

This system of images is broken down and then integrated with Robbe-Grillet's text, to form another closed system (this time a verbal-visual one) where generation is a matter of internal relationships. In cases such as D'Agostino's installation 'Trans-Europ Expressed,' which uses Robbe-Grillet's film, the organic, generative function is open and acts across media; a film work generates an art work.

Although specific examples of the different concepts of generation are given by Leach, Morrisette, and Kirkpatrick, these concepts deal with generation as a common element; they involve attempts at classification on a universal, rather than a particular level. Only in the final essay of the book is the actual activity of generation itself seen as a specialized instance of exchange between the verbal and the visual. In 'Images and Texts: A Dialogue' Alain Robbe-Grillet elucidates a specific function of generative 'diacritical relations,' defining verbal-visual relationships as 'problematical'; text and image call each other into question. A work such as *La Belle Captive* is 'an ensemble of contradictions in which the text and the images are going to play antagonistic roles. In short, the role of the text is to put the image in a state of crisis' (p. 39). Such a particular description views generative activity from within creative procedures, rather than circumscribing it passively from without, thereby promising a confrontational, but productive, dialectical relationship between literature and art which changes constantly, perpetually open to the future.

This short book provides a useful introduction to one of the most significant aspects of the relationship between contemporary literature and visual art — generation — that is only beginning to be studied and analyzed. Leach's essay draws attention to, and catalogues, writers and artists using generative methods in an interdisciplinary fashion, while Morrisette and Kirkpatrick discuss and define the parallel existence of generation in literature and art in a manner specific to the two artistic media. The field which supports and supplies generative creation is explored by Racevskis, who finds it diacritical and relative in nature, while Robbe-Grillet probes the nature of his specific use of interdisciplinary generation, arriving at an analysis which is fruitful not only in terms of his own work, but also in that it suggests a method by which the critic might examine other works of this nature. In a very few pages this volume not only approaches an important, original topic, but also looks at its most meaningful parameters and suggests possible considerations for future study. (MARGUERITE GARSTIN, UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA)

*WALTER J. ONG. *Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word*. London and New York: Methuen 1982. Pp. 280. Paper US\$10.95

'Language,' writes Walter Ong, 'is so overwhelmingly oral that of all the many thousands of languages — possibly tens of thousands — spoken in the course of human history only around 106 have ever been committed to writing to a degree sufficient to have produced literature, and most have never been written at all' (p. 7). Despite this, little scholarly attention has been devoted to studying the contrasts and interrelationships between literacy and primary orality — the author's own term to describe the speech modes of cultures entirely untouched by literacy. In his book, Walter Ong attempts to catalogue the differences between literary and oral forms of expression and to point out the manner in which the predominance of one or the other mode shapes the poetry of an era or culture.

The book begins with an historical account of the discovery of oral patterns in Homeric poetry, and proceeds to a delineation of the characteristics of orally-based thought and expression. The author then traces the history of written and printed language in terms of the increasing influence of literacy on poetic form and basic human speech and thought processes. The final two sections of the book provide us with a brief outline of oral and literary poetic forms (especially in terms of narrative structure and characterization) and of relevant poetic theories. The historical development, as the author sees it, goes from an original state of primary orality to an ever-increasing reliance on written texts, and finally to the present stage of secondary orality, which has been brought on by our increasing dependence on electronic media. This orality bears 'striking resemblances to the old [form] ... but is essentially a more deliberate and self-conscious orality, based predominantly on the use of writing and print' (p. 136).

In view of the vastness of the subject and the dearth of previous scholarship, a leisurely and philosophical approach would have been appropriate. Instead, we are offered a succession of briefly discussed ideas and concepts, supported by a cosmopolitan assortment of examples, which often consist of little more than a title. This format is at times an obstacle to the reader's ability to assess in sufficient depth the material provided. The book would have benefited from the inclusion of more and lengthier texts for the reader's consideration. Only once are we given comparative texts — two English versions of Genesis 1:1-5 (pp. 37-8). One wishes for many more.

The author chooses an historical, or diachronic, approach to his subject, for only in this way can the contrasts and shifting relationships

between oral and literate speech be brought properly into focus. But while the author is meticulous in providing an example for each statement he makes, the underlying concept of a linear development seems overly simplistic. There always have been, and probably always will be, writers who attempt to close the gap between oral and literary language. While clear linear development may be discernible in the ever-increasing proliferation of written communication, movements devoted to bringing literary language closer to everyday speech and to oral principles recur periodically. Oral characteristics, though often less showy than the superimposed literary patterns, are invariably present to a certain extent wherever written language is truly alive. The real emphasis in Ong's approach, rather than historical as he proposes, is contrastive, for the author catalogues the structural differences between a hypothetical oral language and its evolved written form. Do two such distinct modes truly exist, or does not literate language at its best describe an intricate dance between the two poles?

The reader is troubled, as well, by certain omissions in this study. For the subject is not so entirely new that one does not expect a number of important aspects of it (children's folklore, for example, as well as oral ritual poetry, gesture, ritual and dance) to be given their place. While passing reference is made to the phenomena of sign language (p. 7) and political sloganism (pp. 38-9), it is only to point out that both are based on oral forms of expression. Greater detail on these and other interesting matters would have been appreciated.

Walter Ong's bibliography is large and impressively wide-ranging, and his examples of both poetic (literary and oral) and everyday language have been gathered from an impressive number of different cultures and eras. These facts alone make the book useful for any student of oral tradition. At the same time, however, the eclectic nature of this book in some ways deceives, and perhaps even detracts from its usefulness. While many poetic traditions are referred to in passing, there is a frustrating lack of depth in most cases. While this cosmopolitan approach certainly lends an aura of erudition to the book, a few well-chosen examples discussed in careful detail would have been more useful for the reader. The same is true in terms of the author's use of scholarly sources, for there are abundant references to other studies, but seldom enough detail. Some major scholars, such as Bausinger on oral expression, or Bultmann, on Gospel studies, are not even mentioned. A giant such as Lévi-Strauss is brushed aside in a few sentences.

The book is also somewhat marred by the fact that Professor Ong's own use of language is not always felicitous. One would wish that his obvious appreciation of poetic expression had given rise to greater clarity

ity and elegance in his own writing. Repeated phrases, trite epithets and convoluted sentences are all too frequent. An example of this is the unfortunate repetition of the adjective 'untimely' to describe Milman Parry's death (pp. 6 and 20), not to mention the bizarre phrasing in the earlier of the two occurrences, whereby that untimely death is unwittingly ascribed to the hand of Albert B. Lord. One wonders what 'consciousness raising' really means as a description of writing (pp. 151 and 179). Other minor flaws ('such as an eagle, for example' [p. 76]) mar the flow of ideas. And one cannot help regretting that the author has found it necessary to invent the terms 'orality' and 'technologizing' in the first place. He coined 'orality' to avoid such unsatisfactory and even misleading alternatives as 'illiterate,' 'preliterate,' and 'oral literature.' 'Technologizing' occurs in the title and otherwise, fortunately, rarely, if at all. But perhaps standard English could prove itself capable after all of conveying these basic concepts?

Despite such drawbacks, *Orality and Literacy* is useful as an introduction and, in particular, as a preliminary bibliography to a subject that has been ignored far too long. Let us hope that others take up the subject where the author has left off, as I am sure it is intended that they should. For, as Walter Ong points out, our traditional scholarly preoccupation with written forms of language notwithstanding, 'the basic orality of language is permanent' (p. 7). (SARAH TRACY BOHNET)

* LOUISE S. FITZGERALD and ELIZABETH I. KEARNEY. *The Continental Novel: A Checklist of Criticism in English, 1967-1980*. Metuchen, NJ & London: Scarecrow Press 1983. Pp. xiv + 496. US\$32.50

