

BOOK REVIEWS

MARTINSEN, DEBORAH, AND OLGA MAIOROVA, EDS. *Dostoevsky in Context*. 171
Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2015. Pp. xxiv+329. \$45.95 CDN paperback.

Irina Erman, College of Charleston

The first volume in the Cambridge University Press “Literature in Context” series to focus on a Russian writer, Deborah Martinsen and Olga Maiorova’s *Dostoevsky in Context* offers a thoughtfully curated collection of thirty-five short essays that describe Russia as it was experienced by Dostoevsky and his contemporaries. The volume aims to inform students and general readers about the “artistic, journalistic, political, religious, and economic” (1) worlds that Dostoevsky inhabited. In doing so, the essays also examine how Dostoevsky interacted with these contexts and transmuted his wide-ranging life experiences into his fiction. Thus, while it presents the writer as a man of his epoch who was profoundly shaped by the social and political transformations that Russia underwent during this time, *Dostoevsky in Context* also highlights Dostoevsky’s unique life trajectory and helps nonspecialist readers appreciate the creativity and vision with which he engaged with the major issues of his day.

The volume presents its own cross section of contemporary Dostoevsky Studies. As the editors explain in their introduction, the essays that have been selected “not only re-examine well-studied contexts (such as Christianity, realism, serfdom, legal practices, revolutionary terrorism, and ‘the woman question’), but they also explore emergent contexts (such as Islam, empire, childhood, gambling, symbolic geography, penal practices, race, and biology)” (3). This makes *Dostoevsky in Context* particularly valuable as a classroom companion to inform discussion by helping students navigate questions regarding race, empire, or Dostoevsky’s portrayal of Jewish or

Muslim characters, and approach those issues within the Russian context. Further, the expert essays gathered in this volume can prove valuable to specialist readers as succinct summaries of important issues in the field, which can also point to avenues for further scholarly exploration.

172 The focus and scope of *Dostoevsky in Context* emerges clearly when we compare it with other important resource texts, such as Kenneth Lantz's *The Dostoevsky Encyclopedia* (2004) and *The Cambridge Companion to Dostoevskii* (2002) edited by W.J. Leatherbarrow. In their introduction, Martinsen and Maiorova also rightfully point to Joseph Frank's masterful five-volume biography as the starting point for all subsequent discussions of the writer in his time. Their curated approach, however, explicitly differs both from Frank's exhaustive study and from Lantz's collection of 248 alphabetically arranged entries, which cover topics ranging from Dostoevsky's own writings to relevant people, places, literary influences, and key concepts. *Dostoevsky in Context* is organized into two main parts, with Part One focusing on "Social, Historical, and Cultural Contexts" and a shorter Part Two dealing with "Literature, Journalism, and Languages." The first part of the book is further divided into four thematic sections, which foreground the changing political, economic, social, and cultural landscape experienced by Dostoevsky and his contemporaries. This sets the main topic for the entire volume, in that it focuses primarily on the country's transformation during and after the Great Reforms. As the volume concentrates on the 1860s and 1870s, the picture of Dostoevsky it presents is largely that of the post-Siberia author of the major novels and the *Diary of a Writer*. In this, the collection tailors itself to the classroom, in which *Crime and Punishment* and the mature novels appear with much greater frequency than Dostoevsky's early works. Its concentration also decreases overlap with the eleven essays featured in W.J. Leatherbarrow's *The Cambridge Companion to Dostoevskii*, which opens with the intellectual and literary influences that shaped Dostoevsky in the 1840s.

Perhaps the most impressive aspect of Martinsen and Maiorova's volume is how well it anticipates and addresses major questions that arise in the classroom. The first five essays speak to various aspects of the question: why does such a level of political dissatisfaction persist, and, in fact, even rise to the level of terrorism and revolutionary agitation, after the abolition of serfdom and Alexander II's other reforms? In the first entry, Richard Wortman discusses the judicial reforms and the tensions they exposed, particularly when it came to the newly instituted jury trial. Nathaniel Knight's subsequent essay on the abolition of serfdom offers a concise explanation of its origins, the causes leading to its 1861 abolition, and the disappointment produced by the compromises undertaken by the reform's architects. Derek Offord's excellent entry on nihilism and terrorism highlights the resulting "mutinous mood" (49) of the 1860s and 1870s and beyond. The essays complement and reinforce each other quite well. At the end of the section, Jonathan Paine's piece on the economy offers a pithy summation for the main subject of this section, explaining that "[t]he Great Reforms contained within them, or at least within their implementation, the seeds of their

own failure" (68).

Three more essays fill out the picture of Russia's social and political transformation in the first section of the book. James Scanlan's entry on "Socialism, Utopia, and Myth" and Anna Schur's on "Punishment and Crime" contextualize and examine Dostoevsky's engagement with these concepts. Scanlan's and Schur's essays help to explain Dostoevsky's critique of philosophical and ethical systems that view human beings as entirely rational and controlled by their circumstances. Meanwhile, Barbara Engel's essay on "the woman question" documents the conditions faced by women in the nineteenth century and explains why the issue of "women's lack of economic options and their resulting sexual vulnerability" (58) emerges so prominently in Dostoevsky's texts. Why does Varenka Dobroselova marry her rapist? Does Sonya Marmeladova have any viable alternatives to help support her family other than prostitution? Engel's essay helps students understand how women's lack of options leads to the self-destructive choices made by Dostoevsky's abused heroines.

Section Two on "Political, Social, and Cultural Institutions" features a wide range of scholarly approaches. Richard Wortman's discussion of "Russian monarchy and the people" argues that a "crisis of autocracy" (82) emerged during Alexander II's reign, leading up to his eventual assassination. Olga Maiorova's entry on empire paints a nuanced portrait of Dostoevsky's views on the Russian empire's others. Maiorova offers an interesting reading of the depiction of non-Russian characters in Dostoevsky's *House of the Dead*, arguing that it is best understood in terms of his imperial vision of messianic Russianness developed upon his return from Siberia (89). Harriet Murav's essay on "Jews, Race, and Biology" offers a different approach by recontextualizing "the question of Dostoevsky and Jews in light of emerging notions of race" (123). The section also features essays by Inessa Medzhibovskaya on education; Michael Gordin on science, technology, and medicine; Susan Morrissey on suicide in its cultural context; and Robin Feuer Miller on the figure of the suffering child in Dostoevsky's work. Finally, Richard Rosenthal quotes from the DSM-5 to diagnose Dostoevsky's gambling addiction, and discusses the relationship between gambling and his creative process.

Irina Reyfman's essay in Section Two is worth singling out for its practical usefulness to students. Reyfman explains Peter's Table of Ranks and provides helpful commentary on the ranks and relative circumstances of many of Dostoevsky's characters. As we move on to the considerably shorter Section Three, we find three helpful entries on "Space and Place" in Dostoevsky's world. Anne Lounsbery's "Symbolic Geography" focuses largely on the tension between the center and the periphery, or the urban and rural, in the literary imagination. Robert Belknap and Sarah Young contribute analyses of the ever-important symbology of St. Petersburg and the Crystal Palace.

The essays featured in the final section of Part One on "Religion and Modernity" do justice to Dostoevsky's often inconsistent, evolving views on religion. Nel Grillaert's examination of various aspects of "Orthodox Spirituality" is followed by Irina Paert's

discussion of Dostoevsky's interest in "religious commitment on the margins of the established church" and his "understanding of Old Belief as a form of social protest" (199). Mikhail Dolbilov offers a psychoanalytic reading of Dostoevsky's attitude to Roman Catholicism as "a projection or inversion of the hidden fears and doubts one has about one's own religion" (208). Robert Geraci's essay informs students about the role and importance of Islam and the Caucasus region in the Russian empire, and provides an excellent diachronic analysis of Dostoevsky's attitudes and references to Islam, which ranged "from a neutral acceptance or positive appreciation [...] to a more combative, dichotomizing stance" in response to the conflict with the Ottoman Empire (216).

