, and old-fashioned courage, on a willingness to pursue what may be unpopular at the moment and speak out against the merely popular, and on faithfulness to the academic calling itself" (114). The new, tough demands of that calling in pluralistic, complex universities prompt Harold T. Shapiro to speak of the prerequisite of "moral leadership" (98). President of Princeton University for over a decade and previously President of the University of Michigan for eight years, economist Shapiro does not balk at the responsibility of acting "as an example of personal integrity" (93) and articulating his principles with forceful directness:

It is more helpful, however, to focus on the positive and think of integrity as reflecting such qualities as open commitment to a set of academic and social values; forthrightness, discernment, steadfastness in the pursuit of a vision; fierceness in the defense of the cultural conditions (such as thoughtful debate and reasoned inquiry) required for scholarship and education; compassion and a capacity to compromise (to a point) when that is what is required to move a community forward. (93)

This collection actually throbs with issues of integrity, ethics and professional conduct — all derived from experience. I have chosen to concentrate on only two essays, for they indicate to me arenas where colleagues in the Humanities, particularly, could assume strong roles of initiation and leadership. In "How Can Universities Teach Professional Ethics?" Amy Guttmann exposes the false dichotomy between moral reasoning and moral conduct. The Laurence S. Rockefeller University Professor of Politics at Princeton argues that, to avoid the hypocrisy of being "adept at reasoning but unable to act" and the indoctrination of doing "the right thing without ever articulating reasons" (158), the ethics of the academic profession demand the blending of the two. Having taught ethics and public policy for over two decades, Guttmann is a firm believer in the vivid concreteness of the case study model, "engaging our students and colleagues in ethical reasoning [by] present[ing] them with case studies along with philosophical readings that articulate and defend relevant principles of ethical life" (159). Our professional conduct as teachers, which can encompass a wide sweep of issues, from the dynamics of classroom authority, the syllabus itself, speech codes, and protocols of multiple authorship to the exercise of peer review, remains a

neglected topic. Henry Rosovsky, Geyser University Professor emeritus at Harvard, and Inge-Lise Ameer, doctoral candidate at the Harvard Graduate School of Education, lament the decline in mentoring and the ignorance of questions of conduct and the dimensions of a social contract. Rather than invoke the nostalgia of the good old patrician days, when standards of professional conduct were absorbed at dinner table, prep school and club, they provide models of seminars in professional conduct tailored to and, they suggest, necessitated by the liveliness, diversity and meritocratic principles of the mass university.

Whether addressing issues of institutional governance or disciplinary adherence and disaffection, these studies are rooted in the world of the large contemporary university, itself embedded in a network of government, corporate and community alliances. Indeed the very nature of corporate alliances—from partnerships, joint-stock companies and patent controls to sponsored chairs, labs, auditoria and buildings—is highly charged in today's academy. Issues of the *Canadian Association of University Teachers Bulletin* throughout 1999 and 2000 have alerted readers to a host of dangers. Eyal Press and Jennifer Washburn's "The Kept University" relate the charges of Berkeley's Chancellor, Robert Berdahl, that the agreement the University signed with the Swiss pharmaceutical giant Novartis giving Berkeley \$25 million to fund basic research in the Department of Plant and Microbial Biology toward the production of genetically engineered crops "would disqualify a leading intellectual center from the ranks of institutions able to provide the kind of research — free from vested interest — that is the hallmark of academic life" (Press and Washburn 40). Distance and privilege are concepts in tension, and in ways Milton's depiction of the Olive Grove of Academe did not anticipate. While the academic grove must not be removed from the world, which its research informs, illumines and often improves, it must also be imbued with and enabled by the ethos of unimpeded inquiry. However, for time-servers within and for critics outside the academy, distance could justify remoteness and disinterest, and privilege could suggest mere entitlement. Moreover, these tensions are not unrelated to the disciplinary debates within the Humanities where, as the studies under review have argued, conversations will continue about ways to accommodate the strident ideology of the demoversity (Kernan), to take responsibility for the dialectic of textuality (Scholes), to nurture the heart (Tompkins), to encourage the exuberant spirit (Axtell) and to value the performative ethos (Winn).