This book, like its predecessor covering the years 1900-66 (1968), is unquestionably a useful compilation, especially for undergraduate students in literature courses, as it will save them the tiresome labour of ploughing through the annual volumes of the *MLA International Bibliography*, where they would also encounter many titles in idioms other than English or the target language. The listed items of secondary literature are sorted into six major groups. Four of these are based on language: French, Spanish and Portuguese, Italian, and German (including West and East Germany, Austria, and Switzerland). The other two groupings are more geographical in nature: Scandinavian, and Russian and East European (including Lithuanian and Rumanian). Dutch and South Slavic fiction is not covered. The term 'novel'

in the title refers in the event to prose fiction in general, unless Kafka's 'Ein Landarzt,' Boccaccio's *Decameron* 13 (why is not 'Andreuccio da Perugia' listed under *Decameron*, like the other stories from that collection?), Verga's 'La lupa,' and Maupassant's 'Boule-de-suif' are novels. In point of fact 'Ein Landarzt' is listed under 'A Country Doctor,' while 'Boule-de-suif' is not translated – actually if all works had been listed consistently under the original title, with the English translation(s), it would not have been so often the case that a work appears under the original *and* under a translated title, e.g. *Königliche Hoheit* / *Royal Highness* (Th. Mann) and 'Sobač'e serdce' / 'The Heart of a Dog' (Bulgakov). Some authors, too, are placed rather eccentrically, e.g. Koestler and Delblanc as writers of German novels, Canetti and Delicados as Italians. In his review of the 1968 volume, Professor Fugate questioned 'the usefulness of some of the brief entries from survey works.' There is a plethora of such entries in the 1983 volume: for example, seven works of fiction by W. S. Reymont are listed, but the reference under each of these titles is to Krzyżanowski's monograph in Twayne's World Authors series, and nine references under B. Jarnés, also to a volume in the Twayne series. Finally, the lack of consistency and the almost complete absence of diacritical marks in the transliteration of Russian names and titles is most confusing. Incidentally, according to the preface, 'All of the criticisms listed herein have been read by the compilers.' (J.K. WIKLEY, UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA)

*ERNSTPETER RUHE et RUDOLF BEHRENS, eds. *Mittelalterbilder aus neuer Perspektive*. Beiträge zur romanischen Philologie des Mittelalters, Band 14. München: Wilhelm Fink Verlag 1985. Pp. 464. DM68.00

C'est là un ouvrage important, fidèle, dans l'ensemble, à son titre en ce qu'il tend à déposséder bien des idées acquises sur la 'courtoisie' médiévale, et y réussit en grande partie. On ne saurait trop louer Ruhe et Behrens du travail qu'ils ont ainsi coordonné, d'abord lors d'un colloque réuni à Würzburg en 1984, puis dans ce gros volume qui en publie les communications et discussions.

Il est humainement inévitable que, dans un travail collectif groupant une trentaine de collaborateurs, tout ne soit pas égal. Mesurée en valeur propre des points de vue, en hauteur de pensée et en intérêt méthodologique, une distance considérable sépare certains de ces chapitres. Quelques-uns d'entre eux présentent à mes yeux une grande

importance, touchant aux fondements même des recherches sur les cultures médiévales: ainsi, de façon du reste très différente, les textes polémiques de R. Schnell et de H.U. Gumbrecht, ceux de D. Kelly, de C. Segre, de R. Sprandel et quelques autres qui, à eux seuls, suffiraient à justifier l'existence de ce livre. Plusieurs, en revanche, et non sans intérêt à un niveau mineur, discutent, en termes parfois hâtifs, de points de détail ou de thèmes imparfaitement définis: ainsi, sous les noms de Schoell, Baehr, Busby.... Ces disproportions nuisent peu néanmoins à l'unité du volume.

La structure équilibrée de celui-ci en facilite beaucoup la lecture, la critique et l'assimilation: trois parties de dimensions égales (120 à 140 pages), comportant un nombre comparable d'articles (7 à 9), présentent successivement la discussion de deux questions étroitement connexes: 'Amour courtois und höfische Literatur' et 'Subjektivität im Mittelalter'; puis – ce qui, sous un certain angle, peut apparaître comme leur projection narrative – 'Strategien des Erzählens,' entendues dans un sens large, embrassant l'ensemble des modes narratifs entre le onzième et le quatorzième siècles. Une quatrième partie, plus courte (50 pages, 4 auteurs), d'intérêt épistémologique, opère un retour sur les visions critiques du Moyen Âge: 'Vermittelte Mittelalterbilder' (ainsi, M. Mancini, pp. 438-55, sur l'interprétation des troubadours par Lacurne au dix-huitième siècle, Stendhal et Nietzsche au dix-neuvième).

Tout le livre – et c'est là ce qui lui confère sa valeur propre – pose une série de problèmes d'interprétation de portée générale. Il le fait çà et là de manière implicite ou indirecte, ailleurs de manière très explicite. L'essai de R. Schnell (pp. 75-111) soumettant à une critique serrée la notion de culture de cour, par opposition à une culture ecclésiastique, m'a particulièrement retenu. Il définit un espace de liberté – généré par ce que cette civilisation eut d'ambigu et de peu systématique – espace où s'inséra et se déploya ce que nous nommons poésie. Interprétatifs aussi, et centrés sur le cas illustre, équivoque et exemplaire que constitue le *De amore* d'André le Chapelain, les cinq contributions qui ouvrent le volume (pp. 13 à 74, Benoît, Cherchi, Karnein, Payen et Roy). Dans la seconde partie, les textes de Porion et de Ruhe (pp. 183-209) respectivement consacrés à la 'littérature comme mémoire,' et aux questions relatives à ce que désignent les termes modernes d'originalité et de plagiat, touchent aux fondements *socio-textuels* d'un art. Dans la troisième partie, les textes de Kelly (pp. 289-302) et Segre (pp. 329-43) s'opposent méthodologiquement de façon constructive, à propos de structures narratives en profondeur apparentées. Tandis que le savant italien pratique une herméneutique rigoureusement

nourrie de sémiologie, son collègue américain élabore, relativement à des poèmes de Froissart, une notion de *forma tractandi* qu'il rapproche de celle de 'montage', devenue courante dans le langage esthétique contemporain.

Plusieurs auteurs saisissent leur objet dans une perspective plus strictement diachronique, le situant par rapport à un passé ou à un avenir. Ainsi, Mölk (pp. 320-8), qui reprend le passage célèbre de Bernard d'Angers sur lequel se fonde le peu que l'on sait ou devine de l'origine et de la performance des 'chansons de saint' archaïques; Sprandel (pp. 344-63), qui s'interroge sur la fonction du récit historique dans la société allemande des quatorzième et quinzième siècles, et Uitti (pp. 380-91) sur la signification hagiographique des Mémoires de Joinville; Suard (pp. 364-79), qui explore les frontières mouvantes de l'épopée, du roman et des contes folkloriques; Limentani (pp. 420-37), qui se pose la question de la traductibilité des textes.

Trois des essais réunis dans la seconde partie (ceux de Corneau, Kay et Zink, pp. 147-82 et 240-9), auxquels répond, dans la troisième, celui, curieusement propiét, de Maddox (pp. 303-19), rouvrent une discussion souvent esquissée ailleurs, mais où rarement les enjeux ont été clairement définis, sur le thème topique *vs* sincérité. Que ce dernier terme (maintenu ici par Kay seule) soit atténué en *subjectivité* ne nous avance, à mon avis, pas beaucoup. L'essai de Zink, le plus significatif de cette série et dont on s'attendrait à ce qu'il clarifie la situation, ne le fait pas vraiment, pour une raison qu'explique discrètement une note de bas de page: ce n'est là qu'une version modifiée de l'introduction d'un livre de cet auteur, qui a paru en même temps que *Mittelalterbilder: La Subjectivité littéraire* (Paris: Presses universitaires de France 1985), livre excellent, dont on peut discuter les présupposés mais dont l'introduction du moins est à la fois située, explicitée et nuancée par les 235 pages qui la suivent! L'essai de Wolfzettel (pp. 210-39) se tient apparemment à l'écart de cette problématique, mais tend à fournir d'importants critères, dressant un bilan des efforts jusqu'ici réalisés pour introduire, dans la description et l'interprétation des textes médiévaux, la perspective psychanalytique. C'est là un champs immense (Wolfzettel cite 90 titres d'études plus ou moins récentes) et dangereusement miné, mais aujourd'hui incontournable ... au risque, pour le novice, d'y chercher longtemps son itinéraire, entre les chemins divergents du jngisme et du freudisme lacanisé ... (PAUL ZUMTHOR, UNIVERSITÉ DE MONTRÉAL)

*STEPHEN G. NICHOLS, JR. *Romanesque Signs: Early Medieval Narrative and Iconography*. New Haven: Yale University Press 1983. Pp. xiii + 248. Paper US\$10.95

During the past two decades, the major upheavals in critical theory have been centered in questions of language and signification. With the exception of Peirce, Heidegger and Ricoeur, most of the modern sources of language-based critical thought have ignored medieval speculation about the functions and limits of language as a mediator of man's relationships to God, to the world of things, to his fellow man and to himself. As a result, those medievalists who were aware of this tradition tended to experience a certain frustration about the insular character of modern thinking about language.