Journalism and print culture are featured heavily in Part Two, on "Literature, Journalism, and Languages." Konstantine Klioutchkine opens the section by describing print culture and the media landscape. Part Two also features essays by Ellen Chances, Sarah Hudspeth, and Kate Holland, on Dostoevsky's journalism at different
174 time periods. Susan Layton's contribution on travel writing focuses on *Winter Notes on Summer Impressions* and its context. There are also three notable discussions of genre and Dostoevsky's creative inspirations. Liza Knapp writes about Dostoevsky's "eccentric" realism, and Linda Ivanits illuminates Dostoevsky's engagement with folklore at various periods in his life. Maude Meisel pens a superbly informative essay on theater and its role in Dostoevsky's creative life. Carol Apollonio's fascinating entry both discusses the translation history of Dostoevsky's texts and also situates his work as a translator in the context of the increased demand for translation that accompanied the democratization of the reading public in his time. In her essay on foreign languages, Karin Beck analyzes why Dostoevsky marks certain characters with linguistic differences in his texts. Beck's essay helps explain why Stepan Verkhovensky, for example, constantly switches between Russian and French and what it signals. Part Two concludes with Irene Zohrab's entry on censorship, which provides important information about the censorship landscape in general, and its impact on Dostoevsky's writings.

The essays gathered in this volume complement and connect with each other, but they are also eminently excerptable and ideal for use as short, informative background readings for class. The fact that each topic comes with a list of suggested readings also makes the collection a valuable tool for student project development. Nor is the value of *Dostoevsky in Context* limited to Dostoevsky seminars. Because the primary focus of most of the essays is on the contexts themselves, this book would be an excellent companion text for nineteenth-century Russian literature survey courses and for a range of thematic literature courses dealing with the second half of the nineteenth century.

SONG, MINGWEI. *Young China: National Rejuvenation and the Bildungsroman, 1900-1959*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Asia Centre, 2015. Pp. 379. \$49.95 US hardcover.

Andrea Bachner, Cornell University

Song Mingwei concludes his monograph *Young China: National Rejuvenation and the Bildungsroman, 1900-1959* with a reflection on the connotations of youth in contemporary China through the lens of Liu Cixin's science fiction story "Micro-era" ("Weijiyuan," 1999): When the last human returns to earth after millennia, he finds a culture of eternally young micro-humans in a perpetual state of happiness, yet without capacity for development. Disburdened from the responsibility of history or politics, Liu's micro-humans present an eerie image of contemporary Chinese youths steeped in a "Chinese dream" that has erased political action in favor of carefree consumption. This condition, as Song suggests, resonates in strange ways with the hopes for China's youths that Chinese intellectuals such as Lu Xun uttered during the first decades of the twentieth century and beyond: On the one hand, this is precisely a generation no longer burdened by "the weight of tradition and [...] the gate of darkness," as Lu Xun hoped could be achieved by the sacrifice of the old for the young (qtd. in Song 335). On the other, this salvation of the children—I am echoing Song's reference to the ending of Lu Xun's short story "A Madman's Diary" here—is also emptied of any meaning. As such, the discourse on youth that was of crucial importance to Chinese history and culture during much of China's long twentieth century has come to an end of sorts. But since this end is an unsatisfactory one, based on the suspended temporality and significance of youth, the trajectory of "young China" is not yet over. Thus, Song's questions at the end of his book have lost nothing of their urgency: "But who are *we*? How are we constructed as 'youths', new youths, or old youths, or people with memories or regrets about youth?" (339-40, emphasis in original). The discourse of youth continues to oscillate between paradoxical extremes: "Every utopia is at the same time dystopian" (340).

175

This emphasis on the contradictions of youth pervades *Young China* as a constant rhythm of counterpoints even as Song leads his readers through an exquisitely constructed cultural history of China from 1900 to 1959 viewed through the prism of discourses on and novels about youth: from late Qing discourses to May Fourth, from the realism of Mao Dun and the anarchism of Ba Jin to the lyricism of Lu Ling and Lu Qiao, and finally to the Maoist expressions of youth in Yang Mo's *Song of Youth* and Wang Meng's *Long Live Youth* in the 1950s. Each of the seven chapters, with Chapter One serving as a more conceptual introduction, focuses on the framing of youth in the work of one author or in a group of texts that are connected through their modes of youthful discourse, determined by the political and historical context at play. Since an excellent chapter outline can be found in the book's prologue, I will not dwell on the content of each chapter here, but focus on the main insights of the

book as a whole. As the book progresses diachronically from the late Qing to the 1950s, and with its focus on the literary practice of one author or a small number of authors in each chapter, *Young China* does not present a taxonomy of different avatars of youth, or only insofar as these can be inferred from specific literary examples. Instead, the conceptual trajectory of the book is largely developed through particular cases and leaves it for a reader to infer many of the theoretical ebbs and flows of youth discourse. After all, the book presents itself as a “synthesis of cultural history and narrative analysis” focused on the trope of youth, not a conceptual reflection on the notion as such (2). By the same token, its literary analyses draw on theories of the *Bildungsroman*, without, however, participating in elaborating or contesting that theoretical discourse itself.

176 All of the carefully contextualized examples that Song presents in exquisite detail, however, contribute to one overall argument about the role of youth in modern China, one that emphasizes its profoundly contradictory character. This contradiction, even paradox, hinges upon the aporetic characteristics of youth that need to be in evidence for the concept to fulfill its cultural, political, and ideological role. On the one hand, by definition, youth has to embody an unruly force, one that contests or even destroys the old, but also one whose unbounded energy cannot be tethered to any specific role or ideology. Otherwise, it would lose its ineffable power and remain impoverished and stagnant instead, no longer worthy of the absolute injunction to unrestrained vitality that had made youth such a crucial, enticing notion for Chinese intellectuals and writers alike to begin with. On the other, youth is not simply a free-floating, vague signifier of energy and new beginnings for modern Chinese intellectuals either. Instead, its force is usually tied to a political agenda in the contexts and works analyzed in *Young China*: such as the call for national rejuvenation in the late Qing and May Fourth eras, or the leftist activism of the 1930s as featured in Ba Jin’s and Mao Dun’s works, or the Maoist ideologies of the 1950s. In other words, youth oscillates between embodying a force of rupture and being tamed or subsumed under a particular political agenda. Or, as Song writes, “[how] can the two conflicting forces, formlessness and transformation, be reconciled in the symbolic figure of youth” (20)? And indeed, for youth to be discursively and politically productive, it needs to integrate both sides. Or rather, since the two, as the contradictions they are, cannot be easily integrated with each other, those who work with the symbolic currency of youth have to manage the fact that there exists no smooth integration of its two extremes.

This is not only a problem on the level of political discursivity and the contradictory meaning of youth that different politics deploy. On the level of literary works, this aporia reappears as a problem of narrative form. The selection of literary texts in *Young China* centers on one novelistic form: the *Bildungsroman*. But even as the examples under analysis show affinities with the *Bildungsroman*—not only because of shared generic traits, but also because of cases of literary influence and intertextuality—it is their divergence from generic rules, or else their falling short

of the standards of the form, that proves most productive in Song's discussions. The *Bildungsroman*, as Song theorizes with the help of works by Franco Moretti, Georg Lukács, and Mikhail Bakhtin, traces the becoming of its young protagonist as a balance between self-recognition and the realities of the world and the society in which the character lives. In the course of the narrative, the youthful energy that puts the protagonist at odds with societal expectations undergoes a process of tempering, one that is featured in the novel not as a regrettable loss of youth, but rather as the successful fulfillment of a character's potential, wedding the desired outcome for an individual's development and a satisfactory closure after the teleological trajectory of the narrative. And yet, as surfaces especially forcefully in Lukács's reflection on the *Bildungsroman*, the very fact that its plot is, in Moretti's words, "the symbolic form of modernity" (qtd. in Song 51) leads to the fact that the teleological unity of self and world often remains conflicted.