Coda [Ital.: *L. cauda* tail.] A passage of more or less independent character introduced after the completion of the essential parts of the movement, so as to form a more definite and satisfactory conclusion. (Winchester 227)

I wonder at times how the touted New Oxford Dictionary, to be released in 2010, will define the Humanities. The current, much supplemented text, "the greatest effort since the invention of printing, the longest sensational serial ever written" (Winchester 220), limits the entry to "learning or literature concerned with human culture: a term including the various branches of polite scholarship, as grammar, rhetoric, poetry, and esp. the study of the ancient Latin and Greek classics." Its latest citation of usage is 1893. Surely no phantom of the pathological Dr. W. C. Minor will be resurrected! But how will this Victorian language change to reflect a fundamentally altered reality? How will the new entry explicate and detail the shared task of Humanities teaching and scholarship: the making of meaning out of our created human world, its languages and literatures (ancient and modern), its musical and visual arts, the events of its past and its systems of thought, both secular and religious? And how will this entry deal with the hotly contested concept of values — as constructed or exhumed, celebrated or lamented, reformed or reconfigured in the studies of the late 1990s?

As the stimulating, provocative, affirming arguments of Martha Nussbaum's *Cultivating Humanity*, Wendy Steiner's *The Scandal of Pleasure*, Jane Tompkins's *A Life in School*, James Axtell's *The Pleasures of Academe*, and James Anderson Winn's *The Pale of Words* lead me to hope, the New OED entry will have to be expansive indeed. It will illustrate that by providing both antidotes to amnesia and means of interpreting society and culture, the Humanities share a commitment to the critical understanding of human thought as it develops in time, and a belief that all knowing and thinking are inflected by values and norms, which must themselves stand up to critical reflection. Such revolutions in meaning-making as the constructivism of Kuhn, Benjamin and Lévi-Strauss, tentacular theories of narrative, and thick descriptions of culture, ethos, identity and nation have effected genuine transformations in how and why we conduct research, in what we teach, and in the kind of supervision we offer our graduate students. The entry into the academy of women, ethnic and racial minorities, and people of different classes and sexual orientations has resulted in a massification of higher education and its intense intellectual cross-fertilization. This widening of cognitive maps sketches new ways of speaking about created or retrieved cultural meanings for the light they cast on the imaginative universe in which they were recorded. Some maps are available; others are being dreamt. It's not all annihilation to a green thought in a green shade, but the interpretation of our created human world constitutes a never-ending story.

University of Alberta

Works Cited

- Augustine of Hippo, Saint. *Confessions*. Trans. R. S. Pine-Coffin. Middlesex: Penguin, 1961.
- Axtell, James. *The Pleasures of Academe: A Celebration and Defense of Higher Education*. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1998.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. *Homo Academicus*. Trans. Peter Collier. Oxford: Polity Press in association with Basil Blackwell, 1988.
- Bowen, William G. and Harold T. Shapiro, eds. *Universities and Their Leadership*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1998.
- Hill, Christopher. *The English Bible and Seventeenth-Century Revolution*. London: Penguin, 1994.
- Kernan, Alvin. *In Plato's Cave*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1999.
- Press, Eyal and Jennifer Washburn. "The Kept University." *The Atlantic Monthly* (March 2000): 39-54.
- Scholes, Robert. *The Rise and Fall of English; Reconstructing English as a Discipline*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1998.
- Tompkins, Jane. *A Life in School: What the Teacher Learned*. Reading, Mass.: Perseus Books, 1996.
- Winchester, Simon. *The Professor and the Madman; A Tale of Murder, Insanity, and the Making of the Oxford English Dictionary*. New York: Harper Collins, 1998.
- Winn, James Anderson. *The Pale of Words; Reflections on the Humanities and Performance*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1998.