

twentieth century, Holly wonders whether “it is not too absurd to wonder why we do not write today as Stokes once did” (200). Holly’s methodology is interesting. She says at one point that she is “a convinced advocate of retroactive readings, that is, using the commitments of the present to engage ideas of the past, and vice versa” (200), and this strategy of awakening Stokes’ subjective, individual and internal methods serves to demonstrate that his approach has not been erased by the heavily empirical and ‘positivist’ art history that has dominated since the middle of the twentieth century.

Perhaps it is only during the last decade or so that we could arrive at this position of challenging the hierarchy of art criticism of the twentieth century with alternative epistemologies. Only in recent years, for example, have rigorous alternatives been put forward against Clement Greenberg’s notion that painting is representative of art in general, whereas Stokes’s work on the plastic arts, as we have seen, demands critical categories that exist beyond the scope of an analysis of painting. Furthermore, the developments towards understanding what we might call ‘aesthetic history,’ a mode of writing about past art, literature and architecture that very self-consciously pushes forward the receiving consciousness of the critic as a legitimate locus for the study of art, is even more important. These ideas, again, are being freshly considered in work on figures such as Stokes. Indeed, two of the more self-conscious commentators on art history working today are Stephen Bann and Michael Ann Holly, and both might be best understood as thinkers in the tradition of Ruskin, Pater and Stokes.

The vitality of *The Coral Mind*, therefore, stems largely from strong contributions that not only engage with Stokes’ ideas about art and form, but embrace them as an alternative methodological apparatus for getting to grips with art and the history of styles. This study is a welcome and vibrant addition to both the critical body of work about Stokes and also to the epistemological debates ongoing in art history.

Thomas E. Wartenberg and Angela Curran (eds.), *The Philosophy of Film Introductory Readings*

(Oxford: Blackwell, 2005) pp. 308.

Reviewed by LUCY E. FRASER

Ph.D. candidate in Film Studies, University of Birmingham

The central concern of *The Philosophy of Film* is the philosophical questions that support the interrogation of film as an academic field. The editors have in mind a specific, targeted audience and aim to “acquaint undergraduate students . . . with the issues and controversies that constitute the philosophy of film” (1). The increased interconnectedness between popular culture and the media it supports facilitates that

film and philosophy are cast together as the visual media is probed – beyond entertainment and escapism – for meaning and philosophical insight.

The selection of essays in this collection range from early scholars, such as Hugo Münsterberg (1916), through the period of classic film scholarship, concerned with the formal and aesthetic characteristics of film (during which time film was struggling to find acceptance as a serious academic discipline), to a second period dating broadly from the 1970s, at which point film scholarship became concerned with the discourses of modern theory. This second period is interrogated in essays by both contemporary theorists and philosophers. Sometimes the distinction between theorist and philosopher becomes blurred, but certainly writers such as Noël Carroll, David Bordwell and the late Gilles Deleuze have contributed substantially to the enfranchisement of film as an academic discipline. The last section – “What Can We Learn From Films?” – provides a veritable finale of fun. Essays in this section analyse specific films through the work of a range of philosophers, including Kant, Descartes, Nietzsche, and Plato, to the point at which, instead of analysing films as exemplars of ideas, ideas are used to ‘read’ films (cf. Genette 1983 on the text at the service of theory and *visa versa*).

The collection comprises twenty-seven essays arranged thematically into seven sections, each of which poses a discrete question (from “Do We Need Film Theory?” to “What Can We Learn From Film?”) and is prefaced by a brief introductory essay, providing an abstract of the section and a selection of study questions. The abstracts are useful, outlining arguments and providing a rationale of choice, thus aiding the selective reader; the study questions provide food for thought, encouraging reflective reading. Although somewhat didactic, the value of this approach should not be underestimated. It is all too easy to read hurriedly through an essay without taking on board the issues addressed.

A number of seminal essays are included. We have François Truffaut’s “La Politique des Auteurs” and Andrew Sarris’s response on “Auteur Theory and Film Evaluation,” which scholars might have read in Mast and Cohen (1985) or, more recently, in Braudy and Cohen (2004). Likewise, there are influential essays by Münsterberg, Arnheim and Bazin, published in J. Dudley Andrew’s 1976 anthology *The Major Film Theories*. These are major critical works and it is fitting that these essays be included here; Wartenberg and Curran’s text provides an excellent introduction to film scholarship. Endnotes are sequential to individual essays where appropriate, and original sources for these essays are detailed in prefatorial acknowledgements. I would have preferred these to be given with each essay, but this is a minor concern in an otherwise efficient collection.

Film, or more particularly, scholars of film, fought long and hard to achieve the recognition of film as an academic discipline. However, with the increased availability of film for home viewing, particularly since the advent of the DVD, the ever increasing extras, and the internet, there is now an excess of uninformed writing on film. In contrast, *The Philosophy of Film* is a pleasure to read: it is a discerning anthology of key works by philosophers, theorists and critics of film, compiled with integrity and providing valuable resources for film scholars both new and old alike.

### Works Cited

- Braudy, L., and Cohen, Marshall. *Film Theory and Criticism: Introductory Readings*. (Sixth Edition). Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Dudley Andrew, J. *The Major Film Theories: An Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1976.
- Genette, G. *Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method*. New York, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1983.
- Mast, G., and Cohen, Marshall. *Film Theory and Criticism: Introductory Readings, Third Edition*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1985.

Michael Hoey, Michaela Mahlberg, Michael Stubbs, and Wolfgang Teubert,  
*Text, Discourse and Corpora*  
 (Continuum, 2007) pp. 253.

Reviewed by LAURA STRAKOVA

Ph.D. candidate in Applied Linguistics, University of Birmingham

*Text, Discourse and Corpora* is not corpus linguistics ‘as usual,’ marked as it has been by lateral explorations of linguistic features and functions using general and specialised corpora. Although the book contains plenty of conventional corpus analysis, its chapters move well beyond the margins of convention to address some of the deeper conceptual challenges of the discipline. Through theoretical discussion and illustrative case studies, the four authors, all leading corpus linguists, show how, from the base of empirical data, corpus linguistics fits with larger issues in psycholinguistics, social theory, epistemology, and literary stylistics. Each author devotes two chapters to exploring the relationships between lexis and text (Mahlberg), lexis and grammar (Hoey), corpus linguistics and discourse (Teubert), and the configuration of a model of language that accounts for both language system and language use (Stubbs).

Hoey demonstrates how his corpus-based theory of lexical priming (*Lexical Priming* 2005) can account for the creative literary choices writers make and, in his second chapter, examines how personal grammars come to “exist as a product of our primings” (31). Priming, for Hoey, is a psychological concept: Frequent and repeated encounters with how words, structures, or patterns behave in the past will lead individuals to expect, and hence produce, the same kind of lexical behaviour in the future. A corpus is a record of those primings. Mahlberg’s innovative final chapter links with Hoey’s first chapter in explaining what stylistics stands to gain from the creative use of a specialised literary corpus. She utilizes a custom-built corpus of Dickens’ work creatively by producing several reference corpora and by automating a search for recurrent phraseology; what she finds are distinctive stylistic patternings and characterizations which would be unobservable to the unaided eye, and which show up important differences between Dickens and his literary contemporaries. Stubbs posits a four-part model of language that accounts for both language system and language use, an uncomfortable dichotomy never adequately resolved by corpus linguists. To exemplify the link between system and use, he analyses the phraseology of *world* in the British