In most of the Chinese examples under discussion in *Young China* in particular, such a closure usually never arrives. And even as the *Bildungsroman* serves as a narrative template, the novels under discussion diverge from this model at some point or fall short of its narrative promise: "The textuality of the *Bildungsroman*, like youth itself, is to be tamed, but is not always tamable" (59). A case in point is Ye Shengtao's novel *Ni Huanzhi* (1928), which Song uses to introduce a reader to the key concerns of *Young China*, followed by a longer analysis in Chapter Three. Even as the novel follows the life of its protagonist Ni Huanzhi, the narrative traces a series of crises and disillusionments as Ni's political ideals are consecutively crushed. Rather than leading up to a moment of fulfillment and integration at the end, the novel starts with a moment of individual empowerment and hope that disappears as the plot progresses. And, rather than sustaining a smooth line of development, the narrative structure of *Ni Huanzhi* consists of a series of beginnings and endings. As Song points out, Ye's novel is not an exception, but rather the rule among the Chinese examples that make up the corpus of *Young China*. With few exceptions—for instance, where youth becomes completely subsumed under a political agenda, as in Yang Mo's *Song of Youth* from the 1950s—youth proves either too unruly for an integration of self and world, or its energy and ideals are crushed, leading to narrative quandaries of stagnant plots, aborted endings, or problematic character development.

This is an extremely interesting phenomenon, as the mostly European form of the *Bildungsroman* is being adapted to the historical vicissitudes and political necessities of China's long twentieth century, of which *Young China* covers almost sixty decades. As Song suggests, although without reflecting more in depth on this question, this might have much to do with the centrality of the discourse of youth in modern Chinese culture, which is also the central argument of *Young China*, namely

that during the last hundred years or so, youth, as the product of discursive practice, has functioned as a dominant trope and sustained a symbolic centrality in China's pursuit of modernity. In a culture of modernity, youth stands for newness, future, and change; and it gains a symbolic meaning that transcends its biological definition as the immature and

vulnerable period of adolescence. This makes it applicable to a wide range of reflections on a changing world. (15)

178 But the very plasticity of youth that makes it such a potent tropological vessel also interferes with its political and narrative functions, reflecting a double aporia of figuration. First, youth, as a biological, individual, and generational marker, becomes cathected to national rejuvenation, and yet, to translate biological time into national temporality also raises the question of how to frame national development, once the energetic burst of a new beginning has done its duty. Second, literary representations have to concretize and individualize this symbolic message yet again in the form of a single character, or, at times, a group of individuals. And while a suspended, timeless temporality might mark a utopian endpoint (without end), for instance for Marxist ideology, it makes for a narratively unsatisfactory structure, while the plot of an individual's successful maturation might clash with a historical moment in which the nation is still in crisis. These frictions between narrative, historical, and political temporalities are thematized most explicitly in Chapter Two of *Young China*, in Song's insightful discussion of the trope of "old youth" in late Qing narrative: "Youth is elusive, temporal, and short-lived, in the sense that it grows 'old' instantly" (93). The topic of youth's achronicity and resistance to representation pervades the whole book, however. Youth is both too fungible and too evanescent for the political and narrative roles that it is called upon to assume in a modern Chinese context.

This doubled problem of figuration, compounded by the fact that youth is supposedly both a trope and an agent of change, makes the Chinese cases of youth discourse coupled with the model of the *Bildungsroman* so interesting, not only for a reflection on the cultural history of China, but also, potentially, for a more global, worlded approach to questions of narrative form and the circulation of generic patterns. And yet, this is not the conceptual direction that *Young China* takes. After all, the book is situated in the disciplinary context of Chinese literary studies, not in that of Comparative Literature, and is thus also bound by field-specific rules and expectations. Nevertheless, precisely because Song's book pays so much attention to contextualizing each of the cases under discussion, since the literary is so closely tied to the biographical, historical, and political, it is also suited for a non-specialist reader. Indeed, one of the many admirable traits of this meticulously researched and smoothly narrated work is its accessibility, even as it also contains extremely valuable insights for a specialist audience. The questions of the changing meaning of youth during China's long twentieth century that Song's *Young China* raises are not only of enduring importance for the Chinese context, but also open up new ways of thinking about the links between politics and aesthetics, and about the transcultural circulations and diachronic vicissitudes of literary form.

UNGUREANU, DELIA. *From Paris to Tlön: Surrealism as World Literature*. New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2017. Pp. xi+332 illus. \$108.00 US hard-cover; \$31.46 US paperback; \$25.16 ebook.

David F. Richter, Utah State University

Part of Bloomsbury Academic's "Literatures as World Literature" series, Delia Ungureanu's *From Paris to Tlön* studies the surrealist aesthetic within the broad context of world literature. In contrast to local European avant-grade variations such as dadaism, vorticism, and futurism, Ungureanu demonstrates how surrealism gained a literary audience around the globe in just two decades, as manifested in poetry, visual arts, surrealist objects, fashion design, and even advertising. This posture breaks with many studies on the subject that treat surrealism as a uniquely European phenomenon, albeit with Latin American variations. Rather, Ungureanu's study draws on the "network" theories established by social anthropologists including Elizabeth Bott, Jeremy Boissevain, and J. Clyde Mitchell to map surrealism's "network of circulation" around the globe (3). Over the course of seven chapters, she traces the theoretical underpinnings of the movement, the international characteristics of its influence, the central position of the surrealist object as a form of intellectual exchange, and the broad reach of surrealist aesthetics and politics. Thus, Ungureanu highlights levels of networking, influence, and impact from the surrealist core in Paris to the Argentine writer Jorge Luis Borges's short stories "Tlön, Uqbar, Orbis Tertius" and "Pierre Menard, Autor del Quijote"; Russian-born author Vladimir Nabokov's seminal work *Lolita*; Turkish Nobel Prize writer Orhan Pamuk's novels *The Black Book* and *The Museum of Innocence*; and Romanian author Mircea Cărtărescu's works *Nostalgia*, *Blinking*, and *Solenoid*.

179

In treating surrealism as a global phenomenon, Ungureanu moves the discussion of surrealist aesthetics beyond what many consider a predominantly poetic and artistic movement. Ungureanu rightly suggests that by the late twentieth and twenty-first centuries, the surrealist mode can be seen in gothic, noir, and detective fiction, and in other manifestations of narrative. In doing this, she extends the conversation of surrealist criticism to incorporate writers not often associated with the movement, in addition to questioning the confines of orthodox surrealist groups and intimating that the writers discussed in the volume "never existed in isolation but participated in networks that have many points of intersection and that inform each other in the most unexpected ways" (15).

In the initial two chapters, Ungureanu addresses the French roots of surrealism in 1920s and 1930s Paris, from the theories of the father of surrealism, André Breton, to the continuously revisionary models of surrealism's greatest practitioner, the Spanish artist Salvador Dalí. The volume discusses the origins of the movement and their dependence on parlour games, café and bookstore meetings, the establishment of "little magazines" such as *Littérature*, *Minotaure*, *Documents*, and others, and the

foundational surrealist premises of the first and second manifestoes, including automatic writing, surrealist objects, dreams and the subconscious, and mad love. These venues and aesthetic concerns were key in the networking of intellectual groups in Paris and beyond, which by the mid-1930s was evidenced in the publication of surrealist bulletins in multiple languages, Breton's international travels to Prague, the Canary Islands, and Mexico, and the growing interest in surrealism in Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Romania, and Serbia.

