

study and professional discipline, serves.¹ 'In our society,' Hawkes writes, 'in which *Hamlet* is embedded in the ideology in a variety of roles, the play has, for complex and historical reasons, always already begun. And onto its beginning we have always already imprinted a knowledge of its course of action, and its ending' (p. 312). Hawkes pursues a twofold argument: first, to show that an interpretation of *Hamlet* forces one to read in the 'fundamental mode' of 'looking backwards, re-vision, or reinterpretation, the running of events over again' (p. 313) in order to specify the preconditions of discourse, and that the play encodes this recursiveness in its structure and language; second, to show that in a centrally illustrative case, John Dover Wilson's attack on W.W. Greg's revisionary interpretation, to read *Hamlet* presupposes English consensual ideology. The case of Dover Wilson's attack upon Greg, and his dedication to the counter-argument in favour of critical orthodoxy (that is, the Ghost *does* tell the truth), exemplifies the cultural force of *Hamlet* as an inscribed text. It also exemplifies, Hawkes argues, the inflexibility of 'Eurocentric' interpretive criticism. *Hamlet* demands more, rather than less, flexibility. (It is, of course, merely the paradigmatic case for all literary texts.) The interpretation of *Hamlet* forces upon the critic what the Eurocentric insistence upon orthodoxy and authority can never provide: the recognition that the text is plural, that is, the sense of 'a text as a site, or an area of conflicting and often contradictory potential interpretations' (p. 330). Hawkes then proposes, in a stunningly unexpected move, that the model for the interpretation of *Hamlet* should be American jazz music (in which interpretation *constitutes* art). The improvisational spirit of jazz, its free play (or, simply, its demand that the players 'play with'), has defined the 'transatlantic mode in our century and before it, to an extent that might now force us to recognize that criticism makes Americans of us all' (p. 331).

The final sentence of Hawkes's essay, and the last in *Shakespeare and the Question of Theory*, puns upon Fortinbras' name to link him to the 'name of the greatest black American jazz trumpeter' (p. 331). This is an appropriate conclusion for a collection most of whose contributors are American, and most of whose concerns appear to be those of North American English departments. Many of the essays do succeed in refocussing, often with scholarly clarity, occasionally with genuine brilliance, some classical problems, and in raising other problems that elude the boundaries of

traditional Shakespearean scholarship.² The presence of essays in which theory is only decorative, severely marginalized in the pursuit of 'normal' scholarship, or blatantly idiosyncratic, undercuts the promise of the collection's title, and will probably dismay readers who approach it from the direction of an interest in literary theory. More importantly, the absence of essays fully demonstrating the bearing of Narratology, Phenomenology, Hermeneutics, or many separate theoretical models, such as those developed by Bakhtin, Foucault, Iser or the Neo-Marxists, important in the European context of literary studies (and in Departments of Comparative Literature), weakens the collection's potential usefulness. It seems overwhelmingly a product of, and a commentary upon, the present state of theory in North American English Departments. And, as the fascinating and conceptually powerful contributions by Felperin, Freund, Parker, Goldberg, Greenblatt and Hawkes indicate, there is hope for that region: its vast *antra* are not wholly lightless. (ROBERT RAWDON WILSON, UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA)

¹TOBIN SIEBERS. *The Ethics of Criticism*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press 1988. Pp. 246. No price.

Time and time again, this book presents us with a most unattractive choice: we can either respond by saying, in effect, that we *kind of* (or *sort of*) see what it means and keep on reading; or, if we are bothered by the lack of precision, we can stop to ask questions; the trouble with which is that the questions it prompts are untoward ones; they lead nowhere. In his 'Acknowledgements,' for example, after telling us that his life with his wife and daughter had made him 'realize again and again that literature does have to do with life,' Professor Siebers adds this: 'My life with them is the story that I most prefer to read and to write.' What is this supposed to mean? That he sees his life with his family as a form of literature? And that — perhaps because it allows him to feel he is a writer as well as a reader? — he prefers this form of literature to all others? But if so, where does this public acknowledgement leave *us* his readers?

I suppose it might be said that the reader who decides to continue reading past such sentences is asking for trouble. And there is another one

¹ Hawkes's essay reappears as the fifth chapter in his *That Shakespearean Rag: Essays On & Critical Process* (London: Methuen 1986).

² Readers who might wish to pursue further the application of literary theory to Shakespeare should consult *Alternative Shakespeares*, ed. John Drakakis (London: Methuen 1985). Someone, such as Terence Hawkes, should examine Methuen's role in bringing Shakespeare and literary theory together in a marriage, if not of true minds, at least of compatible energies.

as early as the middle of the book's opening paragraph: 'To criticize,' it reads, 'in conjunction with ethics places literary criticism at large.' (What does 'in conjunction with' mean here? How can you place anything 'at large'?) So I had better admit that if I had not agreed to review this book I certainly would not have read it all the way through. As Samuel Johnson once put it (by way of justifying his habit of looking into most books, rather than reading them from cover to cover: what Boswell called 'his cursory mode of reading'), 'when I take up the end of a web, and find it packthread, I do not expect, by looking further, to find embroidery.' But it is true, of course, that we do expect reviewers to look further: just in case. So I have done my duty. I have read *The Ethics of Criticism* all the way through. And what I have to report is that it is every bit as exasperating as my first impressions led me to expect it would be.

For one thing, it is very badly written. Here are a few more examples of the kind of writing that can be found on most pages. 'I argue,' Siebers tells us, 'that suffering is only a commodity, not a property of literature ...' (p. 9). (Only a what? Not a what?) 'That modern literary theory remains discontent with itself ...' (p. 40). (A typo?) 'If modern literary theory truly values a victimary rhetoric, it remains a mystery why theory is so often associated with intellectual terrorism' (p. 195). (A what rhetoric?) 'Modern feminism cannot divorce itself from Freud because psychoanalysis invented the twentieth-century myth of the self' (p. 198). (Feminism is married to Freud? Which myth is *the* myth? And how can its invention by psychoanalysis prevent divorce?) 'If one subscribes to the metaphor that men penetrate women in the sexual act, it means that their sex may be wounded' (p. 207). (How does one subscribe to a metaphor? Is 'penetration' in this context a metaphor? Why should it mean what Siebers says it means? Does it only mean this if one subscribes to the metaphor?) 'That the sexual act wounds women remains an extraordinarily provocative image. It provides an avenue to the conscience of men' (p. 208). (An image? An avenue?) 'Other critics blame language for the spread of unthought' (p. 235). (Really?) 'Language and unthought join forces as weapons of death in the service of nuclear devastation' (p. 235). (Do they now?) 'The human space is often heavy with the stale grandeur of annihilation. More often it is simply mundane, as it should be, sounding of human language, conversation, and noise' (p. 239). (The human space? Often heavy? Often heavy? Stale grandeur? Human language, conversation, and noise?) Finally, here is the last 'sentence' of the book: 'The finally human is literature' (p. 240). (The *finally* human? Is *what*?)

Occasionally, Professor Siebers writes passages whose meaning is reasonably clear. Consider, for example, his description of the two basic

attitudes toward literature that he thinks characterize what he refers to as 'the tradition of critical thought as we know it' (p. 221):

Traditionally, ethical criticism has tried to avoid the question of literature in two ways. Either it limits the value of literature for moral thinking in the manner of Plato, or it stands in for literature by affirming, in a Nietzschean gesture, the essentially fictive nature of all moral discourse. Either literature cannot compete with moral philosophy, or everything is only literature, but this 'only literature' refers to the idea that meaning in general is fictional, mythical, or deceitful. (p. 220)

But in the first place, if we think of such critics as Johnson, for example, or Coleridge, or Ruskin, or Leavis — critics whose names are not even mentioned in this book, even though they have surely done more than most to help us understand what is involved in the ethics of criticism — we quickly realize that this is simply, and rather shockingly, inaccurate. And in the second place, even though *it* is clear enough (and clearly false), only two sentences later we are plunged back into the dark:

Not to think about literature, modern theorists assume, is the only way to think critically and ethically. [Which modern theorists assume this? What can such an assumption possibly mean?] To think about literature is to deny the possibility of thought. [Is this silliness perhaps meant to wear down our resistance?] The objective of critical theory would seem to be not to think about literature. [Which critical theory? Monty Python's?]

But how *not* to think about literature?

This question, perhaps the master question for the ethics of criticism, requires a context with some finality [This question requires a context? With some finality? Why?], and the current scene provides none better than that of nuclear criticism. (pp. 220-21)

What does the possible 'master question' mean? For a while, I thought it was supposed to mean that one cannot avoid thinking 'about' (or, perhaps it would be better to say, 'in terms of') literature because 'everything is only literature.' But apart from the fact that I certainly do not believe that 'everything is only literature,' I do not think Professor Siebers believes it either. So how can he claim that this is 'perhaps the master question for the ethics of criticism'? Why does he not see that one easy way to avoid thinking about literature is to think about something else? This, after all, is what he himself does throughout this book. But perhaps the 'master question' means something different? Perhaps it means that the key question confronting the student of literature is how to avoid talking about it in inappropriate ways. Perhaps. But if so, what are we supposed to make of the reflections that precede it? The way in which Siebers has formulated his 'master question' reminds me, at any rate, of what Ben Jonson once said about 'doubtful

writing'; it 'hath racked me,' he said (and 'racked' seems to me *exactly* the right word), 'beyond my patience.'

Finally, I have to say that in so far as the book has an argument, it is muddled. 'Far from being a battleground of contesting ideologies, modern literary theory comprises,' according to Siebers, 'a united front when it comes to the importance given to the ethics of criticism' (p. 13). Siebers does not try to argue that 'modern literary theory' is not 'a battleground of contesting ideologies'; he simply assumes that it is not. Presumably because he thinks that it comprises 'a united front': what he tries to show, then, in the somewhat clearer formulation of the blurb, is that 'critical theorists are united in their insistence on the ethical importance of their work.' But is it true that modern literary or critical theorists are united in this way? Is it true, in other words, that 'there is,' as Siebers would have it, 'finally a question whether anyone on the current scene conceives of a criticism that is not ethical' (p. 13)? On the surface, at least, it seems to be rather obviously untrue. Fredric Jameson, for example, is a critic with a high reputation on the current scene and he certainly does not think of his criticism as being ethical. On the contrary, as he explains in his book *The Political Unconscious* (also published, incidentally, by Cornell), Jameson thinks of himself as writing *against* 'what we will call *ethical criticism*,' which he thinks is 'still the predominant form of literary and cultural criticism today, in spite of its repudiation by every successive generation of literary critics (each for a different reason).'¹ It is unfortunate, especially in view of the generalizations he makes about 'modern literary theory' (and, later on, about 'critical theory'), that Siebers has nothing to say about Jameson in particular or about any other Marxist critic. On the other hand, he would not disagree with the contention that something thought of as 'ethical criticism' has indeed been frequently repudiated by various generations of literary critics. His point is that even when literary critics have repudiated ethics, they have invariably done so for ethical reasons. But even if there is (as I think) something in this, it surely does not justify either the claim that contemporary theorists form some kind of 'united front' or the accompanying suggestion that they are far from being engaged in a struggle over 'contesting ideologies.'

I think that Siebers would have been better placed to make the kind of argument he seems to want to make if he had started off from the conviction (as expressed by Samuel Johnson in his *Life of Milton*) that 'we are perpetually moralists, but we are geometricians only by chance. Our

intercourse with intellectual nature is necessary; our speculations upon matter are voluntary, and at leisure.' From this point of view, there can *(pace* Fredric Jameson) be no exceptions: we are all of us perpetually moralists, whether we like it or not. As S.L. Goldberg has recently pointed out, this has nothing to do with choice: it is simply the consequence of 'the out, this has nothing to do with choice: it is simply the consequence of the value-shaped nature of all inter-human mental activity. Choice,' Goldberg adds, 'is only one mode of such activity, one place on the whole spectrum of adding, noticing, foregrounding, selecting, heeding, realizing, respecting, feeling, noticing, foregrounding, selecting, heeding, realizing, respecting, delighting, preferring, ranking, loving, valuing, deciding, and all the other modes of reflective and unreflective judging.'² If the varied and complex nature of inter-human mental activity means that we cannot help being perpetually moralists, it does *not* mean that we are necessarily moral or ethical. Nor does the realization that we are all moralists do anything, in itself, to bring us together in some kind of 'united front.' But it does help us to see that it makes no sense at all to criticize someone simply for being a moralist. What matters, clearly, is the *kind* of moralist he or she is.

Here, then, potentially, is the starting-point for what could, it seems to me, be an extremely interesting comparative and evaluative inquiry into the work of influential contemporary theorists. To adapt what D.H. Lawrence has to say on the subject in his 'Art and Morality' essay, in some of them we would presumably expect to find 'a finer morality,' in others 'a grosser. And,' as Lawrence added, 'as soon as you see a finer morality, the grosser becomes relatively immoral.' Siebers, however, is unfortunately anxious to assure us that *his* book 'is not an exposé aimed at the so-called immoral practices of critics' (p. 13). 'Unfortunately' because what is the function of this assurance if not to discourage us — especially in its use of the words 'so-called' — from asking the really interesting questions? Such questions as By whom? and Which particular practices? It may be, for example, that some, at least, of the grossest or crudest forms of morality are to be found in the writings of those critics who have been most openly hostile to morality or ethics. I'm thinking, among other things, of Richard Rorty's claim that in the first interview in the book *Power/Knowledge* Michel Foucault 'sounds too much like a Nazi ideologue suggesting that the administrative apparatus for carrying out the Nuremberg Laws betrays the spirit of the National Socialist revolution, and hinting that it would be better if Jews were beaten to death on the spot by their neighbours.'³ But there is nothing as controversial as

1 Fredric Jameson, *The Political Unconscious* (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press 1981) 549.

2 S.L. Goldberg, 'Literary Judgment,' *The Critical Review* 28 (1986): 20.

3 Richard Rorty, 'Beyond Nietzsche and Marx,' *London Review of Books* (Feb. 19 - Mar. 4 1981).

this in Siebers's book and I suspect, in fact, that this is the kind of writing he has in mind when, after making the (to me) highly implausible claim that no idea 'is more widespread today than the notion that language is by definition violent,' he says that 'critical language risks being the most violent of all' (p. 9). The implication seems to be that such violence is something the critic should strive to avoid at all cost. On the other hand, Siebers's obvious belief that he himself is very critical suggests that this implication may not be intended. As so often in this book, it is difficult to decide what is intended. And this, despite the fact that Siebers thinks of himself as writing against both the so-called 'Intentional Fallacy' and what he takes to be a widespread 'suspicion of decision itself' (p. 15). Whatever his intention, at any rate, from my point of view he is not critical enough. In the world for which he writes — the outlines of which can be discerned when he tells us that the 'Summer 1984 issue of *Diacritics* ... introduced the phrase "nuclear criticism" to the reading public' (p. 221) — his 'polemics' (as he calls them) against various theorists may indeed seem 'severe' (p. 13) but, if so, that only tells us how sheltered a 'world' it actually is. The problem has to do with Siebers's hopelessly limited conception of 'the reading public.'

I'd like to end up with a reminder: this book is published by a University Press, Cornell's. (GARRY WATSON, UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA)

J. HILLIS MILLER. *The Ethics of Reading: Kant, de Man, Eliot, Trollope, James, and Benjamin*. New York: Columbia University Press 1986. Pp. 120. US\$20.00

'What could this mean, the ethics of reading?' Par cette question introductive, J. Hillis Miller entre d'emblée dans le vif de son étude. Il s'y propose d'explorer et de soutenir l'hypothèse suivant laquelle toute lecture comporte nécessairement un moment éthique propre. Ce moment spécifique constitue non seulement une réponse à un 'must,' mais il débouche en tant que tel sur un acte politique ou cognitif. Autrement dit, l'acte de lecture est en soi un acte performatif.

Sans ignorer les questions que sa thèse risque de soulever, Miller choisit d'explicitier son point de vue à travers une série de lectures sophistiquées. Il effectue un parcours en six étapes (Kant, de Man, Eliot, Trollope, James et Benjamin), et il examine chacun de ces auteurs au moment privilégié où celui-ci se lit ou se relit. Ces minutieux examens ponctuels donnent lieu à autant de lectures rhétoriques stimulantes très bien menées qui, partant d'une option déconstructionniste manifeste, l'amènent à argumenter sa thèse.

Les analyses de Kant et de Paul de Man, qui ouvrent la série des essais, permettent à Miller de poser la base théorique de sa réflexion. Déplaçant le lieu traditionnel du débat sur Kant, de l'esthétique vers l'éthique et de la seconde *Critique* vers *La métaphysique des mœurs*, Miller, en bon déconstructionniste, sélectionne une note de bas de page et un exemple dans le vaste texte kantien. Il montre ainsi avec beaucoup de finesse comment Kant s'oppose à lui-même dans son concept de respect (*Achtung*) et dans son recours à la loi morale comme maxime personnelle à valeur universelle. Il démontre aussi toutes les analogies et les figures qui structurent le texte. Cependant, en même temps, il s'appuie lui-même sur ces jeux d'analogies et de figures en les dominant comme une nécessité intrinsèque du langage: là où le concept fonctionne plus, le récit apparaît. Ce qui lui permet d'en user ainsi est son analyse de l'impératif catégorique comme déjà le lieu d'un récit: lorsque je me dis 'agis comme si (*als ob*) c'était une loi universelle,' le 'comme si' implique le détour par une narration fictive. Miller fait voir comment l'exemple que donne Kant (celui d'une promesse mensongère) d'une part n'est en rien un exemple mais est contenu dans le propos théorique même de Kant, d'autre part s'ouvre sur des lectures contradictoires et incertaines. Argumentant à partir de ce lieu performatif de la promesse, Miller montre que récit et loi se retrouvent dans cette instance de la différence où l'on est divisé d'avec soi et où l'on repousse sans cesse le moment de sa validation. C'est là que le moment éthique trouve sa place: dans l'illisibilité nécessaire du texte: 'What the good reader confronts in the end is not the moral law brought into the open at last in a clear example, but the unreadability of the text' (p. 33). Avec Paul de Man, c'est précisément cette notion d'illisibilité qui est reprise et reformulée. Si, en dominant l'éthique comme le lieu impératif, de Man suit Kant, il s'en éloigne considérablement lorsqu'il spécifie qu'une telle catégorie est *linguistique*, et non subjective. Revenant sur la notion d'allégorie telle qu'énoncée par de Man, Miller conclut que tout acte de lecture est forcément une exemplification de la loi d'illisibilité. Les quatre essais suivants se présentent alors comme autant d'exemples de ce principe.

Avec Eliot, Trollope, James, et Benjamin, la question éthique est abordée sous diverses perspectives. La lecture du Chapitre 17 de *Adam Bede* amène Miller à revoir de près la question du réalisme exposée par George Eliot en regard de sa propre activité d'écrivain. Tout comme avec Kant, Miller fait une lecture subtile de ce passage dont il démonte les figures. Jouant le niveau implicite ('covert') contre le niveau explicite ('overt') du texte, il montre en quoi la lecture par George Eliot de sa propre écriture révèle une contradiction interne entre d'une part la revendication d'un langage réaliste littéral, non figuratif et, d'autre part, la reconnaissance non dite du fait que

la narration réaliste doit dépendre du langage figuratif même, d'une figure spécifique: la catachrèse. L'essai sur Trollope aborde pour sa part le problème de la 'lecture de soi.' Lisant *An Autobiography*, Miller dévoile à nouveau une contradiction interne. En effet, si Trollope veut persuader ses lecteurs de la valeur de ses romans parce que ceux-ci prennent modèle sur la réalité sociale qu'ils reflètent, Miller montre comment la production de ses personnages romanesques revient implicitement à un acte d'auto-fécondation au cours duquel Trollope s'imprègne de ses propres créations et mine secrètement la valeur affirmée des ouvrages. Le dernier chapitre intitulé 'Re-reading Re-vision: James and Benjamin' constitue une sorte de conclusion. James y joue un rôle prépondérant tandis que l'étude de Benjamin est ramenée à une simple 'coda.' L'examen attentif des préfaces à la 'New York Edition' et, plus précisément, de la préface de James au 'Golden Bowl', nous engage à suivre le processus complexe de re-lecture. De ce processus, il ressort paradoxalement que la bonne re-lecture est nécessairement une lecture dévante par rapport au texte dans le sens où la lecture ne s'attache pas au texte en tant que tel mais à sa force latente, à ce que James nomme 'the matter' ou 'the thing.' Re-voir c'est re-lire, et re-lire, c'est lire la loi latente qui gouverne le texte. Faisant un rapprochement entre 'Die Aufgabe des Übersetzers' de Benjamin et la préface de James, Miller montre que la notion de 'reine Sprache' est une autre figure pour 'the thing' ou 'the matter' que porte implicitement le texte. 'The endpoint of my exploration,' écrit Miller, 'is the strange and difficult notion that reading is subject not to the text as its law, but to the law to which the text is subject' (p. 120). Le texte n'en reste pas moins perpétuellement sujet à révision: il ne peut dévoiler que lui-même et cache 'the matter' autant qu'il le révèle. En ce sens, il reste essentiellement illisible. Faisant enfin une analogie entre re-lecture et réécriture, Miller montre en quoi l'acte de critique littéraire est un acte authentiquement éthique puisque, dit-il, 'it opens access for my readers and students not to the meaning of the text as such ... but to the "matter", the "thing" or "force" latent in the work.' Un tel acte, continue-t-il, 'is a response to an irresistible demand, an "I must," and it is an act which is productive, a doing which causes other things to be done in their turn' (p. 120). Par là, c'est finalement toute son entreprise qui trouve sa justification.

Si les analyses de Miller sont fort bien faites, son double appui sur Kant et de Man semble parfois précaire. Il démonte les contradictions kantienues, mais il se fonde sur elles. Ses extensions et ses analogies généralisantes sont problématiques: donner le 'als ob' comme une histoire, l'exemple de Kant comme 'a miniature novel' n'est guère évident, pas plus que le fait de glisser d'un échec possible (que la promesse mensongère se détruise elle-même dès qu'elle se donne comme loi universelle) à un échec nécessaire (toute

promesse se détruit elle-même de façon identique). Quant à de Man il est le seul à échapper au principe de contradiction: nulle fissure du texte n'est déglacée, nul gouffre n'est découvert. Le concept d'illibitilité, chez de Man, serait-il lui-même lisible de part en part? Notons en outre que les rapports entre explicite et implicite, entre texte et contexte ou encore l'analogie entre lecture et écriture demanderaient 'impérativement' à être développés. Ces réserves faites, l'ouvrage de J. Hillis Miller réussit quand même le tour de force d'être à la fois au carrefour des modes (théorie de la lecture, regain d'intérêt pour l'éthique, retour à Kant) et dans les chemins peu fréquentés d'une 'éthique de la lecture' originale, stimulante et, qui en plus est remarquablement écrite. Il annonce un second volume que l'on peut qu'attendre avec impatience. (MARIE-PASCAL HUGLO, UNIVERSITÉ DE MONTRÉAL)

MICHAEL S. BATTS. *A History of Histories of German Literature*. Prolegomena. Canadian Studies in German Language and Literature, Vol. 37. Frankfurt/Bern/New York: Peter Lang Verlag 1987. US\$22.50

Friedrich Schlegel's 'Dialogue on Poetry,' published in August 1800, contains a fourteen-page survey of European literature that devotes four pages to the Greeks, almost as much space to Italian and Spanish literature from Dante to Cervantes, and a little more than one page to German literature — less than to Shakespeare alone. The only German poets mentioned are Fleming, Weckherlin, and Goethe. In some ways, this survey was deliberately provocative; Schlegel belittled the Romans and barely mentioned the French (on the grounds, as the reader discovers later, that the one thing to be learnt from the French is that you can have a great nation without poetry). In its neglect of German literature, however, the canon established by Schlegel was not unrepresentative of the general climate of opinion. German medieval poetry was largely unknown, and the view that the five centuries from the middle of the thirteenth century to the middle of the eighteenth had produced no German poet of international stature seems to have been a commonplace. It is hardly surprising then that no major scholar or critic attempted to write a history of German literature before the Napoleonic wars aroused patriotic passions. In fact, while Batts expertly reports on such forerunners as St. Jerome's *De virtus illustribus* or the lists of authors in medieval romances, he found no work that could properly be called a history of German literature until, in 1780, Christian Heinrich Schmid began to publish his 'Skizze einer Geschichte der teutschen Tichtkunst' in the periodical *Olla potrida*.

By that time, historicism had begun to be the fashion among the intellectual elite, and twenty years later Friedrich Schlegel could claim categorically that 'the science of literature is its history'; but, to judge from Batts's account of it, Schmidt's 'Skizze' was not exactly a masterpiece, and such progress as was made during the next quarter of a century was slow and erratic. Admittedly, E.J. Koch, now remembered almost exclusively as Wackernöder's teacher in Berlin, did some first-rate pioneering work on German medieval poetry, and C.F. Flögel published his *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur*, which was to become a source book for Coleridge; but — as A.W. Schlegel's Berlin lectures on what would now be called comparative literature demonstrate — the main intellectual effort still went elsewhere. By 1806, such publicists as Adam Müller could claim that German literature had become the dominant force in European letters, but this was due to recent achievements that had not yet become fit subject matter for the historian. Meanwhile, however, French armies had begun to occupy an increasingly large area of Germany, patriotism was on the rise, and the systematic study of German poetry could be seen as a means of raising national consciousness. The histories written in response to the changed circumstances were numerous, and they clearly reflect the spirit of the times. Thus, Heinsius, in his *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur* (1811), found Hofmannswaldau 'immoral and, consequently, un-German'; J.D.E. Preuss, in his *Die schönen Redekünste in Deutschland* (1814), wished the basis of all German literature to be 'patriotism and idealism'; Ludwig Wachler, in his *Literaturgeschichte* of 1818-19, held forth on the uniqueness of the German national character; Franz Horn, in his history of *Die Poesie und Beredsamkeit der Deutschen* (1822-29), proclaimed that 'a poet without a fatherland would be a poet without poetry'; and Pischon in his *Leitfaden zur Geschichte der deutschen Literatur* (1830) expressed the hope that his work would contribute to awakening in young people 'the genuine German tendency (*Sinn*) towards loyal love of their fatherland and pious faith.' Michael Batts reports all this *sine ira et studio*, but the reader of his account may well feel that the circumstances under which the German tradition of literary historiography began to take shape were unpropitious.

Of course, as Batts points out, the early practitioners of the art were soon forgotten, and the first history of German literature that proved to be lastingly influential, Georg Gottfried Gervinus's *Geschichte der poetischen Nationalliteratur der Deutschen*, was not published until 1835-42. This massive work is no longer within the purview of the present volume of Batts's *History of Histories*, which quite properly has the subtitle *Prolegomena*, and readers interested in literary historiography will look forward to the next volume of this knowledgeable and scholarly account with

eagerness. If they will also look forward to it with mixed feelings, this is not the author's fault. As Batts points out, Gervinus's first article on the problems of literary historiography ends with a peroration in which it is stated that in performing its function as *Kulturträger*, the German middle class had to overcome two main obstacles, 'Ritter- und Judentum.' If German *Germanisten* in the nineteen-twenties and thirties played, to put it mildly, an undistinguished role in the fight against national-socialism, the seeds for this failure were sown early. (HANS EICHNER, UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO)

JANET BATSLER, TONY DAVIS, REBECCA O'ROURKE and CHRIS WEEDON. *Rewriting English: Cultural Politics of Gender and Class*. London: Methuen 1986. Pp. 160. Cloth \$25.00, paper \$11.95

These discussions of literary pedagogical issues in the current British system are pleasing in their earnestness and consistent alertness to their own assumptions. The writers have gathered eight essays whose coherence, they tell us, derives 'from a common politics, feminist and socialist' and their shared attempts to 'grasp the intricate and contradictory ways in which cultural processes and their products are inextricably enmeshed in the historical structures and power relations of class societies' (p. 4). The collectivity of this writing is likely its strength — each chapter feels thoroughly argued, and its weakness — some sections seem homogenized, with no individual voice coming through.

The collection includes two strong essays on 'Culture and politics,' in which the usefulness of the canon as a tool of imperialist and classist domination is examined; and 'Education: literacy and literature' which criticises the 'house-trained specimens' of Marxist, feminist, or post-structuralist thought for reinforcing the 'bewilderment and tedium that already alienate most students and ordinary readers from [literature]' (p. 26). The third essay, 'Fiction as politics: working-class writing in the inter-war years,' would be of most interest to those with a concern for the specific internal manipulations of leftist cultural debates. While the authors provide some general information about the relationship of working-class writing to the dominant literary discourse of the thirties (it was marginal), and offer a brief description of the kinds of literary productions working class writers were engaged with, the chapter is dominated by its analysis of the approach taken by left-wing literary and cultural journals of the period.

Of more general or broader interest are the two essays dealing with gender inscription in popular fiction, male adventure stories, which they refer to as 'masculine romance,' and women's conventional romance novels.

It is refreshing to read about the reinforcement of masculinity as a cultural construct (their discussion includes Lawrence, Fleming, and Household). The analysis operates by way of interrogating the significance of the invisible obvious, such as the observation that 'the authority of the hero is typically registered ... in terms of and explicit and normative heterosexuality' (p. 75). The discussion of the women's stories, too, offers pleasing twists of insight, such as their noting that whether the novel is 'rough' or 'respectable' (in the genre of historical and exotic romantic fiction) '[w]omen's necessary obedience to the commands of love is a continuing theme' (p. 91).

The effect of the women's liberation movement on literary production and analysis is the focus of the last three chapters. Their discussion of academic feminism and a 'worker writer' movement with a large contingent of women writers (and the hopeful 'democratization of the cultural practices of writing and publishing' [p. 136]) brings together these writers' beliefs and practices. Accounts of the conflicts working-class women readers and writers have in their families and in their relationship to feminist organizations are treated as opportunities for feminist consciousness raising, rather than for feminist guilt.

While *Rewriting English* is probably too, located in its British context to be of great use to a Canadian generalist, its precise historical and contextual approach to questions of literature and literacy is informative. As well, this book is reassuring to those who believe that the academy and the community it lives in (and on) have some necessary and interesting connections. (JEANNE PERREAULT, UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA)

*PETER SHILLINGSBURG, *Scholarly Editing in the Computer Age*. Athens: University of Georgia Press 1986. Pp. 178. Paper US\$12.00

Making mountains out of molehills. Perhaps in no other branch of literary scholarship has this not unusual preoccupation been so assiduously practised as in textual studies: making editorial mountains out of textual molehills. From the eighteenth century, when Richard 'slashing' Bentley could devote several pages of notes to proving that 'Malelas' should be written with an 's', to the present, when some editors of novels go to great lengths to defend the inclusion of line-hyphenations in a critical apparatus, we have witnessed this fascinating (though sometimes disturbing) scholarly activity.

In recent years, however, the focus of this activity has shifted to textual theory, and there has been a plethora of theoretical commentary on such seemingly well-grounded issues as 'copy-text,' 'authorial intention,' and 'ideal texts.' We have been bombarded with nice distinctions between 'states' and 'versions,' and with a multitude of opinions regarding exactly what

constitutes a 'text.' As Leonard Neufeldt has recently stated: 'Today we tell ourselves and each other that even as the bibliographer establishes evidence of the author's intentions, we are presented also, and perhaps principally, with evidence of the editor's need to live coherently, to impose a definition of the nature of a literary work on the process of editing and, through that editorial process, on the specific document before him or her — a process that determines not only textual changes, alterations, and emendations but also decisions over the format of the edited text. ... "Intention" is not a fixed object or essential principle to be discovered, but is the result of a series of negotiations between text, editor, critic, and, perhaps, other readers.'¹ It is, to be sure, rather complicated and, in the view of some matter-of-fact textual editors, unnecessary.