Recently, though, semioticians, like psychoanalysts, have become alert to the history of their discipline. Medievalists, on their side, have begun to bring back into their proper intellectual perspective the enormous and profound tradition of medieval speculation about language and signs. What is more, medievalists are simultaneously demonstrating the *productive* aspects of medieval semiotics: that is, of considering medieval semiotics as *semiosis*.

Stephen G. Nichols, Jr. has written an important and original book dealing with eleventh-century culture not as a product, but as a process, as a projection, into viable cultural patterns, of a Christ-centered theology of signs. This book might be called a study in the poetics of an era. 'By showing that historical events — including the present — could be represented as resembling and thus rephrasing significant past events, notably those found in religious texts, one might then demonstrate that secular history did indeed belong to Salvation history' (p. xi).

Like the French *Annales* school of historiography, the year 1000 is taken by Nichols as an intellectual pivotal point. Considering the examples of Richer of St. Rémy (Rheims), of Rodolphus of Cluny and of Scotus Erigena, Nichols illustrates the monastic concern with the 'Logos as a discourse which shapes and transforms the material world. A principle transcending time and space, it takes as a given the ongoing nature of creation' (p. 5). 'Sacred history and *historia* combine to demonstrate the principle of continuity and change, of *translatio* by which the multiplicity of events in the world could be shown to be a part of divine intentionality' (p. 9). I would be interested to know on what grounds Nichols equates the Logos with 'the conventional language enunciated by the divinity for the rational ordering of the world' (p. 2).

Despite the seductiveness of '1000 a.d.' as a lightning-rod for good ideas, Nichols would have done well to define more clearly the norms that he believes to have prevailed in earlier historiographical thought before the tenth century, and also to situate the typology he encounters in the eleventh century with respect to Augustine's *City of God*, to Eusebius, to the Roman historians, and even to Virgil, whose incomplete and failing Roman teleology dovetailed on many points with that of the Christians, Eusebius, and the Roman historians. The reader of Nichols's book will find a broader reflection upon the notion of *historia* in late antiquity and the early middle ages in Bernard Guenée's splendid *Histoire et culture historique dans l'Occident médiéval* (Paris: Aubier 1980).

If Nichols shuns large chronological scope, he is at home with details. By his lucid references to romanesque art of many genres (church façades, manuscript illuminations, reliquaries, maps, and the like), Nichols allows us to grasp the discursive basis of several medieval art forms. However, in doing so, Nichols never commits the error, so prevalent among students of iconography, of reducing details in the plastic arts to fixed verbal meanings. To the contrary, Nichols is capable of grasping the visible detail as part of a syntax and of a larger dynamic specific to the medium and to the individual artifact.

Thus, the discussion of Otto's carefully orchestrated opening of Charlemagne's tomb and of the discussion about the invention of Charlemagne 'in majesty' creates powerful insights into the ideological genius of that age. However, as Janine R. Dakyns's *The French Middle Ages in French Literature 1851-1900* shows, such totalizing gestures by French monarchies hardly ended in the middle ages. Nichols's study of the Christological dimensions of Roland's passion is a stunning demonstration of how erudition may be brought alive in the study of the visual and textual poetics of the Roland legend.

Nichols's discussion of the cultural context of the *Chanson de Roland* is notable not only because of its rich sense of detail and its scale of vision, but also because it elevates the century-old debate about the origins of that poem to a new level of insight into the poem as a system, and not as an agglomeration of elements. The discussion of the Biblical and cultural resonances of Roland's horn help us to explain not only why we in our time might find the motif of the horn in the epic so terribly moving, but why the poem dominated the poetic imagination of the twelfth century as well. Nichols's skilled use of learned sources will help to diminish the false polarity of the orality-literacy dispute about the origins of the Oxford version of the *Roland* — and

for this we may be grateful, since the debate has long since become redundant, sterile and caricatural.

Although this book emerges from a shared scholarly venture (Nichols has been one of the most gregarious and ecumenical medievalists of his generation), this is one of the most original and resourceful books about romanesque art that I have read. It has a clarity and aptness that is the culmination of a long search for a new medievalistic discourse. It is unpolemical, jargon-free and packed with fresh ideas on every page. Because it deals with an inaugural moment in our culture — a moment when so many viable modes and conventions of modern culture were catalyzed into existence — this book should attract the interest of serious readers of subsequent eras as well. (EUGENE VANCE, EMORY UNIVERSITY)

*JOHN V. FLEMING, *Reason and the Lover*. Princeton: Princeton University Press 1984. Pp. xii + 196. US\$20.00

When John Fleming's *Roman de la Rose* appeared in 1960 it proposed that by listening to Jean de Meun's Reason we would be in a position to judge the moral precepts of his *Roman de la Rose*. This view was not generally accepted. Reason, according to the detractors, was not to be relied upon. It was argued that no figure from the indisputably postlapsarian garden of *Debut* could possibly provide authoritative moral instruction.

Reason and the Lover, at least in its inception, is Fleming's answer. It begins with the refutation of specific arguments against his assumptions about Reason. Fleming's frequently searing responses tend to distract from the validity of his essential position: that even in a postlapsarian world, reason, the image of God within us, is a dependable guide if we but exercise our free will and follow her recommendations; and that Jean de Meun depicts reason as man's ruling faculty, in no way to be confused with Alain de Lille's *Natura* of the *Planchu*. If the Lover rejects Reason it does not reflect upon the latter but rather demonstrates her lack of dominion in one who is ruled by sexuality and is hence irrational.

Once Fleming leaves refutation behind, what he has to say is well and closely argued, providing new and valuable insights into the theological and literary sources for Jean de Meun's Reason. The relationship between Jean's Reason and Boethius's *Philosophia* of the *Consolatio* has long been recognized. Fleming readily accepts *Philosophia* as Reason

son's 'mother' but seeks a closer literary antecedent, which he finds in *Ratio*, the Reason with whom Augustine converses in the *Soliloquia*.

Fleming's focus of interest is the three thousand lines of dialogue between Reason and the Lover. This passage, like the dialogues of Boethius and Augustine, is fictionally autobiographical with an opaque narrator/persona in need of advice. In his last chapter he explores the relationship between the *Soliloquia* and Petrarch's *Secretum*, which takes the same form but with Augustine in the role of Reason and *Veritas* as the silent moderator. Fleming perceives in Petrarch a new generation, for whom reason is human and rational discourse the means by which the truth can be made known. He proposes that Petrarch was strongly influenced by the *Roman de la Rose* in which he would have appreciated the roles played by the contributions of Cicero, Augustine, and Boethius. He admits, however, the highly speculative nature of this chapter, acknowledging that Petrarch's *Secretum* might equally well have been the product of a parallel literary and theological formation.

Fleming's discussion of the Ciceronian content of the *Roman* is very helpful to those who have hitherto found it a red herring. It is a red herring, for Jean de Meun teases, but it is simultaneously significant. Augustine wrote the *Cassiciacum* dialogues as a philosopher, using Cicero as his model. While Christian Ciceronianism was a fairly common phenomenon in late antique literature, there had been problems in reconciling pagan eloquence with Christian truth. This conflict impedes communication between Reason and the Lover. The passage on friendship, for example, remains for the lover on Cicero's pre-Christian level of understanding. Reason speaks through St. Aelred de Rievaulx's Christianized version of Cicero's *De amicitia*, the *De spiritali amicitia*. What was for Cicero an altogether too rarely found relationship is incomprehensible to St. Aelred for whom friendship is the Christian's love of his fellow man. Similarly, discussions of justice which might be perceived as having their origin in the *De republica*, *De legibus*, and the *Hortensius* in fact find their source in their Christianized form through Augustine and Lactantia.

In the third chapter, 'Of Words and Things,' Fleming explores a related dimension of Reason's failure to communicate with the Lover. Augustine considers reason the inventor of language as does Jean's Reason herself. He also considers language to consist of conventional signs or words. It is reason which decides whether words or signs will be granted the *auctoritas* to identify the thing named. This thought is as essential to the whole of Jean's *Roman* as is Reason's account of the Castration of Saturn, since Christian allegory works through historical 'signs.' For Reason, a gloss is a means to a revelation. Reason, us-

ing the story, or sign, of the end of a pagan Golden Age is recounting the fall of man, the overthrow of an inner justice whereby reason ruled the passions. The Lover, objecting to her unladylike use of language, has failed to understand a Christian gloss which unerringly depicts his fallen state. For him, a gloss serves to conceal, not to reveal. The final passage of the poem demonstrates the Lover's understanding of the commands of the god of Love, the use of metaphor to conceal his hedonism. Reason, recognizing the Lover's misuse of words, does not grant them 'authority.'