Subsequent chapters offer case studies that exemplify Ungureanu's hypothesis of the networking of surrealist practices that led to a global market for surrealist creativity. In Chapter Three, she first addresses Jorge Luis Borges's short stories "Pierre Menard, Autor del Quijote" and "Tlön, Uqbar, Orbis Tertius" and their intertextual connections with a short analysis of Lautréamont's handwriting written by Dr. Pierre Menard and published by Breton in May 1939 in a surrealist dossier. Borges knew of surrealist aesthetics through his readings in Buenos Aires of the Parisian magazine *Minotaure*, and articles published in *Littérature*, *Mesures*, and the Argentine review *Sur*, to which Borges was a regular contributor. Ungureanu addresses provocative questions reading the genesis of Borges's "Pierre Menard" and whether Borges could have read Dr. Menard's article on Lautréamont before writing his own short story. Notwithstanding Borges's continual rejection of surrealism and its insistence on dream writing, Ungureanu shows how his stories reflect the "two unnamed characters behind Borges's text who came to haunt him: Lautréamont and Breton" (80). Like the invention of new worlds and realities emblematic of surrealism, Borges's fictions highlight the unsettled boundaries between fiction and reality, textuality and lived experience.

Chapters Four and Five examine the entrance of surrealism into the North American marketplace, largely through the efforts and successes of Salvador Dalí, although the path had been paved previously by the cubist and dadaist creations of Francis Picabia, Marcel Duchamp, and Man Ray and their exhibitions at New York art galleries in the 1910s. Ungureanu writes that the interest in surrealism in New York was generated in large part due to the avant-garde art gallery of Julien Levy and Alfred Barr's support of the Museum of Modern Art. This gave a forum for Dalí and others to promote their work internationally and would eventually lead to Dalí's self-proclaimed "triumph over New York" (157). Breton also sought an audience and support from the rising generation of artists in the New World, such as Roberto Matta and Robert Motherwell, and he and Dalí employed opposing strategies to gain the stronghold of the American marketplace.

Chapters Six and Seven address the appearance of surrealist tendencies in narrative form in the writings of Russian-American novelist Vladimir Nabokov, Turkish writer Orhan Pamuk, and Romanian author Mircea Cărtărescu. These chapters not only address a genre not often associated with surrealism, but also detail the vast network of often-overlooked surrealist tendencies in these works. For example, Ungureanu establishes intriguing connections between a story published by Dalí in

1931, titled “Rêverie” (to which he returned in his memoir in 1942), in which he discusses a young girl named Dulita, whom he describes “in terms that are remarkably suggestive of *Lolita*” (219). Ungureanu proposes that Nabokov was likely familiar with Dalí’s writings since they were reviewed in America’s leading magazines such as *The New Yorker*. She traces changes in the variations of both stories, which seems to underscore further connections between the two writers, and thereby suggests that Nabokov’s renowned 1955 novel owes more to surrealism than most might realize.

In her discussion of Pamuk and Cărtărescu, Ungureanu returns to the subject-object relationship developed in the influential writings of Marcel Proust. She recognizes how Proust endowed objects with a life of their own and how this paved the way for Breton’s surrealist objects. This use of objects is mobilized in Pamuk’s and Cărtărescu’s novels in a variety of ways, and in this sense establishes a unique connection to surrealist aesthetics. Ungureanu examines Pamuk’s 1990 novel *The Black Book* in conjunction with surrealist writer Louis Aragon’s 1926 text of the same title, “Le cahier noir.” The surrealist tendencies in Pamuk’s work employ dreamlike mysteries inherent to noir fiction, and thematic motifs related to anxiety, memory, and oblivion. In Cărtărescu’s writings from the 1990s to 2015, objects are given a sinister dark crimson colour, and their repeated use of the Romanian word *stacojiu* (268) suggests that realities emerge from deep beneath the surface of things as surrealist environments always had. Like Borges’s fictional worlds, Cărtărescu’s texts also demonstrate fantastic surrealistic worlds “where mirrors cease to reflect reality and become prophetic objects” (291), alongside mirrored objects and images that resonate with Man Ray’s photography and with the writings of a wide range of authors, from Breton to Franz Kafka. In addition to the seven chapters discussed here, Ungureanu’s book is supplemented with 34 black and white images and 12 colour plates, all of which contribute to the rich cultural variety of the volume. These images, drawing on cultural artefacts of the avant-garde period such as sketches, photographs, literary magazine covers, and Tarot cards, in addition to paintings by Vermeer, Dalí, and others, give visual texture to an otherwise already comprehensive study of the vast cultural production of the surrealist project.

From Paris to Tlön demonstrates a masterful knowledge of surrealism from its beginnings in France to its incorporation in literature and art in the present day. Ungureanu should be applauded for the extensive bibliography her study synthesizes and the insightful connections she makes between Breton, Dalí, and the many “surrealists” who came in their wake. Perhaps one omission from Ungureanu’s lengthy study is the influence or impact of surrealism on Asian and African writings. Given that the volume highlights “World Literature,” a chapter-length look at those from Japan, Cairo, and Iraq briefly mentioned in the introduction (11-13) would be a welcome addition to round out the volume. By studying surrealism as a world literary movement, this book treats international surrealist artists and writers in both cultural and political frameworks as their innovative creations sought to rebel against established norms in the aftermath of World War I and beyond. In

short, Ungureanu's study is ambitious in its breadth, meticulously researched, wide-ranging in its treatment of surrealism and its global impact, and a welcome addition for students and scholars alike interested in broadening their understanding of the genres, geographies, and international networks of the artists and writers associated with surrealism.

PAULICELLI, EUGENIA, DRAKE STUTESMAN, AND LOUISE WALLENBERG, EDs.
Film, Fashion, and the 1960s. Bloomington, IN: Indiana UP, 2017. Pp. x+231.
 \$80.00 US hardcover, \$35.00 US paperback, \$34.99 US ebook.

Hilary Radner, University of Otago, New Zealand

- 182** The last decade has greeted a wealth of new research on film and fashion, a relatively neglected area throughout the twentieth century, its increasing importance in the twenty-first signaled by the inauguration of the journal *Film, Fashion, and Consumption* under the editorship of Pamela Church Gibson, the first issue of which appeared in January 2011. *Film, Fashion, and the 1960s* constitutes a welcome addition to this growing body of published work and includes a number of authors whose names will be familiar to scholars in the field such as Pamela Church Gibson herself, Stella Bruzzi, Drake Stutesman, and Nick Rees-Roberts, among others. The chapters are loosely grouped according to topics, into three sections that suggest the scope of the project: "1960s: Youth Culture and Sexual Liberation"; "Cities, Nations, and Fashion"; and "Gender: Modernity/Tradition." An epilogue by the costume designer Adriana Berselli, noted for her work on Michelangelo Antonio's *L'Avventura* (1960), with a preface by the lead editor Eugenia Paulicelli concludes the volume.

In the introduction to the volume, the editors ambitiously proclaim that "[t]he chapters in this volume demonstrate the conscious relationship that cinema of the 1960s had with fashion as an industry, as spectacle and aesthetic, and as a means of performing gender" (5). To a greater or lesser degree, the chapters touch on these crucial issues, with Ronald Gregg's opening chapter, "Sanitizing the Beatles for the Revolution," and Pamela Church Gibson's chapter tucked away in Section Three, "The Fashioning of Julie Christie and the Mythologizing of 'Swinging London': Changing Images in 1960s Britain," highlighting the nexus of influences that determined the leading role accorded to fashion in this period. Nick Ree-Roberts's "Single Men: Sixties Aesthetics and Vintage Style in Contemporary Cinema," the final chapter in the section "Gender: Modernity and Tradition," appropriately argues that we consider the ongoing influence of the developments that originated in this crucial decade, especially with regard to "heritage, masculinity, and style in contemporary European cinema" (207).