It would be foolish to suggest that textual theory is unnecessary or irrelevant to textual practice: definition, demarcation and direction are essential. Greg's seminal article on 'The Rationale of Copy-Text' and James Thorpe's *Principles of Textual Criticism* are two cases in point. But it does seem of late that a great deal of time has been spent on hair-splitting theoretical issues — perhaps to the detriment of common-sense editorial treatment. It might be argued, in fact, that theoretical discussion (of such issues as copy-text,) has confused and contorted an otherwise practical editorial procedure or have made it appear a more important issue than it really is. Some editors are getting tired of what seems to be an attempt to elevate scholarly editing to the realm of metaphysics, largely in an attempt to justify the large sums spent on scholarly editions. And some of these continue to produce excellent editions of literary texts oblivious to or ignoring or just uninterested in the large accumulation of camouflage thrown up by the post-structuralist textual theorists.

Unfortunately, Peter Shillingsburg's *Scholarly Editing in the Computer Age* often perpetuates that kind of over-indulgence in theory for theory's sake. When one reads his introduction one is pleased to have in hand what seems to be a response to the confused theoretical basis of the discipline — an attempt to define and defend the essence of editorial methodology. 'I have tried,' he states, 'to focus on the editorial concepts that seem to give rise to inadequately articulated "principles." I have tried to identify what it is that we want in editing which occasionally seems to run contrary to received editorial wisdom.' When he adheres to that aim, Shillingsburg is brilliantly lucid, witty and readable; and his views are extremely valuable, especially when they illuminate the variances between such textual critics as Tanselle

¹ 'Neopragmatism and Convention in Textual Editing,' *Analytical and Enumerative Bibliography* 1.4 (1987): 229.

and McGann. Shillingsburg knows his field and writes eloquently of what he knows.

But Shillingsburg does not always adhere to his stated aim; like so many other textual theorists, he cannot resist an exploration of his subject 'in the abstract' nor the urge to investigate the 'ontological status' of the text. A brief look at his chapter on 'Forms' illustrates his propensity to abstractness. He begins solidly enough. 'Editing is, above all,' he states, 'a matter of forms. The content, the substance, the meaning of the work of art, has been usually thought of as the preserve of authors and of critical interpreters. But the forms, the details of presentation, are often thought to be the responsibility of editors' (p. 18). Thus far, one cannot argue. He then goes on to distinguish four 'formal orientations' — perspectives 'on forms which lead to the selection of one set of formal requirements over another' — which editors generally espouse: historical, aesthetic, authorial, and sociological. And even here one can agree, and see that the examples serve to support his distinctions. But, not content to rest, Shillingsburg then tries to insist that the 'orientations' are part of the editor's makeup — that certain personality traits, values, etc., predispose certain editors to adopt a particular 'formal orientation'; almost as if the editor were born with a sociological rather than an aesthetic orientation. He does, in fact, talk of 'sociological' and 'historical' editors. This, to me, seems quite perverse and unnecessarily esoteric. I am convinced that most good editors let the texts themselves dictate the editorial approach; while they might have some preconceived biases, perhaps based on what has worked well in the past, they are rarely dyed-in-the-wool 'historical' or 'sociological' editors. Many, in fact, would be surprised to find themselves labelled as such because they try to keep an open mind — to ensure that theory does not blind them to the practical issues of editing. Shillingsburg suggests that the 'fierce editorial debates [an exaggeration] between partisans of these basic positions have been waged for years outside the ken of the formalists, structuralists, semioticians, poststructuralists, deconstructionists, and reader response theoreticians who seem to wage their own debates with equal intensity over cheap reprints or scholarly editions.' It might not be too far-fetched to suggest to Shillingsburg that such debates have also been waged 'outside the ken' of many good editors as well.

Happily, however, Shillingsburg's theoretical discussion is followed by two sections on 'Practice' and 'Practicalities'. And, even though he insists that his practice arises out of his theory, there are many things to be learned from his editorial experiences with computers that will benefit any editor. The footnotes themselves are especially detailed and wide-ranging. In his chapter 'Computer Assistance to Scholarly Editing' several types of collation

software are discussed, the obvious drawbacks to the 'input' methods admitted, and clear examples of results are offered. And he reasonably admits that 'the computer is only an assistant to the editor. It does no editing. Its prodigious capacity to do menial tasks endlessly and accurately makes it the editor's dream assistant.' Shillingsburg makes no claim to the effect that his method is the best, or that his work on the Thackeray edition has provided the ultimate editorial approach, but just that here are some editorial practices that have proven successful. Take them or leave them.

My chief regret on reading this book, then, is that the theory outweighed — and sometimes obscured — the practice. Perhaps, since the chapters were offered as a series of lectures and therefore more readily accommodated a theoretical framework, Shillingsburg should have altered his material and its focus when it was published as a book. He should, in my opinion, have concentrated on editorial practice. That, in view of all that has already been written about 'authorial intention' and 'ideal texts,' would have been a more valuable contribution to textual studies. (R.G. MOYLES, UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA)

'COLLECTIF DE L'ÉCOLE DE TRADUCTEURS ET D'INTERPRÈTES. *Bibliographie du traducteur/Translator's Bibliography*. Cahiers de traductologie 6. Ottawa: Les Presses de l'Université d'Ottawa 1987. Pp. xii + 332. Cdn\$39.95

The latest in a series of works put out by the University of Ottawa's School of Translators and Interpreters, the *Translator's Bibliography* is a revised and enlarged version of Jean Delisle and Lorraine Albert's *Guide bibliographique du traducteur, rédacteur et terminologue/Bibliographic Guide for Translators, Writers and Terminologists*, published in 1979 and out of print for some time now. As well as providing the usual updating of material (research for this new version stopped in 1985), the new bibliography differs from its predecessor in that it places greater emphasis on research tools for specialized areas of translation and contains a substantial section on the Spanish language and an important sub-section on legal translation.

The volume is divided into six parts. The first part is a general bibliography of translation, interpretation and terminology studies, classified according to the following rubrics: theory of translation, pedagogy of translation, history of translation, literary translation, Bible translation, technical translation, interpretation, terminology and documentation, machine translation and computer-aided translation, conference proceedings, miscellaneous publications, and bibliographies, journals, directories. The second and third parts are devoted respectively to French and English

language reference works, while the fourth part gives a bibliography of bilingual dictionaries. Part five, which is entirely new, offers similar listings for Spanish. The sixth part, the longest in the book at some 150 pages, covers 87 specialized domains, ranging from heraldry through otorhinolaryngology to animal culture. The book ends with an index of authors.

The *Translator's Bibliography* will undoubtedly be of great practical use as a reference text for translators and writers, as well as for students and professors working in translation and related disciplines. It will be of less value to researchers who are working *on* rather than *with* translation, as the bibliographies are far from exhaustive, especially when we go beyond national frontiers to look at non-Canadian sources. The section on literary translation (36 entries) is particularly disappointing in this respect. All in all, this new volume is a welcome addition to the rapidly growing literature on translation and translation studies, but it also serves as a reminder of the vast amount of work which remains to be done. (ANTHONY PURDY, UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA)

*HUGO DYSERINCK and KARL ULRICH SYNDRAM, Hrg. *Europa und das nationale Selbstverständnis. Imagologische Probleme in Literatur, Kunst und Kultur des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts*. Aachener Beiträge zur Komparatistik, Bd. 8. Bonn: Bouvier 1988. Pp. 435. No price

The volume comprises the proceedings of a symposium sponsored by the *Fondation Européenne de la Culture* and organized in September 1984 at the *Centre Universitaire de Luxembourg* by the Aachen professors Hugo Dyserinck and Karl Ulrich Syndram. The implications of these proceedings by far (and happily) surpass what is usually understood by 'imagology' as a branch of 'comparative literature.'

This is particularly evident in Hugo Dyserinck's leading paper 'Komparatistische Imagologie. Zur politischen Tragweite einer europäischen Wissenschaft von der Literatur' (pp. 13-37), a dense, well-documented text, directly and indirectly affected by all the latent contradictions of present-day comparative studies: historicism vs. the intrinsic study of literature, national vs. supranational point of view, i.e. *grenzüberschreitender Vergleich*, factual positivism vs. generalization, ideological neutralism vs. ideology on comparative bases, an 'European science of literature' vs. 'Eurocentrism,' a cultural tendency that appears to be still prominent, in spite of its limits and capacity of generating errors. It becomes ever clearer that when 'comparative literature' tries to tackle collective 'European' problems, it ceases to be a

mere academic endeavour. It is even obliged to take an attitude toward the 'European' problem as such, in the context of today's world: The European Community, the division of Europe into ideological camps, the East-West relationships, European consciousness and national peculiarities, etc. It is worth noting (and applauding) that a traditionalist like Hugo Dyserinck — who, nevertheless, works in an international European context — realized that modern comparative literature can no longer remain a strictly historicist, erudite, neutralist and inactual domain. This is, for the time being, only a partial reorientation, but one that is sufficiently clear by implication.

The crucial issue is the following: can or cannot *imagology* (=identity vs. otherness as opposite or complementary terms?) contribute to the emergence of a European image? Does this image, or does it not, coexist with certain national images? Is the main tendency to drift closer to 'Europe,' or away from it? Is there a tendency to differentiation, or one to unity? To cooperation, or to conflict? To a defensive, offensive, or neutral Europe? In the last analysis, to nationalism, or internationalism? What would be the exact meaning of these terms? All these problems, impossible to be told apart from a certain form of ideological attitude, are discussed by Hugo Dyserinck with remarkable acumen, but also with every possible precaution (pp. 17-19). A very uncomfortable position for a professor but unavoidable for a 'European'. At this point in Dyserinck's text, a new dilemma appears: 'European consciousness,' as part of 'world literature,' or 'Eurocentrism,' a trend that proclaims the superiority of European specificity over all the others? Which trend fosters the tendency to look upon Europe as the cultural centre of the world (in this respect, see also J.B. Priestley's *Literature and Modern Man*, London 1960, unmentioned). Europe is not even viewed as such, in its entirety, but is cut down to its Western part, which leads to an even more restrictive and exclusive definition of 'Europe,' i.e. Central Europe, South-Eastern Europe or the USSR not parts of Europe?

All the proceedings of the colloquium are marked inevitably by these tensions, solved, as the case may be, in manners that depend on each participant's experience, competence and affinities. For purely pragmatic reasons, Hugo Dyserinck feels inclined to restrict comparative studies to the study of (West) European literature, proclaimed as *Hauptbeziehungsfeld* (p. 31). He is concomitantly aware, however, of all the risks of provincialism and of a 'limited view,' as well as of those pertaining to European 'imperialism'. We agree that it is quite premature to speak of a 'European nation,' that a formula like 'European laboratory' (p. 32) is more appropriate for the present reality and necessities. A question, however,

immediately arises: what is the meaning, what is the purpose of such laboratory research? We can find but one answer: to gradually build up a system of supra-Eurocentric international literary relations, to which each and every literature may contribute with all its representative specific values in a free, competitive way. These literatures will inevitably remain national, but not autarchic, isolated and exclusive; they will be predisposed to external exchange and cooperation. As for ourselves, we have defended this point of view before, mainly in the essay 'Etiemble ou le comparatisme militant' (Paris: Gallimard 1982), known to the author and quoted by him (p. 37).

Do the proceedings of the Luxembourg symposium offer a complete image of 'Europe' in either its extensive, or restricted formula? Hard to say, as long as the gaps are so obvious. As far as Western Europe is concerned, there are no 'images' of the Northern countries (cf. Marija Lehtonen, 'La littérature suédoise de Finlande: une littérature nationale,' in *Neohelicon* 1, 1979, 191-214), of Italy, Spain, Portugal, Austria (cf. Adolf D. Klarmann, 'Ubs in Orbe: Austrian Literature between the West and East,' in *Actes du IV^{ème} Congrès de l'I.A.L.C.*, I, 445-451; and prior to that, Thomas Mann, *Gibt es eine österreichische Literatur?*, etc.); South-Eastern Europe is dealt with by a single text which, though quite competent, cannot possibly cope with the complexity of the problem: Zoran Konstantinović, 'Bild und Gegenbild. Ein Beitrag zur Imagologie der südosteuropäischen Völker in der Phase ihrer nationalen Wiedergeburt' (pp. 283-294). In this order of ideas, it would have been worth remembering H. Pohrt's study, 'Die Bewegung der nationalen Wiedergeburt bei den Slawen in ihrer Bedeutung für die Entfaltung der Slawistik in Deutschland 1800-1850,' in *Zeitschrift für Slawistik* XVIII (1973), pp. 387-410. We would also like to mention our own study of the incipient 'European' consciousness of Romanians: 'Les lumières roumaines découvrent "l'Europe,"' in *Littérature roumaine: littératures occidentales. Rencontres* (Bucaresti, 1982, pp. 10-48). Naturally, it was not the intention of the organizers of the symposium to 'evict' Central or South-Eastern European literatures from Europe itself, or to question their 'Europeanness.' But Eurocentrism remains a fact and its titles of nobility are many. The man who is probably its most renown theorist, Ernst Robert Curtius, is evoked by Manfred S. Fischer in an excellent study: 'Europäisches und nationales Selbstverständnis bei Ernst Robert Curtius' (pp. 321-366). The illustrious German Romanist provides a few emendations: Europe is the third path, midway between nationalism and internationalism; the West must be defended against hostile Eastern influences; the West is in a perpetual crisis, etc. It is not less true that, in Ernst Robert Curtius's view, Europe is cut down to the 'great powers' of the West, especially France and Germany, and reduced to 'humanism' (p. 330), the latter being a theoretical stereotype.

Coudenhove-Kalergi's definition of 'European culture' is also worth-while remembering: Hellenic in depth, Latin in width, Gothic-Christian in height. A somewhat more complete image of Western Europe.

At the opposite end of the spectrum, we read a series of good studies on the national identities of plurilingual and 'small' literatures: Manfred Geisiger, open-minded, well-documented, with evident talent as a publicist, deals with the 'Nationales Selbstverständnis in den Literaturen der Schweiz' (119-134, an issue previously debated by François Jost: 'Y a-t-il une littérature suisse?' in *Essai de littérature comparée*, Fribourg 1964 I, 315-338); Victor Hell, 'Vers une littérature supranationale et multilingue en Alsace' (135-146); Joseph Th. Leerssen, 'The cracked lookingglass of a servant': Cultural decolonization and national consciousness in Ireland and Africa' (103-118); Gilbert Tausch, 'Un créneau étroit entre l'Allemagne et la France: Le Luxembourg à la recherche d'une conscience nationale (1839-1945)' (381-418). What do these studies demonstrate? That 'la prise de conscience' is a fact and, we haste to add, a fertile reality. But ideological ideas and alternatives are prompt to appear: nationalism, Eurocentrism or internationalism? One is tempted to say that literatures can under no circumstances avoid such traps.

On a very high level, this is also the lesson conveyed by all the imagology studies. The actual findings are to a great extent contradictory. The shaping of a 'self-image' enhances self-awareness. At the same time, however, there is a marked growth of the sense of alteration, of differentiation, which often has as consequences the denial of the image of the 'stranger,' intolerance, nationalism, chauvinism. The image of 'otherness' is negative, rather than positive. Some studies in this collection testify to the reality of hostility, deforming-mirror images, preconceptions, idiosyncrasies. Needless to say, almost all these phenomena have objective, historical causes. The result, however, is the same: a real Grévin museum of national idiosyncrasies: Holger Klein, 'Zerspiegelung? — Bilder von Preußen — Deutschland in englischer Prosa, 1890-1914' (71-102); Pierre Brunel, 'L'Image de la Grande-Bretagne chez Claudel' (171-186); Hans Rothe, 'Fremd- und Eigenbilder von und über Slaven, vornehmlich bei Polen und Russen' (295-320). One could also mention, in the same sphere of preoccupations, Klaus Heilmann's recent volume, *Das Rumänienbild im deutschen Sprachraum, 1775-1918. Eine imagologische Studie* (Köln-Wien: Böhlau Verlag 1985, *Studia Transylvanica*, Bd. 12). What do Germans think of Romanians? Very, very contradictory thoughts, presented by the author with great ability and diplomacy.

Finally the imagology studies also demonstrate another important fact: the decisive role played, in one way or another, by preconceptions. They coexist in time and space within one and the same culture which often

hatches perfectly contradictory images and judgements of one and the same reality. There are, also, double aspirations, national and supranational at the same time. A good example, in this respect, is given by Elke Emrich's 'Der jansköpfige Deutsche - Zum nationalen Selbstverständnis in der deutschen Literatur von Herder bis Nietzsche (1770-1870)' (147-170). Very important, in a sense the most important, is the aesthetic relation national vs. universal (Karl Ulrich Syndram, 'Ästhetische und nationale Urteile. Zur Problematik des Verhältnisses von künstlerischem Wert und nationaler Eigenart' [29, 244], an excellent study dealing with: local value/universal value, universal verification through national reception, typical/atypical, etc.). Indeed, one could hardly speak of 'world literature' without subscribing to the notion of universal literary value. The same problems are raised by the history of fine arts (Götz Pochat) and of music (Stephan Nachtshelm).

Rich in materials and suggestions, the collection informs, stimulates and prompts questions for further study. In the long run, it still owes us a decisive answer to the question: is literary Europe an autarchic reality of the spirit, or merely a province of *Weltliteratur* with equal rights and duties? If the latter is the case, then how does Europe conceive its relationships with the literary worlds of Asia, Africa, Latin America and so forth, with all the world's literatures of the year 2000? Food for thought for Hugo Dyserink... (ADRIAN MARINO, CLUJ-NAPOCA)

*THOMAS KOEBNER und GERHART PICKERODT, Hrsg. *Die andere Welt. Studien zum Exotismus*. Frankfurt: Athenäum 1987. Pp. 388. No price

The title of this collection of essays, first presented as a series of lectures in 1984-85 in the Phillips-Universität of Marburg, encapsulates the collective interests and limitations of its authors. While the adjective 'andere' in the main title suggests that he might be reading about the 'other' non-European world, the subtitle immediately redirects us to the traditional, though recently-revived and fashionable, field of the study of European exoticism. As professed by the editors in the introduction, there is, in fact, nothing exotic about the approach and the subject matter of these essays: 'Unser gemeinsamer Gegenstand ist jedoch nicht unmittelbar die andere Welt, sondern das in seinen Konturen sich verändernde Bild von ihr: der europäische Blick auf die andere Welt' (p. 9). The emphasis on Europe and European views of alien cultures places this work within the larger trend which in North America has produced studies such as Edward Said's *Orientalism*, Rana Kabbani's *Europe's Myths of Orient* and Christopher Miller's *Blank Darkness: Africanist Discourse in French*. Interestingly,

however, the contributors of *Die andere Welt* choose to distance themselves from the North American discussions (not a single reference is made to the above-mentioned works). This may be in part due to methodological differences between the German scholars, less inclined towards Foucault and Derrida, and critics like Said and Miller. There are nevertheless certain ideological similarities between *Die andere Welt* and the North American studies of exoticism.

The thirteen essays of this volume strictly adhere to the editors' objective seemingly for the purpose of revealing the insidious ways in which fascination with exotic regions has been, at least from the eighteenth century to the present, transformed into a program for the colonization of these same lands. In this sense, the volume is not devoid of a political vision, even if at times it borders on self-congratulation. The following statement, intended as yet another demystification and denunciation of colonialism, by Günter Giesenfeld in his essay on popular novels about Indo-China, 'Von Jean Hougron zu Scholl-Latour,' is a case in point:

Die Hauptantriebskraft des Kolonialismus ist materieller Natur. Er kann kurz definiert werden als der Prozeß der Ausbreitung des europäischen Machtbereichs über die ganze Erde seit dem Ende des 15. Jahrhunderts (p. 318).

Here, as in Hermann Hofer's declaration (in his essay, 'Befreien französische Autoren des 18. Jahrhunderts die Schwarzen Rebellen und die Sklaven aus ihren Ketten oder Versuch darüber, wie man den Guten Wilden zur Strecke bringt') that 'Der Mythos vom Guten Wilden wird zum guten Gewissen der Kolonialmächte' (p. 148), European intellectual history is revealed to have been tinged with what could now be deemed questionable material and political ambitions.

If the thirteen essays themselves can be seen as a sample of today's European intellectual stance, those past ambitions have, at best, been sublimated into 'second-hand' exoticism, i.e. no longer associated with a distant and unknown land but rather with Europe itself and, particularly, the expansionist periods of European history. Embedded in the same logic is an obsessive self-absorption which calls into question the possibility of countering Eurocentrism. Even in the most severe challenges to Eurocentrism, Europe remains the focal point.

In its least interesting manifestations, to take as an example the subject matter of the last essay, 'Das Traumschiff: Exotismus in Unterhaltungssendungen des Fernsehens,' contemporary European exoticism has been reduced to the lowest common denominator of popular culture. This genre of drama, known to North American audiences in the television series 'The

'Love Boat,' is described by Hans-Friedrich Foltin as one of the most insipid and the least intellectually demanding forms of exoticism:

Im Gegensatz zu einer wirklichen Reise entstehen ihnen [Fernsehzuschauern] nur ganz geringe Kosten, keine Unbequemlichkeiten, kein Risiko. Die Zuschauer brauchen noch nicht einmal ihre Phantasie zu bemühen, ganz im Gegenteil: Kreativität ist bei der Rezeption strikt ausgeschlossen (p. 378).

It may be a sign of times that such television series are both in Europe and North America among the most popular programs. That the Enlightenment's paradoxical positions vis-à-vis the 'other,' as argued by Gerhart Pickeroth in 'Aufklärung und Exotismus,' and the nineteenth-century internalizations of the fear of the unknown, as discussed by Thomas Koebner in 'Geheimnisse der Wildnis: Zivilisationskritik und Naturexotik im Abenteuerroman,' are the predecessors of 'Traumschiff' or 'Love Boat' makes one nostalgic for the earlier types of exoticism. This seems to have been the consensus of the contributors, for only three essays are devoted to examples of contemporary exoticism. Along with Foltin's analysis the other two, Volker Klotz's 'Sieben Jahre lebt' ich in Batavia: Kult, Spiel und Sport mit dem Exotismus in der Operette,' Jan Berg's 'Dokumentarische Exotik im Film,' are nevertheless a refreshing complement to the types of literary and historical studies with which most specialists are preoccupied.

Even within the more traditional realms of study *Die andere Welt* offers major contributions to the field. The best examples of which, researched and written in the tradition of historical analysis, a method that has fallen out of fashion in North America, are: Alexander Perrig's 'Erdrandieller oder die schrecklichen Nachkommen Chams: Aspekte der mittelalterlichen Völkerkunde,' a meticulous categorization accompanied with representations of the types of creature/inhabitants of the world imagined in the Middle Ages, Urs Bitterli's 'Die exotische Insel,' the opening essay which provides the framework for the ensuing essays, and Karl-Heinz Kohl's "'Travestie der Lebensformen' oder 'kulturelle Konversion'?" Zur Geschichte des kulturellen Überlauftums,' an analysis of the history of renegades ranging from Baron de Lahontan to T.E. Lawrence.

In spite of some repetitions, difficult to prevent in this particular type of collection, the volume as a whole provides a wide range of discussions which enrich the study of European exoticism. (NASRIN RAHIMIEH, UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA)

*WOLFGANG BADER und JÁNOS RIESZ, Hrg. *Literatur und Kolonialismus I. Die Verarbeitung der kolonialen Expansion in der europäischen Literatur.*

Bayreuther Beiträge zur Wissenschaft, Vol. 4. Frankfurt a. Main/Bern: Peter Lang 1983. Pp. 348. SF75.00

Dieser Sammelband enthält in seinen elf Aufsätzen eine Vielfalt von Ansätzen zum Thema der Kolonial-Erfahrung und ihrem Niederschlag in den verschiedenen europäischen Literaturen. Er ist geprägt von einem frischen Geist der Fragestellung, der auch in anderen Publikationen, die von jüngeren Gelehrten jüngerer bayerischer Universitäten (Bayreuth, Würzburg, etc.) seit einiger Zeit erscheinen, sichtbar wird. Mit deutlichem Schwerpunkt in der Romanistik (S.7), fasziniert vor allem die Heterogenität von Stoffen und Methoden in der Beschränkung. Der Jargon hält sich für eine deutsche Publikation — in erstaunlich erträglichen Schranken. Und der einzige Einwand, der sich bei der Lektüre einstellt, ist derjenige eines zu ausgeweiteten Literaturbegriffs. So ist der hochinteressante Aufsatz von Manfred Tietz 'Der Indio als Christ und Priester: Zu den Grenzen der Akkulturation,' der die systematische Rasseninferioritätsentwicklung innerhalb der spanischen Missionsliteratur zeigt, eindeutig eine anthropologische und kaum eine komparatistische Problembehandlung.

Doch ist jeder Aufsatz innerhalb des gesteckten Rahmens interessant. János Riesz umreißt in den einleitenden 'Zehn Thesen zum Verhältnis von Kolonialismus und Literatur' die instruktive Fragestellung, warum im deutschen Kulturraum diese Frage besonders interessant ist (angesichts der nur kurzen politischen Erfahrung, die das deutsche Reich als Kolonialmacht hatte). Wolfgang Bader entwirft in einem ebenso soliden wie traditionellen Essay das Rollenbild, welches der pikareske Roman in der spanischen Literatur von der Erfahrung in der Neuen Welt gab. Und es ist auch für den Nichtkundigen einleuchtend, wie das soziale Geflecht des Abenteuerromans ins Mutterland zurückprojiziert werden konnte in eine ganze Typologie dessen, woran die Gesellschaft krankte. Hans-Jürgen Lüsebrink analysiert die Textstrategien von Abbé Guillaume-Thomas Raynalds 'Histoire Philosophique et Politique des Établissements et du Commerce des Européens dans les Deux Indes' (1770) als historischen, deskriptiven, philosophischen und narrativen Diskurs. Ein informativer Abriss deutscher Afrika-Unterhaltungsromane zwischen den beiden Weltkriegen von Thomas Bleicher enthält nicht nur eine systematische Bibliographie, sondern auch eine typologische Wertung, wie sich soziale Wertvorstellungen an der exotischen Welt mit einem Herrenmenschenum messen konnten und wie sich dies in präfaschistischen Erzählhaltungen zeigte; wie aber auch andersseits eine dialektische Antizivilisationskritik in einer Minderzahl solcher Abenteuerromane zum Ausdruck kam. Der französische Kolonialroman nach der Jahrhundertwende, Carl Einsteins Negerplastik und

andere Themen beleuchten weitere Perspektiven. Einen willkommenen Abschluß bildet Gerhard Köpfs 'Der halbe Türke. Literatur und koloniale Wahrnehmung' — es ist eine geistreiche Darstellung eines Deutschen in der Bundesrepublik und seinem Kontakt mit Menschen aus andern (kolonialen Welten); sie ist in der pointierten Glossierung der literarischen Bewältigung dieser zeitgenössischen Erfahrung höchst lesenswert.

Wer eine systematische Darstellung des im Titel implizierten Themas erwartet, wird enttäuscht sein. Wer jedoch eine gekonnte Behandlung kolonialer Themen aus der Sicht deutscher Komparatisten zur Kenntnis nimmt, kann sich eine stattliche Anzahl instruktiver Bilder machen. Leider gibt es keine wissenschaftlichen Kurzbiografien von allen Beiträgern, sondern nur der beiden Herausgeber. (JOSEF SCHMIDT, MCGILL UNIVERSITY)

*BEATRIZ PASTOR. *Discurso narrativo de la conquista de América*. La Habana: Ediciones Casa de las Américas 1983. Pp. 570.

To undertake any kind of overview of the literature of the Spanish discovery, conquest, and colonization of America is a monumental task. The volume of both primary and secondary sources is enormous, the time span is long, and the Americas are vast. To have undertaken the task and produced a coherent new synthesis that illuminates, rather than sacrifices, the many facets of the subject is therefore a singular achievement, which Beatriz Pastor has accomplished remarkably well.

Her success results in part from the application of very judicious criteria when determining the scope and character of her book. She is concerned primarily with narratives of the conquest, the Spaniard's encounter with the land and its inhabitants, and their successful and failed attempts to subdue them both. The span of time is approximately 70 years, from the Discovery in 1492 to the Araucanian Wars of the mid-sixteenth century, but the texts chosen for commentary are both few and representative. The choice has allowed Pastor to cover the continents and take the broader view, while, at the same time, providing the detailed textual commentary necessary for the case she intended to build.

From the earliest chapters it is clear that the discourse of conquest is neither static nor the product of a single voice. It is the result of a constant dialectic, Europe versus America, the known versus the unknown, myth versus reality, the civilized versus the primitive, success versus failure, loyalty versus rebellion, leading to a synthesis that will eventually give rise to a Spanish American consciousness. Moreover, as the discourse of conquest evolves towards this synthesis, it is constantly changing, in response to each

new objective or accommodation sought by the conquerors in their new environment.

The diaries and letters of Columbus are the first stage in this process. They represent a mythologizing discourse, indicative of the Admiral's inability to look at the New World except through European eyes and in the light of his own preconceptions. His stubborn identification of the Caribbean islands with the Far East resulted from a desire to confirm his theories of cosmography and prove that he had opened a route to the wealth of the Orient for those who had supported his voyage. If the image he created was a response to his vision of a bountiful land, of which even the inhabitants were a marketable commodity, the image conveyed by Cortés was, by contrast, that of an enterprising and loyal warrior. The *Cartas de relación*, written by Hernán Cortés between 1519 and 1526 to Charles V, contain a discourse of justification through which Cortés sought to affirm his loyalty to the crown and proclaim the virtues of his civil and military leadership. As Pastor has shown through comparison with other sources, they are a singularly personal view of events surrounding the conquest of Mexico, from which there emerges the myth of the righteous conqueror who appears, nevertheless, to have been well versed in the ways of Machiavelli.

The second stage in the trajectory traced by Pastor entails the unravelling of these images. The expeditions to Florida and territories north of Aztec Mexico, as far as the southern plains of the present United States, undertaken after the conquest of Cortés, were all fuelled by myths: the Fountain of Youth and the Seven Cities of Cibola, whose wealth supposedly rivalled that of Tenochtitlan and Cuzco. Their failure, however, produced a discourse, stripped of its earlier mythologizing, that provided a remarkably different view of reality. In *Los Naufragios* (1542) of Alvar Núñez Cabeza de Vaca, who lived for ten years among the native people (1527-37) after surviving the disastrous expedition led by Pánfilo de Narváez to Florida, the weaknesses of the Spanish and their arms in a hostile environment are fully exposed. Although Columbus in Jamaica and Cortés in Honduras had also learned that the land could be inhospitable, Cabeza de Vaca's account of his survival makes the point more forcefully. The image of Cabeza de Vaca and his companions, cast naked on a beach, to be clothed and fed by Indians, is evocative of a reversal of roles and the need to relearn the ways of civilization in order to survive in a hostile land.