Fleming has not randomly used Augustinian concepts or those of others to analyse Jean's text. My own generalized and oversimplified explanation of his discussion is in no way exhaustive. He has carefully and thoughtfully analysed the dialogue between Reason and the Lover and then mined its phraseology, vocabulary and theological constructs to propose that various works by Augustine, the work cited by St. Aelred, and the *De iusticia* by Lactantia, *inter alia*, form super-texts to the *Roman*. He thereby assumes for the *Roman* an audience which would be capable of recollecting from the super-texts very similar and often identical passages, phrases, or even individual words in close proximity, by which Jean's context for his own words would become instantly apparent and his meaning revealed. Fleming's documentation is impressive, as is the scope of his research, so that there can be no doubt whatsoever as to his contribution to scholarship on the subject of the *Rose*. If he is to be criticized it is for having sometimes made the argument too long and complex. For example, in the third chapter regarding the meanings of *amor sauvage* and *Quarage* where there are many super-texts and two key words from the *Confessions*, the complexity is such that one must posit a super-audience. Beyond mentioning Deschamps, Machaut, Chaucer, Froissart, and of course Petrarch, as heavily indebted to the *Rose*, Fleming does not address the question of Jean's readership.

For Fleming, Petrarch was the ideal reader of the *Rose*, one who would hear the resonance of the super-texts as he read the text. Yet a generation after Petrarch the *Rose* was sadly misconstrued. For Christine de Pisan it was emblematic of the anti-feminist attitudes which surrounded her. It would perhaps have been rewarding for the reader had Fleming not only charted the continuation in Petrarch of a syncretic medieval mentality but explored the breakdown of that continuity, of which Petrarch himself may be seen as a precursor. Fleming searches for a solution in Augustinian terms to Petrarch's conclusion without conversion in the *Secretum*, but the answer may possibly be found elsewhere. It is not Augustine but Petrarch's Augustine who

beittles Laura, the woman (*muliercula*), while for Petrarch himself there could be no renunciation of a fictional Laura, even of her soul, for Petrarch loved not Laura but the words she inspired. Any renunciation would have had to be extra-textual. The erosion of the syncretic harmony that made Jean de Meun's greatness was perhaps in part due to the erosion of Augustine's authority in matters of rhetoric. (JOAN BRUMLIK, UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA)

* ANTONIO GÓMEZ-MORIANA. *La Subversion du discours rituel*. Québec: Éditions du Préambule 1985. Pp. 167. No price

The four essays gathered in this book are thematically and methodologically closely connected. Three of them examine particular points of the text and the context of the *Lazarillo de Tormes*. The last one discusses similar aspects in the *Quijote*. The approach is predominantly one of intertextual semiotics and the dimensions of meaning explored relate to repressive policies and ideologies of Golden Age Spain. The thrust of the argument is to bring to light a socio-political and intellectual significance heretofore unobserved or at least neglected. Gómez-Moriana's encompassing concern, it seems to me, is to recover the historical horizon of Spanish Counter-Reformation as a system of discursive practices that is evoked, exposed, and indirectly denounced in the great literary works of the time; also, to comprehend genetical-ly and systematically the singular artistic form of these epochal masterpieces.

The examination of the intertextual play of the *Lazarillo* and the *Quijote* is directed towards their evocation and parody of religious and ecclesiastical discourses, especially those related to inquisitorial operations. As the author informs the reader, some obvious manifestations of this kind have been previously noted by various scholars. But the extent and importance of these implications had not been shown. Nothing less than the literary form of the *Lazarillo*, and subsequently of the picaresque genre as a whole — that is, fictional autobiography of an at the end dubiously regenerated sinner — is originally a parodic subversion of the type of confessions presented under the peremptory demand of the Holy Inquisition. This thesis of Gómez-Moriana's deserves the most serious attention.

Several passages of the *Quijote*, and equally its overall artistic design, obtain a sharp relief of allusive and ideological-critical significance.

tions, once the pertinent discursive horizon has been actualized in these essays. It appears that the tradition assumed and ironized by Cervantes is not merely the Renaissance system of literary genres; rather, it includes the non-literary discursive forms of clerical domination. Gómez-Moriana's assertions are supported by the evidence of lexical and stylistic items, often formulaic phraseology, and structures of composition.

The interest of this book extends to its theoretical and methodological presuppositions. The author repeatedly reflects on the conception of textuality that presides over his approach. He distances himself from the type of Structuralism that deals exclusively with a given literary text. He also criticizes reception-studies limited to intratextual data. Nonetheless, the conceptual tools of Structuralism and some insights of reception-theory are used in these essays with assurance and propriety. The heuristic model of this critical effort could be defined as a generative intertextuality. Gómez-Moriana sees the books as crossing points of the institutionalized discursive practices of a culture. Such evocations of ritualized discourse can be subversive, he shows, by way of irony, because they are not mere actualizations of a normative discourse, but 'readings' of it. The ironic reinterpretation of the ritual genre is indicated by a variety of *impertinent* linguistic marks that alienate the solemnity of the rite and thus constitute functional 'agrammaticalities.' This play of discourses produces anti-ideological meaning.

These essays suggest several additional historical and methodological questions. What was the exact degree of intolerance exercised by the censors and civil and ecclesiastical authorities of post-Tridentine Spain, if indeed, however indirect and half-hidden, so eminent dissent could be objectified through the parodic play? On the theoretical side, I sense a possible conflict between the notion that a text has a historically open and evolving virtuality of meaning, and the strict historical contextuality that emerges from these analyses and indicates a privileged original confluence of contemporary codes (despite the fact that some of them were at the time archaic, and some, revolutionary creations of the singular authors and works). Gómez-Moriana's research is precise in results and fertile in suggestions; its technical sophistication is exemplary also in that it rarely disturbs a highly urbane expository prose. (FÉLIX MARTÍNEZ-BONATI, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY)

*NICLAS ULENHART. *Historia von Isaac Winckelfelder und Jobst von der Schneid*. 1617. Nach Cervantes 'Rinconete y Cortadillo.' Kommentiert und mit einem Nachwort von Gerhart Hoffmeister. München: Wilhelm Fink Verlag 1983. (*Literatur-Kabinet*. Deutsche Literatur in Reprints. Hrsg. von Gunter E. Grimm. Bd. 1.) Pp. 287. Paper DM48.00

Niclas Ulenhart wird in den einschlägigen Geschichten zur Barockliteratur in den meisten Fällen nur mit eins zwei Sätzen erwähnt, und zwar als Übersetzer des Buches *La vida de Lazarillo de Tormes* (Burgos 1554) und der Novelle 'Rinconete y Cortadillo' (1604) von Cervantes. Wie wichtig allerdings die literarisch und rezeptionsgeschichtlich bedeutende Nachdichtung der Novelle, von einer Übersetzung kann nach Hoffmeister wohl kaum gesprochen werden, für die deutsche Literaturgeschichte im weiteren Zusammenhang der Wirkungsgeschichte Cervantes ist, bemüht man sich nicht um die einschlägige Forschungsliteratur, wird durch die Informationen deutlich, die Hoffmeister im Nachwort der vorliegenden Ausgabe mitteilt. Danach schöpft Ulenhart mit seiner Übertragung der Novelle auf den deutschen Meridian, also der Eindeutschung der Sevillaner Gaunerzunft in die Prags, die ihm so vollständig und auf kongeniale Weise gelungen sei, daß es bis 1868/69 dauerte, bis die Cervantinische Vorlage entdeckt wurde (p. 268), die erste eigenständige deutsche Schelmengeschichte (p. 277). Ulenhart habe es wohl mit Absicht unterlassen, im Titel seine spanische Vorlage zu nennen; denn 'in einer Zeit' so Hoffmeister, 'als man wie die Biene aus vielen Blüten Honig sammelte, um die deutsche Literatur den romanischen Ländern ebenbürtig zu machen und das Plagiat als rühmlicher Diebstahl galt, wertete man es durchaus als Kavaliersdelikt, das Original verschwiegen zu haben' (p. 267).