As the above chapters suggest, scholars in fashion studies, popular culture studies,

and cinema studies will find a wide range of material from which to cull readings that might usefully augment their current course readers, from Anupama Kapse on Bombay cinema to Louise Wallenberg on the costume designer Mago (Max Goldstein), who contributed to Swedish director Ingmar Bergman's distinctive style. Both of these appear in the volume's final section, following Pamela Church Gibson's chapter on Julie Christie. In addition to Gregg's chapter on the Beatles, Section One, "The 1960s: Youth, Culture, and Sexual Liberation" boasts Amy Herzog discussing the relations between Andy Warhol's portrait film and 1960s pornographic peep show loops with regard to what she calls the "art of undressing," and Stella Bruzzi looking at Pier Paolo Pasolini's *Teorema* [*Theorem*] (1968) and its use of costume "to introduce a different sartorial sensibility altogether, one very much rooted in the sixties" (57). In the same section, Drake Stutesman adumbrates the use of the hat in *A New Kind of Love* (1963) and *Puzzle of a Downfall Child* (1970).

Astrid Söderburgh Widding's chapter opens Section Two, "Cities, Nations, and Fashion," focusing on the French New Wave and how changes in cinema and fashion heralded a reformulation of urban space. Also in this section, Eugenia Paulicelli's chapter "Fashion, Film, and Rome," which explores how post-World War Two Italy regenerated its film and fashion industries as synergistic cultural attractions that contributed to a burgeoning tourist industry, is especially welcome. Pat Kirkham and Marilyn Cohen's chapter closes this section, offering an analysis of the intersections between fashion and costume in two American films, *Breakfast at Tiffany's* (1961) and *That Touch of Mink* (1962), that exemplify the complicated relations between American culture and French fashion that mark the post-War period.

Notwithstanding the richness of the individual chapters, the volume remains ultimately unsatisfying, failing to deliver on its initial promise and leaving the reader with a sense that it offers a loose collection of interventions in the general area that lack consistency and breadth. The cover image, a 1955 photograph of Sophia Loren, contributes to this reader's perception that the volume lacks a focused perspective in that its relevance to the volume's timeframe of the 1960s is not immediately apparent. As the editors point out in their introduction, the 1960s witnessed a number of significant cultural shifts as a consequence in part at least of the coming of age of the post-World War II baby boomers who sought to distinguish themselves from their parents. Their politics, tastes, and sexual mores represented a significant departure from the more staid and cautious lifestyles of earlier generations. In the same period, the film industry underwent significant changes with television coming to the fore, especially in the United States subsequent to the demise of the Hollywood studio system, and European art cinema gaining a growing purchase on the public imagination of the younger generation across national boundaries.

Cinema became increasingly willing to mobilize other dimensions of popular culture, including fashion, to extend its diminishing reach. "Costuming," as Pamela Church Gibson underlines in her discussion of Julie Christie in *Billy Liar* (1963) and *Darling* (1965), both films directed by John Schlesinger, became not so much the stuff

of “character” as of “fashion,” with Christie, who starred in both films, gracing the pages of the fashion magazine *Vogue* rather than fan publications such as *Picturegoer*. Church Gibson writes that in the years subsequent to her appearance in these two films, which arguably elevated her to star status as a sartorial icon, “Christie would be photographed by Richard Avedon, Irving Penn, and David Bailey” as the top fashion photographers of the period “for fashion magazines, rather than for publicity purposes” (141). Church Gibson also details how Julie Harris, who designed many of the clothes worn by Christie in *Darling*, and who won an Oscar for her work on the film, also “shopped” for items, notably at Biba, owned by 1960s innovator Barbara Hulanicki, who along with Mary Quant pioneered the boutique, as opposed to the couturier, as the source of fashionable clothing, privileging a youthful style that was both affordable and fresh. Here, we see a clear instance of the 1960s, as Church Gibson points out, offering a template for the kind of synergistic cooperation between cinema and fashion that would characterize the last decades of the twentieth century, and continue into the twenty-first, in which “style” was available to anyone young enough to wear the “look,” no longer the prerogative of the wealthy. In her roles in these two films, Christie incarnated the new ideal of the Single Girl popularized by Helen Gurley Brown in her 1962 book *Sex and the Single Girl* and later as the editor of *Cosmopolitan Magazine*, with its international circulation, but also the emergence of a new fashion system in which style would originate on the street as frequently as it would emerge in the drawing rooms of the wealthy and famous, in which ready-to-wear would preempt bespoke garments as the favored garb of those celebrities considered trendy and photogenic.

184

Unfortunately, this sense of the shifting terrain of fashion, cinema, and celebrity is not sustained throughout the volume. In general, it offers the reader a panoply of topics in the area of film and fashion that roughly correspond to the period and general perspective of the editors, but without sustaining a comprehensive vision of the larger context in which these topics emerge and play out. These reservations aside, however, the volume remains significant and useful precisely because it opens up new areas of inquiry and signals a number of as yet underresearched topics that will continue to preoccupy researchers in the years to come.

WORK CITED

Brown, Helen Gurley. *Sex and the Single Girl*. Bernard Geis Associates, 1962.

YU, SHERRY. *Diasporic Media beyond the Diaspora: Korean Media in Vancouver and Los Angeles*. Vancouver: U of British Columbia P, 2018. Pp. 248. \$75.00 hardcover, \$29.95 paperback, \$29.95 ebook.

David C. Oh, Ramapo College of New Jersey

Sherry Yu's book *Diasporic Media beyond the Diaspora: Korean Media in Vancouver and Los Angeles* advances two purposes: a diasporic understanding of ethnic media, and diasporic media as an intercultural media system. Combining a cultural production approach with content analysis, Yu produces an engaged comparative analysis of Korean 'diasporic media' in Vancouver and Los Angeles. Through the analysis of telecommunications policy differences, national policies on multiculturalism, market size, and immigration histories, Yu's discussion of these case studies reveals how structural differences matter in the shape of Korean diasporic media in the two cities and the implications for these media to contribute to an intercultural media system that is, as Yu argues, marked by availability and accessibility.

185

Including the Introduction, the book is structured into seven chapters. The Introduction sets forward the primary argument of the book, which is that diasporic media are not simply "*media for the Other*" (6; emphasis in original). Instead, Yu argues that diasporic media are constitutive elements in an intercultural media system that contribute to society beyond the diaspora. Furthering this argument, Chapter One sets the theoretical framework, claiming that intercultural media must be both available and accessible for "broader society" in order to deepen understanding and to enrich dominant culture (21). The chapter also argues that diasporic media is preferable as a conceptualization to ethnic media because of its attention to transnationalism, its emphasis on the liminal character of diasporas, and its implicit inclusion of multiple forms of media content.

In Chapters Two through Four, the book carefully examines the policy and economic structures that shape diasporic media as businesses and as sites of media practice. Chapter Two examines the policy differences in Canada and the United States, focusing primarily on telecommunications policy, Canada's official multicultural policy, and the US's lack of formal policy. Chapter Three addresses the availability and accessibility of Korean diasporic media in Vancouver, while Chapter Four examines Los Angeles. Each of the chapters is marked by thorough, descriptive detail.

In the final two chapters, Yu shifts toward comparative analysis and policy prescriptions. Chapter Five summarizes the preceding description of diasporic media in Vancouver and Los Angeles, comparing the two cities' Korean-language media and engaging in new directions in her discussion, including implications of the "Korean Wave," the surge of transnationally distributed Korean mediated texts. In the book's final chapter, Yu points toward policy prescriptions that would better support diasporic media and in turn create a more progressive intercultural media system.

Though some of her suggestions are politically unlikely, it is important to have these arguments enter into public discourse to structurally and culturally value the role of diasporic media.

Diasporic Media beyond the Diaspora makes important contributions to the field of ethnic media/diasporic media/minority media research. Most importantly, it conceptualizes what most scholars refer to as “ethnic media” in a generative new formulation. As Yu points out, it is increasingly necessary to consider transnational flows of ideas, news, media, capital, and people when understanding ethnic and racial difference, including in diasporic media. In addition, her ambitious attempt to demonstrate that Korean-language diasporic media is “media for all” provides an original framework for approaching future work on diasporic media. It is a timely and important intervention.