In the southern continent, the expeditions that followed the initial conquest were also driven by myths, the most fertile being that which spawned the quests for Eldorado. Explorations along the Amazon basin not only confirmed the hostility of the land, but also dismantled whatever remained of the myth of the righteous conqueror after the promulgation of

the New Laws in 1542 and the outbreak of civil war in Peru. The documents chosen by Pastor to illustrate the point are the accounts of the ill-fated expedition led by Pedro de Urstá, which culminated in the rebellion of Lope de Aguirre (1561) and his voyage along the Amazon to the sea, the effects of which are summarized by Pastor in the following terms:

El orden épico ha sido substituido por el caos de terror; la armonía, por el conflicto; la unidad por la división; la justicia, por la arbitrariedad; la obediencia, por la indisciplina; y la conquista, por la sedición, en una representación de la realidad fragmentada y conflictiva de la Conquista, que ya no aparece presidida por el mito del guerrero-vasallo-cristiano sino por la problemática figura de un traidor que se define por el rechazo global de cualquier forma de aceptación o compromiso con el orden ideológico, político y social que preside y encarna simbólicamente la figura del Rey. (p. 415)

The restoration of the discourse of the conquest to its former epic stature occurs in Alonso de Ercilla's narrative poem on the war in Chile *La Araucana*, the three parts of which appeared in 1569, 1578, and 1589, respectively. Although earlier texts, including those discussed by Pastor, made both a deliberate and unconscious use of the content and structure of the literary narrative, none exploited it to the same extent as Ercilla. She argues that his attribution to the Araucanians of all the positive values normally found in the hero of a Renaissance epic, amounted to a process of integration of the American with the European conducive to the awakening of a Spanish American consciousness. It led him also to an appreciation of the humanity, culture, and social institutions of the indigenous people that caused him to reject the very notion of conquest and its effects.

Although there is some familiarity in what Beatriz Pastor writes about each of the texts studied in her book, her approach is fresh and the comparisons among them are often illuminating. Moreover, the values of her work is greater than the sum of her commentaries on each text. She provides a framework for the analysis and re-evaluation of additional texts of the same period from the point of view of their ideology and the literary models they used. Notwithstanding a little unnecessary repetition in the recapitulation of arguments at the beginning of some chapters, her writing is clear and lucid. Her *Discurso narrativo de la conquista de América* is an extremely readable and informative account that contributes significantly to the interpretation of the documents of a period of history that continues to attract broad critical attention and still exerts an influence on modern times. (RICHARD A. YOUNG, UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA)

BELL GALE CHEVIGNY and GARI LAGUARDIA, eds. *Re-Inventing the Americas: Comparative Studies of Literature of the United States and Spanish America*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1986. Pp. 384. US\$49.50

The significance of the phrase 'reinventing America,' devised by Henry James and rejuvenated by Gary Wills, does not become apparent until the last quarter of this book, where it is related to the urgent necessity experienced by Latin-American literati for the formulation of a general literary theory applicable to their particular cultural and historical traditions to replace critical standards imposed from Europe and the United States. This theme is the specific concern of the last 60 page section of the book devoted to criticism and it underlies the rest of the work based on literary history.

The interlocking literary triangle of Europe, Anglo-America and Latin America is a significant area that comparatists have sadly neglected, indeed almost ignored. As the editors observe, 'We discovered both that many people thought this field of comparison a natural and important one and that very few people were prepared to undertake it' (p. viii). There have been some intriguing titles such as Harry Bernstein's *Making An Inter-American Mind* (University of Florida Press 1961) and José A. Balseiro's *The Americas Look at Each Other* (University of Miami Press 1969), but little in the way of outstanding scholarship. One book is exceptional, however, Antonello Gerbi's *The Dispute of the New World* (Enlarged edition, translated by Jeremy Moyle, University of Pittsburgh Press, 1973). A history of the notion of biological degeneration in the Americas, Gerbi's book is one of the most distinguished contributions to the history of ideas published anywhere in the Western world. The present collection of essays is a hopeful sign that the discipline of comparative literature will finally devote to the triangle of Europe and the two Americas the serious attention that it deserves.

The general introduction shows no awareness of previous scholarship concerning the triangular relationship, and like most of the included essays it concentrates on 'modernity.' The period from discovery until the twentieth century is summarily treated in less than twenty pages with the emphasis on economic history rather than literary movements, which have not necessarily coincided in the two areas. As a result, many of the indicated relationships are inaccurate. The attitude toward nature in Andrés Bello's 'Ode a la agricultura en la zona torrida,' for example, is contrasted to that advanced by his North American contemporary, Emerson. Bello perceives nature as 'the sustaining ground for a moral and collective order,' while Emerson regards nature 'as a presence that is actualized by, even as it actualizes, the self that contemplates it.' Both observations may be true and both could be

used to show that the passage from classicism to Romanticism took place earlier in the North than in the South, but the confrontation as it stands is not apt. Bello's poem belongs to the tradition of the neo-classical Georgic, and it should be compared with any one of the many examples of the genre produced throughout the eighteenth century in the British colonies of North America.

The concentration in the introduction on economic and social history is probably responsible for the neglect of international literary movements. Much is said, for example, about the encounter between Indians and whites from the perspective of social history, but only brief mention is made of the impact of French romantic images derived from Chateaubriand and of related conventions borrowed from Scott and Dumas. It is accepted that modern writers derived inspiration and followed models from Europe, but there is little awareness of prior examples of classicists and romanticists.

The major theme of the entire book, one that can hardly be contested, is that the two Americas, Ibero and Anglo, 'share fundamental historical experiences, experiences articulated and imaginatively transformed in their literatures, that underwrite the integrity of a comparative exploration' (p. 3). A secondary theme, prominent in the critical section and underlying the two others, is that the United States, as an industrial and political juggernaut, has consciously worked to become the principal arbiter of the western hemisphere and has consequently had a baleful effect upon the literary development of other nations in the area. In addition, it has sought to impose its own standards as the reader and interpreter of writings from these nations. There is a good deal of truth in this thesis, but it does not tell the whole story. For one thing, the astounding reception throughout the entire world of the contemporary Latin American novel proves that the region possesses an autonomous literary presence. Not only are contemporary Spanish-American writers not dominated by the United States, but many of them consciously oppose what they consider to be unacceptable attitudes of the North. Also, Latin-America more than any other literary zone has taken over one contemporary facet of theory, that of magic or marvellous realism, which is amply discussed in the present volume. I wonder, however, why no one has yet cited in connection with magic realism the Hawthorne-Henry James term *romance* as they use it in the sense of mingling of the marvellous with the real and exemplified in the ghost stories of Henry James.

The introduction touches lightly upon a third theme, one almost as important as that of shared literary experience, that is, the relative cultural unity of the United States contrasted with the diversity of Latin America, composed as it is of nearly two dozen independent nations. Even more

important, the literary contacts linking these nations to each other are much less strong than those between each one of them and the cultural capitals of the world, particularly those in North America, Europe, and in recent years, East Asia. Brazil, as an independent cultural entity, also needs to be taken into consideration. One of the articles in the collection properly refers to 'the superstitious attachment of value to the European' as a phenomenon affecting both perennial Americas equally (p. 134). Europe is a perennial source of not only inspiration and influence, but also of subject matter.

The individual articles of the collection are divided into three groups, comprising history and the literary imagination, perspectives on literary criticism, and the lives and fictions of American women, the latter a category somewhat extraneous to the general purpose of the book. These articles range in substance and tone from a solid down-to-earth interview with the oral historian Margaret Randall, who unequivocally rejects 'much that passes for trendy "new" and "innovative" literature' (p. 216), and an application of trendy esoteric theory to Whitman that resembles an undergraduate essay in its self-consciousness. One of the best contributions is that of Bell Gale Cherry, one of the two editors, comparing Melville and Carpenter as modernists in the sense of belonging to a national literature independent from the European. A superb definition of culture quoted from Carpenter could be applied to the study of comparative literature in general: 'the accumulation of knowledge which permits a man to establish relations, beyond time and space, between two similar or analogous realities, explaining one in terms of its likeness to another which could have been produced many centuries before' (p. 41).

This article along with most of the section on criticism deals with the objection of many Latin Americans to having their culture appraised by North American standards and to their related opinion that the appeal to the so-called 'universal' in literature amounts to conformity to the Western mainstream. This objection is cogently expressed by the Uruguayan novelist Mario Benedetti: 'Should Latin American literature, at the moment of its greatest flowering, be made meekly subject to the canons of a [European] literature that is formidable in its traditions but is now going through a period of crisis and fatigue? ... Should structuralist criticism be thought of as the inevitable yardstick with which to measure our letters? Or, on the contrary, together with our poets and novelists, shouldn't we also be creating our own critical focus, our own methods of investigation, our own evaluative guidelines, produced by our very own conditions, interests, and needs?' (p. 291).

The question may be raised whether taking issue with 'the presumed universality of literary theory,' as do the critics in this book, is tantamount

to rejecting the notion of universal literature as expounded by Etienne and others. The answer is that universals and a common poetics are by no means the same thing. If there were no such thing as universals, as Etienne uses the term, comparative literature would be a somewhat dubious discipline. Literary theories comprise value systems, whereas universal literature consists of works in all areas of the world together with all the value systems by which they are judged. The ultimate value system is that of universal appeal, which is measured by such objective criteria as repeated editions, translations and general awareness. Literary study need by no means be confined to works that rank highly by these criteria, that is, by and large the masterpieces. But when Latin American writing as a whole is subjected to these criteria, it is certainly exempt from the domination of alien criticism, European or North American, trendy or traditional. In this sense the criteria of universal literature have had considerably more weight than the trends in professional criticism.

The critical section of this book raises important issues and successfully confronts them, perhaps because of the widespread vogue for theory during the present moment. The field is wide open, however, for other scholars to cover historical relationships and provide concrete evidence of exactly how writers in the two hemispheres have reacted to various aspects of life. (A. OWEN ALDRIDGE)

*ALBERTO FLORES GALINDO. *Buscando un inca: identidad y utopía en Los Andes*. La Habana: Ediciones Casa de las Américas 1986. Pp. 400.

Il y a un phénomène qui a été maintes fois observé dans le passé et qui pourtant n'a rien perdu de son intérêt. Il s'agit de ce que nous pourrions appeler 'le narcissisme culturel' des pays dits développés. À l'heure actuelle il y a une contradiction entre notre accès immédiat à l'information et notre ignorance, voire notre indifférence, à l'égard de tout ce qui se passe ailleurs. Cette contradiction qu'on a tenté d'expliquer comme étant le résultat de la saturation d'information 'disphorique' engendrerait, en plus d'une certaine fatigue, un degré d'insensibilité morale plus ou moins élevé. Or, cette argumentation n'est pas sans intérêt, surtout si l'on pense à certains produits des mass-média qui semblent tirer profit du malaise qui précède notre insensibilité morale, en nous proposant une image caricaturale 'des autres'.

Cette image faussée à dessein, en particulier celle des habitants du Tiers Monde, chercherait à instaurer une sorte de 'poetic justice' selon laquelle 'les autres' mériteraient tous les malheurs qui les accablent et notamment ceux qui découlent de la violence politique. Ainsi, par la mise en jeu de la rhétorique du 'dire et ne pas dire,' ces *fables* veulent nous amener à penser

que le bien-être dont jouissent les pays développés n'est que le corollaire du pacifisme, de l'esprit de travail et de la sagesse de leurs habitants, tandis que les malheurs 'des autres' seraient la conséquence naturelle du fait d'avoir les qualités opposées.

Ces réflexions-là ont été inspirées par la lecture du livre que nous allons commenter par la suite: *Buscando un inca: identidad y utopía en Los Andes*, (à la recherche d'un Inca: identité et utopie dans les Andes), d'Alberto Flores Galindo, Premier Prix dans la catégorie 'Essai' au concours Casa de las Américas 1986. Ce livre réussit à mettre en évidence d'une façon magistrale le contraste frappant entre ces versions dégradées, tantôt des autres, tantôt le passé, qui flattent notre désir de symétrie morale et ce que, pour des raisons d'ordre pratique, nous appellerons ici 'la vérité historique.'

Le thème général en est le Pérou, depuis la Conquista jusqu'à nos jours, et son objet spécifique: essayer de retracer la trajectoire d'un mythe crucial pour la compréhension d'une série de mouvements sociaux qui ont bouleversé ce pays depuis l'assassinat d'Atahualpa en 1533 jusqu'aux tentatives subversives de Sendero Luminoso (Sentier Luminieux).

Dans le mythe en question, né peu après la Conquista, s'amalgament trois éléments préexistants, à savoir: le concept vernaculaire de 'Pachacuti' (cataclysme qui terrasse l'ordre établi pour lui substituer un ordre nouveau), l'idée chrétienne du millénium et une version idéalisée du 'Tahuantinsuyo', nom quéchua de l'ancien empire des Incas. A. Flores Galindo insiste sur le fait qu'il s'agit là d'une version idéalisée qui viendrait satisfaire au niveau imaginaire les terribles frustrations qu'ont subies les autochtones sous le régime colonial.

Néanmoins, sa fonction est beaucoup plus complexe qu'elle ne le paraît à première vue, car elle implique autant la recherche de l'identité perdue à cause de l'impact dévastateur de la culture européenne, que l'aspiration utopique élaborée à partir de quelques éléments de ce qui jadis avait été une réalité historique. Or, même si cela ne s'est fait que lentement, 400 ans d'histoire ont altéré l'infrastructure économique et sociale de la région andine et le mythe, à son tour, a subi des modifications. C'est ainsi qu'il est devenu par moments un projet économique, politique et social à contours bien définis.

Mais l'un des aspects les plus intéressants de cette oeuvre c'est que, même si le thème central y est 'l'utopie andine,' l'approche dont l'auteur se sert lui permet de réfuter une fois pour toutes quelques suppositions erronées, mais fort répandues, sur l'histoire de l'Amérique Latine: Premièrement, que la Conquista avait réussi à détruire pratiquement toutes les manifestations significatives des cultures précolombiennes et, deuxièmement, que le Virreinato du Pérou avait été une région qui, à cause de sa prospérité

et de son atmosphère de paix, avait pris du temps à se joindre au mouvement indépendantiste de 1810.

Pourtant ce que la recherche met en évidence est justement l'opposé: ce ne sont que les manifestations les plus visibles des cultures vernaculaires qui ont disparu, car parmi la population indigène des Andes du moins, nombre de formes d'organisation sociale ont persisté et, spécialement, ce que nous pourrions appeler 'les structures mentales' ou 'les schèmes de pensée' qui avec le temps ont assimilé les fragments de la culture européenne qui atteignaient ces régions-là. De cette intégration sont nées des conformations originales qui, comme il fallait s'y attendre, furent modulées par des circonstances historiques concrètes. Tel fut le cas de la croyance en un nouveau 'Pachacuti' qui viendrait, encore une fois, renverser l'ordre établi pour mettre à sa place le Tahuantinsuyo, mais si dans sa version originelle ce sont les Espagnols qui sont passibles d'une punition pour leurs méfaits, à l'époque de la République déjà, ce sont les 'mistis' criollos qui en font dorénavant l'objet.

Pour ce qui est du calme 'relatif' que le Virreinato aurait connu sous la Colonia, la recherche montre qu'entre 1730 et 1780, date à laquelle s'est produite l'insurrection de Tupac Amaru II, il y eut quelques 128 *mouvements* du même genre. Qui plus est, les historiens de l'époque rapportent que cet épisode, à lui seul, aurait laissé un solde de 110,000 morts, dont 10,000 espagnols. Il est à noter que dans la plupart de ces soulèvements, aussi bien que dans ceux qui se sont succédés pour culminer avec les actions de Sendero Luminoso, 'l'utopie andine,' cette idée d'une commotion sociale capable de déclencher un ordre nouveau, a été la force génératrice. Le nouvel ordre serait, jusqu'à un certain degré, l'opposé de celui jusqu'alors en place et se conformerait à l'idéal de ce que, d'une façon équivoque, quelque'un appela à une occasion 'l'empire socialiste des Incas.'

En conclusion, *Buscando un inca: identidad y utopía en Los Andes* n'est pas seulement une oeuvre dont on ne saurait se passer si l'on cherche à comprendre l'origine et le développement d'un mythe crucial, mais un livre qui aide en outre à éclairer ombre d'autres problèmes plus généraux d'ordre historique et anthropologique tels que: la complexité de l'interaction culturelle entre vainqueurs et vaincus; le contraste entre 'la vérité historique' et les versions dégradées de 'l'autre' ou du passé et, enfin, les stratégies mises en oeuvre par une communauté qui, par une fatatité historique, se trouve tout d'un coup dépourvue de son identité et d'un projet collectif. En dehors de l'importance que cette oeuvre revêt pour les spécialistes de l'histoire et de la culture de l'Amérique de langue espagnole, la sobriété et l'élégance de son style la rendent tout à fait accessible au lecteur moyen et, par conséquent, nous nous permettons de recommander vivement qu'elle

soit traduite en anglais et en français. (JOSÉ R. VARELA, UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA)

JÁNOS RIESZ, Hrsg. *Frankophone Literaturen außerhalb Europas*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang Verlag 1987. Pp. 175. SF40.00

Some *québécois* might take it as a backhand compliment that this collection of conference papers, presented in Siegen in early 1985 and dealing specifically with Francophone literature outside of Europe, skips over Quebec, though this must have been an error of omission, not commission. Quebec is outside Europe, but what these authors had in mind is that other further-out non-white francophone network linking the Caribbean, Africa and the Indian Ocean. La francophonie is multi-layered, to the extent that labels within it rarely stick.

Yet while there is a wide range of subject matter in *Frankophone Literaturen außerhalb Europas*, a distinct consensus of method and style of research does emerge from these pages, one too often neglected. German is hardly a linguistic sarcophagus, as was once said of Portuguese, a vessel in which to seal messages of great beauty which may never wash up onto inhabited shores. It is unfortunate, though, that studies like those assembled here by János Riesz will not be better known outside Western Europe until they are translated into French or English, since these scholars are so manifestly committed to events beyond the Hexagon. French 'ist nicht mehr unbedingt die Sprache Frankreichs' (p. 62).

Rather than perpetrate the injustice of skimming over twelve texts which are almost all rich and provocative (especially those by A. Pibarot on Césaire's reading of Mallarmé, B. Ischinger on Western criticism and formal innovation in Cameroon and Senegalese prose, and W. Glinga contrasting West African historical novels with their largely Arabic historical sources), let me limit my remarks to a single facet of francophone literature outside of Europe, what we could call the continuum between standard French and 'French-based' Creoles in the diglossic contexts of the Antilles and the Indian Ocean, an issue of course related to the general one of choosing to write in French rather than in native languages and to the likelihood that distinct African versions of French are incubating in Africa, e.g. René Philombe's 'français-ewondo' or Aminata Sow Fall's 'français-sénégalaisé' (p. 93). To be sure, the future and shape of French over the next century depends on much more than the success or failure of literary experimentation. A look at the interface between French-language literatures and French Creole literatures might nonetheless be suggestive of what is to come.

At one pole of the French-Creole continuum lie works in French like those by the *guadeloupéenne* Simone Schwarz-Bart and the *réunionnaise* Anne Cheynet, the first of whom Helmut Rumpf quotes as saying 'l'impression de mettre dans cette espèce de langue française que j'écris à ma manière créole, l'esprit de notre langue [le créole]' (p. 59). Leaning heavily upon the Caribbean creolist Jean Bernabé, Rumpf argues that this tactic is inevitable — 'da weder durch die Gesamtheit der Signifikanten des Französischen, noch durch die des Kreolischen das kollektive Wissen vermittelt werden kann, sondern nur noch durch Konnotationen, d.h. durch das assoziative Verbinden von Sprache und Erfahrung' (p. 61). Diglossia *per se* is not responsible for this 'dérive' (p. 78), rather a particular kind of diglossia, one in which creoles remain confined to oral settings. It is important to distinguish between personal bilingualism, an individual's capacity to deal with two languages, and diglossia, a social arrangement in which different languages are used in different situations (e.g. Creole in 'typically creole' settings, with friends, family and orally; French at school, in public, *in print*). In such settings, if an author wants to be *read*, there is no option but French, perhaps a somewhat trafficked French replete with glossary. In Schwarz-Bart's words: 'j'aimerais bien que les Antillais puissent me lire' (p. 60—my emphasis). Or in those of a counterpart from the Indian Ocean, Anne Cheynet: 'Mon roman est traduit du créole et s'il existait une graphie officielle je l'aurais écrit en créole' (p. 78). Both Schwarz-Bart and Cheynet are slightly disingenuous in these remarks since either could well have written in Creole, orthographic traditions existing in both Caribbean and Indian Ocean Creoles since the beginning of the nineteenth century, though, granted, readers would not be numerous.

Two middle terms on this continuum are supplied by Joachim Schulz, whose 'Zwischen 'Créolité' und 'Créolité': Zur modernen reunionesischen Literatur' is an exemplary account of the historiographical disputes which animate canon-formation in 'Third World' literatures in general and Creole literatures in particular.

Créole is the banner and battlecry of Réunion poets Gilbert Aubry and Jean-François Sam-Long in their *Poésie réunionnaise, 1900-1980* and *Créole 1982: La créole s'exprimera tant en créole qu'en français*, though French remains 'la langue privilégiée étudiée et maîtrisée parce qu'au plan de l'expression elle est nettement supérieure au créole et nous situe au niveau de la communication et de la recherche internationale' (p. 75). As above, however, it is crucial to determine the rules of any given diglossic situation, i.e. how the use of languages is distributed. According to the paradigm set forth by the *Créole* manifestos, it is obvious that French would be elicited in scholarly, refined and international contexts from which Réunion Creole

would be excluded: 'Créolité seient nur an einer harmlosen kreolischen Folklore interessiert' (p. 80).

Créolité, on the other hand, advocates Réunion Creole as the primary language of literary and social communication. From this perspective, there should be no privileged interest in or promotion of popular songs or performance in Creole, since 'durch diese Sprachpolitik werden eine einheitliche Graphie des Kreolischen und eine Alphabetisierung in kreolisch verhindert, und somit stehe das Kreolische als geschriebene Sprache vorläufig immer noch im Schatten des Französischen' (p. 79). Armand and Chopinet, editors of *La littérature réunionnaise d'expression créole 1828-1982*, thus insist upon a fully literate culture in Réunion Creole. Such a literature would still be diglossic, but only in a weak sense, only insofar as French would be the instrument of outside communication — though a glance at Armand and Chopinet's anthology (Paris: L'Harmattan 1983) shows that its entire paratext (jacket blurb, introduction and table of contents) is in French, a contradiction which plagues militant creolists around the world.

The final term in the continuum is that stage in which a Creole is established as an autonomous literary vehicle with all that such implies in terms of legal and political status, educational primacy and, ultimately, a readership, and in which French is only another foreign language. There are no examples of such an event in this book, by definition, and very few in actual fact. Ulrich Fleischmann's 'Die vieldeutige Liebe zu Choucoune' does, however, discuss what such a stage might mean by addressing the ways that a fully-realized Creole work, in this case the poem/song 'Choucoune' by the nineteenth century Haitian barde nationale, Oswald Durand, can (and even must) swallow and digest the French pre-texts which anticipate it, including diglossic practice itself.

'Choucoune' is considered a founding work of the Haitian Creole canon and was popular throughout the Caribbean, first in a version by the Cuban singer Celia Cruz, later in an English calypso by Harry Belafonte. Fleischmann sees it as transcending diglossia (and hence escaping the continuum) through the process of literary cannibalism the Brazilian poet Oswald de Andrade urged upon colonial writers in his 1928 *Revista Antropofágica*: 'Aparentemente faremos o jogo do colonizador, mostrando-nos encantados com ele, admiradores de sua superioridade, desejosos de ser como ele. Mas, enquanto isso, estaremos convivendo, aprendendo sua maneira de ser, observando sua ciência e de seus possuídos, o que pode ser de proveito para nós' (p. 45). Put somewhat less metaphorically, this translates into Fleischmann's observation that 'nicht der romantisch-französische Diskurs umschließt das Kreolische, sondern der kreolische Diskurs hat sich das Französische einverleibt' (p. 42). Perforce

omitting juicy detail, most unfortunate given the intrinsic aesthetic interest and emotional appeal of 'Choucoune, let us consider the following sequence of 'Verdaunungsvorgängen' ('digestive events') upon which Fleischmann bases his claim: 'Durand, der "chevalier-poète," wurde von Durand, dem bäuerlichen Brautweber gefressen; diesen fraß Durand, der haitianische Lebemann; Durand, der Romaniker, verspeiste alle drei, wurde selbst aber wieder Opfer von Durand, dem Kreolen. Dieser lebt unbeschädigt fort — wenn er nicht schließlich von einer simplifizierenden Literaturgeschichte gefressen wird' (p. 43).

No act of gluttony like that last step (in which a literary historian bites off maybe more than he can chew), can be found in *Frankophone Literaren außerhalb Europas*, whose authors tend more to the *Feinschmecker*. It deserves a readership far beyond the circle limited to scholars and students of francophone African and Caribbean literatures. These *Romanisten* are *Komparatisten*. (GEORGE LANG, UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA)

*MAX DORSINVILLE. *Solidarités: Tiers-Monde et littérature comparée*. Montréal: CIDIHCA 1988. Pp. 196. \$15.00

Max Dorsinville's latest work *Solidarités: Tiers-Monde et littérature comparée* (1988) shares certain elements with his previously published *Caliban Without Prospero* (1974) and *Le pays natal* (1983). Like the latter, it is a collection of previously published essays. It shares with both works the idea that québécois literature and 'Third World literature' have certain commonalities. *Solidarités*, however, has a broader base.

As the title indicates and the epigraphs illustrate, (quotations from *Hosites noires* by Léopold Senghor and *St. Urbain's Horseman* by Mordecai Richler) the central theme that binds these nineteen essays, short stories, and interviews spanning the years 1974 to 1987 is the idea of solidarity, whether it is a call for community involvement to help those who do not have a voice, or the fact that it is exemplified by literary texts with similar themes in different languages. The book, divided into four parts whose titles 'Solidarités,' 'Dialogues,' 'Hommages,' and 'Échos' again repeat the theme, consists of essays in English as well as French.

In the preface Dorsinville explains that he dedicated the book to Karl Lévêque, the Haitian activist priest 'porteur de solidarités' (p. xiii) who died in 1986. In fact, the opening essay of Part One — 'Témoignage pour ceux qui ne parlent pas' — which appeared originally in *Le Devoir* in 1974 was written by Lévêque. It is a plea on behalf of fifteen hundred Haitians in Canada who were threatened with deportation. Lévêque writes that more people should

come to their defense. That essay is followed by Dorsinville's response to Lévêque's call to action: 'Pour l'amour de Dieu, qu'on leur donne une chance!' which appeared a few days later in the same newspaper. Dorsinville writes that this newest wave of immigrants should be allowed to stay and that their established counterparts should be concerned about their plight. Part One ends with four related short stories inspired by this issue.

In 'Manif' the first person narrator, a professor at the Institut d'Études Africaines, accompanies one of his students to a large demonstration in support of the Haitians. Although he feels out of place among the young activists and is married, he continues to see Barbara alone. 'Yvresse' describes their developing relationship. 'Innocence' takes place during a Sunday drive with the narrator's family during which his wife Denise mentions that a friend noticed him at the demonstration. Denying he was present, the protagonist feigns innocence. The last instalment, 'Miroir,' takes place years later in Dakar when the professor receives a letter from Barbara. It causes him to indulge in reminiscences about her, especially her first visit to his office when she spoke of her past, having been raised in Kenya the daughter of Protestant missionaries.

Part Two, entitled 'Dialogues,' consists of three recent radio interviews of Dorsinville. 'Le pays natal,' conducted by Karl Lévêque in 1984, followed the publication of the book of the same name. Dorsinville discusses Césaire's influence on québécois writers of the 1960's. The second interview by Nicole Dionne, 'Présence haïtienne à Montréal' is more personal in nature as the author relates his experiences in Quebec between 1960 and 1968 at a time when there were few other Haitians living there. Over the years, however, thousands more settled in Montréal and a community was established. The last interview (from 1986) called 'Votre passeport, s'il vous plaît' was conducted by Dominique Blondeau and covers the same ground as the previous ones.

Part Three — 'Hommages' — contains ten book reviews ranging from a collection of poetry (Joël DesRosiers' *Métropolis Opéra*), to a Canadian high school textbook. Half of the reviews (Ngugi Wa Thiong'O's *Writers in Politics, Detained, and Homecoming*, Paul Déjean's *The Haitians in Quebec*, and Gerald Moore's *Wole Soyinka*) are in English. Other reviews include Auguste Viatte's *Histoire comparée des littératures francophones*, Ambrose Kom's *George Lamming et le destin des Caraïbes*, and Sébastien Joachim's *Le Nègre dans le roman blanc*. These books cover a wide area — comparative literature, and sociology, for example, and thus reflect the author's diversified interests.

'Échos,' a series of scholarly essays, closes *Solidarités*. In 'Le Silence des commencements,' and 'Le Langage des commencements,' Dorsinville focuses

on two writers who build a bridge between their culture and another. Bernard Dadié whose *Iles de tempêtes* is set in Haiti and Roger Dorsinville whose latest works are set in Liberia. In the essay on Dadié's play, Dorsinville studies the role of silence, while in the essay on Roger Dorsinville, he finds that three 'codes' characterize his writings: 'le code légal,' 'le code biblique,' and 'le code africain.' The last essay, entitled 'The Odysseus Myth in Caribbean and African Literature,' is an ambitious undertaking in ten pages, but after mentioning the presence of the myth in fifteen works in English and French, Dorsinville concentrates on Césaire's *Cahier d'un retour au pays natal*.

It is significant that the title *Solidarités* is written in the plural. Dorsinville has succeeded in showing how it functions in life and in different language literatures. (RENÉE LARRIER, RUTGERS UNIVERSITY)

*PATRICK TAYLOR. *The Narrative of Liberation: Perspectives on Afro-Caribbean Literature, Popular Culture, and Politics*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press 1989. Pp. 251. US\$29.95

Rough going for Caribbeanists who have not paid their dues to Hegel, Marx, Sartre and Fanon, *The Narrative of Liberation* will be essential reading for those who want to open that field up to the delights of Western dialectics (though some would say close it down by).

Taylor knows as much as anyone about Frantz Fanon, his key to Caribbean history. Of interest to Fanon fans will be his commentary on the early medical publications, including his thesis accepted at Lyons in 1951: *Altérations mentales, modifications caractérielles, troubles psychiques et déficit intellectuel dans l'héredo-dégénération spino-cérébelleuse*. As Taylor informs us, this thesis was composed after *Peau noire, masques blancs* was deemed unacceptable as a medical thesis at the biologically oriented Lyons Faculty of Medicine, but it too contains in germ some of his later thought, notably the notion that mental disorder is possible only through 'a consent of liberty,' even if it involves an organic complication (p. 27) — evidence if any more were needed to the effect Jean-Paul Sartre exerted on Fanon at that time. In fact, what will make the first two chapters and passages of those which follow difficult or frustrating for those in search of the perspectives on Afro-Caribbean literature promised in the sub-title is that Taylor insists, rightly so, that there is no comprehending Fanon or the 'narrative of liberation' without a thorough discussion of the Hegelian dialectic, in particular the Master-Slave relation, its famous turning-on-its-head by Marx and the later fine-tuning of that inversion by Sartre. To the surprise of those

familiar with these arguments (anyone who ever once was or might still be a Leftist intellectual), Taylor throws in a wild card, Kierkegaard, whose importance both to Sartre and Fanon are documented in some detail.