Mit dem hier vorliegenden reprographischen Nachdruck des *Historia*-Exemplars der Herzog August Bibliothek in Wolfenbüttel ist nun der erste Band der von Gunter Grimm herausgegebenen Reihe, *Literatur-Kabinet*, Deutsche Literatur in Reprints, der Öffentlichkeit zugänglich. Es sei vorweggenommen, daß es sich hier um einen willkommenen Beitrag zur Erweiterung des allgemeiner zur Verfügung stehenden barocken Textkorpus handelt, da der Stellenwert der *Historia* eine kritische Ausgabe wahrscheinlich nicht rechtfertigt, was man allerdings auch bezweifeln könnte. Warum jedoch in dem Zusammenhang Grimm als Herausgeber der Reihe darauf verzichtet hat, über die Auswahlkriterien, über die Absichten, Ziele und die Methode der textkritischen Darstellung im Anhang der Bände dieser Reihe oder in einem Vorwort zu informieren, ist unverständlich und ein bedenklicher Man-

gel, der, das wäre zu wünschen, in einem der folgenden Bände hoffentlich beseitigt wird.

Der Aufbau der Ausgabe ist nun folgendermaßen gestaltet: dem Nachdruck folgen ein knapp gehaltener Textkommentar, Literaturangaben zu weiteren Ausgaben der *Historia*, zu Cervantes und seinen *Novelas*, der Cervantes-Rezeption in Deutschland und abschließend zu Ulenhart. Das Nachwort vermittelt wichtige Angaben über Leben und Werk Cervantes, über seine *Novelas ejemplares* und 'Rinconete y Cortadillo', die Cervantes-Rezeption in Deutschland, Niclas Ulenhart, die Beziehung seiner *Historia* zu 'Rinconete y Cortadillo', das deutsche Milieu in der *Historia*, die Eindeutschung der Gestalten, über Stillenden und die Wirkungsgeschichte. Mit diesen vielen, wenn auch recht kurz gehaltenen nützlichen Hinweisen ist der Band nicht nur für die Vergleichende Literaturwissenschaft im Zusammenhang stoff- und rezeptionsgeschichtlicher Fragestellungen von Interesse, sondern besonders auch für die Germanistik und überhaupt den interessierten Leser. (HOLGER A. PAUSCH, UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA)

*HANSJÜRGEN BLINN. *Shakespeare-Rezeption: Die Diskussion um Shakespeare in Deutschland*. 1. *Ausgewählte Texte von 1741-1788*. Berlin: Erich Schmidt 1982. Pp. 184. DM44.00

This is a most useful anthology of documents because for scholars and students alike it has been quite a chore to locate these sources dispersed in various books, if not libraries. Within the given time frame, here the reader finds everything he needs from Caspar von Borck's first *Versuch einer gebundenen Übersetzung des... Julius Caesar* (1741) to Schiller's observations on Shakespeare (1788) including an unabridged reprint of J.E. Schlegel's *Vergleichung Shakespears und A. Gryphs* (1741) as well as Lenz's *Anmerkungen übers Theater* (1774); even Frederick the Great has his say on Shakespeare and Goetz.

Blinn's 29-page introduction is a little masterpiece in its succinct summary of the history of research and of the reception of Shakespeare in eighteenth-century Germany without which the literature of the Age of Goethe would surely have taken a different course. It is interesting to note that it was not only J.E. Schlegel who contrasted the French classicists with Shakespeare, but, almost simultaneously, also Albrecht von Haller (1746); that it was not Wieland's translation (1762), but W. Dodd's anthology *The Beauties of Shakespeare* (London 1752) which in-

spired young Goethe first of all: that it was the much maligned and neglected F. Nicolai who praised Shakespeare as a dramatic paradigm to follow – despite his apparent lack of erudition and order (1755). As a result, Lessing's 'unique' position as revolutionary innovator (17. *Literaturbrief*) loses some of its luster since Lessing followed in the wake of a previously established tradition of anglophilism (see Blinn, pp. 20-1). Similarly, Blinn emphasizes the continuity of enlightenment tendencies which the Sturm und Drang brought to fruition (p. 28). This is a refreshingly judicious and timely change in perspective. Blinn's introduction gains an extra dimension through focusing on the changing image of Shakespeare in poetological and sociological terms: for instance, the history of the German reception of Shakespeare from Lessing to Schiller must be viewed from the vantage point of the varying distance between Aristotle and Shakespeare; and as to the rejection of the *Ständeklausur* and of the three dramatic unities, this is but the reflection of the growing emancipation of the middle class from absolutist rule.

From a critical viewpoint I would have liked to see an appendix with a few samples of early translations of Shakespeare between Borck (1741) and Eschenburg (1775), which are hard to come by. Moreover, the 102 bibliographical entries lack a systematic approach: within thematic sub-categories items should either have been listed in alphabetical or chronological order. Finally, H. Oppel's *Englisch-deutsche Literaturbeziehungen I* (Berlin: Erich Schmidt 1971) is missing. (GERHART HOFFMEISTER, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SANTA BARBARA)

*ERNST BEHLER. *Die Zeitschriften der Brüder Schlegel*. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der deutschen Romantik. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft 1983. Pp. viii + 192. DM50.00

In the course of his life, Friedrich Schlegel edited four periodicals, *Athenäum* (1798-1800), *Europa* (1803-1805), *Deutsches Museum* (1812-1813) and *Concordia* (1820-1823). In the years from 1960 to 1975, the Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft published photo-mechanical reproductions of these journals with extensive introductions by Ernst Behler. The present volume reprints these introductions in a slightly revised form, but also contains two brief new chapters, dealing with 'The Brothers Schlegel as Journal Editors' and 'The Theory of the Journal in the Poetics of the Brothers Schlegel'. The history of these periodicals adds up to

a kind of intellectual biography of Friedrich Schlegel, and as Behler writes about them with the mastery and the elegance his readers have come to expect of him, the volume is a welcome addition to the literature on early German romanticism.

The *Athenäum* was the only periodical which A. W. and F. Schlegel edited jointly; it was here that the course envisaged by the early romantics for modern literature was first mapped out. As Behler's account makes clear, the most significant contributions to the journal were those by Friedrich Schlegel and Novalis, and its fifth issue, published in April, 1800, marks a shift towards mysticism in which the elder Schlegel did not participate.

Friedrich Schlegel found a publisher for the *Europa* when he was on his way to Paris; he desperately needed a source of income and intended to appeal to a wider public than had been the case with the *Athenäum*, but the journal folded after four issues. Behler rightly emphasizes A. W. Schlegel's contributions to this journal, particularly the shortened version of four of his Berlin lectures on literature, which contains a massive onslaught on the Enlightenment. Friedrich Schlegel's articles on painting in the *Europa*, which clearly foreshadow his impending conversion to Roman Catholicism, became so influential that Goethe in 1817 complained of the 'legislative authority' which they enjoyed among the young Romantic painters.

The *Deutsches Museum* owed both its existence and its character to the Napoleonic wars. In 1810, Friedrich Perthes, who owned a reputable publishing firm in Hamburg, had founded a *Valerianisches Museum*, which for a brief time provided a forum for patriotic German writers but had to close down when Hamburg was incorporated into France. Schlegel was persuaded to continue it under a different name. The four fields to which he intended to give pride of place in it were history, philosophy, literature and the fine arts. He now held that it was the main task of a national literature to keep a people aware of its own past, and the *Deutsches Museum* clearly marks the shift in his focus of interest from the Romance literatures of the 13th, 14th and 15th centuries to the Germanic Middle Ages. Strangely enough, however, he opened the pages of this patriotic journal to an outrageous article by an acquaintance, von Steigentesch, that asserted at considerable length the basic inferiority of the German literature of the last fifty years – the epoch of Lessing, Goethe and Schiller! – to that of the French. Goethe suggested that the article was accepted by Schlegel because von Steigentesch served such excellent dinners at his house, and cynical as this sounds, nobody, including Ernst Behler, who quotes Goethe's

remark, has come up with a better explanation of Schlegel's extraordinary editorial gaffe.