186 The book’s importance is furthered by focusing attention on production structures, including micro-level newsroom work practices and macro-level policies such as immigration, telecommunication, multiculturalism. In an area of research that is dominated by studies of text and, to a lesser extent, audience reception and surveys, her historically rooted ethnographic analyses of two cities’ Korean-language media are exceptional. The thick description Yu provides is a strength of the book that can inform other media ethnographies, including those that are not centered on diasporic media. Her attention to two different sites in which Korean-language media operate is doubly impressive. The triangulation of data in this way clarifies how different national policies and market forces matter in the construction of diasporic media, particularly news coverage.

While the book makes important contributions, its ambitious goal of demonstrating that diasporic media constitute an intercultural media system is overstated. For instance, Korean-language diasporic media are not easily accessible because, as the book indicates, language barriers persist and because their intercultural role is limited to their joint participation with Korean civil society organizations. It would be more accurate to say that Korean diasporic media make limited contributions to an intercultural media system. By saying so, I do not believe this diminishes the quality of the scholarship or importance of the work, but delimits the argument.

Scholars of ethnic media may also find it a bit peculiar that the book does not engage with the assimilation-pluralism framework of ethnic media, the dominant framework since Robert Park’s influential book *The Immigrant Press and Its Control* (1992). It also does not consider the merits of newer approaches such as Melissa A. Johnson’s application of self-categorization theory to ethnic media or David C. Oh’s diasporic identity framework. Perhaps the reason is to make a clean break in order to advance the argument of diasporic media as “media for all,” but it is a missed opportunity because of the theoretically generative insights that that could be gained by putting these different understandings of ethnic media/diasporic media in conversation. For instance, how does constituting an intercultural media system promote assimilation and the loss of the pluralistic role of the ethnic press, as Stephen Harold

Riggins might argue? Also, how would the diasporic media conceptualization be applicable to ethnic media produced by groups that have been forcibly displaced locally, not transnationally, by the forces of settler colonialism, such as *The Cherokee Phoenix*?

Despite some lingering questions, Yu's book promises to make important contributions to diasporic media research. Yu contributes productively to the study of diasporic media/ethnic media by developing a diasporic media conceptualization and an intercultural media framework that will guide future scholars.

WORKS CITED

- Johnson, Melissa A. "Incorporating Self-Categorization Concepts into Ethnic Media Research." *Communication Theory*, vol. 20, no. 1, 2010, pp. 106-25.
- Oh, David C. "Reconsidering Ethnic Media Research: An Argument for a Diasporic Identity Framework." *Atlantic Journal of Communication*, vol. 24, no. 5, 2016, pp. 264-75.
- Park, Robert Ezra. *The Immigrant Press and Its Control*. Harper and Brothers, 1922.
- Riggins, Stephen Harold. "The Promise and Limits of Ethnic Minority Media." *Ethnic Minority Media: An International Perspective*, edited by Stephen Harold Riggins, Sage, 1992, pp. 276-88.

187

BOUCHER, FRANÇOIS-EMMANUEL, SYLVAIN DAVID, ET MAXIME PRÉVOST, DIR. *Mythologies du superhéros: Histoire, physiologie, géographie, intermédi-
alités*. Liège : PU de Liège, 2014. Pp. 242. €40.00 paperback.

Chris Reyns-Chikuma, Université de l'Alberta

Il existe de très nombreux ouvrages sur les superhéros (SH). L'énorme majorité est en anglais et porte évidemment sur les SH américains. *Mythologies du superhéros* (*Mythologies*) est donc exceptionnel puisque d'une part il est entièrement écrit en français et d'autre part il contient trois chapitres, ainsi que des références fréquentes à des SH non-américains. En effet, mis à part des articles ou chapitres en français sur les superhéros (il est vrai de plus en plus nombreux dans les dix dernières années), *Mythologies* est seulement le sixième livre en français, après *Super héros!* de Jean-Marc Lainé (2011), *Mythe et super héros* de Alex Nikolavitch (2011), *La Société des superhéros* de Jean Philippe Zanco (2012), *La Sociologie des superhéros* de Thierry Rogel (2012), *Le Dico des superhéros* de J-M. Lainé et Jean-Marc Lofficier (2013), et *Superhéros: une histoire française* de Xavier Fournier (2014), ainsi que deux petits ouvrages pédagogiques, l'un, *Superhéros et philosophie* par Simon Merle (2012) et

l'autre, *Les Superhéros* (2014), un essai de vulgarisation, de Marc Atallah, auteur du cinquième chapitre du livre recensé ici. Seuls les deux premiers ouvrages sont référencés par plusieurs auteurs des chapitres qui constituent *Mythologies* puisque les quatre autres n'étaient pas encore sortis lors de l'écriture de ces chapitres. Sauf celui de Fournier qui est aussi le moins universitaire et le plus francocentrique, tous traitent des SH américains. *Mythologies* ne fait pas exception à cette dominance américaine et présente même cela comme évident puisque c'est seulement dans une note du premier chapitre, après l'introduction, que Michaël Meyer de l'Université de Lausanne écrit : « La mythologie des superhéros débute à la fin des années 1930 aux Etats-Unis » (27), pour préciser ensuite dans une note de bas de page : « Si dès le début du XXe siècle on repère des personnages que l'on peut a posteriori classer dans la liste des superhéros (par exemple Le Nyctalope en 1911, The Shadow en 1930 ou The Phantom detective en 1933), il apparaît néanmoins que ceux-ci restent des cas isolés qui n'inaugurent par *[sic]* - pour « pas »¹ un genre fictionnel spécifique comme le fera plus tard superman » (32). Ceci est une réponse anticipée au livre de Fournier cité ci-dessus qui tend à essayer de montrer que les SH auraient en fait commencé leur carrière en Europe, et surtout en France. Cette note de bas de page renforce aussi l'interprétation d'un auteur plusieurs fois cité dans *Mythologies*, Serge Lehman, qui explique la mort des SH français et européens dès avant l'âge d'or du SH américain dans ces fictions en BD, *La Brigade chimérique* (2009-10) et *Masqué* (2012-13).

Cependant, dans leur introduction de vingt pages, « L'Essence mythologique du superhéros », dans une perspective plutôt européenne par rapport aux études états-uniennes, les trois auteurs (canadiens) qui ont dirigé cette collection de chapitres élargissent le point de vue sur les SH en le reliant aux mythologies anciennes. Ces mythes ne sont pas ici seulement compris au sens anthropologique du terme (avec Durand, Eliade, Campbell, et Cailliois souvent cités ici), et spécifiquement en référence aux mythes grecs (avec *Les Grecs ont-ils cru à leurs mythes: essai sur l'imagination constituante*, de Paul Veyne [1983]), et scandinave (Thor), mais aussi aux mythes créés longtemps après dans nos sociétés occidentales modernes, comme les mythes de Don Juan et de Monte-Cristo (voir *Le Dictionnaire des mythes littéraires* de Pierre Brunel cité ici), puis ceux d'Arsène Lupin et Sherlock Holmes.

Les quinze auteurs de ces articles viennent d'ailleurs de pays francophones : de France (Limoges, Sorbonne), de Suisse (Lausanne), et du Canada (Concordia, Chicoutimi, Ottawa, Sherbrooke, York, Toronto, Collège Brébeuf), sauf bizarrement aucun (?) de la Belgique, pays des Comics/BD et où le livre est pourtant publié (Liège).