In Taylor's scheme of things, a narrative of liberation is one that 'goes beyond myth to render itself historical' (p. 18), one that is a 'demand for mutual recognition' (p. 227). The Hegelian flavour of his concept is accentuated in his elaboration:

Fanon's narrative seeks to render the myths of colonialism intelligible so that they can be transcended in free creative activity... The task is to tell the story of human freedom by transcending its situation in such a way that freedom is communicated and the oppressive situation transformed. It is the overthrow of the myths of finitude by the power of the infinite that makes such transformation possible. (p. 19)

With this large order in mind, Taylor takes up three Caribbean myths: Haitian *vaudou*, the Anancy trickster tales and *négritude* as promulgated by Aimé Césaire. Each of his discussions is well-informed and perceptive, though hardly to be recommended as introductory reading given the Fanonist 'over-determination' which marks them.

The role of *vaudou* in the Haitian revolution was significant, but it later came to be manipulated by the Duvalier dynasty to conserve its own reactionary power. 'Vaudou reached its peak in the Haitian revolution. Nevertheless, the revolution cannot be reduced to *vaudou*' (p. 109). Nor can *vaudou* to revolution, because 'there is nothing intrinsic to the *vaudou* narrative order that demanded that the believer enter into a struggle for liberation' (p. 118; emphasis added). This criterion is a far-reaching one well-founded on Taylor's earlier discussion, but it hints at the main ideological dilemma of the book and haunts the reader of its last chapter. Can any narrative have anything intrinsic that makes a 'believer' or just plain reader do anything, let alone enter into a struggle for liberation? That can of worms ought not be opened in these narrow confines, so let us suppose for the sake of argument that certain narratives can.

Wide-spread in the Caribbean and in Africa, the Anancy trickster tales were 'part of a cultural order in which the techniques of survival and pragmatic resistance to oppression are emphasized' (p. 146). But just like *vaudou* they are not full-fledged narratives of liberation, since they lend themselves to too many interpretations and are potential weapons to too many. For example, to 'the extent that a black bougeoisie has replaced the white master and satisfied itself with an intermediary role, it is this class that both faces the trickster's attack and itself plays the role of trickster' (p. 149). Fanon had much to say about *négritude*, as have many others, so Taylor's account of it, a necessary cog in his argumentation, breaks no ground.

'Negritude represents a struggle for identity rather than for survival (the trickster tale) or for social change (Yaudou religion)' (p. 152). 'Césaire's negritude goes beyond simple narcissism, but it ultimately fails to resolve the contradiction between mythical and liberating narrative' (p. 153).

Narratives do have some logic. A gun in Act One has to go off before the curtain falls. Or there must be good reason why not. Thus, when the reader of *The Narrative of Liberation* approaches the final chapter s/he knows that one of two things must out. Either Taylor will produce the goods, verifiable samples of liberating narrative, or else he will come out and admit there are none he knows of because, alas, the Caribbean is still a neo-colonial zone, its writers zombies stuck in mythic modes of resistance, survival and identity quest. Given what a narrative of liberation, as defined, is supposed to be and do, that may have been the most logical outcome. Getting 'the infinite to overthrow the finite' is no mean task. But this second logical conclusion would have flown in the face of the manifest creative richness of Caribbean culture, produced a shrill diatribe, and anyway been of little interest to those unconverted to Fanonism.

So the gun went off, Taylor having drawn a bead on George Lamming and Derek Walcott. What attracts him to Lamming is that the Barbadian recognizes that 'one's own freedom necessarily implies the recognition of the freedom of the other and the responsibility to actualize that freedom in history' (p. 201) — the above Hegelian 'mutual recognition.' Walcott, the future Nobel prize winner (if the reviewer may be allowed to editorialize), is slightly more problematic. To prove his case Taylor is obliged to exclude poetry, the most-renowned achievement of the St. Lucian, since 'much of Walcott's poetry remains tragic' (p. 189), 'tragedy' having been equated with non-liberating narratives in which characters resign themselves to fate. The readings which ensue both of Lamming and of Walcott are informative, but at this point an eerie feeling begins to creep in that heavy theoretical guns have been brought to bear on the wrong theatre of war. Is there anything in Lamming or Walcott which demands that their readers 'enter into a struggle for liberation,' to apply the yardstick Taylor laid against Yaudou above? Were Lamming or Walcott really what Fanon had in mind when he wrote on his deathbed, 'Come, then, comrades, the European game has finally ended; we must find something different' (p. 45 in Taylor).

Pyrotechnics notwithstanding, there is a political dimension in Fanon which is missing from Taylor. The narrative of liberation the dying Fanon described was to be told by (and not to) revolutionary peasants engaged in active political struggle, including armed combat. Taylor knows this very well and shows it in the early chapters. This reviewer himself admires Lamming, Walcott and for that matter his colleague, not comrade, Patrick Taylor, but

the logic of the latter's own narrative bound him to a course which was contradictory. In the final analysis, these contradictions are Fanon's own, since the subjects of his concern have turned out not to be the Subjects of history, at least so far. Yet the man is in the grave. Let us respect his last wishes. (GEORGE LANG, UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA)

EDWARD KAMAU BRATHWAITE. *Roots*. La Habana: Casa de las Américas 1986. Pp. 304. No price.

Roots is a collection of eight essays originally published separately between 1957 and 1981. Brathwaite, a Barbadian, is a celebrated poet, as well as being an historian of some distinction. He combines his two vocations in these essays of literary criticism and cultural analysis which manage to combine those elusive qualities of wit and erudition.

The volume is published by the Cuban 'Casa de las Américas' and is the winner of the prestigious Casa de las Américas prize for 1986. It is unusual for a non-Cuban to win this accolade; one must suspect that Brathwaite's political leanings, together with his undoubted literary talent, helped him to carry off these particular laurels. For the dust-jacket's claim that Brathwaite's work is characterized by 'great objectivity' is manifestly untrue. As historian, poet, critic, and essayist, Brathwaite reveals himself as the champion of the neglected and the downtrodden, the pundit of the African influence, the popularizer of popular literature.

As Brathwaite points out in the fourth essay in this collection, 'Caribbean Critics,' West Indian literature has suffered from a dearth of literary critics, while those few it has had in the past have tended to be European-oriented scholars, who have devoted all their attention to 'official,' scribal literature. By involuntarily adopting European critical procedures, these critics, Brathwaite argues, have done West Indian literature a great disservice. He summarizes the situation thus:

We are therefore faced with the strange situation where the work of a body of writers, mainly concerned with the communal values of their creole society, is examined in a more or less 'academic' fashion by a body of critics trained to respond almost exclusively to European influences, and whose main concerns are with 'the artist' and 'the individual.' (p. 117)

Brathwaite himself attempts to redress the balance by emphasizing the African rather than the European heritage of Caribbean culture, and by highlighting the community rather than the individual. What Brathwaite naturally does not acknowledge is that such a dramatic shift in perspective

leads to a different, but not necessarily a lesser, distortion. It is as if critics were viewing the scene through a pair of binoculars, first through one end and then through the other; what they need to do is throw away the end binoculars altogether and look at the true scene with the naked eye.

Despite his own kind of 'positive discrimination,' Edward Brathwaite is certainly foremost among a *nouvelle vague* of Caribbean critics, with a broader, less insular outlook on West Indian culture, and a refreshing boldness of style and ideology. The very fact that *Roots* is published by 'Casa de las Américas' (instead of Oxford University Press, which publishes Brathwaite's poetry) indicates a new Caribbean-centred orientation, a new self-reliance and resilience. Brathwaite himself has done much to create the cultural climate for this new attitude, not least by publishing these influential essays at intervals over the past thirty years. It is useful now to be able to obtain these essays in one volume, showing not only the evolution of Brathwaite's own cultural theories, but also reflecting the changing emphasis in Caribbean literary criticism during that period.

One of Brathwaite's most impressive achievements is the way in which he has placed oral culture in the centre of the literary debate in the Caribbean. In the past, oral literature was given virtually no critical attention, partly because it was considered inferior by virtue of its popularity, and partly because it was the domain of the underprivileged, the non-academic. The single most remarkable and probably most influential essay in this collection, 'History of the Voice,' is an analysis of the language used in oral and oral-derived poems. After reaffirming the importance of the African influence on West Indian literature, after resurrecting the 'folk' and the 'people,' Brathwaite turned his hand to salvaging the 'nation language' (dialect by another, prouder name) from disrepute. And succeeded.

It is the 'infinite variety' of Brathwaite's interests that make him such an entertaining and perspicacious essayist. The classic study of Jazz and the West Indian Novel, included in this volume, is a case in point, and an excellent example of comparative literature practised in a vital and readable fashion. What is even more surprising is that an academic like Brathwaite should be able to use *convincingly* elements of popular culture jazz, blues, calypso, reggae, and 'nation language' — in his own poetry.

In his poetic trilogy, *The Arrivants*, Brathwaite offered the reader a modern epic which attempted to synthesize the complex West Indian historical experience. In these essays we are offered a similar attempt at the synthesis of the West Indian cultural scene; both books succeed because the ambitious panoramic views are filtered through one recognizable, idiosyncratic, Caribbean consciousness. (KATIE JONES, UNIVERSITY COLLEGE OF SWANSEA, WALES.)

MARTIN BERNAL. *Black Athena: The Afroasiatic Roots of Classical Civilization. Volume 1: The Fabrication of Ancient Greece 1783-1985*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press 1987. Pp. xxxii + 575. Hardcover US\$45.00, paper US\$15.00

LINDA VAN NORDEN. *The Black Feet of the Peacock: The Color-Concept 'Black' From the Greeks Through the Renaissance*. Comp. and ed. John Pollock. Lanham, MD: University Press of America 1985. Pp. xii + 228. Hardcover US\$35.75, paper US\$16.50

The first volume of Martin Bernal's *Black Athena* has already been widely recognized — correctly — as an important achievement. Its principal theme of the political and ideological roles played by disciplinary studies in Europe since the late eighteenth century is not a new one, but is here supported with a depth of passions and a breadth of erudition that are both quite unusual. For these very reasons, it is incumbent upon a reviewer to look with care at those of its areas that coincide with those of one's own competence. Bernal has set out to understand and overturn the 'dominant model' ruling common understanding of classical civilization and its place in the development of modern Europe in the (Western) academy. He claims to do no less than create a new Kuhnian paradigm. His argument is not specifically difficult to follow in its principal lines.

At least since the fifth century B.C., and through the European eighteenth century it was generally agreed that high culture had come to Greece as a result of colonization by Egyptians and Phoenicians at the beginning of the first millennium B.C. This culture then developed not only indigenously, but through constant exchanges with these same cultures. Although he does not go into it in any detail in the present volume, Bernal asserts that linguistic, archaeological and other historical evidence for these claims is rife. This 'Ancient Model' remained generally accepted when so many of the texts were rediscovered during the Renaissance, and was strengthened well into the European eighteenth century.

At the same time, however, a series of elements were developing to threaten this understanding. Foremost among these, as Bernal puts them, were 'Christian reaction, the rise of the concept of "progress", the growth of racism, and Romantic Hellenism' (p. 189). That each and all together endangered the ancient model is clear enough. Christianity remained in an age-old feud against both Judaism and Islam (not to mention older Egyptian religions). The long and stable history of ancient Egypt, once so admired, could now be viewed as an antiprogressive stagnation. Racism, both anti-black and anti-semitic, gave cause to look askance on any Egyptian or

Phoenician background to Hellenic civilization. Romantic Hellenism sought to make Greece the unique cradle of Western culture.

Bernal asserts that these forces combined in the early nineteenth century — between 1815 and 1830 to be precise, and chiefly in Germany — to establish a new 'Aryan model' for understanding Greek civilization. According to this, sometime in the early first millennium B.C., there was a colonization from the North by Indo-European (Aryan) speakers of 'pre-Hellenic' indigenous tribal cultures. Philosophy, art, mathematics and the rest then all developed from within. Greek culture, understood as the foundation of subsequent European civilization, was thus given a Northern, 'white' character. Linguistic, religious, mythical and other aspects which had demonstrably no relation to Indo-European patterns were all ascribed to those indigenous 'pre-Hellenes' who had been colonized (rather as late Newtonian mechanics used an 'ether' to explain wave transmission).

Greek culture and the European past were thus cleaned up. At first racism tended to pick on Egypt (seen as black?), and all idea of an Egyptian past was dismissed within a generation of the first efforts (in the eighteenth century). Non religious anti-semitism came late in the nineteenth century (Bernal claims), and any Phoenician contribution was then equally swiftly dismissed. As we may suppose, things only grew worse through the second world war, but after that, the 'broad Aryan model' (making room for Phoenicians) was gradually readmitted: in part, no doubt, because of the Holocaust, the foundation of Israel, and the discrediting of vulgar anti-semitism. Even there, Eurocentrism reigns supreme, for modern Israel is usually considered a European presence in an Afroasiatic Middle East.

This summary is no doubt slightly unfair, and Bernal's arguments are not so simple as this may have suggested. One may however be suspicious of the motives behind the time spent on disarming and discrediting any would-be critic: first by placing *all* the detailed positive arguments in favour of the ancient model in subsequent volumes (three now rather than the two announced in this volume) and second — less generously — by implying that disagreement sets one amongst the racists, the self-protective classicists, or those who gain advantage from being a part of a Eurocentric elite. (The rather cheap-shot dismissal of Anne Dacier's contribution to Homeric studies by accusing her and her husband of a 'well-paid and opportunistic conversion' to Catholicism, p. 208, is symptomatic: in the first place, the conversion was long prepared by her and her family's search for some sort of religious accommodation; in the second, its connection with her scholarly work is in any case unexplained.) Nonetheless there remain a number of unanswered whys with regard to the argument about the implantation of the

'Aryan model.' It is on them that I wish to concentrate here, for this first volume is really about that implantation.

We need of course to take Bernal's four forces together, for he himself seems to imply that their combination is what is important. Even so they seem rather weak as an explanatory device. In the first place, a Christian reaction argues as much against ancient Greece as against Egypt and Carthage (even if we take account of later Hellenic — neoplatonic and patristic — contributions to Christianity; while no one confused the Greek 'progress' was difficult of perception in Greece itself after the Peloponnesian wars and the Macedonian invasions of the late fourth century. Thirdly, Northern European racists were hardly more generous towards the 'dirty Greeks' than towards black Egyptians (were the latter *really* so perceived?) or semitic Phoenicians, whatever their sentiments towards the 1821 Greek War of Liberation from the Turks (taken to imply they could now see the Greeks as dynamic white Europeans).

Then remains only the matter of Romantic philhellenism (which might or might not overcome racism). Such philhellenism was indeed widespread, but why should it replace, for example, the long tradition (unmentioned by Bernal) of mythical genealogies deriving European countries from Troy? These came, after all, in the wake of Virgil. The Christian West, as Johan Huizinga has put it, continued to be pro-Trojan. Both France and England had such myths. They were of course Virgilian before they were particularly pro-Trojan or anti-Greek, and they were symbolic rather than historical — as the Greek descent claimed: but the difficulty is real, for so much of this is recognizably a matter of symbol. The point is that, *of themselves*, symbols are drawn from Roman, Greek, Trojan, or even Egyptian story did not get in the way of Eurocentric belief. Which is why Bernal needs the simultaneity of his four forces.

Now, neither racial anti-semitism nor black racism was born in the nineteenth century. As to the former, one need think only of Marlowe's Barabas or of Shakespeare's Shylock (among many others). Unless one wishes to try and argue that this is religious anti-semitism because of the *theological* strictures against usury, these depictions have all the hallmarks of racial anti-semitism (although, in any case, if Christian reaction is a valid cause of the creation of the 'Aryan model' it is difficult to understand why religious anti-semitism would not be: except only that it dates from the New Testament and could hardly explain something happening in the nineteenth century).

As to the latter (black racism), the posthumous collection of Linda Van Norden's essays is eloquent. They show in erudite detail the ambivalence and complexity of the term 'black' as it was used in literary texts mostly from the

late Middle Ages and the Renaissance. One thing finally clear, however, is that from the earliest times of Greece itself (e.g., pp. 138-39) down to Milton, who situated Satan in darkness (again, however ambiguously: p. 196), black was symbolically associated with things harmful: Phaeton's theft, burning the world and turning the 'Aethiopes' black; Niger's daughters who are black of mood, black of feeling, and solidly black of body; black Lechery (pp. 67, 73); black as zero, as chaos, as evil. Nothing is made 'better,' of course, when one can demonstrate without the slightest ambiguity that such views predate the nineteenth century by several centuries. Nor would such views of blackness be racist in themselves. But they were as soon as they characterized 'Aethiopes' or 'Niger's daughters.'

What is my point? Simply that Bernal's four forces, the ones he selects as most necessary to explain the implantation of his 'Aryan model,' just will not do. Neither kind of racism awaited the nineteenth century. Christian reaction could explain too many things (again not dating from the nineteenth century). Progress should dismiss all halted societies indiscriminately. Philhellenism may or may not have undergone a qualitative change during the eighteenth century and then finally with the Romantics (what of the many Humanists who could only be so characterized?). Indeed, Bernal is less than wholly precise in this last aspect of his argument. At least once, he approaches misrepresentation.

In the chapter where he first discusses the growing turn against Egypt, the name of Thomas Blackwell occurs three times: once promoting Greece as the cradle of Western culture (p. 208), once connecting Homer and Scotland (p. 210), and once associated with Hamann and Herder, who is held to have turned against Egyptianism (p. 226). Now in fact, in his *Enquiry into the Life and Writings of Homer* of 1736, Blackwell was fairly exhaustive in the matter of Egyptian sources and indeed of Phoenician transmission: at not inconsiderable length he discussed both, and their importance to Greek culture in general and Homer in particular. 'Many of the Egyptian Doctrines and Customs passed thro' *Phoenicia* into *Greece*,' he wrote, adding that refugees from the former 'carried along with them into their new Settlements, both the *Phoenician Arts*, and the *Egyptian Learning*' (Blackwell, p. 233). Bernal, to be sure, does not claim Blackwell did not write such things. He just uses him *as though* he did not. This is surely a pernicious use of scholarship, and, in a volume whose appeal is to an extensive variety of expertise, not inspiring of confidence in its use of other documents and the resulting claims.

Bernal may doubtless assert that his interest only lies in those parts of Blackwell's work that play a role in the 'new' development: Greece as the childhood of Western culture. Such narrow interest, however, deleting the

full context of argument obviously alters our understanding of the development. One thing clear — as we have just seen — is that the idea of a Greek cultural cradle did not imply the impossibility of an important 'horizontal' relationship with Eastern cultures. The same remained the case even for so late — and for Bernal so important — a writer as F. A. Wolf, one of his major 'Hellenomaniacal' exhibits. In his *Prolegomena ad Homerum* (1795), Wolf did not, Bernal avers, 'go into the problems of the origin of the Greek alphabet' (p. 487, n.3 to p. 283). Now Wolf is taken to signal the moment of the unequivocal rise of Greece, and such a claim — albeit relegated to a physically distant footnote (why? one wonders) — is thus of some importance. It is also untrue.

While Wolf did not go into the question with any very great care, he did say quite clearly, at the outset of his Chapter XIV, that the Phoenicians were either the inventors of writing or so improved it as to justify their being called its inventors. The Egyptians also had their role. Whatever the historical obscurities, the creation of the art of writing was both commonly and, he said, *correctly* attributed to them. It is the case that when he named the Egyptians as the inventors of parchment and paper (Chapter XVI), he called them 'barbarians.' The word is clearly pejorative and belittling. But we must also note Wolf's aim in the *Prolegomena*. He was concerned neither with whether the Phoenicians (or the Egyptians) invented letters, nor with the primacy of Greece. He sought to show how the Homeric epics were oral poems created by Greeks sometime early in the first millennium B.C. He thus needed to argue that the art of writing, for whose existence earlier evidence abounds, a) developed elsewhere, and b) was not necessarily put to immediate use in Greece. Only by doing so could he claim, he supposed, a wholly Greek origin for the *Homeric epics*. Doing so, of course, he both assumed advanced literate cultures elsewhere (Egyptian and Phoenician, as well as Hebrew), and that their invention *would* become important at the time when the poems were collected and written down, as he also acknowledged their important role in Greece as a whole.

So long as one accepts (as I do) that some such Eurocentric model as Bernal describes was consolidated very much when he suggests it was in the nineteenth century, do all these *caveats* matter? Does it matter that its clear proof seems to rely on rather partial analysis of eighteenth-century texts? Does it matter that Bernal's four forces, even taken together, are too weak a prescription?

Well, yes, it does. Apart from the immediate target of a certain Hellenism and a certain version of European history, Bernal wants to characterize what he takes to be modern Eurocentric arrogance. If Eurocentrism is more than some merely local and so rather minor

phenomenon, then some version of its history is indeed required (Bernal is quite right to assume so). As Samir Amin has recently observed (*Eurocentrism*, New York: Monthly Review Press 1989), all cultures have their provincialisms, whatever form of rejection of alterity they may take. But these are quite different from the kind of 'paradigm' (if one insists) one can call an ideology, entailing a complex interplay of such rejections with their more positive counterpart, and whose purpose is to maintain the dominance of a mode of production or even an entire culture. What explains and what enables the dominance of the Aryan model is therefore important, even if it is only a small part of what we call Eurocentrism. This volume is mainly about the implantation of that model. It seems to me that implantation remains unexplained. (TIMOTHY J. REISS, NEW YORK UNIVERSITY)

*ANN THOMSON. *Barbary and Enlightenment: European Attitudes Towards the Maghreb in the 18th Century*. Brill's Studies in Intellectual History, 2. Leiden: E. J. Brill 1987. Pp. VII + 173.

Barbary and Enlightenment owes too much to Edward W. Said's *Orientalism* and too little to the author's own research and interests in the study of history. The last sentence of the blurb on the dust-jacket gives away the essence of the book: 'Dealing with an area that has hitherto attracted little attention, [Barbary and Enlightenment] throws new light on how enlightened Europe saw the rest of the world, and on the rise of racism.' With this declaration the readers should find themselves within the familiar domain of Said's creed, i.e. Western attitudes towards non-Western cultures are suspect, because they are by and large dictated by colonial ambitions. That Thomson reaches similar conclusions is evident in her assumption that racism is a purely European phenomenon whose roots can be found in eighteenth century attitudes towards Barbary.

In spite of her attempts to demonstrate certain 'enlightened' European views of North Africa, she falls back upon the type of reductive reasoning which has become the norm among Said's followers. For instance, in Part One, based upon some very interesting findings, she points out 'We should ... be very attentive of the way Islam was used by "enlightened" authors, whose motives in writing about this subject were frequently complex' (pp. 24-5), but later forgets her own warning and issues the following sweeping statement regarding late eighteenth and early nineteenth-century writing on Islam:

from then onwards, hostility and contempt for Islam and the Turks have been the norm in the West. This underlying current of hostility should not be forgotten when reading eighteenth-century texts about Islamic societies, even if the authors frequently attempt to go beyond current stereotypes to achieve a juster understanding of what they see. (pp. 31-2)

In the post-*Orientalism* era it is impossible to forget the Western stereotypes of Islam, but what is hardly ever remembered by today's historians is the hostility of the Turks towards European, to say nothing of other Islamic, nations. In this regard, if anything is being 'Orientalized' it is the history of the Ottoman Empire. The Turks found few allies among other Muslims they conquered. Anyone who assumes Muslim nations in any period of history have been united under one banner should put aside *Orientalism* and read Turkish historical chronicles.

To her credit, Thomson delves into European sources which reveal the ambitions and the power of the Turkish Empire. Her discussion of the captivity narratives written by and about Christian slaves on the Barbary coast sheds light, though be it indirectly, on the very complex nature of the North African states in the eighteenth century. Thomson cannot be reproached for factual shortcomings in her research, but rather for her disregard of some significant historical factors.

If the dust-jacket eliminates all suspense, the conclusion tempts the reader to skip over the sometimes monotonous chapters to get to the gist of the argument. The conclusion is, in fact, one of the most concise sections of this book. Its model should have been followed in the intervening chapters, for if we know from the outset that Europeans stereotyped Barbary, it seems hardly interesting to discover *how* this was rhetorically achieved. Again Said has provided Thomson with a poor model.

Although Said's name is not mentioned until the last sections of Part One, 'Preconceptions,' his influence is present throughout. The table of contents delineates the progression of Thomson's argument: Part One ('Preconceptions'), with a predictable tone and yet an extremely well-documented presentation, leads to Part Two with its three chapters on Location, Race, and Society and Government, which then concludes with the single chapter of Part Three, 'Towards the Conquest.' Needless to say, this last chapter, by the time the reader reaches it, is superfluous. Few readers will be jolted out of their seats when they read:

The argument is clear: the justification for the conquest of Barbary is that it will bring enlightenment, but this enlightenment is synonymous with the development of trade which is to profit Africa of course, but also — and mainly — Europe. ... The true

nature of the Europeans' growing interest in North Africa is here starkly revealed. (pp. 134-35)

For a scholar shrewd enough to detect the economic factors behind the conquest of Algiers, Thomson shows little awareness of the universal character of all conquering forces. There are few benevolent invaders in the history of mankind; early Islamic history is itself a long narrative of such conquests. If Europeans used the liberation of 'white slaves' and the dangers imposed by pirates to their shipping vessels as justification for invading Barbary, the Ottoman Turks had previously resorted to equally 'deceptive' reasoning to extend their Empire into North Africa.

Thomson cannot be faulted for not having provided an extensive survey of the history of the Ottoman Empire, but some of her naive conclusions raise issues which go beyond the declared scope of her study and require a more comprehensive view of the social, economic, and political setting of the nations in question. At the end of the book, some important and troubling questions remain unanswered: given the European tendency to stereotype inhabitants of the Islamic world, what is unique about the fate of Algiers prior to 1830? Why was not a similar domination of North Africa possible at an earlier date? Was the conquest achieved only through the prevalence of certain hostile attitudes towards North Africans? Had Thomson attempted to answer some of these questions, she would have produced a far more enlightening study.

The most successful segments of *Barbary and Enlightenment* are those which deal with eighteenth-century racial and geographical designations, which tended to place North Africa and its inhabitants within the larger European civilization, and the way in which they were transformed in the course of the nineteenth century. Thomson's competent analysis of the philosophical basis of such presumptions reveals that she is quite capable of going beyond the confines of her present study and contributing to 'intellectual history,' the series in which her book has been published. We may hope that she will no longer find it necessary to force her findings into academic fashions. (NASRIN RAHIMIEH, UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA)

*ALBERT GÉRARD, ed. *European-language Writing in Sub-Saharan Africa*. Comparative History of Literatures in European Languages, VI. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó 1986, 2 vols. Pp. 1289. US\$89.00

European-language Writing in Sub-Saharan Africa constitue le huitième ouvrage de l'impressionnante série 'Histoire comparée des littératures de

langues européennes' publiée par l'Association Internationale de Littérature comparée.

Cet ouvrage se veut 'un survol et une synthèse du développement historique' des littératures africaines en langues européennes. Dans l'introduction, Gérard aborde le problème méthodologique complexe que pose une classification de ces littératures. Si elles ont en commun un élément géographique (produites au sud du Sahara), ou politique (colonisation et indépendances), elles n'en diffèrent pas moins l'une de l'autre lorsqu'on considère les paramètres chronologiques raciaux, ethniques, linguistiques, nationaux ou régionaux. C'est à partir de la langue, du temps et de l'espace comme paramètres essentiels que l'ouvrage s'organise autour de quatre grandes idées qui en constituent les quatre parties: sous le regard de l'Occident, prise de conscience noire, pouvoir noir et enfin, un point de vue comparatiste. Ce dernier met en relation et rapport des langues, des temps et des espaces divers.

Il n'est pas possible de passer en revue ici tous les chapitres présentés dans les deux volumes que compte l'ouvrage. Parmi les chapitres que nous avons trouvés d'un intérêt particulier, il y a celui par Albert Gérard, consacré aux origines — assez lointaines il est vrai — des littératures africaines en langues européennes. Il s'agit des auteurs du 16^e, 17^e, et 18^e siècles qui écrivent en Latin (Latino, Amo, Capitain), Paul Edwards présente les auteurs qui ont écrit en Anglais (Phyllis Wheatley, Olauda Equiano). L'ouvrage a aussi intégré certaines littératures complètement ignorées ou peu connues jusqu'à ce jour. C'est le cas des littératures de Liberia présentées par Femi Ojo-Ade et celles en Espagnol présentées par Annette Dunzo. On pourrait citer également le chapitre par Bernard Mourais consacré aux origines du théâtre francophone avec l'École William Pony. L'article de Clive Wake sur Madagascar souligne la place que le hain-teny, genre traditionnel malgache, occupe dans la littérature malgache moderne.

Les chapitres consacrés à l'Afrique du Sud présentent comme une production nationale les œuvres d'écrivains noirs et blancs écrites en Africains (par A.J. Getzee, Tim Couzens et Stephan Gray) ou en Anglais (par Michel Wade). Ces chapitres illustrent particulièrement bien le rapport qui existe entre le mouvement de l'Histoire en Afrique du Sud et la production littéraire de ce pays. La contribution de Martin Stein sur la Négritude retrace les origines bien connues de la Négritude. Plus intéressante est la description du climat intellectuel et idéologique à l'époque: les rapports des intellectuels africains avec le Parti Communiste. Ceci montre que la *Lettre à Maurice Thorez* de Aimé Césaire ne représentait pas un problème individuel: plusieurs intellectuels noirs de l'époque ont dû affronter. L'article de Manuel Ferreira sur la poésie militante en Portugais

mérite aussi d'être signalé ainsi que les articles de Kadima-Nzui, Fernando Lambert et Albert Gérard consacrés aux maisons d'édition en Afrique: au Zaïre, au Cameroun et au Sénégal. Le chapitre IX est totalement consacré au Nigeria et il est suivi de deux autres chapitres consacrés aux pays anglophones de l'Ouest et de l'Est. L'intérêt de ces chapitres réside surtout dans la présentation des littératures moins connues comme celles de la Sierra Leone, de la Gambie, de la Zambie, du Malawi et de la Somalie.

La dernière partie de l'ouvrage est un heureux complément qui, en adoptant un point de vue comparatiste, permet de relativiser les différences géographiques, linguistiques et chronologiques. L'article de Janis Mayes sur l'emploi de l'ironie au Cameroun et au Nigeria, de même que la contribution de Gerald Moore comparant l'Afrique subsaharienne au Maghreb, méritent une mention spéciale à cause de l'attention particulière que les deux auteurs accordent à l'aspect formel: techniques narratives, ton, style, instance narrative, symbolisme. On pourrait signaler également le dernier chapitre consacré à la recherche dans les pays socialistes. Depuis *Des Africanistes russes parlent de l'Afrique*, l'Afrique et l'Europe Occidentale se sont peu ou pas intéressées à ce qui se fait en Europe de l'Est. On retrouve dans les articles de Vladimir Klima et Elena Riazova les noms connus de chercheurs comme Jamila Ortova et Peter Galperina, mais aussi une vue générale des travaux sur les littératures africaines. Cette inclusion des travaux en provenance des pays socialistes est une occasion pour rappeler l'importance historique de la Conférence de Tachkent et celle de la Havane pour les écrivains du Tiers-Monde.