In contrast to F. Schlegel's other journals, the issues of the *Deutsches Museum*, which was a monthly, appeared on time. When it ceased publication at the end of 1813, Schlegel blamed the political situation and the publisher, who did not meet his financial obligations to the contributors, but Schlegel had in any case lost interest in this uncharacteristically staid and stolid venture. *Concordia* seems to have been intended to have six issues per year, but only five were published in 1820, and the sixth and last issue did not appear till 1823. The journal reflects the shift in Schlegel's interest from literature and history to theology. Its pages were only open to Roman Catholics, and its contributors were agreed on the paramount importance of religion in all walks of life, including politics. The medieval studies in the *Deutsches Museum* had served scholarly and patriotic interests; in the *Concordia*, Schlegel proposed in all seriousness that an ideal constitution should be modelled on the 'old German' (i.e., medieval) Holy Roman Empire. With the evident approval of the editor, one of the contributors to the *Concordia* stated categorically that democracy was incompatible with the 'dignity of Christianity.' Needless to say, there is not the slightest indication in Behler's comments that he shares these views; but as he is one of the extremely few scholars who have paid serious attention to the philosophical underpinnings of the 'political romanticism' represented by the *Concordia*, he understands how Schlegel and his friends arrived at their convictions and can report on them *sine ira et studio*. Reflecting, as it does, the unique expertise Behler gained as editor of the critical Friedrich-Schlegel-edition, this is a most useful book. (HANS EICHNER, UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO)

*HELMUT F. PFANNER. *Exile in New York: German and Austrian Writers After 1933*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press 1983. Pp. 252. US\$18.95

After a relatively brief history of only some twenty-five years of exile studies, which focused primarily on authors, works, genres, regional and political aspects, and questions of definition and methodology, it is perhaps not a coincidence that three works appeared in one year, 1983, which view the German exile situation in the United States in a more comprehensive manner: Jarrell C. Jackman and Carla M. Borden, eds., in *The Muses Flee Hitler: Cultural Transfer and Adaptation 1930*

-1945¹ present a series of papers dealing with the contributions of German scientists, scholars, artists and musicians to their respective fields in the United States; Anthony Heilbutt's *Exiled in Paradise: German Refugee Artists and Intellectuals in America from the 1930s to the Present*² places the exile condition in its historical and social context and, using a wealth of material and examples, examines problems of identity, the 'Selbstverständnis' of the exiles and their multi-faceted reaction to their new environment; finally, the work under review presents an almost clinical examination of living and working conditions of German-speaking exile writers in New York. Another work, also published in 1983, presents *Latin America and the Literature of Exile: A Comparative View of the 20th-Century European Refugee Writers in the New World*, edited by Hans-Bernhard Moeller.³

It is significant to note that these more comprehensive investigations clearly reflect the realization of a perspective of exile literature in which attention shifts from discrete manifestations of exile to its almost all-encompassing existence. The need for the interdisciplinary approach, which underlies these studies, had already been projected at the First International Symposium on Exile Literature in Stockholm, 1969. More recently, its continued applicability has been reaffirmed by Joseph P. Strelka: 'Das einzige und übergreifende und wirklich alle Exilliteratur wesensbestimmende Element ist ihre Entstehung aus einer Existenzsituation heraus.'⁴

Pfanner makes a notable contribution to our understanding of this 'Existenzsituation,' in particular of 'the more personal aspects of the exile - its psychological effects and cultural consequences' which, he rightly observes, 'are still largely unknown' (p. 14). Framed by chapters dealing respectively with the onset of exile ('Introduction' and 'The Escape') and its less precisely definable end ('The Question of Return' and 'A Borrowed Home'), the study traces the various stages and aspects of the exiles' situation in New York which, besides Los Angeles was the largest center of German refugees in the United States. Under sometimes cryptic chapter headings such as 'The Nightmare of Rejection,' 'Lack of a Blueprint,' 'A St. Bernard Becomes a Dachshund,' 'Doctors and Housemaids Wanted,' Pfanner recounts and explains the exiles'

1 Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press 1983

2 New York: Viking 1983

3 Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag 1983

4 *Exilliteratur: Grundprobleme der Theorie, Aspekte der Geschichte und Kritik* (Bern: Verlag Peter Lang 1983) 67

emotional experience on entering the United States, sometimes delayed or refused,⁵ the frustrating problems of everyday life, the often unhappy, at times degrading experiences in making contact with Americans, refugee organizations, civic or federal agencies to find some relief to the economic and human hardships to which they were exposed.

In reading this account one must bear in mind that Pfanner's sources are autobiographical writings of German and Austrian exile writers: letters, diaries, memoirs, autobiographical novels, both published and unpublished, and that he considers their authors to be 'perhaps best equipped to understand and describe the exile condition' and to 'speak representatively for the larger group of intellectual refugees' (p. 19). This approach may not be wholly acceptable by readers who regard the autobiographical statement to be essentially subjective, open to prejudice and distortion, and thus not an appropriate base for broad sociological, and, by implication, objective conclusions. Their discomfort may be increased by the many examples given within the study itself of different reactions to various conditions by individuals having different professional, socio-economic and political backgrounds (e.g. pp. 39ff., 52ff.). However, such objections do not reduce the inherent merit of Pfanner's book: the use of autobiographical materials is fully justified by its immediacy and the true-to-life experience transmitted – which carries its own convincing arguments.

With few exceptions, German intellectuals found it difficult to continue their former profession: Carl Zuckmeyer, after having been a script writer in Hollywood and a drama teacher in New York, became a farmer in Vermont; Johannes Urzidil converted his leatherworking hobby into an income producing trade, and F.S. Grosshut, a lawyer in Germany until 1933, first worked with his wife as a servant couple, then for years in a garment factory, a period retold in his unpublished autobiographical novel 'Der Schwitzkasten' (The Sweat Box). There are also examples to the contrary: Erwin Piscator, who trained many actors in his 'Dramatic Workshop,' was one of the few successful theater people; some musicians (Otto Klemperer, Bruno Walter) were immediately integrated into American musical life' (p. 77); and as many as sixty refugee professors found positions, at various times, at the New School for Social Research in New York. Physicians, having a market-

ble profession, generally also found employment, although they had to pass rigorous medical and English language examinations. Martin Gumpert might have been included among those mentioned (p. 78ff.). A leading medical practitioner, historian and public health official in his native Berlin, Gumpert not only reestablished his medical practice in New York, but also became a well-known consultant, author and editor of medical publications, and continued to write poetry and prose.

'The Cultural Conflict' between Europe and America and the related problem of language acquisition were among the greatest 'non-material' obstacles to making a satisfactory adjustment to life in the New World. Real or perceived differences in habits and attitudes, value judgments, not to say prejudices, concerning aspects of American culture, difficulties in, and in some instances unwillingness to learn English not only prevented many exiles from accepting New York and the United States as their new home; they are as well evidence for a lasting bond with their former German or Austrian cultural environment. It would be an important undertaking to probe even deeper than Pfanner does into this apparent contradictory intellectual position and emotional state of adherence to a tradition whose representatives not only rejected the exiles but threatened their very existence. The same state delayed the departure of some until well into the thirties, or prevented it altogether (pp. 21f.).

The scope of Pfanner's study is broad and includes chapters on 'Exile Politics,' 'The Question of Return,' and on 'A Borrowed Home,' remaining in the United States. His treatment is balanced and fair, which is notable for a subject with a great potential for accusations and recriminations. Although Pfanner limits his inquiry to the fate of 'German and Austrian Writers (in New York) after 1933' and, moreover, states that 'this emigration had a distinctly intellectual character' (p. 14) – a view perhaps more supported by scholarly interest than immigration statistics – in its essence, the study brings out the human tragedy of exile per se, albeit here exemplified by the specific situation of the intellectual, but similarly endured by the much larger number of exiles from other walks of life whose story still remains to be told. Clearly, Pfanner has made a valuable contribution to the study of exile. By focusing attention on its social, economic, psychological and political aspects, he offers both a model and point of departure for similar studies, as well as the opportunity to place previously undertaken, more strictly literary studies into their proper context.

The book contains a helpful bio-bibliographical section on 'Exile Authors and Works' (pp. 199-232) which would have become even more

⁵ For a detailed study of American immigration policy see Hans-Albert Walter, *Deutsche Exilliteratur 1933-1950*, Vol. 2: *Europäisches Apparement und überseische Asylpraxis* (Stuttgart: Metzler Verlag 1984).

informative by including a brief reference to the profession of the many 'authors' who were either (relatively) unknown or not 'professional' writers; and twenty-four portraits. (ERNEST REINHOLD, UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA)

* ADRIAN MARINO. *Littérature roumaine — littératures occidentales*. Traduction par Annie Bontoiu. Bucharest: Editura științifică și enciclopedică 1982. Pp. 228. No price

* IOAN LUPU and CORNELIA ȘTEFĂNESCU. *Bibliografia relațiilor literaturii române cu literaturile străine în perioadă (1856-1918)*. Vol. II, *Literaturile române*. Bucharest: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România 1982. Pp. 440. No price

In the complex project of recovering the lost *cultural unity* of Europe, we cannot overlook those energies of differentiation (or self-deconstruction) at work within the broader cultural episteme of a certain period. These energies may find good ground for their manifestation in the 'gap' between, say, the Western cultural canons and their (often belated) Eastern European counterparts. The interchanges between these two cultural regions have often been viewed too narrowly as a one-way action, with the East massively 'importing' cultural models from the West; or, in rarer cases, rejecting these models in the name of a non-Western, alternative evolution. Comparative literary studies and reception bibliographies (such as these under consideration) will redefine for us the European cultural context, emphasizing its polycentric and dialogical variety, its two-way dissemination of cultural phenomena between East and West, North and South.