L'ouvrage est donc fait de treize chapitres, trois pour chaque partie du sous-titre sauf quatre pour « physiologie ». Comme le suggère le titre de la première partie, « Histoire », le premier chapitre (27-39), « Le spectacle des superpouvoirs, héritages forains, culturistes, et sportifs dans la monstration des pouvoirs des superhéros de l'âge d'or », établit la connexion entre la tradition des superpouvoirs du vaudeville, des foires et des cirques, surtout américaine (LaLanne, Houdini, et les « freaks »), et les superpouvoirs des SH des années 1930-40. Cette connexion avait déjà été faite

plusieurs fois dans le monde anglo-saxon et entre autres remarquablement mise en scène dans le roman de Michael Chabon, *The Amazing Adventures of Kavalier and Clay* (2000, traduit en français en 2003) aussi cité à plusieurs reprises ici.

Le deuxième chapitre, par Maxime Prévost de l'Université d'Ottawa, « Mais où sont les superhéros d'antan ? Porthos, Obélix et la puissance rétrospective » (47-67) continue cette historisation en remontant au Porthos des *Trois Mousquetaires* de Dumas, où il est présenté comme un surhomme, pour revenir vers Obélix comme exemple parodique mais critique des SH contemporains. Le troisième, par Natacha Levet de l'Université de Limoges, « Sherlock Holmes, du surhomme au superhéros » (69-81), met en évidence que cette transformation du héros en superhéros s'est faite surtout par un processus multimédiatique avec les nouvelles versions de Sherlock de cette dernière décennie à la fois sous la forme de comics/graphic novels (entre autres *The League of Extraordinary Gentlemen*, 1999) et au cinéma (2009, 2012). Le quatrième chapitre, plus court (85-96), « Pour une sémiotique de la transformation ; quelques superhéros face à leurs origines », de Marc Atallah de l'Université de Lausanne, inaugure la deuxième partie sur la « Physiologie » du SH. Il conclut que la mission de ces surhumains dans les comics n'est pas de s'interroger sur les troubles identitaires provoqués par la transformation qu'ils subissent mais « insiste sur la réelle problématique des XXe et XXI siècles: le danger ultime ne doit pas être cherché dans la technologie, mais dans la dépendance de cette dernière aux intérêts militaro-industriels » (96).

189

Le cinquième chapitre d'Anthony Glinoe de l'Université de Sherbrooke, « La dynamique d'un groupe superhéroïque : les Uncanny X-Men » (97-111), « débroussaille » (97) le domaine de la dynamique de groupes représentés dans la littérature et dans ce cas celle des Mutants encore peu explorée tant par la recherche française qu'américaine. Le chapitre contient de longs intermèdes théoriques intéressants sans doute mais pas toujours nécessaires dans la compréhension du groupe des mutants pour finalement conclure dans les deux dernières pages de manière peu convaincante, et ce, peut-être parce que l'auteur a choisi un groupe trop large pour commencer à explorer ce domaine.

Le sixième chapitre, « Acta est fabula : la mort de la mort dans la bande dessinée de superhéros » de Jean-Pierre Thomas de York University (113-26), met en évidence le *comic book death*, ce procédé de mort-résurrection dû à la fois à la pression des fans et aux impératifs économiques des grands éditeurs, qui avait pour but de surprendre mais que paradoxalement aujourd'hui certains jugent risible et qui risque fort de dévaloriser le sens de la mort.

Le septième, « La série *Preacher* : un superhéroïsme divinement subversif » (127-145) de Ruth-Ellen St. Onge de l'Université de Toronto se penche sur une série publiée de 1995 à 2000 avec un grand succès et qui, contrairement au discours académique présentant les SH comme des dieux sécularisés, met en évidence un prêtre défroqué profondément religieux. St. Onge montre que cette série est paradoxalement une critique religieuse des institutions religieuses et d'une société percluse d'horreurs

réelles et telles qu'elles sont représentées qui sont à comprendre aussi au sens kriste-vien (*Pouvoirs de l'horreur*).

La troisième partie, « géographie », est sans doute la plus originale dans le cadre français² puisqu'elle ouvre le champ des recherches au-delà de l'aire/l'ère américaine avec trois exemples : France, Inde et Japon.

Bien que tous ces chapitres présentent une perspective intéressante, le chapitre huit est sans doute le plus nouveau. Dans « Le superhéros à l'ère du soupçon : l'exemple de Superdupont » (149-62), Mathieu Bélisle de Collège Brébeuf, Montréal se concentre en effet sur le non-mythe français souvent évoqué mais jamais analysé auparavant. Après avoir cité une série de superhéros européens nés dès la victoire et imités des SH américains comme Fantax, Bélisle nous rappelle qu'il faut attendre 1970 pour voir les premiers héros parodiques français dont Superdupont est le plus célèbre et le plus autonome par rapport au modèle américain. En effet Superdupont est « un superhéros 100% français » qui concentre tous les clichés qui renvoient à la culture française face à l'anti-France, organisation secrète faite d'étrangers, comme l'extrême droite la voudrait. L'auteur conclut ironiquement que « heureusement » pour Superdupont né pendant la période crépusculaire de la France (après De Gaulle, mai 68, le choc pétrolier, le chômage qui ne se résorbe pas), l'anti-France est encore plus faible que lui, et la vieille France qu'il représente peut persister.

Le neuvième chapitre d'Amandine d'Azevedo de la Sorbonne nouvelle, a un titre de par sa longueur assez explicite « Superhéros indiens, mythologie hindoue et modèle américain : le cinéma populaire comme laboratoire d'un héros national » (163-76), et conclut que « [d]emi-dieux d'un monde de Dieux, les superhéros indiens ne viennent pas s'inscrire contre des formes et des histoires préexistantes mais bien avec elles, dans un désir d'exposition et de mise en scène qui rend neuves leurs pérégrinations » (176).

Le dixième chapitre de Vincent Manigot de L'INALCO envisage le superhéros japonais durant la période de l'occupation américaine (1945-52). C'est aussi un chapitre original d'abord parce qu'on ne pense pas souvent au monde des mangas et animés comme ayant produit des superhéros. La majorité des SH japonais sont en fait différents des SH américains, car ce sont des « androïdes » ou des robots conçus en laboratoire, dont le plus connu, Astro Boy, sort juste après l'Occupation américaine du Japon (1952). Contrairement au manichéisme américain où l'on a des SH positifs et des SH négatifs (« the evil »), le même SH japonais est capable du meilleur et du pire. Une explication assez répandue à cette expansion rapide des SH japonais dès 1945 est le sentiment de revanche éprouvé par de nombreux Japonais à la fin de la guerre perdue contre les technologies américaines. Mais Manigot donne une autre explication concomitante, assez nouvelle, qui est la version japonaise de l'eugénisme, influencé par les théories et pratiques européennes, en particulier nazies, rappelant l'influence nazie sur le Japon de l'époque, l'auteur cite Tezuka qui, le 3 mai 1945, écrit ses regrets de la mort des « 'héros allemands' Hitler et Goebels » (185). Enfin, dernière originalité, l'auteur cite des sources originales, japonaises. Manigot conclut :

« Superman n'avait-il pas aidé à défaire le KKK ? A sa manière, Tezuka semble avoir voulu casser le mythe de la création d'êtres parfaits à l'aide de ses créatures, et permettre ainsi à la science d'avancer sur une voie qu'il jugeait plus sage » (189).

L'onzième chapitre est un bon lien entre la troisième et la quatrième partie puisqu'il traite du SH dans une « géographie » différente, le cadre québécois (193-208) à travers la série *Les Invincibles* réalisée par Jean-François Rivard entre 2005 et 2009. Si les jeunes Montréalais « invincibles » « typiques d'une déroute masculine contemporaine s'avèrent incapables d'engagement à long terme » (193) (contrairement à la devise des SH « with great power comes great responsibility ») leur succès est peut-être dû, comme le souligne Umberto Eco dans son apostille à *De Superman au Surhomme* (1993), qu'ils sont perçus comme ayant le courage ou l'inconscience de porter leur médiocrité à son apogée (208). Le douzième chapitre de Célia Sauvage de la Sorbonne nouvelle, « entre héroïne et normalité: négocier sa superidentité au quotidien » (209-20), s'intéresse à la tendance récente de films comme *Incassable*, *Paper-man*, *Kick-ass*, et *Super* qui présentent des SH « bien loin de la masculinité exacerbée et quasi invincible de Batman » (209). Sauvage émet l'hypothèse que l'importance grandissante du thème de la normalité dans les films de superhéros « participerait non seulement d'une volonté révisionniste de repenser et de complexifier le rapport des superhéros à la dualité, à l'identité secrète, à l'identité civile mais également aux artefacts codifiés tels que le costumes, les masques ». Elle permettrait en outre une réappropriation culturelle de la figure des superhéros qui « sortirait du cadre superhéroïque extraordinaire, telle que elle a été pensée à l'origine » (219).