L'ouvrage édité par Albert Gérard soulève plusieurs questions. La plus importante peut-être est celle de la difficulté que posent une classification et une périodisation des littératures africaines en langues européennes. Bien que l'éditeur général de cet ouvrage ait bien défini ses paramètres dans l'introduction, la difficulté d'une classification demeure bien visible dans la répartition des matières entre les différents chapitres. Par exemple, il est étonnant de retrouver Madagascar et les territoires belges dans le chapitre 2 consacré à l'Afrique de l'Ouest. Par ailleurs, le chapitre 3 consacré à l'Afrique du Sud, dans la section post Deuxième Guerre Mondiale, intègre la littérature blanche en Anglais et en Afrikaans. Mais la littérature noire est exclue de ce chapitre pour être intégrée plus loin dans le chapitre 7 consacré à la littérature de protestation en dehors de l'Afrique francophone. À part Madagascar, les autres îles de l'Océan Indien: les Comores, la Réunion, les Seychelles, l'île Maurice (sauf une demi-page consacrée à Edouard Maunick),... sont complètement absentes. Par ailleurs, l'éditeur n'a pas estimé utile d'inclure dans l'ouvrage l'Afrique du Nord. Les différences raciales et culturelles entre le Maghreb et l'Afrique subsaharienne seraient-

elles plus grandes que celles entre cette Afrique et l'Afrique du Sud blanche? Diminueraient-elles pour autant leur similitude dans l'expérience coloniale et l'assimilation culturelle? En quoi les préoccupations des colons Boers en Afrique du Sud seraient-elles plus proches de celles de l'Afrique noire subsaharienne?

Une autre question, mineure sans doute, est celle du rapport entre titre et contenu. Par exemple, dans le chapitre 8, l'article de Adele King est intitulé 'Développement du roman.' Mais sa présentation consiste en de brefs résumés des oeuvres, sans vraiment dire ou montrer en quoi consiste ce développement: est-ce dans les thèmes, les techniques ou l'écriture? Dans le même chapitre Ngandu Nkashama présente 'l'Âge d'Or' sans dire ce qui pourrait caractériser cette période comme un âge d'or. Une troisième question est celle des littératures nationales en Afrique. Certains chapitres sont basés sur un critère national, ainsi les chapitres 9, 10 et 11. S'agit-il là de littératures nationales? Que recouvre le terme national dans ce cas? Les limites géographiques des états actuels suffisent-elles à identifier les littératures produites dans ces limites comme nationales? Une quatrième question concerne le concept même d'une histoire littéraire. L'éditeur général a essayé de garder à l'ouvrage son unité: c'est ainsi qu'il introduit souvent ses commentaires (différents) au début des chapitres, maintenant ainsi une sorte de fil d'Ariane à travers tout l'ouvrage. Sans ces commentaires, on a parfois l'impression que certaines contributions sont quelque peu hors contexte. Cette quatrième question mène à une dernière qui est plutôt d'ordre méthodologique: dans les limites fixes des programmes académiques et de l'organisation des semestres académiques comment enseigner et quels auteurs enseigner? L'éternelle question de la forme et du contenu surgit ici. En effet bon nombre de contributions n'abordent guère l'aspect formel des oeuvres présentées, et tout en reconnaissant l'utilité des contextes socio-historiques, on a parfois l'impression que l'aspect littéraire des oeuvres est submergé par l'histoire et la sociologie. En outre, il semble que dans cette Histoire, la production littéraire de tous les auteurs soit égale: rien n'indique les écrivains importants ni ce qui, d'une certaine manière, rendrait un écrivain important et justifierait ainsi la place qu'il occuperait dans une histoire des littératures africaines.

Il va sans dire que les questions que l'ouvrage suscite sont précisément en fonction de l'intérêt qu'il présente et elles soulignent en même temps les mérites de cet ouvrage. Cet ouvrage consacré aux littératures de l'Afrique subsaharienne est tout aussi impressionnant que ceux qui l'ont précédé, entre autres par la mine d'informations qu'il fournit. En plus des oeuvres littéraires présentées, chaque chapitre est accompagné d'une abondante bibliographie, complétée par tout un chapitre final de bibliographie générale

comprehensive history of the literary relations between these two countries, Patrick O'Neill's *Ireland and Germany* is a chronological survey of the influence and reception of Irish literature in Germany and German literature in Ireland from the early Middle Ages to the twentieth century. Certain segments of the story have been told before, most notably by John Hennig whose work is credited by O'Neill with having first stimulated his own interest in the subject and who, in O'Neill's words, 'to all intents and purposes created the field of Irish-German literary relations.' With the exception of an early (1950) paper which surveys German-Irish cultural contacts from the eighth century to the nineteenth (some seventy percent of which is devoted to exchanges before the age of Goethe), however, most of Hennig's work takes the form of that kind of traditional reception-study which is principally concerned with the origins and development of national images and stereotypes. It has thus remained for O'Neill, a Canadian Germanist trained in Ireland, to both flesh out the rest of the story in a chronological sense and to trace the complex interplay of texts and forces which have, over the years, left an imprint on one side or the other of this longstanding elective affinity. In pursuing his twofold purpose, moreover, O'Neill remains keenly aware of the methodological issues involved in presenting an account of international literary influence and reception. But he recognizes at the same time that the materials for such an account are also imbedded in a geocultural context that has too often been slighted in our hurry to pay due respect to the intertextuality of the works themselves (or, in the case of some major twentieth century Anglo-Irish authors, to their so-called 'extraterritoriality'). And just as he is aware of the fact that the bare enumeration of citations and the other 'data' of conventional reception-study does not necessarily enlighten us — indeed, might even mislead us — about the *Rezeption* (in the more current, Jassian sense of the term) of a literary text or group of texts, O'Neill also knows that someone must first establish, muster and organize whatever 'facts' there may be so that others can — or can choose not to — build upon them whatever scholarly or critical edifices they wish to. He asks for the reader's understanding in this: his book 'consciously retains a nineteenth-century methodology,' O'Neill says, because no other approach seemed as useful or as fitting to an account essentially being set forth for the first time. His point is well taken. In the interests of providing a comprehensive overview of the Irish-German relationship, finally, O'Neill seems willing to incur the displeasure of purists: 'Irish' in his title refers to anyone and anything (including the great Anglo-Irish works) which has 'a substantial connection with Ireland,' and 'literary' is used, in 'an elastic sense,' to include such things as travel literature, memoirs and popular fiction. Given the current

paradigms of literary historiography (which have mostly moved beyond a purely belletristic conception of their subject), few would quarrel with the latter choice. And there is really hardly a better way to come to grips with the entire 'Anglo-Irish question' than by viewing Irish literature in the mirror of its reception and resonance abroad.

O'Neill has divided his history of the Irish-German relationship into four sections, and these themselves already reveal a good deal about the course of that relationship: Part One is entitled simply 'The First Thousand Years,' and it covers, in thirty pages, what could be called the prehistory of the relationship, from the departure of Irish missionaries for Merovingian Gaul in the sixth century to the state of affairs in 1700. Part Two is devoted entirely to the eighteenth century (forty pages), Part Three to the nineteenth (seventy-four pages) and Part Four to the twentieth century (106 pages). Part Two ('The Eighteenth Century'), however, is subdivided into discussions of the German literary impact on Ireland and the Irish literary impact on Germany (O'Neill's use of 'impact' seems to be his way of getting around the inherent problematics of the term 'influence'). This kind of 'directional' division is not uncommon in studies of reciprocal international literary relations (it is used, for example, in Horst Oppe's standard *Englisch-deutsche Literaturbeziehungen*), and it may perhaps be the most manageable way of presenting a truly bifocal account of this kind. But Parts Three and Four are subdivided even further, with sections on the 'impact' of one country on the literature of the other alternating with successive sections on the reception of one country's literature in the other. It is a tidy scheme for arranging the materials of a chronological survey, but it masks the fact that most international literary relationships are built up of more elaborate networks of mutual interpenetration and are not so clearly sequential or unidirectional. That caveat aside, O'Neill has gathered a wealth of information into a very compact volume. For those who are interested in German reactions to Swift or Beckett, Irish reactions to Goethe or Brecht, for those who are interested in the various 'poetic' uses German poets have made of Ireland, the relevant information is here. For those whose interests in the subject go deeper, the book has a fifth section containing useful appendices, including an important checklist of articles on German literature that appeared in the *Dublin University Magazine*, one of the chief vehicles for the dissemination of German writing (including the pioneering translations of James Clarence Mangan) to the English-speaking world between 1833 and 1850. There are also two useful checklists of German translations of Irish writing, one for the nineteenth and one for the twentieth century, as well as a selective bibliography of secondary works. This reviewer noted only one perhaps significant bibliographical omission, both here and in the extensive

footnotes, and that is Syndy M. Conger's *Matthew G. Lewis, Charles Robert Maturin and the Germans* (1977), a study of one of the important Gothic connections between German and Anglo-Irish literature in the early nineteenth century. Considering the scope and compass of his survey, however, and the amount of material O'Neill has had to master for a project of this sort, he has done a most commendable job.

Apart from its obvious utility as a work of reference and as a fund of suggestive materials for future scholarship, O'Neill's book may serve two other functions: It will — one hopes — once again remind those who study European literary relations that there exist important avenues of international literary and intellectual commerce outside the well-known trade routes, so to speak, of the major European cultural powers. And it will — one also hopes — remind us all of how much can be learned from looking at the self-reflective dimension of one nation's literary fascination with another. For as O'Neill says about the German interest in Ireland in the first half of the twentieth century (in a remark that applies equally to many other parts of his account), many German writers attracted to Irish subjects had their 'eyes firmly fixed less on Ireland than on Germany.' Precisely because of the unique insights that can be gained by viewing two literatures in a bifocal perspective, O'Neill's book deserves a wide audience not only among comparatists, but also among scholars of the two literatures whose mutual attraction forms its subject, for they will arguably have the most to learn from it. (JOHN BOENING, UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO)

ISABELLE PIETTE. *Littérature et musique. Contribution à une orientation théorique 1970-1985*. Namur: Presses Universitaires de Namur 1987. Pp. 127. FB685.00

Comparative arts is a relatively young discipline, and this book is a useful guide to the research which has been done in this field in the last fifteen years. Each of the four chapters is devoted to a cluster of theoretical issues. First the status of the comparative analysis of literature and music is examined. This introductory chapter is followed by a survey of the basic orientations of the scholars who take an interest in this branch of Comparative Literature. A specific field — 'la musique dans la littérature' — is chosen for a detailed treatment, and finally the methodological difficulties of the discipline are summarized.

Being well-versed in both musicology and literary scholarship, the author is remarkably sensitive to the pitfalls of superficial parallels drawn between the two arts. She warns us against 'le danger du dilettantisme' (p. 11), and

insists on the 'besoin d'un vocabulaire adéquat' (p. 5). The irony of things is that her book itself is not quite free from terminological impurities. 'Bien que l'on parle de l'art au singulier, il possède de nombreux modes d'actualisation' (p. 21). Adherents of such a view seem to believe that the difference between the media used in the various arts are of secondary importance. I tend to believe that the most important features of each art are inseparable from their media, but my disagreement with Isabelle Piette's starting hypothesis may be no more than a matter of emphasis.

Her aim is not so much to reveal novel, hitherto unexplored aspects of the interrelations between music and literature, but rather to give us an idea of 'l'état présent de la question.' Although I would prefer a study which has more claims to originality, as a reviewer I cannot blame her for not having performed a task which is clearly beyond the scope of 'ce rapide tour d'horizon' (p. 25). What I miss is not a probing analysis of the broader philosophic implications of the questions raised but a more comprehensive guide to research. C.S. Brown, Ulrich Weisstein, and Steven Paul Scher, the three critics most frequently quoted in this book, are fine Comparative Literature scholars, but if such studies in general aesthetics as Oskar Walzel's *Wechselseitige Erhellung der Künste* (1917) or Étienne Souriau's *La Correspondance des arts* (1947) are also taken into consideration, it is somewhat surprising that the influential works of Susanne K. Langer (*Philosophy in a New Key: A Study in the Symbolism of Reason, Rite and Art*, 1942, *Feeling and Form*, 1953) or Nicolai Hartmann (*Ästhetik*, 1953) are not even mentioned. While several East-European scholars are cited, and in one case an essay published in Hungarian is praised (p. 15), Lukács' two-volume aesthetics, written in German (*Die Eigenart des Ästhetischen*, 1963), is neglected. In view of the fact that semiotics does not seem to appeal to the author, it is noteworthy that in her survey she includes the research done by Nicolas Ruwet and Jean-Jacques Nattiez. Still, I regret that the books of Nelson Goodman are not even listed in the bibliography.

These omissions are of no secondary importance, because the above-mentioned works touch upon issues that are too briefly examined in this book. By way of simple example, let me quote a few words from the first chapter of *Littérature et musique*: 'Sans doute faut-il choisir: parle-t-on de langues ou d'arts? Nous préférons privilégier la composante artistique' (p. 28). I fully sympathize with Isabelle Piette's disapproval of the rigidity of certain linguistic approaches to music, but Goodman's *chef-d'œuvre (Languages of Art: An Approach To a Theory of Symbols, 1968)*, may remind us that the relation between 'language' and art cannot be called a mere dichotomy. Any all-or-nothing proposition would be out of place here. Since literature itself is partly a linguistic phenomenon, it may be somewhat

misleading to speak of 'le choix de la direction musico-littéraire plutôt que musico-linguistique' (p. 29).

Isabelle Piette harbours reservations about the validity of such terms as influence and counterpoint in a comparative study of literature and music. I share her scepticism. What is more, I detect a similar ambiguity in the concepts of program music, thematic research, and quotation, or at least would welcome a theoretical investigation of their nature. Once again, Goodman may be helpful; his comments on verbal, musical and cross-modal quotation are illuminating (*Ways of Worldmaking*, 1978).

The most interesting section of the book is an analysis of the role which three musical forms may play in literature. The illustrations are borrowed from other scholars, and in some cases the vocabulary seems to be dated in the new context. Thus, C.S. Brown's observation that in Joseph Weinheber's *Variationen über eine hölderlinische Ode* 'les trois premières variations se distinguent par leur traitement métrique, les trois suivantes par des modifications de contenu' (p. 62), may be open to question, on account of the ambiguity of the term 'content'. As I see it, some of the remarks on variation are either too general or too specific. If 'identité et différence' are the basis of variation, we may wonder why variation should be regarded as a manifestation of 'la musique dans la littérature'; if *The Ring and the Book* is to be taken as an example, we may have the impression that the difference between the two arts is of fundamental importance: In music, 'theme' is given to perception, whereas in literature it must be constructed by the reader.

As I suggested earlier, the author is aware of the methodological difficulties of the comparative analysis of music and literature. She admits that 'un réel contrepoint est impossible en littérature,' because 'la simultanéité des voix' cannot exist in verbal art (pp. 76-77), and she does not fail to recognize that the tension between the tonic and the dominant — the *sine qua non* of the sonata form — has no equivalent in literature. Strangely enough, she does not stick to these perceptions when summarizing earlier research. She seems to accept J.-L. Cupers' thesis that 'la concentration du matériel' at the end of *Point Counter Point* is analogous to 'la strette musicale qui couronne la fugue' (p. 78), although it is quite possible that the analogy is distant, and the use of musical term in the title of this novel is just as metaphorical as in De Quincey's *Dream-Fugue*. The vocabulary in the analysis of the final section of *The English Mail Coach* is again questionable, as the following statement may suggest: 'le sujet est identifié par son contenu, le contre-sujet par sa forme' (p. 80). If works as different as Huxley's parable and *Todesfuge*, a lyric by Celan, can be called 'fugues

littéraires,' I may be tempted to ask for a more specific definition of the criteria of these comparisons.

All in all, this book has the remarkable merits of a well-documented summary of earlier research, but has a theoretical shortcoming: an almost uncritical acceptance of what some earlier critics have said on the subject. The author pays of high price for her modesty: her argument suffers from the same imprecision of terminology which she herself rightly calls the fundamental weakness of comparative arts. She is not prepared to ask whether the intrinsic nature of the media used by composers and writers, the living quality of sound and the actual texture of language, make it possible to take a structure from music to literature. Whenever she suggests that a poet or novelist has borrowed a technical device from music, my impression is that the similarity is due not so much to the influence of music on literature but rather to the fact that there may be similar structural principles underlying different artistic materials. The analysis of such general modes of syntactic organization may be of greater theoretical value than the research into the musical inspiration of specific works of verbal art. (MIHÁLY SZEGEGY-MASZÁK, EÖTVÖS LORÁND UNIVERSITY)

'ALAIN MONTANDON, éd. E.T.A. Hoffmann et la musique: Actes du colloque international de Clermont-Ferrand. Berne: Peter Lang 1987. No price

These are the proceedings of the international conference on Hoffmann's relations to music, held at the Université de Clermont II in December 1985. The conference, under the auspices of the Centre de recherches révolutionnaires et romantiques of that university, was genuinely interdisciplinary in that it brought together musicologists, musicians and comparatists as well as germanists. And it celebrated, in a sense, two events of real interdisciplinary importance: the appearance, in 1985, of a French translation by Professor Montandon of Hoffmann's *Écrits sur la musique* (Lausanne: L'Âge d'Homme); and two performances of Hoffmann's forgotten opera *Undine*, at the Théâtre de Clermont-Ferrand, as highlight of the conference. This opera is all but unknown to English-speaking audiences. And there is as yet no English translation of Hoffmann's writings on music, which include not only review articles and theoretical pieces, but works of a decidedly literary nature, such as the *Kreisleriana*. Given the growing recognition of Hoffmann as a major figure in the development of modern fiction, both in terms of themes and of forms, this conference should have been a major event in interdisciplinary studies. The papers however, if interesting, are disappointing in this regard.

Hoffmann had an incredibly diverse professional life. As the back of the Goldmann Taschenbücher series tells us, he was 'Kammergerichtsrat, Dichter, Komponist, Musikschriftsteller, Kapellmeister und Musikkritiker.' All of these activities have bearing on what he produced as storyteller. But among them music is dominant. Throughout his creative life Hoffmann returned again and again to one question — the relation of music to words. And to interface forms such as opera, with its need to mediate between instruments and voice, between music and verbal acts, or the musical fable, which mixes fictional and didactic elements, critical analyses of real music with 'fabelhaften Begebenheiten.' Hoffmann, it is true, composed music without words, and wrote stories without music. But where these media interact there is a prime opportunity for interdisciplinary studies to sharpen their methods, even if they must accept as direction Hoffmann's tragic premise that music does not want to become story, but has fallen there and is somehow, impossibly, to be liberated. Interdisciplinary studies must still, in this case, operate within the narrative text. And its focal points are two. First, there is theme. What does the presence of music in a fictive context 'mean' to Hoffmann? What changes does its presence, as subject or motif, bring to the thematic and generic field of fiction? Second, there is structure: what transformations does musical logic effect on narrative logic? And what are the generic implications of these transformations? The way music functions in Hoffmann's narratives has enormous bearing on the nature and development of those fictional forms he is best known for: the fantastic and horror. It is surprising therefore that most of the papers in this volume, though they offer a wealth of information, studiously avoid these questions of the thematic and structural functions of music in Hoffmann's fiction.

In the first section of essays, 'Perspectives générales: l'écriture et le compositeur,' we are promised an analysis of interrelations. What we get falls short of expectations. The lead essay, by Montandon, on 'l'imaginaire de la musique' in Hoffmann is too impressionistic. What he means by 'l'imaginaire,' touched off in the text by the 'presence' of music, is both stylistic devices (synaesthesia and so-called verbal music) and a network of figures and themes. Were these latter to be charted in some coherent fashion, on a grid of 'obsessional metaphors' for instance, then some interesting conclusions might be reached. But that is not the case here.

John Neubauer's essay on 'Die Sprache des Unausgesprochenen' follows. It is a carefully focused stylistic analysis of Hoffmann's review of Beethoven's Fifth Symphony, emphasizing the way in which technical and mystical-romantic language in this text 'unvermittelt nebeneinander liegen.' But we want more daring pursuit of the implications of this fact, and resent being put off by resounding commonplaces like the following: 'Die Musik

kann aber letztlich und paradoxerweise erst im Medium der Sprache über die Sprache gehoben werden.' The third essay, Walter Moser's discussion of 'l'écriture de la musique,' is the most theoretically ambitious in the volume. But again, despite the specific text under our eyes, in this case *Ritter Gluck*, the theory seems less to direct than deflect analysis. Moser deploys the Barthesian arsenal in order to come to rest on this bit of logic chopping: 'l'épisode final du "Chevalier Gluck" suggère que la seule solution logique à l'impossibilité de l'écriture sur la musique consistait à thématiser négativement l'écriture de la musique à l'intérieur du texte littéraire.' Hoffmann's brilliantly elusive story is laid in the Procrustean bed of 'modernity,' becoming no more than a chapter in the inexorable triumph of graphocentrism over the phonocentrism that is previously seen to dominate our culture. The final piece in the section, by Jean-Louis Jam, is the least pretentious and most insightful. It veers off into interesting asides, such as a discussion of Hoffmann's ironic use of legal rhetoric in his rendering of musical judgments. But such strands remain, in a Hoffmannesque sense, höchst zerstreute Gedanken.'

The next two sections, on Hoffmann as music critic and Hoffmann as composer, offer some interesting factual perspectives, but again little attempt to raise larger interdisciplinary issues. The musical Rezension, like the short story, is another traditional form of discourse that Hoffmann, writing both as musician and poet, transformed from within. The topics dealt with in these essays — such as Michael Walter's long discussion of Hoffmann's relation to Spontini, both as translator and critic — could have shed light on this transformatory process, but do not. And the particularity of focus is even more visible in the section on Hoffmann's compositions. Here one finds essays, such as Dieter Krickeberg's on the instrumentation of *Undine*, or Michael Almond's on Hoffmann's piano sonatas, that display the very problem Hoffmann faced head-on in his writing about music: the technical analysis, with the aid of printed excerpts from scores, is precise; but attempts to transcribe notes into descriptive adjectives seems to fall into impressionism and cliché. This is seen in the number of times these essayists, when seeking to describe the 'aesthetic effect' of the music they analyse, use the word 'romantic.' This is incantation, not analysis.

The section that follows, 'musique et écriture,' should be the heart of the matter, but (revealing the occasional organization of the essays) offers pieces indistinguishable in method and approach from those of the first section. The long essay of Jean Giraud for example, called 'Éléments musicaux dans l'œuvre littéraire d'E.T.A. Hoffmann' on the title page, is rebaptized at the top of each succeeding page 'Structures musicales.' Yet it remains a rather loose compendium of undigested 'elements': first of examples of 'musicalité

de la langue,' then (using the famous 'découpe' method) of apparent structural calques, such as the ternary song form, A-B-A, said to underlie the three introductory letters of 'Der Sandmann.' Among these essays there is a very good analysis of 'Rat Krespel' by Jean-Charles Margotton, with significant remarks on the architectural metaphor that begins that story and its relation to spatial conceptions of music in Hoffmann's time and the need of such music (and musical structure) to locate what is otherwise unlocatable — in other words, to 'say' the unsayable. And there are real lost opportunities, such as Françoise Ferlan's discussion of the Undine theme. She promises an interesting perspective: how a literary theme, through Hoffmann's adaptation of Fouqué's text, becomes an operatic structure, how it functions to shape a work in a medium that, by its very nature, demands synthesis between the logic of narrative and the logic of music. But again, the essay avoids the responsibility of a clear focus on this problem by abdicating in favour of facile Jungian analysis, or by deferring to such undefined touchstones as the 'romantic' or 'fantastic.'

I like conference proceedings like this one, for they offer an anatomy of what is going on in a particular field. Indeed, the Clermont conference is, in the richness of its materials, state-of-the-art. In two areas in fact: Hoffmann studies, and the study of interrelations between music and literature. And it is here, in its apparent lack of coordination between these two areas, that these proceedings are most symptomatic.

The final section of essays in this volume, for example, returns to a classic comparative question: the 'fortunes' of Hoffmann in France. Hermann Hofer reveals a story by Champfleury, 'Le chien des musiciens,' in which Hoffmann appears in the role of musician. This story was overlooked by Elizabeth Teichmann, but not the Jules Janin story, 'Kreysler,' which he describes at length.

The question of course is why the French were so fascinated with Hoffmann, and with Hoffmann the musician. Pierre Brunel, in his essay on the Hoffmannesque 'temptation' in Balzac, cites a *Mercur de France* article that refers to this influence, in 1830, as a 'contagion.' Given the disease metaphor, it is significant that eight years later in *Gambara*, Balzac makes Count Andrea play the doctor in order to rid Balzac's world once and for all of the Hoffmannesque musician. What does the painstaking elaboration of this story (the author agonized over its composition, perhaps more than he did for the massive *Illusions perdues*) tell us about the depth of Balzac's reaction to Hoffmann? And what does this deep reaction tell us about the culture for which Balzac was striving to be spokesman? The best Brunel can do is blame all this on Walter Scott's infamous article. But basic problems go unexplored, such as Balzac's ambiguous search for a materialist

'philosophy' in a culture of Cartesian dualism. Would not, in this context, Hoffmann's music and his fantastic come to be seen as one — as areas of something otherworldly, operating in the midst of the material, yet something otherwise resistant to assimilation by it? In a sense, all of these essays show a reluctance to take up more troubling questions, preferring to remain within more comfortable parameters, such as those of the old 'orientations étrangères,' where cultures as here can gesture toward each other without fearing to lose their national identities.

In light of recent theoretical investigations, on an international scale, into the nature of fantasy and the fantastic, Hoffmann studies as represented in this volume seem to have stood still. Hoffmann's stories and novels of music and musicians are surely the classical sources for this genre. And Hoffmann's fascination with music as a 'language' is an important determinant in the modality of fantasy. Yet in no essay in this volume do we have reference to the work of Todorov, or Rabin, or Scholes, or Jameson. They have provided the theoretical beginnings for a study of Hoffmann's literary use of music, of Balzac's reaction to that use, and to the place this intercultural dialogue holds in the development of a modern fantastic that dominates the narratives of today. Nor do we have in any essay a single reference to the pioneering interdisciplinary work of Jean-Pierre Barricelli, who in his recent *Melopoesis* suggests that music is not simply analogous to, but perhaps equivalent with, the demonic and the fantastic. If Hoffmann is the writer to whom the origin of these forms or modes is most often traced, then the music that plays such a large role in his works must be a key factor in shaping them. A part of this Hoffmannesque music is of course, as this volume amply shows, conditioned by its time and place. Yet another part, like that spirit of music that informs *Ritter Gluck*, escapes from these boundaries to inhabit, and irreversibly transform, the domain of prose narrative, deflecting it from description of a single assumed reality to superposition of multiple realities in a same 'text.' More than a reversion to phonocentrism in a graphocentric world, Hoffmann's fictive music defies the very idea of centring, and as such releases that narrative Proteus we see operating in the modern forms of fantasy, horror, even science fiction. These are truly international forms, and via Poe and the Russian Hoffmannists, Hoffmann's international legacy. A pity this international gathering of specialists and disciplines did not touch upon it. (GEORGE SLUSSER, UC RIVERSIDE)

JEANNE-MARIE CLERC. *Le cinéma, témoin de l'imaginaire dans le roman français contemporain. Écriture du visuel et transformation d'une culture.* Publications Universitaires Européennes. Série XVIII, Littérature comparée,

Vol. 35. Bern, Frankfurt am Main, Nancy, New York: Peter Lang 1984. Pp. 472. FS87.00

JEANNE-MARIE CLERC. *Écrivains et cinéma. Des mots aux images, des images aux mots: adaptations et ciné-romans*. Metz: Presses Universitaires de Metz 1985. Pp. 347. Sans prix

Ces deux ouvrages constituent un apport majeur à l'étude de l'influence du cinéma sur le roman français contemporain. Ils poursuivent les quelques travaux déjà existents dans ce domaine relativement peu exploré de la littérature comparée. De plus, ils présentent une analyse de l'évolution des mentalités et de l'imaginaire contemporain, car le roman serait le témoin privilégié d'une métamorphose culturelle due à l'invasion des technologies visuelles. Bien que publiés chez des éditeurs différents, ces deux épais volumes sont étroitement liés: le premier explore un vaste corpus de plus de deux cents romans pour y révéler l'influence capitale du cinéma sur la thématique et les techniques narratives du récit contemporain, montrant comment celui-ci reflète une véritable mutation de notre perception du réel; le second s'attache à une analyse des rapports entre l'écriture et le cinéma, à travers d'autres textes jusqu'ici bien négligés par les comparatistes: scénarios adaptés de romans, scénarios inédits et ciné-romans.

L'envergure de ce travail dont la lecture s'impose à tous les chercheurs s'intéressant à ce domaine, rend impossible un compte-rendu exhaustif. Malheureusement, bien que les éditions Peter Lang (Série Publications Universitaires Européennes) aient maintenant une succursale à New York, il semble que ces deux livres n'aient reçu, en Amérique du Nord, ni la diffusion ni la publicité qu'ils méritent.

La première partie du *Cinéma, témoin de l'imaginaire dans le roman français contemporain* montre à quel point, non seulement le cinéma mais aussi la télévision, la photographie et les affiches font partie de la thématique des récits français modernes que révèlent ainsi combien notre perception du réel a été transformée par la civilisation de l'image, et ceci en dépit de l'attitude de mépris vis-à-vis de ces technologies, adoptée par de nombreux romanciers. Pour Jeanne-Marie Clerc, le règne de l'image est avant tout, celui du reflet égarant et de l'illusion qui provoquent une adhésion obscure et viscérale chez le spectateur fasciné. Ces brouillages subversifs de la perception modifient profondément les conventions de l'écriture réaliste: 'La platitude de la représentation, la non-fonctionnalité des objets, l'absence d'ordonnance logique de l'espace subvertissent les codes distanciateurs qui régissaient l'exercice du regard dans le roman réaliste. Un monde en perpétuel déséquilibre, toujours ouvert sur l'inattendu se substitue à l'édifice concerté de l'univers romanesque issu de Balzac' (p. 151).

L'auteur aborde ensuite l'influence des techniques et du code cinématographiques sur les procédés romanesques de narration; parmi ceux-ci des aspects comme le montage ou l'effacement du narrateur qui avaient déjà été analysés par Claude-Edmonde Magny (*L'Âge du roman américain*, Paris: Seuil 1948) et d'autres. Mais Clerc insiste sur l'effet particulièrement déjouant de ces techniques dans le roman, car elles suppriment la continuité logique du récit et elles éliminent la fonction commentative et organisatrice du narrateur.

À la différence de ses prédécesseurs, Jeanne-Marie Clerc ne cesse donc de souligner les contrastes entre les deux média, montrant combien certains procédés cinématographiques vont à 'contre-courant' du récit naturel et contribuent à cette incertitude, cette interrogation sur le réel qui caractérisent tant de romans contemporains. Alors que C.-E. Magny et ses épigones avaient vu l'influence du cinéma uniquement dans le roman épigonal, aspirant à un réalisme brut, proche de la phénoménologie behavioriste, Clerc associe au contraire le cinéma avec existentielle des années quarante, Clerc associe au contraire le cinéma avec la perception d'un monde évanescant où tout n'est qu'illusion et apparence et où l'individu contemporain se trouve environné de doubles illusoirs le privant de sa position centrale d'ordonnateur du monde' (p. 268).