The *Bibliografia relațiilor literaturii române cu literaturile străine în perioadă (1856-1918)*, published by a research group coordinated by Ioan Lupu and Cornelia Ștefănescu, brings together a rich documentary material without which a more systematic and analytical study such as that carried out by Adrian Marino would be almost inconceivable. At the same time, by annotating entries and by employing a consistent definition of *relations* as main criterion of selection ('the concept of relation implies an action between two factors, one that acts and another that receives and reacts' — my translation, p. vi), this massive *Bibliografia...* takes a significant step in the direction of comparative literary history. What the authors catalogue as facts of literary history is a variety of

Romanian articles, essays, reviews, critical notes on (in this second volume) writers and trends from the area of the Romance literatures; also numerous translations, adaptations, 'imitations' after those literatures published in major periodicals. It is true that part of this material remains somewhat circumstantial in character; still, when handled by imaginative writers, even such occasional pieces as the anniversary article, the obituary, the introductory note become significant literary texts (as with Eminescu's theatrical reviews, Macedonski's literary portraits of Baudelaire, Théophile Gautier, Maurice Rollinat, Densusianu's book notes, etc.).

Again, this *Bibliografia...* testifies to the fact that the reception of Romance literatures in Romania at the turn of the century was not a passive, one-sided affair: many of the introductory articles and translations (from Théophile Gautier, Marinetti's manifestoes, from Zola or Anatole France, etc.) led to genuine debates around the idea of symbolism and futurism, the concept of reality in fiction, or the morality of the novel. One can discover among these journalistic products important contributions of comparative literary history: such is P. Ispirescu's 1877 study of the French and the Romanian fairy tales; C. Drouhet's 1906 article on Romanian poetry after Eminescu and its creative assimilation of Hugo, Musset, Gautier or Leconte de Lisle; Ovid Densusianu's discussion (that same year) of Henri Regnier, and his persuasive plea for a Romanian symbolism; N. Iorga's 1916 article on Shakespeare and Cervantes; Pompiliu Eliade's published lecture series (on Pascal, Brunetière, La Fontaine and Eminescu); E. Lovinescu's comments on Émile Faguet and Jules Lemaitre.

More than 350 pages in this *Bibliografia...* record literary relations with France. The coverage of the Parisian literary scene in the Romanian publications of the period was almost exhaustive; but one can already notice a beginning dialogue between the two cultures, with Romanian echoes and contributions to French literature (from writers like Iulia Hasdeu, Hélène Vacaresco, Dem. Lahovary, Radu Crețulescu, etc., writing in French). As Adrian Marino observes in his own book, the essential Romanian aesthetic information around 1910 came mainly from France. The most discussed and translated writers at the time were Baudelaire (about 140 entries), Victor Hugo, Jules Verne, Émile Zola (over 100 entries), Maupassant (500 entries, most of them translations), etc. This period saw a good transposition of Baudelaire's prose poems (A. Stamatiad, 1912); but also several important translations from Dante (N. Gane, 1906, and G. Coșbuc), Verlaine (D. Anghel and St. O. Iosif, 1904), Maurice Maeterlinck (B. Solacolu and V. Sandu, 1914). While the other Romance literatures (with the exception of the Italian)

occupy only a few pages, there are surprising references to provençal literature (mainly to the work of Frédéric Mistral), French literature from Switzerland and Belgium, some Latin American literature.

Relying in part on such documentary material (not all of it properly recorded as yet in Romania), Adrian Marino's book aims to systematize further and fill other gaps: 'S'il existe quelque part dans le Sud-Est de l'Europe une assimilation vraiment totale et en profondeur de cet aspect de l'esprit des Lumières, il serait difficile de trouver un exemple plus concluant que celui de pays roumains' (p. 11). Even where documentation is ample and a few preliminary studies have already been published, Adrian Marino feels the need for a more systematic evaluation of these materials. As usual, his approach is that of a critical hermeneutician and comparatist, viewing literature from the height of the history of ideas (see his previous *Dictionar de idei literare/ Dictionary of Literary Ideas* [1973]; or *Critica ideilor literare/ A Critique of Literary Ideas* [1974]). In this book on literary relations, Adrian Marino again tries to move upward from the infrastructure of available documents to a superstructure of ideas and patterns of evolution. His methodological premises seem to be structuralist and phenomenological: almost every page in this or other of Marino's books reveals an interest in constants and variables, in synchronic systematization and 'bracketing.' But we are promised this time a more dynamic and 'militant' type of comparativism: one that pursues the genesis and circulation of literary ideas within the framework of a truly 'universal' literature, unencumbered by arbitrary geographical or ideological divisions.

Many chapters in this book, conceived at first as independent essays, have a certain demonstrative, polemical undertone. In the context of certain recent Romanian debates in which the advocates of the necessary 'synchronization' of Romanian culture with the Western models seem to be overpowered by the noisy, official propagandists of Romanian 'protochronism' (asserting Romanian priorities in various domains), Adrian Marino's book sounds a dissenting tone. His historical narrative, built around a systematic use of quotations and documents, foregrounds a basic theme: that of the gradual modernization of Romanian literature (or rather of its aesthetic conception) through a cyclical renewal of its contacts with the West.

In Marino's book this scenario has eight chronological acts. Act One ('Les Lumières roumaines découvrent "l'Europe,"' pp. 10-48) marks the moment of the 'prise de la conscience,' of the exultant return of Romanian spirituality in the great family of 'civilized nations.' This was a period of national and cultural awakening, of a 'récupération du décalage' and extensive contacts with the West. Perhaps no other area

in Eastern or Southeastern Europe achieved 'une assimilation vraiment totale et en profondeur de cet aspect de l'esprit des Lumières' (p. 11), no other culture recognized so readily its own aspirations in the topos (myth) of 'l'occident éclairé de l'Europe.' Act Two ('Benjamin Franklin dans la culture et la littérature roumaines,' pp. 49-80) moves this historical narrative to the 1830s, focusing on the role of (an idealized image) of Benjamin Franklin in reorienting the new (mass) culture, or in laying the bases for a Romanian pragmatic ethics. Act Three ('L'ossianisme roumain,' pp. 81-108) credits the Ossianic paradigm (at times indiscriminately mixed with Byronic, Scandinavian, Germanic elements) with replenishing the Romanian concept of the poet as national bard (the period is roughly that between 1840-1870). Act Four ('Les commencements roumains de l'idée de réalisme,' pp. 109-24) recounts the quick assimilation of the realistic doctrines of Champfleury in Romania around mid-nineteenth Century. Act Five ('Les poètes roumains découvrent Baudelaire,' pp. 125-35) emphasizes Baudelaire's catalytic role within several consecutive stages of Romanian modernism (from Macedonski's symbolistic movement, to the later phases of the Romanian avant-garde). Act Six (pp. 136-68), the most substantial in Marino's systematization, presents Eugen Lovinescu's creative use of the impressionistic method in criticism. Acts Seven (pp. 169-205) and Eight (pp. 206-19) examine the reception of two avant-gardist trends (futurism and expressionism) in Romania, and their contribution to redefining the Romanian attitudes to literary innovation (subversion).

Adrian Marino's narrative often proceeds circuitously, allowing ideas to emerge slowly from a mass of quotations and historical details, to interact, to compound a picture that is often left in a state of 'ébauche.' Yet Marino remains basically a lover of certitudes and clarity; he seldom abandons his main method which is that of critical induction, elevating a sequence of data to the generality of idea. This fact, coupled with his interest in the catalytic role played by aesthetic ideas from the West in the modernization of Romanian literature, makes his presentation somewhat one-sided. For one thing, there is little analysis of major literary works, and almost exclusive focus on theoretical (cultural) assimilation, on literary concepts illustrated through minor, period works. Only upon occasion a literary topos is followed through, in its subsequent transformations at the hands of major writers, or brought up-to-date by references to the more recent fate of that concept in Romanian literature. An exception is the excellent article on Lovinescu's impressionism which looks forward rather than backwards, emphasizing Lovinescu's contributions to the European

career of that trend (and, possibly, his anticipations of the later reader-response theories and phenomenological criticism).

