ally shifting, uncertain, ambiguous, insecure and anxiety-ridden middle ground." Morrison is not a seeking a middle ground. On the contrary, as she describes it, her storytelling is a result of having identified that whole for what it is, of having stepped back to look at "the bowl, the structure"—in other words, of having occupied a kind of totalizing perspective.

When Roemer says, referring to fascism, that "a totalizing or totalitarian approach attracts those who feel invalidated by promising them a significant place or role" (p. 358), he is assuming that "totalizing or totalitarian" approaches must be arbitrarily dictatorial pictures defined somehow independently of consideration of relevant particular interests, circumstances, and aspirations. But rejecting this kind of totalizing picture does not mean the denial of the possibility of discovering and defending meaningful social and moral visions, which is what much current storytelling, at least sometimes, succeeds in helping us to do. It might have been interesting, for instance, if Roemer had considered science fiction. Joanna Russ, for one, has said that because science fiction deals with other worlds, it is able to bypass many of the social myths that constrain more naturalistic fiction. And Dorothy Allison says that science fiction stories demonstrate that personal relations can be radically different from what they now are without bringing about a social or moral catastrophe, an insight that she says can change the world. These are, at least arguably, examples of meaningful sorts of storytelling. But we cannot appreciate, or perhaps even identify, their contribution to meaningfulness or its implications without first asking serious philosophical questions about what meaningfulness is.

Storytellers ought not to embrace Roemer's "middle-road." Middle-roads do not challenge inappropriate and mistaken totalizing pictures; they presuppose them. Fortunately there is much storytelling that does indeed challenge mistaken (racist, sexist, positivistic) totalities and it does so by boldly claiming, or at least presupposing the possibility of claiming, a more adequate general moral world view. We still need to see how many of the philosophical assumptions Roemer takes for granted are challenged by the fact that contemporary storytelling does indeed, at least sometimes, play such a liberating role.

SUSAN E. BABBIT
Department of Philosophy
Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario

COFFIN, DAVID R. *The English Garden: Meditation and Memorial.* Princeton University Press, 1994, 170 pp., 86 b&w illus., $35.00 cloth.

Considering their importance—in the generation and elucidation of emotion and especially the creation of joy, melancholy, and tranquility, in the construction of social space and the facilitation of particular kinds of social encounters, in the transmission of social values and the interpretation of political principles (not to mention in municipal and state and federal budgets)—there is surprisingly little written about gardens that addresses philosophical issues. Philosophers, therefore, and especially philosophers of art, will welcome *The English Garden: Meditation and Memorial,* the most recent, and most philosophically interesting, of David R. Coffin's contributions to the field of garden studies.

Professor Coffin, the Howard Crosby Butler Memorial Professor of History of Architecture, Emeritus, at Princeton University, writes primarily as a historian of gardens. (His two earlier books in the field, *Gardens and Gardening in Papal Rome* (1991) and *The Villa in the Life of Renaissance Rome* (1988), focus on the artistic evolution and social contexts of Italian formal gardens.) *The English Garden* joins a small number of art-historical studies of eighteenth-century English gardens—John Dixon Hunt's *The Figure in the Landscape* (1976); Hunt and Peter Willis's anthology of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century writings, *The Genius of the Place* (1975); Christopher Hussey's groundbreaking essay in the social construction of reality by the arts, *The Picturesque: Studies in a Point of View* (1927, 1967); and I. W. U. Chase's *Horace Walpole: An Edition of Walpole's "The History of the Modern Taste in Gardening," with an Estimate of Walpole's Contribution to Landscape Architecture* (1943)—that not only amplify our understanding of the English natural landscape garden (or *jardin anglo-chinois*) per se, but also illuminate its crucial role in the development of the modern era with its new political and social—as well as aesthetic—paradigms and values.

Unlike that in most studies of gardens, the organization of this book is thematic rather than by garden, historical period, or style. Its opening chapters, on "Transience" and "Meditation," raise a number of interesting issues about the nature of gardens and their philosophical possibilities, particularly regarding their relations to death and to our awareness of the passing of time, the secularization of religious values, and the history of emotion and feeling. Those fascinated by the origins of objective knowledge and of the modern preference for objective over subjective organizations of knowledge and those interested in the ramifications of scientific knowledge in everyday life will find in the section on sundials a wealth of in-

Copyright © 2000 All Rights Reserved

formation to feed their theorizing. The discussion on ruins is, I believe, the best in print.