On ne peut ici que résumer les lignes directrices de l'argumentation; celle-ci tire cependant sa force et son pouvoir de conviction de la richesse et de la diversité des aspects spécifiques de l'analyse abondamment illustrée par des exemples. Seule nous paraît sujette à caution la présentation du corpus. Les limites chronologiques semblent mouvantes, tantôt 1925-65, tantôt 25-70, ou encore 25-55. Les critères de sélection ne sont pas assez expliqués: s'agit-il d'un choix 'purement aléatoire'? ou bien a-t-on parfois utilisé d'autres critères: 'représentativité' ou consécration ('prix littéraires')? Une liste des romans constituant le corpus permettrait aux lecteurs de mieux juger de l'importance de la pénétration du cinéma, une des thèses principales de cet ouvrage. On s'interroge en effet sur la différence apparente entre le nombre de romans consultés et le nombre de romans cités. La question de la sélection est également importante puisque cette étude prétend montrer l'influence *globale* du cinéma sur le roman, sans distinction d'école, ni de qualité. On manque de données précises pour porter un jugement mais notre impression générale est que le roman 'populaire' est beaucoup moins cité que le 'Nouveau Roman.' (Il faut cependant faire exception pour le ciné-roman, genre populaire par excellence, analysé en détails dans le deuxième livre.) Ainsi, la thématique et les techniques de 'l'illusion égarante,' inspirées par la technologie de l'image, ont-elles peut-être un effet plus limité que cette étude ne le suggère. Parmi les livres cités, ce sont les Nouveaux Romanciers qui, comme on s'y

attendait, se taillent la part du lion. À leur propos, l'analyse de Jeanne Marie Clerc écarte certains lieux communs de la critique. Elle met en question les notions rebattues d'autonomie et de non-référentialité du texte, pour montrer que le Nouveau Roman est au contraire en prise directe sur notre perception de la réalité mais une perception inquiète et égarée, profondément influencée par la révolution de la civilisation de l'image. On peut regretter que l'analyse des deux romans distingués par l'auteure comme les plus intéressants et les plus représentatifs: *Été indien* de Claude Ollier et *Thryque* de Claude Simon ne soit pas un peu plus développée et surtout qu'elle ne saisisse pas mieux ces œuvres dans leur totalité, parce qu'elle est trop éparpillée dans différentes rubriques.

Alors que la première partie présente une analyse convaincante et fouillée de la place et du rôle des technologies iconiques (cinéma, photographie, télévision) dans le romanesque contemporain et montre leurs répercussions sur l'écriture et les problèmes narratifs, une deuxième partie situe cette étude dans le contexte plus large d'une culture où le visuel moderne retentit profondément sur la transformation des structures imaginaires: le roman serait le témoin privilégié de cette métamorphose. L'entreprise, on le voit, est vaste et ambitieuse. L'auteure ne cherche pas à imposer une théorie. Elle admet volontiers qu'il s'agit d'hypothèses liées à une vaste interrogation de la culture. Cette partie est extrêmement intéressante et stimulante. Elle nous mène d'abord à travers un survol forcément assez rapide de la transformation des rapports entre réalité et imaginaire, dûe à l'apparition de l'esprit scientifique et du progrès technologique, à partir de l'époque de la Renaissance. Dans le cas des techniques iconiques de représentation du réel, il s'est produit un curieux retournement: bien que leur avènement soit dû au progrès scientifique, elles engendrent une image de l'univers qui va à l'encontre des représentations positivistes; elles présentent un monde non plus abstrait mais sensoriellement présent dans son absence même et plongeant ses racines aux sources les plus profondes de l'imaginaire chez le spectateur fasciné (p. 378). La 'culture de l'image' ferait donc appel à une perception de monde diamétralement opposée à l'appréhension logique de la pensée cartésienne. Par son médium (le langage), le roman relèverait essentiellement de celle-ci (un postulat de l'auteure que nous trouvons certainement discutable) mais dans son désir d'imiter la représentation du réel propre aux techniques iconiques, le récit contemporain deviendrait alors le terrain privilégié d'une lutte entre imaginaire et pensée, illusion et 'réalisme traditionnel' qui correspond à l'opposition entre les images et les mots. Le roman devient ainsi, à son tour, un terrain fertile à l'irruption de l'imaginaire nocturne (cf.

G. Durand, *Les structures anthropologiques de l'imaginaire*), longtemps étouffé par la pensée cartésienne.

On voit à quel point cette étude se distingue des analyses précédentes comme celle de Claude-Edmonde Magny ou de Bruce Morrissette qui étaient engagés dans l'impasse d'un rapprochement souvent aléatoire entre techniques romanesques et techniques cinématographiques, rapprochements souvent fondés sur de simples métaphores comme par exemple, les concepts de montage ou de focalisation. Le livre de Jeanne-Marie Clerc, tout en montrant l'influence profonde du cinéma sur le roman, tient compte des différences irréductibles entre les deux média et montre à quel point chacun à sa façon de découper et de dire le monde. À notre avis, elle souscrit cependant à une opposition un peu simpliste entre le langage (et par conséquent, le roman), domaine par essence, de la raison et les images (et par conséquent, le cinéma), domaine par essence, de l'irrationnel. Or on sait bien que le langage n'est pas seulement l'instrument de la raison. D'autre part, le cinéma peut exploiter d'autres réactions que l'adhésion magique du spectateur. Alors que Jeanne-Marie Clerc privilégie les romans de type 'avant-garde', elle semble laisser de côté tous les films (de type expérimental) qui encouragent délibérément la distanciation.

On se méfiera peut-être de l'envergure d'un projet qui aspire à saisir dans leur totalité, des domaines aussi complexes que la culture ou l'imaginaire. Mais l'orientation générale de ce travail correspond à une rupture délibérée avec le formalisme inspiré de la linguistique et de la sémiotique qui exclut volontairement l'étude des rapports entre l'œuvre et son référent, sous prétexte de rigueur scientifique. Jeanne-Marie Clerc trouve plutôt son inspiration chez les anthropologues culturels comme Gilbert Durand ou les philosophes comme Gilles Deleuze et ses travaux sur le simulacre et l'illusion.

Il faut saluer le courage et l'intérêt du *Cinéma dans l'imaginaire contemporain* qui, on l'espère, stimulera d'autres travaux de littérature comparée du même calibre. Ce livre abandonne le champ souvent fort étroit et élitiste d'études comparatives qui refusent de s'intéresser à d'autres domaines que les arts traditionnels, ou qui s'enferment dans une érudition ou un formalisme trop étroit. Le travail de Jeanne-Marie Clerc conjugue une recherche minutieuse et approfondie avec une interprétation stimulante et convaincante d'aspects importants de la culture et de l'imaginaire contemporain.

Si certains esprits terre-à-terre ont ressenti quelque vertige devant les spéculations de la deuxième partie du premier livre, ils trouveront rassurantes les analyses plus concrètes du deuxième ouvrage: *Écrivains et cinéma. Des mots aux images, des images aux mots: adaptations et ciné-*

romans. Celui-ci élargit le champ des écrits où on peut explorer les rapports entre les images et les mots, en s'intéressant aux scénarios et à ces textes de facture tout à fait inédite que sont les ciné-romans.

La première partie étudie le parcours des 'mots aux images' à travers le travail d'adaptation par certains romanciers, de leurs propres romans pour l'écran et présentent une étude détaillée des scénarios et des films de Malraux, Cocteau et Giono. L'oeuvre cinématographique de ce dernier est très peu connue et il est fascinant de suivre, chez ce grand écrivain, l'apprentissage progressif de la spécificité filmique. La caméra force Malraux, Cocteau et Giono à dire d'autres choses que dans leurs romans; l'image rejoint les sources profondes du mythe en ce que si elle véhicule avec elle des normes d'explication du monde, celles-ci sont beaucoup plus vastes, mouvantes et ambiguës que les significations symboliques portées par le langage' (p. 108). On voit que le deuxième volume reprend les mêmes conceptions générales que le premier, au sujet de l'opposition entre langue et images.

Dans la deuxième partie, on suit le parcours inverse: des images aux mots, à travers l'étude des ciné-romans, racontant un film réel ou imaginaire, des scénarios qui ne sont pas des adaptations (avec une analyse détaillée des scénarios de Sartre et de ses rapports avec le cinéma), des ciné-romans de Robbe-Grillet et enfin, un chapitre montrant l'influence d'Alain Resnais sur les romanciers-scénaristes qui ont collaboré avec lui, en particulier Marguerite Duras. Un des thèmes-clés du premier volume apparaît dans cette partie: le visuel dans l'écriture n'est plus caution d'authenticité, comme aux beaux jours du réalisme mais est au contraire 'un ferment de la démultiplication de l'illusion.' Le chapitre sur Sartre et le cinéma, qui aborde un aspect important mais négligé de son oeuvre, montre bien comment sa théorie du regard comme adhésion au monde plutôt que moyen de distanciation, coïncide avec une perception caractéristiquement cinématographique. L'analyse des ciné-romans de Robbe-Grillet insiste sur l'exploitation maximum de ces images plates que sont les stéréotypes de la représentation collective. Les textes hybrides de Marguerite Duras représentent l'ultime témoignage de l'expérience iconique du monde 'repris par l'imaginaire et le fantasme, qui ne peut plus être montré mais dit dans les oscillations d'une parole incertaine, dans les hésitations de retlets brisés' (p. 310). Ainsi, la boucle est bouclée, ce sont les mots, et non plus les images qui deviennent les témoins privilégiés du manque et du non-dit.

Bref, il existe entre les deux livres une cohérence remarquable, en dépit de la diversité et de l'ampleur du corpus. Un matériau très riche s'organise avec une grande clarté. La lecture de ces ouvrages est encore facilitée par l'aisance et la clarté du style. On peut seulement regretter qu'une étude aussi

savante ne comporte pas l'appareil habituel d'une édition universitaire: une bibliographie contenant la liste de tous les ouvrages consultés, primaires et secondaires et un index, pas seulement des titres et des auteurs mais aussi des concepts-clés. Tout en reconnaissant les exigences pratiques qui obligent à circonscrire le corpus, on peut se demander si, étant donné le sujet, il n'est pas un peu dommage de se limiter au cadre d'une littérature nationale. Une analyse des mêmes phénomènes au-delà des frontières de l'hexagone compléterait utilement le travail magistral de Jeanne-Marie Clerc qui marque un véritable tournant dans l'étude comparée du roman et du cinéma. (JACQUELINE VISWANATHAN, SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY)

DAVID BEVAN, ed. *Literary Gastronomy*. Amsterdam: Rodopi 1988.

If there is anything that academics like more than food, it is talking about food. Hence one is surprised that it has taken so long for scholars to study food in literature. Food in anthropology, of course, is a different matter. Levi-Strauss largely built his career — and a good deal of structuralism — around eating and the social organizations and rituals that are the panoply of this commonplace physical act. The study of mythology, for Levi-Strauss, is hardly separable, in practice, from the study of eating. Barthes brought this interest into the area of contemporary culture and what may be called power poetics. *Le plaisir du texte* has much in common with *le plaisir de la table*: eating a meal and reading a poem appear to have certain symmetries. Poe for example found that a genuine poem must be something that could be read 'at one sitting' — his model being, it would seem, a good meal: 'Phagos/Logos,' in the phrase of James Brown cited by the editor of *Literary Gastronomy* (p. 3). But literary scholars have at last begun to be interested, as the appearance of several volumes indicates, including the Rodopi collection of essays *Literary Gastronomy* edited by David Bevan, an issue of essays put out by *Dalhousie French Studies*, the special issue of *Mosaic* on food and eating (forthcoming), and the forthcoming collection of essays *The Power of Self: Eating Disorders in Literature* edited by comparatist Lilian Furst.

One boundary of the symbolism of food in literature is the area of eating disorders and fasting — the primary focus of Professor Furst's volume — anorexia being the subject of intense current interest, especially for historians and feminists, but also for students of psychology and medicine. The theme of fasting is the subject of an essay in the Rodopi volume: J. M. Koetzee's *Michael K: Starving in a Land of Plenty* by Luc Renders, which explicates the power relations involved in food and eating, ultimately in

human dependence on earth and its bounty — not on a hierarchical structure of social relations that control and manipulate the consumption of food. A similar point emerges in a feminist context in what is perhaps the best essay in the volume, Eira Patnaik's 'The Succulent Gender: Eat Her Softly.' Patnaik analyzes the power symbolism of women visualized as edible objects in a number of texts, notably Atwood's *The Edible Woman*. In Atwood's novel anorexia acts as a struggle against unjust power relations, specifically male control of women — and of false ideas in control of individual consciousness.

Atwood herself is represented in the volume by her introduction to *The Canlit Foodbook*. Atwood articulates the idea that underlies all the essays in the collection: 'Eating is our earliest metaphor, preceding our consciousness of gender difference, race, nationality and language. We eat before we talk' (p. 53). Food and eating are, in short, the basic experience of life. Until recent times, human activity was in essence finding, producing, and consuming enough food. Eating is not only essential, but also preoccupying: a recurring focus of consciousness from day to day and year to year, for everybody without exception. Nothing is more basic. Given its primacy, food is a natural topic of investigation in literature, where it has, as one might expect, an immense range of functions and meanings. No complex of symbolism is more overtly determined.

Literary Gastronomy is a survey of the way different writers use food/eating symbolism — Günter Grass ('Food Poisoning, Cooking and Historiography' by Noel Thomas); Crews, Burroughs and Pynchon ('Fast Food/Quick Lunch' by Sanford Ames); Virginia Woolf ('*Boeuf en Daube*' by Bettina Knapp); Vargas Llosa ('Freudian Gastronomy' by Roy Boland); Margaret Laurence ('Culinary Revelations' by Mary Anne Schofield); Tournier ('Reverberations of Eating Each Other' by David Bevan). Humour and puns are *de rigueur* in treating such a topic; the essays are entertaining, often witty. Critics dealing with this subject find food puns almost irresistible — a fact that soon becomes irritating or, worse, distracting. The danger is that indulging in such word-play implies that the subject is not really a serious one. The writers mostly resist the temptation to overindulge, as it were, in punning for the sake of punning. The real problem with this volume — perhaps it is inherent in the form (a collection of papers originally given at a conference) — is that there is no underlying analysis. The volume remains eclectic: interesting, varied, occasionally surprising, but the absence of theoretical discussion disappoints.

By theoretical discussion I do not mean a Derridean or even Barthesian discourse. I mean rather some speculation about what food symbolism reveals as an illustration of the logic of imagination. For example, it seems

clear that in some way eating and being eaten are symbolically the same act. If one eats, one day one will be eaten. Eating is a metonym for being alive — for living itself. But this living has a specific context: it is life, not in the world of immortals (who do not need to eat as we do), but in the world of 'force,' to borrow Simone Weil's term, the world where living, eating, killing, and being killed are all in metaphorical alignment.

For instance, this eater/eaten metaphor is one of the ideas that inform anorexia. Thus, if one stops eating, one will not be eaten: one will, that is, exit from the world of the lifecycle of mutability and mortality with its pain, killing, cruelty, injustice, and nausea. Eating is hardly separable from killing — as is obviously true in the case of eating flesh. The sense that eating/living is really killing has great imaginative resonance in Western culture. It is an essential metaphor of alienation. A memorable passage of Goethe's *Die Leiden des jungen Werthers* is an appalling meditation on life as a devouring monster: the earliest, I believe, to use the symbolism of predatory eating as a metaphor for the horror and meaninglessness of existence — but a common metaphor in subsequent culture.

What we are dealing with in the subject of food in literature is not some *divertissement* — a matter of minor or peripheral importance compared to High Theory — but something central to culture, to literature — and hence to literary theory itself. *Literary Gastronomy* points to this importance, but does not actually explicate it. (MERYVN NICHOLSON, CARIBOO UNIVERSITY COLLEGE)

JEAN-CLAUDE BONNOT et BÉATRICE FINK, eds. *Aliments et cuisine. Dix-huitième siècle*. No. 15. Paris: Garnier Frères 1983. Pp. 210. (568 in total). FF235.00

The editors of this volume deny any possible thematic link to frivolity or to passing fashions. Instead, they justify their enterprise by mentioning the interest in the subject expressed in *l'Encyclopédie* and in the numerous histories of alimentation which critics such as C. Lévi-Strauss, R. Barthes and J.-R. Richard have developed into structural and semiotic studies of a literary and social code. The fifteen articles in the volume are interdisciplinary in nature and are noteworthy for the preponderance of attention they pay to sources not generally considered in 'mainstream' literary studies such as cookbooks, popular literature and manuals. Each highly distinctive article is the result of a unique effort and while they apparently do not fit together in a coherent plan, they do complement each other and constitute a most interesting collection of essays. The major

criticism a reader might offer stems from the extreme specificity of each article. Cook's voyage is not related to other travel literature. The role of nurturing is brought up uniquely in relation to one novelist, while whole genres and decades are missing from the literary and historical perspective, and sources such as journals, memoirs or letters are omitted. The articles lack both editorial uniformity and a certain coherence. Professor La Fon explains, for example, that food is largely absent from novels with a few exceptions, one of these exceptions is that of the libertine novel. Professor Bomel-Rainelli, on the other hand, maintains that food is absent from libertine novels, with the exception of those by Sade. Several authors refer to the absence of French women writers on this subject (in comparison to the presence of numerous English women writers) but they refrain from speculating on the possible reasons for this discrepancy (which piques our curiosity).

The articles can be divided into two categories: firstly, those dealing with the social and popular literary history of cooking and food and, secondly, those treating either the literary and artistic treatment of the theme or the incidence of alimentary symbols or images. In the former category figure Roche, who notes the role of the kitchen in a one-room household and who examines testaments listing kinds of pots and pans as a reflection of the style of cooking; Fink, who traces the changing perceptions of the potato (from an insipid, bilious vegetable to a healthy, tasty tuber) due to the scarcity and cost of wheat, the innovativeness of cooks and the praises of writers; Andries, who relates food to the myth of plenty as reflected in popular literature; Bonnet, who studies cook books and discovers a 'nouvelle cuisine bourgeoise'; the Hymans, who establish the presence and essence of three kinds of regional cooking in 18th-century France: provençale, périgourdine, and flamanche; Lehman, who discusses the popularity of French cooking in England despite the English antipathy to 'things French' as well as the false and unstable basis for the reputation borne by French cooking; Brahimi, who describes Cook's efforts to eliminate alimentary prejudices among his men and who pruned utility and openness to all novel foods in an effort to preserve health; and Cottret, who explores the connection between a holy and healthy life and cooking and charity in the Jansenist schools. Cottret also compares the incorporation of filth in the brews concocted by the *convulsionnaires* with witchcraft.

In the second section, Knabe explores cookery as an art form and Tarczylo examines medical writings which support Christian, moral theology through the metaphor of nutrition. Demoris's nicely developed thesis on Chardin is a Freudian inquiry into the symbolic values of food in the still life genre which depicts almost exclusively the preparation or consumption

of food. Three paintings among those used as evidence, are quite striking: of food, as illustration of the theme of harm done to the maternal body, *La Raie*, as silent memory of the violence inflicted, and *La Bénédicte*, as *Raisseuse*, as silent memory of the violence inflicted, and *La Bénédicte*, as separation through prayer (word) and the mediating presence of the mother with her smile of complicity and understanding. Verry-Moser's brilliant piece recounts LeBrun's Greek dinner, inspired by the publication of Barthélémy's *Le voyage du jeune Anarchis en Grèce* and explains the meal as a manifesto of neo-classical art, as visual nourishment in which the *tableau* of the artist and of the dramatist are united. La Fon describes the transition of food from an ignoble subject fitting neither for a novel nor for a hero/ine's attentions to a symbol of mortality, reality and carnal pleasures. Didier distinguishes food as a sign of fortune and notes the dichotomy in male/female roles as nurturers or consumers of food. Bomel-Rainelli, in discussing Sade, notes that the libertine's choice of food is an indication of the freedom to opt for food or evil. Yet, if taste originates in the fibres of the body, then, she posits, there may be no free will at all involved and the libertine's redefinition of food may not be philosophically unnatural.

The alimentary theme touches many unmentioned aspects of enlightenment philosophy and literature from Palissot's lettuce-munching Rousseau to Voltaire's pastry-cooking Cunégonde, from Jacob's *gourmandise* in Marivaux's *Paysan parvenu* to Sylvie's starvation diet in Challe's *Illustres français*. Indeed, the dearth of available foodstuffs was one of the elements which incited the population to revolt in 1789. There is little need to justify the creation of this volume. Rather, the major criticism of this rich but incomplete cornucopia of scholarly fruits would be to repeat the words of Dickens' hero, 'more, please.' (ROSEANN RUNTE, COLLÈGE GLENDON)

STEPHEN PRICKETT *Words and the Word: Language, Poetics and Biblical Interpretation*. New York: Cambridge University Press 1986. Pp. 280. US\$49.50

Elijah comes to the cave, and hears there, according to the AV, 'a still, small voice,' a fairly precise translation of the Hebrew *qol demamah daqah*, 'a voice of thin silence.' Yet the Good News Bible has 'a soft whisper of a voice,' the New English Bible 'a low murmuring sound,' and the Jerusalem Bible 'sound of a gentle breeze.' What accounts for the unfaithfulness of these versions? The investigation of this problem takes us along diverging paths in hermeneutics, an extraordinary case of institutional deafness. It also makes Elijah's experience germinal to western poetics.

The Good News Bible aims to be 'natural, clear, simple, and unambiguous' (p. 4); the New English Bible self-consciously uses the 'slack, verbose, cliché-ridden language of international communication,' according to one of its translators, for the sake of the ordinary reader, disambiguating cruxes, lightening obscurities, forgetting that contemporary literature is precisely 'problematic, obscure, and attentive to the exact nuances of words' (p. 13), that the culture gap these versions attempt to fill, and the mysterious ambiguity they eradicate, is that which interests us, in our culturally bound age, and marks the collapse of familiar paradigms, both ours and Elijah's. A superb analysis of the passage shows in it a subversion as well as assertion of traditional theology: God is both immanent in natural phenomena, yet absent from them, both speaks and is silent. The logical discontinuity, the 'disconfirmation' — to use one of Prickett's key terms — of all that we have been expected to believe, is characteristic of turning points in literature. Yet under the theory of translation that supposes its task to be the elimination of foreignness and ambiguity, such disconfirmation and thus creativity is impossible. Prickett gives many instances of a host language being changed by a translation, beginning with the Septuagint (pp. 31-32); these generate new patterns of thought. 'A language develops ... through its resistance to new words and concepts' (p. 32). Modern translations of the Bible are themselves heirs to a systematically reductive tradition of interpretation, that assume the superiority of the critic over the primitive text. Another tradition, stemming from Coleridge and Newman and finally manifested in deconstruction, holds the text to be opaque, 'the past is another country' (p. 28); our instruments of accommodation, while never dissolving the opacity, render it more richly revealing. In contrast, paradoxically, the belief in the transparency of the text ensures its inaccessibility.

Robert Lowth, in his famous lectures of 1741, effected a transformation in the idea of poetry. From being identified by formal rules, it came to be regarded as a special discourse, sublime, the language of emotion, according to Wordsworth, of being, according to Heidegger. Two approaches polarise: one saw poetry as the universal original language, the other as particularly intense speech. Each, however, tends to collapse into the other. Attempts to define poetry as the prime language resort to notions of primitive subjectivity and participation; the belief that poetry is a particular language game will grant it a universal validity. Prickett cites Blake and Ricoeur; the latter posits a tensional relationship between poetic and scientific discourse. Poetic discourse restores us to our sense of belonging amid the ruins of descriptive speech. It thus transcends both fact and fiction.

Intermediate between these approaches is that of Wordsworth and Coleridge for whom poetry involves an indissoluble union of thought and feeling, an integration that is not prerational but historical (p. 98). Wordsworth, Prickett shows, using an illuminating comparison with Augustine's *Confessions*, assigns to himself prophetic powers, in the language of revivalism, drawing on Lowth's identification of the prophets with the poets of Israel, and Blake holds the prophetic genius to be indispensable to creative thought. The Lowthian revolution culminated in Hopkin's discovery of parallelism as the elemental principle of poetry (pp. 118-9); thereby the formal aspect of poetry reunited with its semantic correspondence. A beautiful discussion of Hopkin's poem 'Kingfishers' concludes this section. At the same time, the relationship to nature was changing; the external language of Adam was internalised as that of the imagination. For Coleridge, the history of language became coterminous with the history of consciousness. Nature is the subordinate logos repeating God's creation in the finite mind; rather than read the objective Newtonian book of nature, we perceive therein symbols of eternity and a psychological typology. If the poet has a prophetic function, this is discharged through communion with nature. For one school, stretching from Feuerbach to Barthes, this becomes solipsistic. But for Coleridge the effect of his linguistic theory is creative etymology; the history of language is one of desynonymising, perceiving ever finer distinctions and correspondences between the phenomenal world and consciousness.

The fourth chapter begins with a long reflection on Cantos 27-32 of the *Purgatorio* (pp. 149-73), comparing it with Blake's illustration of the scene, *Hal's meeting with Falstaff* after his coronation, and much else. The focus is one what Prickett calls the 'paradox of disconfirmation'; Dante's entrance to the earthly paradise is dominated by his grief for Virgil and his humiliation by Beatrice. Reason and revelation are in contradiction; the supercession of reason by revelation is not experienced as a greater good but as utter and very personal privation. Similarly, in *Hal's rejection of Falstaff*, there is an irresolvable conflict of loyalties, compounded by its personal viciousness. The vision of the twofold, everchanging griffin reflected in Beatrice's eyes corresponds to the disconfirmation of theology by revelation; its ambiguity presents not paradoxical alternatives but a unity Dante cannot yet apprehend. Its duality is superimposed on that of Matilda and Beatrice, Leah and Rachel, action and contemplation. Artistic creativity acquires meaning from the unutterable. 'Only through art can art be transcended' (p. 168). The griffin then stands for the poetic image, and for Blake the poetic genius; in his illustration Beatrice is transformed from a sacramental to a prophetic figure.

Another form of disconfirmation is propounded by the echo in the caves of Marabar in Forster's *Passage to India*: nature is indifferent, responding equally meaninglessly to any word (p. 174). Human insignificance corresponds to social revolution and a shift of genre from poetry to prose realism. The crisis resulted in a pattern of breakdown and regeneration, for example in Wordsworth and Mill, that is the paradigmatic 'inner event of the age' (p. 178), and is also characteristic of the Bible. But it is also a disconfirmation of fact; by the end of the nineteenth century prose realism was itself realised to be a convention, not a true representation of reality. Biblical criticism ironically adopted it as a model just at the moment when it was under question.

Prickett's last chapter culminates in a discussion of metaphor. If poetry, in the Romantic tradition, has a creative, prophetic function, innovating through disconfirmation; if, analogously, translation is most productive when there is no equivalent in the host language, biblical poetics is that which enables us to constitute reality as a whole. Prickett draws briefly on two critics in support of his position. The first is Anthony Nutall, who argues, in his recent *A New Mimesis*, for the creative function of imitation as a means for constituting and comprehending reality; the second, Robert Alter, is criticised for his false distinction between fiction and history in *The Art of Biblical Narrative*. This leads us to the metaphorical function of the Bible on the boundary between languages and cultures, as that which grants us stereoscopic vision, the ability to see two points of view at the same time. The voice is both still and heard; the text is both human and divine. It can be perceived historically or typologically; both are metaphors for an inexhaustible reality (p. 242) and hence have engendered long and rich traditions of hermeneutics. But hermeneutics, and language itself, is both open and closed; a closed system, as the Structuralists say, yet open to surprise and disconfirmation. Prickett's main discussion partners in this section are Berggren and Ricoeur with some references to Merleau-Ponty. Berggren introduces a tensional notion of metaphor; Ricoeur oscillates between regarding metaphor as creating a 'new sort of reality' (p. 229) and as circular (p. 230). This itself derives from structuralist theories that assign meaning to relations, not things. Taken literally, this is logically absurd; metaphorically, it is profound, suggesting 'a new sense of the logical tensions discovered right at the heart of language itself' (p. 233).

Clearly, this is a dense, abstruse, and always fascinating study; often funny, always with an ear for the human as well as intellectual development of its protagonists. Some chapters are better than others: I found the first and the fourth the most coherent. Occasionally, it is repetitive; sometimes the thread is lost; it shows signs of having been composed of separate essays

(as well as marred by inexcusable printing). On the whole, however, it is a wonderfully exciting and telling study. (FRANCIS LANDY, UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA)

MICHAEL LYNN-GEORGE. *Epos: Word, Narrative and the Iliad*. Atlantic Highland NJ.: Humanities Press International Inc. 1987. Pp. 260. US\$39.95

The Homeric poems did not make their appearance in the trappings of a false eternity: yet they have not finished being read.' Thus in the epigraph from Pierre Macherey which opens this extraordinary reading of the *Iliad* and it is in effect the point with which Lynn-George concludes. What comes in between invites, indeed persuades, us to consider a radical reappraisal — a reappraisal — of Homer's epic narrative. Understandably, Lynn-George starts with a consideration of Auerbach's famous characterisation of the Homeric world in *Mimesis* as being 'timeless' and 'invested with the legendary plenitude and primitive simplicity of a lost paradise.' What Lynn-George offers us is an epic world saturated with an awareness of time, so that instead of the 'timeless present' so beloved of writers about Homeric epic he offers us an *Iliad* in which the 'present ... retains traces of the past, and already tends towards the as yet unformed possibilities of the future, relating each way to that which is never simply present' (p. 18). In Book 24 of the *Odyssey*, Odysseus recalls to his father the various different trees he gave him as a child. 'Each ripened at a different time, so that the bunches on them were at various stages when the branches felt their weight under the summer skies.' (p. 24). Sensitive exploring and extending the resonances of this quotation Lynn-George suggests that the whole narrative is structured as one which has "ripened at different times," in the different stages of revelation and recollection' (p. 24) and that as a whole the Homeric epic tells of 'time and transformation.' Auerbach spoke memorably of Homeric epic as 'legendary, leisurely, luminous and loquacious', while P. Vianne speaks of the Homeric world emerging with an 'immediate wholeness'. It is as though many of the most distinguished critics and scholars of Homer have, for whatever reasons and from whatever motives, conspired to conjure up an uncomplicated legendary epic world which is somehow outside of and previous to history and where 'interpretation' is not only unwelcome but unnecessary, a 'closed world' which remains 'timeless, static, hermetically sealed, fixed for all time.' It is this world, and this world of criticism, which Lynn-George wants to challenge, disturb, open up. 'Both lucid and elusive, giving and withholding at the same time, the Homeric epic is a form which neither conceals nor simply reveals' (p. 20). He shows an

Homeric world marked by equivocation and indeterminacy ('it was and it was not') and perhaps most importantly by incompleteness. The *Iliad* opens with an *imperfect* ('*eitei*') being accomplished) and quoting Nietzsche to fine effect (man's existence fundamentally is 'an imperfect tense that can never become a perfect one' [p. 36]). Lynn-George suggests that this sense of incompleteness — a plan and process without end, a plan with no specified *telos* and no knowable beginning — is or should be crucial to our experience of the *Iliad*. Indeterminate, because the relations between 'destiny' and 'freewill', imposed design and mortal desire, are shown to be reversible and we constantly perceive 'discontinuity and yet also an unpredictable indissociability of irreconcilable positions.' This is not a 'closed world' but one in which 'everything is distributed between the two realms of already and not yet' (p. 41) — the realm of the 'imperfect' or what Joyce (in another characteristically felicitous quotation) called the 'neverperfect, everplanned.' With an appropriate and telling oxymoron Lynn-George describes the epic as 'constructed in indefinite certainty.' Death is certain. How and when and who may remember and celebrate and mourn you is not.