Even if Marino does not explicitly connect his historical surveys with the present fate of Romanian literary culture, some of his essays may find a contemporary application: in many ways the confused period described in *Act One*, when Romanian culture lived on its own a veritable 'crise de la conscience Européenne,' in between complexes of inferiority and a not always justified national optimism, resembles the recent decades in Romania. Again, the two chapters examining the cyclic recovery and transformation of the avant-gardist goals in Romania, could be updated by a brief look at the reemergence of experimentation in recent Romanian literature. These final chapters in Marino's book give us a better idea of the extent to which Romanian writers have tried and often managed to turn the frustration of 'belatedness' into a creative reconstruction of the various European trends; also of their repeated efforts 'pour sortir de leur isolement, pour s'arracher à un certain "provincialisme" et entretenir en tant que groupe — plus ou moins constitué — des liaisons internationales' (p. 204). (MARCEL CORNIS-POP, UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN IOWA)

*ROMUL MUNTEANU, ed. *Le Comparatisme roumain II*. Bucharest: Univers 1985. Pp. 360. LEI23.00

Comparatism is one of the best developed branches of literary studies in Romania. It appeared in the nineteenth century and reached a high point later with scholars such as Tudor Vianu, Liviu Rusu, Edgar Papu and others. This growth was due to a variety of reasons. The revived national literature tried to validate itself as a legitimate member of the European concert of literatures and open itself widely to influences such as the French one. The social elites were multilingual and many leading scholars had received training at French, German, or Italian universities. There was also the more general pattern of scholars from smaller or more marginal countries needing and acquiring a better overall view of European literary achievements, which functioned in the Romanian case as it did in the Hungarian or Dutch case.

The present volume is an anthology of recent studies, some of which are translated from Romanian, while others seem to be summaries of the authors' previous research. (No source indications are provided by the volume's editor.) The book is not unitary and some studies clear-

ly do not belong here. Thus the entire third section ('Littérature roumaine — littérature européenne,' pp. 227-360) contains essays on twentieth-century Romanian writers which can be of some interest for the foreign reader, but are certainly not comparatist in nature. The main exception is Liviu Petrescu's essay on the influence exerted by André Gide on Anton Holban and other Romanian novelists (pp. 273-87). In fact a large number of the articles collected are devoted to French-Romanian literary relations. Thus Paul Cornea writes about these relations inside Romanticism (pp. 22-34), Lidia Bote about the symbolist movement (pp. 25-50), Adrian Marino in his discussion of the attitude of the 1920s avant garde towards the concept of realism (pp. 71-80) draws mainly on French material. Angela Ion surveys the reception of Balzac in Romania (pp. 106-23). She points out that already in the 1830s Balzac's novels were read widely in the Danubian principalities and that the first translations appeared in 1836 and 1841. As late as 1938 a leading critic and novelist, George Călinescu tried to demonstrate the superiority of Balzac's novelistic formula by composing *Enigma Otiliei*, a novel in Balzac's style. I missed, however, references to the abundant Balzacian translation activity of the last 50 years or so. Other useful articles refer to Proust's influence on Camil Petrescu, a leading novelist between World War I and II (Irina Mavrodin, pp. 95-105), the early poems of Benjamin Fondane, written in Romanian (Mircea Martin, pp. 252-72), and Proust's Romanian correspondents (Cornelia Stănescu, pp. 81-94). The latter include Antoine and Emmanuel Bibesco, Rachel Brancovan (one of the models for Madame Verdurin) and her two daughters, the poet Anna de Noailles and Hélène de Chimay, the sister-in-law of the comtesse de Greffulhe. The correspondence of Proust with Prince Antoine Bibesco may have amounted to 400 or more letters according to eyewitnesses of the 1930s. Less than a quarter of these were published, but the rest may not be irretrievably lost, according to Ms Stănescu.

Among the essays devoted to other comparatist topics mention can be made of Romul Munteanu's study of the 'world as jungle' topos in modern tragicomedy (pp. 161-79), 'orientalism' in the verse of the symbolist poet Macedonski (Mircea Angheliescu, pp. 215-24), and Ovid Crohmălniceanu's investigation of expressionist aspects in Romanian interwar poetry (pp. 51-70), a topic on which the author has written elsewhere, at greater length. Ion Petrica tackles a very interesting subject, a parallel between W. Reymont's *Pesants* (1904-9) and Liviu Rebreanu's *Ion* (1920), but the analysis is often elementary and the author seems to shy away from value judgments that would inevitably have favored the Polish epic masterpiece.

Two pieces in this collection seem to rise above the others. Johann Wolf summarizes the present findings on the influence of Herder on the Romanian generation of 1848 (pp. 180-98). The influence of Herder's concept of national culture and identity was enormous throughout Eastern and Central Europe and this topic was often treated; Wolf's lucid presentation should encourage further research in this very fertile area of intellectual history. The other is Alexandru Duțu's essay on the evolution of Dimitrie Cantemir's thinking from the model of *axis mundi* to that of 'Pluralité des mondes' (pp. 146-60). Cantemir was a brilliant baroque mind, shaped by the East European (Romanian and Russian) environment, but equally well attuned to the Latin and rationalist West and to the still viable culture of the Islamic Ottoman Empire. He deserves to be better known and Duțu does a good analytical job on the *Hieroglyphical Story* (1705), Cantemir's only 'roman à clef'.

It is clear that in the last 10 or 15 years, Romanian comparatist research has been losing ground in relation to other schools of the neighboring area (in particular the Hungarian one); this is due to the unfortunate political climate in the country. Nevertheless a volume like the present one shows that meritorious work continues and that there is reasonable hope for the future. (VIRGIL NEMOIANU, CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA)

*JOHN VERNON. *Money and Fiction: Literary Realism in the Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press 1984. Pp. 213. US\$19.95

Money and Fiction by John Vernon has a twin focus, presenting itself not only as a study of the theme of money in fiction but also as a meditation on the nature of literary realism. Its basic assumption is that the realistic novel (which here means the nineteenth-century novel) was but one manifestation of a more general cultural shift in modes of representation, a shift that was marked, in particular, by the transition from gold and silver currencies to paper money. The book's stated objective, then, is to elaborate on the analogy between these two forms of representation (literary and economic) and also to provide an account of the social and material worlds they in fact represent. Such a task necessarily involves treating the novel as both document and form: 'Money registers the altered sense of reality that is realism's subject and at the same time enables us to understand the forms of

representation realism evolved to record that subject' (p. 9). The novels which deal thematically with the social transformations wrought by changing attitudes to money are assumed to be the same novels which reflect, in their forms, analogous shifts of social and cultural perception.

In this context of large-scale formal and epistemic change, the name of Foucault inevitably springs to mind. However, John Vernon indicates on the first page of his preface that, although he is tempted to call his work an archaeology of ideas, his approach is both more metaphorical and more eclectic than the master's, and Foucault promptly disappears to resurface briefly only once in the rest of the book. Vernon's other mentors, the Marxist and neo-Marxist thinkers — Jameson, Lukacs, Benjamin, Marc Shell, Edward Said — fare rather better as acknowledged sources of inspiration, but here again the similarities seem less important to the author than the differences, and he declares himself to be, in fact, more of a phenomenologist than a Marxist: 'My method, then, is heterogeneous, and my language is as much metaphorical and literary as it is theoretical, if only because in my view theory should always be sullied by the concreteness of events' (p. 23).

The words used by the critic to establish his distance from those who have influenced him are telling: his approach is *metaphorical* and *eclectic*, his method *heterogeneous* and his language *metaphorical* (again) and *literary*. Now, while there is nothing exceptionable in such an approach — indeed, it would be silly to deny that some of the best books of literary criticism are, by choice, both eclectic and metaphorical — it does have obvious dangers, of which authors should be aware. The first of these involves the question of methodological closure, or lack thereof; in the absence of theoretical delimitation, it becomes perfectly natural and legitimate for the reader to look at those aspects of the problem which have been treated and ask why those particular elements were selected rather than others. When the subject of a book is as vast as that of *Money and Fiction* (even allowing for the restriction of 'fiction' to the nineteenth-century realistic novel) it becomes all the more important that we have a fairly clear idea of the criteria informing the choice of texts and topics. Similarly, if a whole work is built around a single metaphor or analogy (as is ostensibly the case here), it is not unreasonable to ask that the analogy be sufficiently compelling to provide a relatively precise focus for the material studied and to guide the reader through the various levels of the argument without allowing them to become blurred.

Does *Money and Fiction* meet these two requirements? Not entirely, and if we start by looking at the central analogy of the book we shall