After the first two chapters, however, the text seems to shift gears; it becomes more historical and descriptive, less analytical and speculative. Chapter three, "Hermits, Goths, and Druids," examines the various kinds of evidence—both "found" and contrived—of the historic past integrated into gardens during this time; there are also fascinating accounts of the several forms of impersonation and adoption of personae within the garden. Chapter four focuses on the various forms of burial in the garden. Chapter five, "Monuments and Memorials," will prove of least direct value to philosophers. Although the amount and precision of documentation do not diminish, Coffin here seems almost overwhelmed by the wealth of detail, offering far less analysis and less speculation about the meaning. The main philosophically resonant distinction, that between works which commemorate and those which are merely "decorative" or eye-catching, is unexplored (and even undefined). No attempt is made to distinguish different types or purposes of commemoration, nor to establish a conceptual framework for their value—to their builders or to us—although he continues to be meticulous in his historical detail. (We learn, for example, that the first monument to a king was Hubert Le Sueur's 1633 equestrian statue of Charles I, built to stand in Sir Richard Weston's garden.) Nor is there any attempt to distinguish different understandings of history. The mingling of the legitimately historical (Sir Francis Drake) and the legendary at Stowe, for instance, and the uses of British legend—like that of Merlin—by those in power like Queen Caroline are remarked upon but unanalyzed. Similarly, the varieties of decoration are uninterpreted, although this was happening at a time when the possibilities of objective knowledge were of burgeoning interest not only to scientists but to the elite at large, when the Enlightenment was in full swing, and when social and agricultural leaders were insisting on changing centuries of practice based on new knowledge. The result of this lack of analysis is that the mixture of British legend and history, for example, seems to be identical to the conflation made at the same time between certain aspects of ancient Greece and Rome—though this conflation was based on ignorance.

The chapter nonetheless makes a valuable contribution, in the sheer amount of information it provides, to the very recent—and desperately needed—literature on the political dimensions of eighteenth-century English landscape gardens. Douglas D. C. Chambers's *The Planters of the English Landscape Garden* (1993) analyzes the projects of several of the more influential gardenists and their implementations in the various gardens and writings about gardens, and Nigel Everett's *The Tory View of Landscape* (1994) examines the lively debates over the political meanings of gardening and "improvement." Together these works are finally filling in important gaps in our knowledge about the political dimensions of this fascinating and philosophically resonant art form so crucial to the formation of the modern world. Of the three, Coffin's is by far the most "art-historical," that is, he pins down inscriptions, patrons, dates, without necessarily examining their significance; indeed, he is confident that "all three [of the principal types of commemorative monuments, that is, pyramids, obelisks, and triumphal columns] were used together at the same locations *without much apparent significance to the type utilized*" (p. 218; emphasis added), a claim that seems unlikely to be true, given the political controversies surrounding such concepts as "gothic" and "ancient." Surprisingly, he all but ignores Chinese design, which played a salient role in the debates initiated by Horace Walpole in the 1770s over the nature of the state and political authority.

Rich as these latter chapters are in historical and artistic detail, philosophers will find them frustrating in their more summary and factual approach. Coffin mentions changes in the types of heroes chosen for celebration in the gardens, for example, without commenting on what might have motivated such changes (pp. 173, 175). He takes the notion of "meaning" to be emblematic at one point (p. 188) but not at another (p. 193), without clarifying either the differences between them or the reasons for the differences. He documents connections with Masonry in terms of persons and motifs, but not inner concerns or social agendas.

Equally unsatisfying is Coffin's reluctance to address issues concerning the relations between gardens and empire-building in the preceding period, issues for which the way has been paved by the brilliant—and certainly well-known—studies of gardens, exploration, and monarchy by John Prest and Roy Strong. Prest's *The Garden of Eden: The Botanic Garden and the Recreation of Paradise* (1981) examines the connections between new garden styles, religious ideals, early modern science, and world exploration. Strong's *The Renaissance Garden in England* (1979) traces the relations between garden style and monarchy. Such issues emerge quite naturally—one would think unavoidably—in the context not only of the period, but of the plant materials and design motifs of these gardens, which included (in the terminology of contemporary accounts) "a kneeling youthful blackamoor," "a kneeling Indian slave," and "a Negro Slave." (It is in this context that the omission of Chinese influence seems so baffling.) Professor Coffin himself mentions the connection with world exploration as early as page 20, where he notes, "Such figures had geographical rather than temporal allusions, thus expressing the universality of the sun

Copyright © 2000 All Rights Reserved

and associating the garden and its plants with the wonders of the new worlds explored by the plant collectors." His refusal to do more with such compilations of data is particularly frustrating given the breadth and intricacy of his demonstrated knowledge of the complex politics of the periods.