Lynn-George also finds it necessary to address some of the 'sterility' in the reading of Homer which results from the theory of orality. The theory privileged writing and the unique individual artists (a Romantic image) which by definition relegated the 'oral' singers of epic to a world and time of 'primitive simplicity' in which they composed 'without thinking' and should now be protected from the 'violence of interpretation.' Lynn-George will have none of this essentially patronising attitude and sets out to read the *Iliad* as carefully and as scrupulously as any major written work deserves. The results are, to me, exciting; the rewards self-justifyingly rich. As an example, starting from the well-known essay by Adam Perry, 'The Language of Achilles' (pp. 50-152), which examines Achilles' famous reply to the offer of Agamemnon and suggests that Achilles here shows himself as a new kind of hero (Hamlet-ish) who has grown too large for the old (simple) language, Lynn-George offers another reading of the speech which embeds it in the epic and which I find powerful, perceptive and persuasive. I quote a representative paragraph:

Achilles' response to the catalogue's enumeration does not simply amount to a 'sum of destructions.' In a process which is finally neither simply ruin nor construction, the wreckage is reworked into a profound statement of the uncertainties of compensation, the transience of life, the instabilities of word and meaning and the fragility of the very framework by which society attempts to comprehend these forces which can be neither fixed nor framed by the boundaries of any realm, transaction or exchange which excluded the possibility of death. (p. 109)

The *Iliad* is indeed a site of devastation, death and loss. What can epic — *epos* — salvage from all this morality? It might confer *kleos* (immortal fame) as a compensation — but is that adequate? 'The *Iliad* thus structures itself as a question in celebration: does *kleos* ever balance the loss' (p. 122). Ever alert to the objects which furnish the epic world Lynn-George notes that in the first book 'the narrative moves from bow to lyre, from the destruction wrought by the bow of Apollo to the song of the immortals' (p. 152) and he affirms that '[i]t is above all this relation between destruction and immortal that the *Iliad* invites its audience to contemplate' (p. 152). So he traces song that the epic's discourse with death 'a discourse which stresses the finality of out the epic's discourse with death' a discourse which stresses the finality of absolute negation together with the sense of some indefinite future possibility' (p. 172). Not surprisingly he is particularly eloquent about the shield of Achilles which he considers in rewarding detail. One way of looking at the shield, as at the Greek Urn, is to see the art work as offering 'the retrieval of enduring from fleeting process' — at the cost of lifelessness and immobility.

But the art of the *Iliad*'s immortal shield does not seem to strive for a triumph over transience in quite this way. Rather than attempting to resolve a dilemma or to suppress an inherent contradiction, it stages it on a shield composed from both enduring and dying forms, a shield which belongs to a fixed and fluid, fleeting world, in which the most frequently recurring forms are those of loss in death and lasting dance or song. (pp. 186-7)

Lynn-George is particularly good — I would say moving — on Book 24 in which he does not find some sort of satisfying celebration of an achieved peace, closure and order. Following the journey seeking recovery of the dead via the three main constructions — wagon, tent, and tomb — he stresses that this tent which is not a house, not a home, is an 'interstitial and unsettled space, neither Trojan nor Achaian, in which the ambivalent complexities or reconciliation and repudiation are played out' (p. 237) — a space between two worlds and 'a site of a certain neutrality'. Registering the nuances of the words which describe the awesome moment when Priam kisses the hand which killed his sons, Lynn-George shows how the words 'reinforce the shock of this alliance of intimacy and enmity, this dread dalliance between tenderness and slaughter in the language which brings together and meshes those most extreme poles, "killing" and "kissing"' (p. 238). The end is only a *temporary* cessation — there is always the unknowable more to come. The text remains open to the end. There is the pause for burial but 'there is a sense of apprehension, insecurity and urgency on the borders of the text' (p. 254). Nothing settled, nothing closed, nothing timeless, nothing 'absolute and complete' (Bakhtin), nothing totally transparent, no pre-historic primal

paradisaal simplicity — this is the epic world of the *Iliad* which Lynn-George evokes and opens up, a world of always already and not yet.

It is along the seashore, on the edge, at the limits and constantly changing borders, that the *Iliad* stages much of its significant action — not so much the broad plain of the battle nor the wide ways of the sea and homecoming, but the marginal meeting-place in between, a domain of unending dispute and dialogue where each side replies by echo to the silence of the other, a site of shifting shapes produced by reversible processes. (p. 262)

It is indeed a text 'which has not yet finished being read.'

Lynn-George writes — and reads — as a contemporary. Derrida, Blanchot and Nietzsche — among others — are often quoted or cited, though always tactfully and to telling effect. (There is nothing easier than seeding one's work with fashionable names, but in this case every quotation enriches or underscores a point and — as it were — opens up another perspective.) Modernist works in literature are also adduced and again the deployments strike me as peculiarly felicitous. I give two examples. At one point Helen watches a parade and reflects upon a remote past, a former husband, and another distant self. Alongside that Lynn-George briefly brings in Joyce's Bloom sipping Burgundy in Byrne's pub and recalling his first taste of love with Molly Bloom. His reflection is — 'Me. And me now.' Just like Helen. Again, having convincingly characterised the 'epic moment' as being composed of a strange mixture of 'finality and the indefinite' he offers a supplementary definition which fits perfectly — 'that contradiction of survival and annihilation, so strangely intertwined.' The words are Proust's. This then is a reading of Homer of and for our time — though never once guilty of the kind of pretentious melodramatic vulgarities and barbarous anachronisms that mark — or stain — works like *Shakespeare our Contemporary*. Lynn-George knows perfectly well the *difference* of the Homeric world from ours. What he also knows — and powerfully shows — is how and why it is still accessible to us, is indeed, still *readable*. I am not a Greek scholar but like anyone interested in forms of narrative from epic onwards (like anyone *tout court* one would of course hope), I am interested in Homer and I will simply say that this scrupulously and beautifully written book offers the most compelling and exciting work on Homer I have read. (TONY TANNER)

ROBERT LAMBERTON. *Homer the Theologian, Neoplatonist Allegorical Reading and the Growth of the Epic Tradition*. Berkeley: University of California Press 1986. Pp. xvi + 363. Hardcover US\$42.50, paper US\$12.95

Lamberton's work is a revised doctoral dissertation, and still bears some marks of the genre in its overzealous citing of the range of scholarly opinion and its lack of incisiveness. The bulk of the work is given over to Neoplatonic interpretations of Homer. This in practise means Porphyry and Proclus, since Plotinus himself shows little interest in literary interpretation. Nevertheless much space is devoted to Plotinus, partly through speculations of the type: 'It is quite possible that, if we knew more ...' (p. 85). This nebulous quality pervades an earlier chapter on Middle Platonism and extends to the major thesis of the work, the supposed influence of Neoplatonist criticism of Homer on Western European literature, particularly Dante (p. 232).

Lamberton posits a model that 'predicts' (p. 157) an interaction between text and interpretation that is imperfectly realized in various works of late Antiquity and more perfectly realized in Dante. The earlier works discussed are Prudentius' *Psychomachia*, Heliodorus' *Aethiopica* and Musaeus' *Hero and Leander*. The allegorizing tendency typical of the Neoplatonist interpretation of Homer is very apparent in Prudentius, but even Lamberton admits that Prudentius is more influenced by the Christian than the pagan interpretative tradition. With Heliodorus we have the advantage of a partially allegorical reading of the novel by an ancient commentator. Again, however, the influence is not specifically that of Homeric criticism, in fact it is 'neither explicitly pagan nor explicitly Christian' (p. 157). One is accordingly hard put to see its relevance to a book centered on Homer. Even stranger is the case of Musaeus. In his Loeb edition, Thomas Gelzer expresses the view that *Hero and Leander* is totally allegorical. This would fit Lamberton's model of the relationship between literature and criticism: an allegorical interpretation is imposed by the Neoplatonists on Homeric epic, an interpretation which in turn inspires the creation of consciously allegorical epics. But Gelzer's main argument for an allegorical reading is that otherwise the poem would be impossibly bland, and Lamberton hesitates to accept it. In the end he leaves us with the weak statement that 'it may not be unreasonable to view an allegorical *Hero and Leander* as a logical development ... from the later romances' (p. 160).

With the discussion on later influence we are again plagued with uncertainties. 'It is impossible to prove that Dante or his contemporaries supposed Homer to be the sort of poet Porphyry or Proclus thought him to be. It is the purpose of this final chapter to indicate, however, that the

conception of Homer articulated by Greek Neoplatonism was transmitted through influential authors who were read in the West at a time when Homer was not' (p. 235). Thus the crudely allegorizing commentary on the *Aeneid* attributed to Bernard Silvestris may or may not have influenced Dante — as so often, we are 'dealing with intangibles' (p. 289). That the commentary itself displays complete ignorance of Homer, beyond the general assertion that Virgil imitated him, only adds to the reader's frustration.

An epilogue defends the value of Neoplatonist interpretations of Homer, which to most moderns are marked by 'ingenuity of misinterpretation' (so E.R. Dodds on Proclus). They constitute a 'strong misreading' that was valid for the times and influential in the creation of new literature. (JOHN R. WILSON, UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA)

*RENÉ GIRARD. *The Scapegoat*. Trans. Yvonne Freccero. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press 1986. Pp. 224. US\$24.50

René Girard identifies the scapegoat as a person or group arbitrarily and illogically singled out as the cause of societal misfortune or calamity and collectively persecuted or collectively murdered, or both. The massacre of Jews in the fourteenth century, for example, was taken as a means of allaying the Black Death. The Jews, differentiated from the rest of the populace by their religious and ethnic identity, were assumed to have caused the plague. The murderers, in their naïveté, saw their act as just and proper. Girard goes on to demonstrate that myth is a process of justifying persecution and murder, that it is part of the 'scapegoat mechanism,' which contrives the justificatory naïveté. His illustrations include many standard myths, like those of Oedipus and Baldr and Zeus encircled by the Curetes; and his conclusion — his thesis, actually — is that the Gospels of the *New Testament* put an end to myth by precluding any contrivance of justificatory naïveté.

'The myth of Oedipus ... is a persecution text' (p. 27) in that Oedipus is identified as the cause of the Theban plague. Persecution victims may also be said to carry a sign ('Oedipus limps,' p. 25) that differentiates them from their persecutors. With the gods the sign of the victim, differentiation from the norm, is itself the equivalent of societal misfortune or calamity. In the myth of the infant Zeus encircled by the Curetes, who clash their weapons to drown out the infant's crying and who thereby protect him from being devoured by Kronos, 'the configuration and behavior of the Curetes are reminiscent of collective murder' (p. 71). Myth, in Girard's theory, conceals the act of victimization by transforming the persecutors into protectors. So it is with Baldr, who 'will perish, like so many gods, the victim of collective

murder. ... The convention of an invulnerable Baldr merely transforms the representation of a murder into an inoffensive game' (p. 67).

Myth is here presented as a universal mode of self-deception. The mythic stereotypes of persecution are recognized by Girard as 1) a crisis during which there is 2) a general loss of differences (e.g., everyone without exception is subject to the plague), 3) the choice of victim(s) by the victim persecutors — a choice made either totally at random or because the victim belongs 'to a class that is particularly susceptible to persecution' (p. 17), a choice, that is, of differentiated individuals who, as such, are assumed to be guilty of the crimes that 'eliminate differences' (p.24) — and 4) violence, or collective murder, visited upon the victims. The presence of at least two of these stereotypes is said to indicate persecution.

Stereotypes 2 and 3 are juxtaposed, for example, in the mythological monster, which exhibits the loss of differentiation between not only the animal and the human but also the physical and the moral and which in its monstrosity carries the sign of the victim that differentiates it from the persecutors.

Whatever the merits of his argument, which many readers are not likely to accept without question, Girard strikes challengingly close to the real nature of discrimination in positing the human tendency to identify the physical with the moral: 'For political, moral, and medical reasons certain forms of discrimination strike us as reasonable today, yet they are similar to the ancient forms of persecution; for example, the quarantine of anyone who might be contagious during an epidemic' (p. 19). A reader may think at this point of AIDS and ponder 'the borderline between rational discrimination and arbitrary persecution' (p. 19).

The first stage of myth, according to Girard, is the actual persecution of the scapegoat. The second stage is 'the higher order of mythology,' which tends with the victim becoming sacred, thereby concealing from us, and in some cases totally eliminating, the distortions of persecution' (p. 49). Society reconciles itself with its victim by ultimately exalting its victim and, in the process, concealing the scapegoat mechanism that it, society, has manipulated. There is in this an echo of Simone de Beauvoir's notion of *altérité*, a means of justifying one's contempt for the Other by an invalid exaltation of the Other; e.g., woman is accorded a mystic aura in compensation for being denied human *Miscéin*, or, to use an example that is not de Beauvoir's, blacks are accredited with physical grace at the expense of being accorded human equality.

Girard's intent, as a mythologist, is, in this work, to nullify myth or, more precisely, to show that the Gospels nullify myth. His demonstration becomes a combination of mythology and theology. Jesus perfectly fits the identity of

scapegoat; but the scapegoat mechanism here fails to accommodate the higher order of mythology in which the persecutors become the protectors or are reconciled with the victim. The persecuted Jesus remains persecuted and permanently discloses to humankind the undisguised nature of persecution: 'The Passion reveals the scapegoat mechanism, i.e., that which should remain invisible if [the forces of the world] are to maintain themselves. By revealing that mechanism ... the Gospels set in motion the only textual mechanism that can put an end to humanity's imprisonment in the system of mythological representation ...' (p. 166). Once we are free of the shackles of myth we can, according to this view, inquire scientifically into reality: 'The scientific spirit ... is a by-product of the profound action of the Gospel text' (p. 204-5).

The theological premise here is that the scientific spirit is none other than the Holy Spirit, the Paraclete, the universal advocate, the defender of all innocent victims, the *destroyer of every representation of persecution*. He is truly the spirit of truth that dissipates the fog of mythology' (p. 207). Anticipating this premise, the mythologist/theologian insists that from the moment we truly understand myths, we can no longer accept the Gospel as yet another myth, since it is responsible for our understanding' (p. 205).

Girard's theology will not satisfy devout Christians: it identifies myth with Satan, but it does not celebrate the divinity of Jesus. It is, in fact, almost entirely consistent with Thomas Sheehan's antireligious essay (*The First Coming*, New York: Random House 1986). Sheehan theorizes that Jesus did not preach a new coming of God; rather, he reawakened humans to the permanent presence of God among them, the experience of which presence is the Kingdom of God, a simultaneity of present and future (a 'present-future'): 'All Jesus did was to bring to light in a fresh way what had always been the case but what had been forgotten or obscured by religion. His role was simply to end religion ... and restore the sense of the immediacy of God' (p. 68). But religion, according to Sheehan, returned by way of primitive Christianity, with its invention of a resurrected saviour and its deification of Jesus. What 'religion' is to Sheehan 'mythology' is to Girard; but, where Sheehan sees the Gospels as reinstituting religion, Girard sees them as dealing the fatal wound to mythology.

Girard is more methodical and systematic in argumentation than Sheehan but he shares with Sheehan an inclination to editorialize, to substitute rhetoric for logic, and to confuse hypothesis with demonstration. Sheehan writes, 'We may imagine Simon, like Jesus before him, entering the synagogue on the sabbath with a small group of believers' (p. 183) and goes on to base a point relevant to eschatology on this imagined situation. Likewise, Girard imagines that there is an earlier form of the Curetes myth

'that contains collective murder' (p. 71) and, however reasonable we find his idea, we must remind ourselves that imagining is a form of hypothesis and not a part of proof. Or, again, Girard's opinion that something 'could have been in the minds of Mark and Matthew' (p. 141) bolsters no argument other than that something else could also have been in those minds.

In a chapter given over to the mimeticism of rivalry and shame, Girard argues that Peter's denial was a failure in *Misken*: Peter wanted to be indistinguishable from the Jerusalemites and, as it were, to belong, to have a right to warm himself at the fire, but his accent gave him away. The accent, a form of differentiation, is a sign of the victim. What Girard develops here, however, is the impossibility of a differentiable *New Testament*, which, because it is written in a debased language devoid of prestige and is cosmopolitan in its lack of specific accent, is 'perfectly translatable' (p. 153) into any language: 'The Gospels are all things to all people, they have no accent because they are all accents' (ibid). Then, oddly, he cites *Matthew* 5:21-22 (p. 155), which includes the word 'fool' in two different languages: the Aramaic 'Raka' and the Greek 'More,' with the person addressing another as 'Raka' being answerable to the Sanhedrin and the person addressing another as 'More' being subject to hell-fire. There is clearly a significant differentiation at work here, and yet Girard takes no note of it.

There may well be a parallel between Galilean accent vs. Jerusalemite accent on the one hand and Aramaic vs. Greek on the other. Girard does not draw it; and, in translating 'Raka' by 'Fool' and 'More' by 'Renegade,' he offends his own concept of perfect translatability. If 'More' is the Greek transliteration of the Hebrew word for 'rebel,' as many, and presumably Girard, take it to be, then, whether the verbal play (a Greek-Hebrew pun) is deliberate or not, we have a semantic complexity, which by its factor of differentiation exhibits 'persecution behavior' and which is far from being perfectly translatable.

Finding the loose ends and the fallacies in Girard's text is, however, ultimately less satisfying than appreciating the novelty of his approach to myth and the Gospels. For him the Gospels represent the truth that myth is incompatible with truth and, on the basis of this representation, cannot themselves be myth. The Gospels are seen by him to put an end to myth but not to persecution, which history itself proves to have been generated by various and numerous adherents to the Gospels but which, subsequent to the Gospels, cannot be successfully disguised as benevolence.

Girard has no patience with Freudians, who claim to discover symbolic truths in myth, or with the Structuralists, whose study of binary oppositions upholds myth as a repository of vestigial universal truths. In damning them without faint praise or scholarly debate he at least mentions them.

Apparently he has found Rudolf Bultmann unmentionable. This is unfortunate because his polar opposition to Bultmann requires advertisement. Bultmann found considerable myth in the *New Testament*. His *Entmythologisierung* is a means both of separating the myths from the history and of recognizing the experience of the ineffable that the mythic elements, including the parables, alone provide. Until the mythologist/theologian Girard attempts to refute in sustained argument the theologian/mythologist Bultmann he must remain, at least in this reader's eyes, a gifted and challenging amateur. (ROY ARTHUR SWANSON, UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MILWAUKEE)

*MARIE-LOUISE OLLIER, éd. *Masques et déguisements dans la littérature médiévale*. Collection Études Médiévales. Montréal: Presses de l'Université de Montréal; Paris: J. Vrin 1988. Pp. 298. No price

As mimesis of medieval carnivals, charivaris, mummeries, fêtes des fous, religious and funeral rites, and Mummenschanz, the countless instances of masks and disguises in literature call initially for descriptive inventories and analyses of the anthropological phenomenon and its poetic expressions. Much of the present (selected) proceedings of the thirteenth colloquium of the Institut d'Études Médiévales at the Université de Montréal (April 1987) responds to this desideratum of literary history and sensitizes reader and critic to an uncommonly rich aspect of medieval culture. Once the varied corpus (epic, romance, fabliau, lai, nouvelle, farce) has thus been circumscribed, critical reflection can advance first to studying in their philological, rhetorical and narrative detail the textual forms of aesthetically or didactically signifying masks and disguises, and then to distilling from the readings adduced the philosophical, social and literary essence of the French (18 papers), Spanish (2), Latin (1), and German (1) Middle Ages.

The twenty-three papers which follow Paul Zumthor's introductory synthesis ('Le masque du poème: Questions de poétique médiévale,' pp. 9-21) have turned out to adhere as much to this methodological three-step proposed by him as texts and critical temperaments allowed, and whether in the guise of literary historians, narratologists, or Kulturhistorikern, the participants contribute all, in often exemplary fashion, essential pieces to a new mosaic of the period. In 'Masque et personification allégorique' (pp. 151-64) Daniel Poitron traces allegory back to scholarly and popular mythologies, to folklore and legend, to didactic and philosophical writing as old as Plato's; allegoric *paraitre*, replacing symbolic *être*, creates the conditions for the development of art as an act of invention which conceals in order to reveal. With its part of factitiousness and imposture, the evolving

aesthetics of appearance was frequently reviled as the work of the devil (Edina Bozóky, 'Les masques de l'ennemi' et les faux chemins du Graal,' pp. 85-95), but masks and disguises also offered opportunity and protection for authors of a satirical bend, as Claudine Potvin shows in the second part of 'Le masque doctrinal: Enigme et satire dans l'école didactique du *Cançionero de Baena*' (pp. 243-50). The fundamentally subversive paradox of the mask serves in Douin de Lavesne's fabliau, *Trubert*, according to Jean Batany ('*Trubert*: Progrès et bousculades des masques,' pp. 25-34), to assert man's autonomous individual consciousness by taking him beyond traditionally self-evident social roles (on the fabliau see also R. Brusegan). In a related sense, Danielle Buschinger ('Le motif du déguisement de Tristan dans les oeuvres médiévales allemandes des XII^e et XIII^e siècles,' pp. 35-41) sees Tristan's disguises in Eilhart von Oberg, Ulrich von Türlen and Heinrich von Freiberg as forms of social self-abasement, under which forms alone the right to personal passion can be affirmed. With the help of the *Folies Tristan* of Bern and Oxford, Jonna Kjaer develops the Girardian idea of Tristan as a sacrificial scapegoat whose death justifies the bold glorification of profane love by Thomas d'Angleterre ('Le déguisement dans les *Folies Tristan* et la mort chez Thomas d'Angleterre,' pp. 65-73).

Masks and disguises taken on by language itself (see P. Zumthor's inventory, p. 14; and C. Potvin, pp. 243-48) are treated specifically in three papers. Rosanna Brusegan situates the fabliau at that half-way point between oral and written tradition where the loss of the former is the cost (*conte* and *compte*) of the acquisition of the latter (*livre* = book and money) ('Regards sur le fabliau, masque de vérité et de fiction,' pp. 97-109). In 'L'invention du dialogue amoureux: Le masque d'une différence' (pp. 223-31), Christiane Marchello-Nizia shows how early examples of declarations of reciprocal love in dialogue form (Chrétien de Troyes, *Cligès*, vv. 5106-5201) are but a careful elaboration and slow adjustment of new linguistic codes. In his 'Les travestissements du langage et la folie du drap dans la *Farce de Maître Pathelin*' (pp. 263-76), Roger Dragonetti calls such decoding 'giving the Muse something new to wear' ('renipper la Muse,' p. 264). True to his form (*Le gai savoir*, *La vie de la lettre au moyen âge*), R. Dragonetti sets off critical fireworks by observing and auscultating the text to the last sound and shape of its letters: are there not *guille* (guile) in Guillaume and Guillemette, *drap* (the 'stuff' of farce) in *draperie*, *dénier* in the *denier de Dieu*, *oye* (goose) in *monnoye*, and the letters L (*elle*), R (*erre*) and S (*esse*) in *esservelé*? Under such linguistic disguises lie the just and exact meanings of sounds, spellings and names.

Illuminating as these close readings are, they remain isolated, text-bound studies ('on a peut-être ... trop parlé de textes,' admits Emmanuèle

Baumgartner in the concluding 'Table Ronde,' p. 277) which respond only partially to the central question of the colloquium: can the concepts of mask and disguise define medieval (wo)men's particular ways of being and thinking, of questioning, observing and describing themselves (p. 277)? The 'Table Ronde' (pp. 277-95) endeavours to tie up most of the loose ends into a tentatively affirmative answer; in addition, it offers fascinating insights into contemporary criticism where the traditionalists, confronted by post-Nietzschean and post-Freudian notions, mount once again spirited defensive actions against the moderns and postmoderns. The 'Table Ronde' accomplishes on the theoretical level what P. Zumthor achieved methodologically, and it could very usefully be read in second place.

Conclusions reaching beyond the immediate text under scrutiny may be drawn from the remaining papers, among which only Michel Pastoureau's 'Désigner ou dissimuler? Le rôle du cimier dans l'imaginaire médiéval' (pp. 127-40, with illustrations), Bruno Roy's 'L'illusion comme art libéral: Interprétation du *Secretum philosophorum* (XIII^e siècle)' (pp. 75-81), and Jean-Marcel Paquette's 'Masque, songe et métaphore: Le cas de la *Chanson de Roland*' (pp. 233-42) have proven recalcitrant to the reviewer's attempt at systematization. Mask and disguise reveal and conceal the impossibility of unveiling an unequivocal truth (Victoria Guerin, 'Les masques du désir et la hantise du passé dans *Le Bel Inconnu*', pp. 55-63), but when under the sway of uncertainty masked Evil seems to triumph, such triumphs are ultimately futile since the knowledge of a transcending justice will reestablish the equilibrium between religious faith (Peter F. Dembowski, 'Le Faux Semblant et la problématique des masques et déguisements [dans le *Roman de Fauvel*]', pp. 43-53; Nancy Freeman Regalado, 'Masques réels dans le monde de l'imaginaire...', [pp. 111-26, with illustrations] interprets the same text as a didactic *Fürstenspiegel*) and existential discontent which is singularly enhanced by masks pitting those who wear them not only against others but also against themselves (Danielle Régulier-Bohler, 'Morphologies du clandestin: Être ou ne pas être: Le portrait-masque de l'inceste', pp. 141-48).

In a final, remarkably cohesive group of papers mask and disguise are very profitably put into the service of literary theory. E. Baumgartner proposes that the seams left in the Grail cycle by the numerous rewritings of the legendary matter may be privileged places where (trans)scribe(r)s and adaptors reflect on the conditions of literary creation ('Masques de l'écrivain et masques de l'écriture dans les proses du Graal', pp. 168-75). In the *Perlesvaus*, the narrator has redefined the auctorial role of Joseph according to his own narrative requirements, thus subverting the voice of Authority into an empty mask, a mute voice subordinate to the voices of the narrator's actors (Joseph of Arimathea, *Perlesvaus*'s cousin Joseph-Joseu, and the

latter's maternal uncle Josimas) (Dominique Chassé, 'Le déplacement du masque de l'autorité dans le *Perlesvaus*: Le rôle de Joseph', pp. 177-84). In *Masque* et démasquage de l'auteur dans les *Jugements* [du Roi de Bohême et du Roi de Navarre] de Guillaume de Machaut' (pp. 203-09) Laurence de Looze not only retraces the narrator-poet's vacillation between disappearance and reappearance, between presence and absence, but in addition defines the second *Jugement* as gloss and metadiscourse on the first, as a fourteenth-century example of literary reception. Madeleine Jeay discovers a similarly elusive narrator in the incipits of the *Cent nouvelles nouvelles*, a work which explores the relationship between orality and writing ('L'enlèvement narratif: Un jeu de masques', pp. 193-201). According to Michel Zink's interpretation of the prologue to Richard de Fournival's *Bestiaire d'amours*, the meaning which lies behind the mask of allegorical (and other) poetry manifests itself in the temporal gap between the *hic et nunc* of the representation and the absence of that which is being represented, and only memory can bridge that gap and solve the enigma ('Révelations de la mémoire et masques du sens dans la poésie médiévale', pp. 251-60). Eric Méchoulan ('Les Arts de rhétorique du XV^e siècle: La théorie, masque de la *theoria*?' pp. 213-21) rehabilitates secondary *Artes poeticae* (Deschamps, Molinet, Legrand, Baudet Herenc) which, while appearing to be simple poetic recipe books, attempt in fact to formalize the transition from naturally oral to artificially written poetry and to come to grips with the evolving intellectual and linguistic climate of the time. In 'L'auteur comme masque: Contribution à l'archéologie de l'imprimé' (pp. 185-92), Hans Ulrich Gumbrecht organizes literary history into three evolutionary stages: plurivocal literary communication transmitting meanings which are immanent in the medieval cosmology (before Gutenberg), modernism in which authors feel compelled to mask their subjective intents and unstable meanings, thus giving rise to five centuries of criticism, and a new age on the threshold of which critics are less obsessed with authors and their masks, hoping rather to rediscover behind the auctorial institution a corporeality and temporality which have been repressed since the invention of the printing press.

Making two dozen widely divergent and very personal research projects fit under one precise conference theme cannot be achieved without some degree of contrivance. Yet despite its variety, *Masques et déguisements* reflects great unity of purpose and result, which proves how universal, rich and useful the concepts of mask and disguise are, and how successful the organizers of the colloquium and the editor of the proceedings have been in challenging participants and readers to a new view of the Middle Ages. (HANS R. RUNTE, DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY)

*ELIZABETH A. PETROFF, ed. *Medieval Women's Visionary Literature*. New York: Oxford University Press 1986. Pp. 416. Paper US\$12.95

Mystic writing is a genre to which women contributed significantly in the Middle Ages, indeed the largest quantity of extant texts by women is in devotional literature, and much of it is not easily accessible to the interested public. It is therefore good to have a representative selection in paper and in readable translations, much of it fascinating, despite the problem posed by any anthology of excerpts, that one may get an over-all view of some texts, a taste of others, but not deeply into any single text.

Despite the title, the collection here ranges from early Christianity to the fifteenth century, most of it concentrated in the late Middle Ages, and includes women from all over Europe, who wrote in Latin and in a variety of vernaculars. The writings are mainly by the women who had the visions though a few are by men describing them. One might question the inclusion of some of the writers: Hrotsvit was a nun, but she does not seem to have been a mystic, and she wrote narrative poems and dramas, not visions. Christine de Pizan was a secular writer, whose visions are highly self-conscious allegories in the tradition of Boethius and Alanus de Insulis, not divine revelations. She does address the anti-feminism of her world, as the editor says, but that does not seem sufficient reason to include her works in this collection. It might have been better to cite some of her comments in the introduction, rather than trying to force her work into this context, which leads to some distortions. It is misleading to speak of her as self-taught, since her studies were encouraged by a learned father, or to focus exclusively on her defense of women, since so much of her writing is concerned with the political situation in France and directed at the men who could change it. Indeed, several of the women in this collection wrote for a male or mixed audience, a fact which is obscured by the focus on the women's voice.

In an attempt to explain why women tended to have visions in terms of their educational and emotional deprivation, Petroff also seems to overemphasize the illiteracy of the women and their lack of sophistication, though sources she cites in footnotes, some of her own comments, and some of the writers themselves reveal the contrary. She does not mention the theological questions raised by Heloise in the *Problematia*, or answered by Hildegard of Bingen in her letters. She says that women, even if they knew what to do with books, considered writing a male prerogative, although God told several of them to write, and she asserts that their preparation for writing was different from that of literary men, but does not explain in what way. Unfortunately, though she says that she has examined the women's

attitudes towards Latin and the vernaculars, she gives no evidence from their works.

It is of course very difficult if not impossible to find unifying themes for women of such diverse backgrounds and periods, or links between such different kinds of vision as erotic and doctrinal. Nonetheless, Petroff makes good points about the autobiographical material, the women's hesitancy to speak in their own voice and their tendency to let an external voice encourage them, and the different ways men and women use the humility topos. Brief mention is made of the women's criticism of corruption, but more might have been made of the prophetic aspect of some of the visions through which the criticism is expressed and of the audience at which it is directed. This might have countered the implication that the intended audience of the visions is always other women.