And although he mentions a number of women as gardenists, garden visitors, and writers, he nowhere considers implications of gender on the garden making.

The eighty-seven black-and-white illustrations, both photographs of the gardens as they are now and reproductions of contemporary prints, drawings, and watercolors, are beautifully chosen, clear, and effective. Interspersed with the text, they are seamlessly coordinated with the discussion (rarely more than a page away), and fluidly cross-referenced when their complicated subject matter demands treatment in more than one section.

Equally graceful—and generous to the reader—is Professor Coffin's provision of translations of (usually Latin) quotations and his identification of virtually all historical figures, including such ones as "Roman [poets] Virgil and Horace." Lesser known figures, such as Henry VIII's horologist, Bavarian mathematician Nicholas Kratzer, are described not only by the primary functions and relations to gardens, but in terms of other reasons the reader might find them interesting. (The reader may find Holbein's 1528 portrait of Kratzer, for example, in the Louvre; the student of art wants to know this.) The quotations are delicious, and stand at the heart of the book; the author states that "The meaning of a work of art to its owner or to spectators, along with its function in their lives, offers the ultimate reason for its existence. This study is based very much on their original comments as I believe that contemporary accounts offer more perceptive observations than later paraphrases or speculations. In addition, the mode of expression and the words with which different commentators at different times expressed their ideas are important, I believe, for a full understanding of their beliefs." Yet he never lets the words get in the way of the images, or take their place.

The anecdotes are intriguing: Sir William Temple's will "instructed that his heart should be buried 'six feet underground on the south-east side of the stone dial in the little garden at Moor Park.'" In another mood, Lord Rochester deliberately destroyed the royal sundial of Charles II at Whitehall; Coffin surmises that "If [a contemporary's] quotation of Rochester's comment is accurate, the earl was concerned by the expression of the transience of time suggested by the sundial and at least subconsciously may have been disturbed by its commentary on his own mortality." Such stories and quotations bring vividly to life a number of issues in the history of philosophy and will make the book loved by students; indeed, such felicities cry out for the book—or at least a few chapters—to be used in the classroom.

The introduction and conclusion provide valuable perspectives, but philosophers will still need to think through the ramifications of this enormous amount of information on their own. Fortunately for all of us who love gardens or the eighteenth century, Professor Coffin's scholarship is both reliable enough and encompassing enough to enable us finally to be able to think philosophically—and accurately—about these wonderful gardens.

MARA MILLER
Departments of Art History and Religious Studies
Emory University

MEYER, LEONARD B. *Music, the Arts, and Ideas: Patterns and Predictions in Twentieth-Century Culture.* University of Chicago Press, 1994, 376 pp., $17.95 paper.

This is a welcome republication, after twenty-seven years, of an ambitious book that extends the theory of musical meaning the author presented earlier in *Emotion and Meaning in Music* (1956) and goes on to assess the stylistic development (or lack of development) of music in this century against a larger ideological background. (The first two chapters originally appeared in *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* in 1957 and 1959.) The book consists of three parts: (I) a reformulation of the theory of musical meaning now explicitly in terms of information theory, together with a working out of interesting aesthetic problems from this perspective; (II) an argument that Western music and other arts have entered a period of stasis characterized by stylistic pluralism; and (III) a cautionary discussion of the cognitive complexities of recent music. One of Meyer's central insights has been that music theory must be informed by an understanding of listeners' cognitive predilections and limitations, and that is a driving force behind this book. A related preoccupation is the relationship Meyer later termed "implication" and "realization," present here both at the level of the individual work and at the level of stylistic and historical development.

I remember this book from my student days as a great inspiration; *Emotion and Meaning* is still the richer work. The first three chapters of *Music, the Arts, and Ideas* may constitute a better introduction to Meyer's thought, but the depth of musical insight in *Emotion and Meaning*—the way it ranges over what seems to be nearly every important music-theoretical issue from harmonic function to hypermeter—is positively exhilarating, and one misses the same specifically musical depth in the present book. Nevertheless,

Copyright © 2000 All Rights Reserved