Given the real difficulties of writing a comprehensive introduction to such material, not to say the amount of space available for such a large body of texts, it might have been better to give only the salient facts about the women and include more texts, letting them speak for themselves. In any case, it is useful to have these excerpts so accessible, along with the vast amount of information in the footnotes and in the extensive bibliography. (JOAN M. FERRANTE, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY)

DAVID J.A. ROSS. *Alexander Historianus: A Guide to Medieval Illustrated Alexander Literature*. 2nd edition. Athenäum: Frankfurt/Main. 1988. Pp. 145. Hardcover DM54.00

No figure from classical antiquity exerted so powerful or constant a grip upon the medieval literary imagination as did Alexander the Great: and no scholar has made a greater contribution to our understanding of that literature and its place in medieval culture than David Ross. In addition to numerous articles on a wide range of subjects, Ross has placed all of us who work in the field of Alexander studies in his debt by providing us with two indispensable tools for our research: George Cary's *The Medieval Alexander* (which he edited for publication) and his own *Alexander Historianus*, originally published in 1963 and now reprinted in a second edition that contains a substantial amount of new information. In fifteen pages of additional notes at the end of the text, Ross directs the reader to publications that have appeared since the first edition. The most substantial revision from the first edition involves a rethinking of the Greek manuscript tradition (see especially note 46, p. 115). The existence of an additional note offering supplementary bibliography or a slightly revised interpretation is indicated by an asterisk in the margin of the text.

Alexander Historiatus is a model of careful, systematic scholarly endeavour. Its goal is to promote further study rather than to solve any problems. In a brief preface, Ross articulates the threefold purpose of his work: to list the illustrated manuscripts and early printed editions of all the European literary treatments of Alexander produced during Antiquity and the Middle Ages; to arrange this material in order to facilitate understanding of the relationships among the various works; and to give a basic (though in no way complete) bibliography for every text with which he deals. He divides his study in accordance with the two main streams of Alexander literature. The first, larger section considers the fictional accounts based ultimately on the late antique romance of Alexander, composed in Greek, known as Pseudo-Callisthenes; the second section deals with the principle historical accounts of Alexander and their far less numerous progeny.

There is little need to rehearse here the intelligence or the value of *Alexander Historiatus*. At the time of its original publication it was widely and justly hailed as essential for anyone interested in the medieval Alexander tradition. Time has confirmed that assessment. Ross offers, for example, a particularly useful overview of the history of the so-called Alexander Romance that had such an enormous influence on the literature of western Europe. Of particular importance in this development was the priest Leo of Naples, who in the mid-tenth century transcribed then translated the Greek original into Latin ('very mediocre Latin,' as Ross comments in another publication). In the eleventh century an anonymous editor corrected — that is, improved the Latin — and expanded Leo's version. This interpolated version was itself the source of two later expansions; and in this expanded form Leo's narrative, now conventionally called *Historia de Preliis Alexandri Magni*, became the source for a long series of verse or prose versions in virtually every European language. These narratives, listed in Ross's book, include some of the most important works of medieval literature. Indeed, the medieval fortunes of Alexander are essential for anyone wishing a thorough view of medieval literature. For example, the study of the changing treatment of Alexander provides extraordinary insights into the continuing tension between secular success, or heroism, and Christian virtue.

Given the nature of Ross's book as a tool for further research, I think it appropriate here to lament the current state of research, especially on this side of the Atlantic, on the medieval Alexander romances. Many remain unedited, untranslated, unstudied. A seemingly endless stream of books and essays pours forth concerning Arthurian romance, while the romances about Alexander are all but ignored. I can only hope that the publication of the second edition of *Alexander Historiatus* will kindle a greater interest among medievalists in the rich tradition of literature which it so ably and

methodically records. (DENNIS M. KRAATZ, UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT DALLAS)

FELIX KARLINGER, IRMGARD LACKNER, Hsrg. *Romanische Volksbücher: Querschnitte zur Stoffgeschichte und zur Funktion ausgewählter Texte: Barlaam, Iosaphat, Magelone, Genovefa, Bertoldo*. Texte zur Forschung, Band 29. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft 1987. Pp. 350. No price

Neither title nor subtitle make it quite clear that this volume is in fact an anthology. The editors present for each story varying numbers of excerpts (from 1 to 11) in all Romance languages, accompanied by German translations. As a result, the reader has abundant evidence of the impressive richness of four popular literary traditions, but is left with a collection of textual fragments which is doubly frustrating: reestablishing narrative sequence by lining up excerpts from Provençal, French, Catalan, Spanish, Portuguese, Italian, Rhaetoroman and Rumanian versions has proven impossible, and the very attempt at sequentiality precludes in most cases close interlinguistic comparisons.

A good deal of this frustration is alleviated by excellent introductions to the four stories and, for *Barlaam* and *Genovefa*, by running commentaries on the excerpts. The volume becomes thus a helpful study guide, summarizing the origins and literary fortunes, the manuscript tradition and printing history, the pan-European significance and critical reception of the stories. The documentation (pp. 307-45) is useful, though it might have been presented in a less complicated manner. After the chapter Notes (pp. 307-18), there are lists of bibliographical references to three years' (1974-76) worth of general works (pp. 319-20) and to the four texts (pp. 320-45): for each story the references are divided into 'Texte' or 'Ausgaben' (Roman numerals) and 'Sekundärliteratur' (Arabic numerals), with a supplementary section, 'Verwandte Stoffe' (Latin capitals), for *Genovefa* (p. 336). This arrangement makes identification of a given excerpt rather cumbersome (the Spanish version of *Bertoldo*, pp. 268-72, is insufficiently documented). There is a general index on pages 347-50.

The four stories receive uneven critical treatment. Felix Karlinger has reduced his commentary on *Genovefa* to a strict minimum, but compensates with felicitously long passages in seven languages (pp. 158-223). Irmgard Lackner offers an excellent introduction to the 'Dialogus Salomonis et Marcolfi' tradition (*Bertoldo*, pp. 224-305), but then abandons the reader with: 'Doch lassen wir die Texte für sich selber sprechen' (p. 243), which they do to a certain degree only. Angela Birner's *Magelone* (pp. 98-157), and

Barlaam und Josaphat (pp. 23-97), by the editors, are clearly the strongest pieces: they are expertly introduced and include copious excerpts; the selections from *Barlaam* have been most helpfully integrated into the critical study.

The theoretically-inclined reader will expect from the introduction by Felix Karlinger (pp. 1-21) a resolution of the contradiction inherent in the title of the volume. Indeed, so close is the association between the notion of 'Volksbuch' and the work of Germanists and German folklorists that the terminological and generic transfer to the Romance sphere is difficult even for an expert. *Cartile popolare*, *libro popolare* (or *popolaresco*), *livre bien pliegos de corde*, *conto tradicional*, etc., provide but very approximate (and, as the scholarly 'literatura de canya y cordeia' in Catalan shows, not always 'popular') labels for a complex cultural reality, so that Felix Karlinger finds himself reduced to quoting three German definitions of the 'Volksbuch' (pp. 2-3) and to drawing up descriptive catalogues of the characteristics of the Romance equivalent (pp. 3-21). The reader, should s/he be disappointed, will find there ample compensation: in his wide-ranging (including Latin America) yet succinct survey, Felix Karlinger evokes not only questions of European literary history and of inter-national borrowing, but also fundamental cultural problems such as illiteracy vs. literacy, orality ('Volkszahlung') vs. literature ('Kunsliteratur'), rural culture vs. urban culture, reception experience vs. aesthetics of reception. Compared to the highly literary specimens of popular French, Provençal, Spanish and Portuguese stories, the 'more oral' and hence much less known manifestations of Rumanian and Rhaetoroman narrative traditions emerge from this introduction and volume as the true critical treasure; there is also, tantalizingly, mention of popular illustrations in Romance 'folkbooks,' especially in Italian and Catalan (pp. 9-10, 16).

As a 'Text zur Forschung' this volume will have marked an important étape: it takes stock of what has been accomplished in the study of popular literature, and it invites exploration of barely perceived or as yet unsuspected echoes of the peoples' voices. (HANS R. RUNTE, DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY)

*NIKLAUS LUHMANN. *Love as Passion: The Codification of Intimacy*. Trans. Jeremy Graines and Doris L. Jones. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press 1987. Pp. 256. US\$30.50

The translation of Luhmann's 1982 book *Liebe als Passion: Zur Codierung von Intimität*, into English by Jeremy Graines and Doris L. Jones is a welcome event. Luhmann's dense, tightly structured book strives to situate

passionate love within a quasi-scientific framework, and it therefore enters the vast Occidental discourse on love in an eminently 'modern' fashion. For if it is true, as at least one contemporary psychoanalyst, Ethel Spector person, believes, that such discourse has virtually disappeared in our age because of the prestige of science, which values only what it can unequivocally explain and interpret, then it may indeed be necessary to attempt analysis which downgrades sentiment and highlights if not scientific 'hard fact,' then at least the controlled perspective of semantic codification. Luhmann's book is a fascinating and richly evocative exploration of love 'codes' from the Medieval period through to the contemporary era. While it is not easy to read (in large part because of a mediocre and sometimes downright inadequate translation from the original German, in combination with poor editing by Harvard UP), it is worth every minute expended by the reader. The work is especially valuable for the psychologically oriented scholar, for whom the approach of symbolic codes will challenge a familiar focus on 'inner' drives and needs. Such a reader need not, of course, reject analysis along the lines of psychological determinism after reading Luhmann's book. Rather, one will find the psychological approach strengthened and invigorated by this carefully written and prepared semantic study. It is therefore the richest of critical reading experiences.

According to Luhmann, who follows a traditional stress on societal convention in matters of passion, we love and suffer according to cultural imperatives, of which we may not always be consciously aware, but frequently sense nonetheless at the deepest levels of the self. He sees his principal task as the elucidation of these imperatives across the panorama of Western civilization. Passionate love is examined not as feeling, but as 'constituting a symbolic code' (p. 8), which in turn 'encourages one to have appropriate feelings' (p. 9). Our amorous fate appears dictated by the media of communication, thus, we love as we read.

Moving from Medieval times, which are not the centre of the book, to the seventeenth century, Luhmann perceives a dramatic shift from idealization to paradoxicalization, with a concomitant reordering of the justification for loving. Whereas love as idealization rested on a foundation of knowledge, the paradoxicalization of *amour passion* in the seventeenth century depended principally upon the imagination. By paradoxicalization, Luhmann means the significant contradictory pairs which mark at least French literature in the classical period: 'conquering self-subjugation,' 'desired suffering,' 'vision in blindness,' and a 'preference for illness and imprisonment' all converge in the central point of excessiveness, where hatred and love — more paradox — are intertwined.

Luhmann makes clear that in the ongoing process of separating intensely personal relationships from impersonal ones (a process begun in the second half of the seventeenth century, but not realized wholly until the nineteenth), the classical period in France stands out as an incisive moment for its awareness of the code as a 'model of behaviour that could be acted out' (p. 20). A woman being seduced was thus propelled by subscription to cultural and linguistic codes in her immediate and individual situation, to clear pattern in the novels of La Fayette as well as in a work such as the *Lettres portugaises*, where the heroines appear determined or fated to love by subliminal recognition of semantic codes.

The seventeenth century also witnessed 'the incorporation of sexuality into the code as an essential component of love,' as the paradoxicalization process dissolved the old battle between 'higher' and 'sensual' love. However, as Luhmann makes clear, it is not until the nineteenth century that love as the ideal systematization of sexuality becomes a fully realized concept. The entire shift from the classical code of *amour passion* to the 'Romantic' one of self-referentiality (i.e., autonomy of and through love) forms a large part of Luhmann's work. These sections are less sharply focused and delineated than those on classical codification, in part no doubt because of the 'fuzzy' contours of 'Romanticism' *per se*. Yet, his tracing of the increasingly paramount claims of individuality offers a convincing portrait of the transitional formats which ultimately stabilize in an intensified awareness of individual claims in matters of love. During the Romantic period, too, as Luhmann demonstrates in considerable detail, intimacy becomes inseparable from marital bliss, in a radical departure from *courtisane* and *amour passion*, which had emphasized passionate love as extra-marital. (This focus on adultery is a result, Luhmann believes, of the incompatibility, in older, traditional societies, of intimate pair bonding and the demands of a stratified social network stressing continuity and duration; hence, the original formulation of passion as *outside* marriage, to be absorbed into it during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.) 'Romantic' love thus attempted to transcend *amour passion* by 'incorporating an infinitely enhanceable individuality' through 'the reconciliation with marriage.'

In the book's final sections, which seek to decode the contemporary period, Luhmann becomes elliptical, perhaps because he realizes how tentative his conclusions must, at this time, remain. Nevertheless, he is convincing in his analysis of the 'new' formulation of the code: he believes love is now viewed as an essential 'problem' — that of locating a loving and lovable partner, and of making such a bond last through permanent commitment. His comments seem all too true, applicable to an age where

personal freedom is prized above all else, while society's requirements are persistently downgraded and downplayed.

These brief, generalized remarks do not begin to do justice to Luhmann's complex and multi-layered work. There are invaluable comments on almost every page. One would only wish for, in addition to better translating and editing, more time and space to expose and develop in greater detail the wide-ranging, yet subtle conclusions he draws. Despite a claim to dissecting Western European cultural codes, the book's major focus is on French society and culture, in the classical and Romantic periods, and much less on English and German literary and philosophical trends. The latter are briefly developed, but not always adequately integrated into Luhmann's analysis. For this critic, the emphasis on the French was of enormous interest, but those seeking fuller study of developments in other European countries may have to find their material elsewhere. Furthermore, the historical base of the book is often quite sketchy. Since Luhmann is writing essentially from a socio-linguistic framework and not from a historical one, this limitation need not be particularly distracting. However, because there are many references to historical causation, some further attention to their pertinence and impact may have been warranted. These are not, nevertheless, major objections. Given what Luhmann set out to do, he has succeeded superbly. He has written a 'passionate' study for those who remain captivated by questions of why we love, how we love, and whom we love. This is a novel and worthy perspective on age-old issues, valuable to literary scholars, as well as to sociologists and cultural historians, all of whom will benefit from Luhmann's rigorous scholarship and his wide range of readings, in conjunction with a powerfully original conceptual base. (LOUISE K. HOROWITZ, RUTGERS UNIVERSITY)

C. LAUVERGNAT-GAGNIÈRE et B. YON, éds. *Le juste et l'injuste à la Renaissance et à l'âge classique*. Actes du colloque internationale tenu à Saint-Étienne du 21 au 23 avril 1983. Saint-Étienne: Publications de l'Université de Saint-Étienne 1986. Pp. 260.

Sur un sujet crucial, un colloque, et maintenant un livre (de bonne présentation malgré quelques pages redoublées), ont pris le parti courageux, et rare encore, de la pluridisciplinarité. Sans doute est-on loin d'une communauté d'approches, ou même d'une véritable confrontation de méthodes et d'objets (les débats, malheureusement, n'ont pu être transcrits). Après un avant-propos de C. Lauvergnat-Gagnière, les études sont réparties en trois groupes: 1) Le 'juste' chez quelques penseurs - 2) Le 'juste' dans l'histoire - 3) Le 'juste' dans quelques œuvres littéraires.

Inaugurant avec Marsile Ficin la série des 'penseurs', Cesare Vasoli ('Juste justice et loi dans les commentaires de M.F.') rappelle que pour cet auteur le critère de justice est à rechercher dans la sagesse universelle de Dieu. La loi humaine, malgré ses limites, procède de cette loi divine; elle devrait être exercée par un seul homme, un sage. Mais, à Platon et Dante (*Monarchie*), Ficin ajoute saint Paul: depuis le sacrifice du Christ, l'homme justifié par la foi peut espérer dépasser l'observance de la 'justice légale', et s'ouvrir à la 'virtus universa' de la justice divine.

Pierre Quillet (l'impossible classement de la vertu de justice dans les hiérarchies de Charles de Bovelles) se promène avec humour (mais de façon si allusive qu'on a parfois peine à le suivre) dans les complexes hiérarchiques du philosophe (*De septem viciis, De duodecim numeris*...). Le problème de la justice met en cause à la fois la logique aristotélicienne de la *médité* et les architectures visionnaires de la tradition néo-platonicienne (elles-mêmes variables et s'efforçant d'harmoniser des séries d'origine païenne, mosaïque ou chrétienne).

Jacques Chomarat ('Le juste et l'injuste chez Erasme') suit dans l'*Ecclésiastes*, puis dans des diverses *Paraphrases*, le travail du syncrétisme érasmien, qui amalgame des notions telles que *caritas, gratia, pietas, justitia*, avant de distinguer *justitia hominum* et *justitia Dei*. La Loi de Moïse, les lois païennes, ne réalisent qu'un minimum de justice. La Loi du Christ doit restaurer la loi de nature. Mais en l'homme cohabitent, depuis la Chute, sentiment de la justice et expérience de l'injustice. Erasme s'en tient au dédoublement entre lois humaines, nécessaires pour limiter la violence, et Loi du Christ; toujours il est permis de juger celles-là selon celle-ci.

Pour Jean-Jacques Marchand ('Le juste et l'injuste chez Machiavel'), l'auteur du *Prince* ne s'éloigne pas au même degré du droit et de la morale. Dans divers écrits de 1503, puis dans le *Prince*, Machiavel se sépare de la pensée juridique: le pouvoir politique lui paraît légitimé par sa capacité de conserver et de renforcer l'état. Il n'est pas de droit qui justifie l'incapacité. En revanche, sur le plan moral, Machiavel serait plus prudent, cherchant à cerner les conditions et les limites de l'art de 'ne pas être bon' en gouvernant.

Jacques Ridé ('Guerre juste et guerre injuste selon Martin Luther') s'intéresse au traité *Les gens de guerre peuvent-ils être aussi en état de grâce?* (1526). La fonction militaire consiste selon Luther à maintenir l'ordre et la paix sur terre. Elle est juste en soi. La révolte de l'inférieur contre son supérieur (c'est-à-dire contre l'ordre institué par Dieu) est toujours injuste. Inversement, le supérieur a toujours le droit de réprimer la révolte de ses sujets. Dans le cas d'une guerre entre égaux (deux seigneurs ou deux

peuples), a tort celui qui commence la guerre. Est seule juste la guerre contrainte et forcée, de légitime défense.

Marguerite Soulié ('Le juste et l'injuste dans la pensée de Calvin') montre comment le Réformateur distingue, avec saint Paul, 'justice de la loi' et 'justice de la foi'. L'homme aliéné ne saurait accomplir la Loi donnée par Dieu; même s'il l'accomplissait, il n'aurait pas accès au mystère de la justice divine, dont les effets peuvent choquer le sens humain de la justice. De fait, nous n'avons nulle 'justice' à moins d'être 'justifiés' par Dieu. Mais pour l'homme justifié, la loi prend un sens nouveau.

Dans une contribution très riche, Nicole Dockès ('La loi, l'équité et la paix, ou la justice selon Jean Bodin') cerne la notion bodinienne de 'justice harmonique', développée au dernier chapitre de la *République*. Bodin combine deux modèles mathématiques (progressions arithmétique et géométrique) pour obtenir sa progression 'harmonique'. De même il mélange, en les simplifiant, les justices 'commutative' et 'distributive' d'Aristote. Sa justice 'harmonique' combine justice démocratique (égalitariste) et aristocratique (fondée sur fortune et naissance). Ainsi sont associées la loi (rigide) et l'équité (malléable), ce qui permet à la République d'atteindre la paix à quoi s'identifie la vraie justice. La *République* applique le principe de la justice harmonique tant au 'mode de gouvernement' qu'à la justice pénale et civile.

Du côté des historiens, Pierre-Roger Gaussein ('Deux formes de monarchie absolue, deux conceptions de la justice de Charles VII à Louis XI') retrace l'évolution de l'absolutisme sous les deux règnes considérés. Après une analyse de la composition du Conseil, instrument de l'autorité royale, P.-R. Gaussein montre que le pouvoir 'absolu' de Charles VII restaure l'institution judiciaire (ordonnance de 1454), alors que le pouvoir 'despotique' de Louis XI la met sous tutelle.

Michel Reulos ('La justice, attribut essentiel du roi de France au XVI^e siècle') suit, quant à lui, l'évolution de l'absolutisme royal jusqu'à la fin du XVI^e siècle. Dans l'action du roi sont associés deux sens du mot 'justice', pratique (l'application de la loi), et moral (la vertu de justice, que le roi met en oeuvre pour corriger des abus). Le souverain absolu a de plus en plus le pouvoir de faire la loi; dès lors, la vertu d'équité, préchée dans les 'remontrances', apparaît surtout comme un moyen de contrôler ce pouvoir même.

Joël Lefebvre ('Un programme socio-économique égalitaire au temps de la Réforme') présente la *Constitution pour la Province de Tyrol*, de Michael Gaismair (1526), dont il fournit la première traduction française, assortie d'une bibliographie critique. J. Lefebvre rappelle le contexte du projet 'communiste' de Gaismair, rédigé entre deux insurrections de la 'Guerre des

Paysans' qui, au Tyrol, est aussi une révolte du 'prolétariat' minier. Se référant, comme les *Articles* des paysans allemands, à la 'justice selon Dieu', Gaismaier envisage la suppression des villes, de la noblesse, du clergé, et de la bourgeoisie. Il réorganise sur des bases démocratiques la vie religieuse, l'administration, la justice, 'nationalise' les hôpitaux et les mines, interdit le négoce individuel. J. Lefebvre souligne l'originalité de Gaismaier par rapport aux *Articles* à la pensée de Müntzer et aux utopies littéraires.

Joseph Pérez ('Conquête et colonisation du Nouveau Monde: la querelle des justes titres chez les penseurs espagnols du XVI^e siècle') analyse le problème juridique, théologique et moral qui se pose à l'Espagne, dès les années 1510. La conquête a-t-elle été juste? La pratique de la *encomienda* et du travail forcé des Indiens est-elle compatible avec l'évangélisation? J. Pérez situe les combats de Las Casas, contre l'interprétation théocratique des bulles alexandrines de 1493, contre l'esclavage de fait des Indiens. Les leçons de Vitoria sur les 'justes titres' sont encore une contestation du droit de conquête et de tutelle. Après un temps de réformisme, la réaction des colons conduira le pouvoir espagnol à légitimer les privilèges acquis.

Vient ensuite, par Hugues Neveux, une brève 'Étude comparée de la notion justice dans les soulèvements paysans allemands (début du XVI^e siècle) et français (milieu du XVII^e siècle)'. Relevant que tous ces insurgés en appellent à une 'Justice' supérieure. H. Neveux précise aussitôt que les références allemandes à la 'Justice de Dieu' ont une portée révolutionnaire, mais non celles aux 'Anciennes Coutumes', que présupposent l'ordre existant, comme le feront plus tard les appels des paysans français à la Justice du Roi.

Jean Jehasse analyse pour sa part 'Le juste et l'injuste sous Richelieu (1635)', à travers la littérature politique et polémique (de M. de Morgues à Balzac). Il montre autour des méthodes du Cardinal un double mouvement de réduction de la vertu de Justice, et de mise au point d'une notion laïcisée du 'Juste', renvoyant moins à 'Justice' qu'à 'Justesse', au calcul, dans tous les domaines, de rapports de forces.

'À propos de la politisation de l'humanisme tardif européen', Klaus Garber présente en quelques pages un sommaire de ses travaux sur 'Jacques Auguste de Thou et le Cabinet Dupuy'. Esquissant un inventaire de la Collection historique des frères Dupuy, évoquant leur rôle de relais intellectuel et diplomatique (notamment entre la France et l'Allemagne), K. Garber pose les bases d'une 'archéologie' du concept moderne d'État, qui perd un peu de vue la question précise de la justice.

Ouvrant la série des études 'littéraires', Robert Vallat propose une analyse lexicologique de 'Juste et injuste dans les *Illustrations de Gaule et Singularitez de Troye* de Jean Lemaire de Belges'. Après un relevé

d'occurrences, une brève étude sémantique met notamment en évidence le sens de 'pouvoir', commun au juste et à l'injuste.

Christian Bec ('Justice et libéralité: le projet courtois de Bandello') montre que le *Novelliere* met en scène la 'parfaite justice' des Princes pour mieux négocier, contre promesse d'immortalisation, leur 'libéralité', vertu nécessaire à la survie et au confort de l'écrivain-courtois, dont l'œuvre de Bandello ne cesse, entre les lignes, de défendre le statut.

Autre étude lexicologique de 'juste et injuste', le travail de Michel Gliaigny se donne l'œuvre de Ronsard pour objet, tout en prétendant, avec une modestie exagérée, se limiter à un travail de 'linguiste'. Un examen, notamment, des cooccurrences 'justice et force', '... et pouvoir', '... et peuple' semble révéler une évolution de l'idée ronsardienne de la justice, de plus en plus associée à la paix, au contrôle du pouvoir, à la réciprocité de services entre le roi et le peuple.

Jean-Marc Pelorson ('Le thème de la justice dans *Don Quichotte*: utopie et contre-utopie') revient sur trois épisodes célèbres (Quichotte 'protégeant' le jeune André, Quichotte 'libérant' les galériens, Sancho rendant la justice à Barataria) pour montrer que Cervantes ne se contente pas de ridiculiser l'idéalisme dans l'exercice chevaleresque de la justice; les adversaires de Quichotte ne sont pas justifiés; et c'est Sancho, dans l'épisode carnavalesque de la seconde partie, qui montre la voie d'une justice opératoire pour la société des hommes.

Rolf Tarot ('Justice et injustice dans le drame silésien') relit *Charles Stuart*, tragédie de Gryphius, à la double lumière du néo-stoïcisme de Lipsé et du refus luthérien de la rébellion. Contre A. Schöne, qui faisait de cette œuvre une tragédie du martyr (où Charles = le Christ). R. Tarot y voit surtout la critique politique des révolutionnaires, d'où se déduit un programme d'obéissance et de *costantia*.

Ruprecht Wimmer ('Le prince juste et l'usurpateur dans quelques drames jésuites') retrace l'évolution du théâtre jésuite en terre d'Empire, des années 1570 aux environs de 1660. R. Wimmer s'intéresse d'abord à la *Comédie de Constantin* (Munich, 1575), qui met en scène la difficile conquête d'un pouvoir juste par un prince devenant chrétien. À l'opposé, les 'tragédies' de l'empereur byzantin Maurice (à partir de 1603) montrent le souverain en proie à l'erreur, dont il choisit d'être puni en ce monde. Par la suite, l'histoire de Constantin perd sa dimension spirituelle et devient un motif de propagande au service des Habsbourg (Avancini, *Pietas Victoria*, 1659).

Enfin Roger Lejosne (John Milton et les voies de Dieu) analyse la conception miltonienne de la justice, liée à une idée personnelle de la grâce: l'homme a reçu une grâce suffisante qui lui permet de choisir et d'être responsable de ses actes. De même que les individus, les peuples peuvent

faire le choix d'être vertueux et libres, ou de connaître le juste châtimement de la tyrannie. Et les lois d'un état juste doivent risquer plutôt de mal réprimer les vices que de limiter la liberté individuelle des justes.

Si elle décourage la synthèse, cette collection d'essais n'en est pas moins importante par la richesse des aperçus qu'elle procure et des rencontres qu'elle suggère. (FRANÇOIS CORNILLIAT, RUTGERS UNIVERSITY)

*JONATHAN GOLDBERG. *Voice Terminal Echo: Postmodernism and English Renaissance Texts*. New York and London: Methuen 1986. Pp. 208. Hardcover US\$26.00, paper US\$13.95

Literary history — what is to be done about it? Nothing, it is not doable; better to *undo* it. These seem to be the answers offered, subtextually, by Jonathan Goldberg's five poststructuralist readings of Renaissance texts collected in this volume.

In reviewing a book whose introduction bears the heading 'Terminals,' one is entitled to begin at the end. Goldberg's final essay, 'Milton's warning voice: considering preventive measures' (pp. 124-58), engages more directly with literary history than any of the other essays here — inevitably, since Milton's texts are extraordinarily self-conscious about their place in literary history, even, uncannily, in *future* literary history. This, indeed, is Goldberg's theme: 'the blocked writer who becomes the great stumbling block for future writers' (p. 125). He pursues it through an argument of baroque complexity and elusiveness, even by the standards of the complex and elusive readings elsewhere in this book. Milton, in Goldberg's account, attempts to neutralize the threatening precursor-figures, Spenser and Shakespeare, through a strategy of displaced allusion and (mis)appropriation, echoing Shakespeare's Sonnet 15 ('When I consider every thing that grows') in his own sonnet 'When I consider how my light is spent,' and Raleigh's prefatory sonnet to *The Faerie Queene* ('Me thought I saw the grave, where *Laura* lay') in his own 'Methought I saw my late espoused saint,' displacing an inappropriate echo of Spenser into his sonnet 'On Shakespeare,' and, notoriously, misremembering a key episode of *The Faerie Queene* (Guyon in the Cave of Mammon) in his *Areopagitica*. Milton's strategy, devious and perplexing though it may be, is equalled if not surpassed in deviousness by Goldberg's discourse about it, and we may well wonder whether the motive for deviousness might not be the same in both cases. Milton is responding to the pressures of his own literary-historical belatedness: 'Milton's aim is to make his own belatedness into an earliness' (p. 141). Goldberg here quotes Harold Bloom, and the theme of Miltonic anxiety of influence (both the

anxiety Milton suffered and the anxiety he made later poets suffer in their turn) is, of course, one that Bloom has made his own. So much so, indeed, that we may speculate that, by venturing to take up an issue so closely associated with Bloom, Goldberg might have contracted an influence anxiety of his own, one that twists and perplexes his discourse in a way parallel to the twists and perplexities induced by Milton's fear of belatedness.

Nor is Bloom the only possible source of anxiety. Like Milton confronting the double threat of both Spenser and Shakespeare, Goldberg faces at least one other precursor figure, and perhaps two, in addition to Bloom. For the 'figure of Echo' which Goldberg pursues throughout this book — both the Ovidian myth and the motifs of allusion, intertextuality, and the fading of 'voice' into writing — has already been pursued by John Hollander in a book of that title (*The Figure of Echo: A Mode of Allusion to Milton and After*, 1981), and again by Joseph Loewenstein in *Responsive Readings: Versions of Echo in Pastoral, Epic, and the Jonsonian Masque* (1984). Hollander's book is unmistakably marked by the influence of his friend, Bloom, while Loewenstein's is just as clearly influenced by his teacher, Hollander, so Goldberg, by taking up this theme now, actually risks coming *fourth* in a chain of transmitted influences. Responsible scholar that he is, he of course cites both Hollander and Loewenstein (as well as Bloom) in his footnotes to 'Milton's warning voice,' but he does not directly confront his critical precursors here. This confrontation is displaced to the introduction where, however, it is still relegated to the footnotes. Here Hollander is praised ('[t]he book is invaluable,' [p. 162]) and Loewenstein blamed — evidently for being insufficiently sensitive to the subversive possibilities of Echo and allusion in the texts he studies. Goldberg, it appears, is anxious not to be conflated with Loewenstein's overly *un*anxious approach.

The thesis, then, is that the parallelism between Echo as a figure in literary texts and Echo as a relationship *between* texts, already explored by Hollander and Loewenstein, is itself echoed in Goldberg's book: Echo and intertextuality in the history of literature are his themes, but they are also a burden from which he suffers in the history of literary criticism. And not only in the Milton essay, where these issues are most directly relevant, at both levels. Rather, I think that this pattern can be generalized to the whole of *Voice Terminal Echo*. Throughout his readings, Goldberg displays a considerable anxiety to distance himself from familiar literary-critical stances toward the texts under discussion. He does this partly by appealing to theory and to theorists. Strategically displacing the orthodox, 'domestic' discourses of Renaissance studies — historically and philologically based, with an overlay of New Critical close-reading practices — by the 'alien' discourses of