191

Le treizième et dernier chapitre revient au SH aujourd'hui peut-être le plus connu, avec « *Spider-man: Turn off the Dark* : Intermédialité et identité du superhéros » (221-34) par Luc Vaillancourt de l'Université du Québec à Chicoutimi. Vaillancourt s'interroge pour savoir dans quelles mesures l'intermédialité, le passage d'un média à un autre, met en question l'identité du « héros », en particulier à partir de l'adaptation sur Broadway (201). Il conclut à l'incompatibilité fondamentale des modes de représentations narratives qui explique l'échec relatif de Spider-Man à Broadway (234). Cependant, si comme l'écrit aussi l'auteur, il est indéniable que la logique de cette multiplication « pour le moins déroutante d'univers parallèles » est essentiellement marchande (222), il faudrait pourtant reconnaître que « introduire un afro-latino-américain dans *Ultimate Fallout n.4*, Michael Morales » (222) peut être aussi vu comme une ouverture multiculturelle à la réalité multiethnique de la société. Bien que le SH soit encore loin de l'ouverture statistiquement représentative, ne voit-on pas ici une faiblesse francophone qui est d'ignorer ou de déconsidérer un acte qui est aussi, et de manière concomitante, multiculturel, et non pas seulement motivé par le gain ou le « Politiquement Correct ».

Mythologies est donc un livre tout à fait intéressant. On peut regretter que bien que le livre inclue quatre chercheuses, ce qui est en fait plutôt positif car encore rare dans le domaine des recherches sur les BD et les SH, il n'y ait aucun chapitre sur les superhéroïnes, et, même si certains chapitres contiennent ici et là des allusions et des

perspectives critiques des *gender studies* et sur la mise en question de la masculinité, en particulier sur l'histoire de la virilité basée sur l'ouvrage collectif d'Alain Corbin, il n'y ait pas un seul chapitre se concentrant sur ce sujet. En outre, on en est encore à se demander pourquoi les éditeurs francophones continuent à snober les index. En revanche, l'ouvrage contient une série d'images de bonne qualité illustrant les propos des treize chapitres à la fin du volume.

En dépit de ces quelques rares lacunes, l'ouvrage reste un livre-clé pour tout chercheur (et amateur aussi d'ailleurs, car il ne contient pas de jargon ou même, sauf dans un chapitre, de théorisation excessive) sur les SH, la représentation de l'héroïsme, et l'intermédialité.

It is a pity that such beautifully written and interesting chapters won't be read by the majority of comics researchers, since English-speaking academics often do not read non-English sources, in contrast to the francophone academics of this volume who did read and use English-language sources.

192

NOTES

1. Détail mais aux effets malheureusement désagréables à la lecture, le livre est parsemé de coquilles.
2. Il existe déjà de nombreux articles et chapitres sur ce sujet dans le cadre américain.

FAWAZ, RAMZI. *The New Mutants: Superheroes and the Radical Imagination of American Comics*. New York: New York UP, 2016. Pp. 368. \$89.00 US hardcover, \$29.00 US paperback.

Anna F. Peppard, Brock University

The title of Ramzi Fawaz's *The New Mutants* is reference to a 1965 essay in which literary critic Leslie Fiedler describes new forms of literature that envision "the transcendence or transformation of the human" into a race of "mutants." Fiedler views this transformation as both fantastical and real; elsewhere in his essay, he claims the hegemony will recognize these mutants as members of the increasingly influential counterculture. *The New Mutants* is also, of course, the title of a long-running Marvel comic book, in which a group of superpowered teenagers are, as one old tagline put it, "feared and hated by the world they have sworn to protect." This dual reference serves Fawaz well, as his book's central topic is the interconnection of postwar superhero comics with the same era's history of liberal, progressive, and radical thought; in this, Fawaz interprets the mutant protagonists of postwar superhero comics as countercultural heroes who both reflect contemporary upheavals and imagine future changes even as they keep the world safe from the egomaniacal machinations of

Magneto and Dr. Doom.

Across seven chronologically and thematically organized chapters, Fawaz charts what he describes as the evolution of the American superhero “from a nationalist champion to a figure of radical difference mapping the limits of American liberalism and its promise of universal inclusion in the post-World War II period” (3). Each chapter advances this thesis by analyzing a particular comic book series or group of series as a reflection of, and reaction to, certain sets of historically relevant themes. Chapter One reads early issues of *The Justice League of America* as evidence of an increased sense of international responsibility within 1950s American culture. Chapters Two and Three read early issues of *The Fantastic Four* in conversation with the Cold War, radiation fears, and the rise of second-wave feminism. Chapter Four reads space operas from the 1970s starring the likes of the Silver Surfer and the X-Men as reflections of a nostalgic longing for the previous decade’s promises of transformation. Chapter Five investigates the rise of “working class” consciousness in comics from the 1970s, and Chapter Six reads demonic possession stories in several different superhero comics from the 1980s as critiques of the “Me” decade’s “[s]elf-interest, overconsumption, and profligate investment in immediate pleasure” (200). Finally, Chapter Seven argues that the increasingly traumatic, intergenerational, and intersectional conflicts within *The New Mutants* series from the 1980s represent the end of an era, evincing the decline of the postwar fantasy of universal citizenship in favour of a newly fractured, but also newly multiple, view of American society and culture.

193

In each chapter, Fawaz’s inventive analysis highlights the sophistication and complexity of popular texts that remain underexplored relative to contemporaneous films and television shows. More than this, Fawaz argues that superhero comics might be unique among popular texts in their ability to explore progressive themes and ideas. Throughout, Fawaz asserts that characters who are defined by their non-normative bodies and multiple identities, and who continually transform from one person (or thing) into another, are ideally suited to articulating anxieties and fantasies related to the changing nature of postwar American society, and the changing boundaries of human identity and potential in postwar American culture. Admittedly, the radical or subversive capacity of the superhero body is not a new concept, having already been identified by Scott Bukatman and Aaron Taylor, among others. Yet the creativity and passion of Fawaz’s analysis and the thematic and historical breadth of his examples makes an old argument newly convincing. Fawaz’s style is another boon. Throughout, Fawaz’s writing is infused with infectious energy; he knows these comics, but he also clearly loves them, and he embraces that love to propel his investigation into why so many people have found these stories so appealing for so many years.

Unfortunately, however, Fawaz often fails to balance this passion with suitable acknowledgement of the actual and possible limits of superhero comics’ supposed radicalness. This neglect is inexcusable; dozens of academic books and many more journal articles have thoroughly documented the superhero genre’s deeply embedded

jingoism, misogyny, racism, and ableism, as well as the mainstream American comic book industry's exploitative labour practices. Although Fawaz should be lauded in his efforts to emphasize the superhero genre's ability to appeal beyond the straight white adolescent male audience that has too often been assumed to be its only audience, it is also unavoidably dishonest to discuss the *X-Men* franchise as a celebration of radical plurality while sidestepping the reality of how few women and racial or sexual minorities have written or drawn *X-Men* comics, as well as the political shortcomings of the straight white men who have, inescapably, dominated their production and consumption. Perhaps the book's greatest weakness is the problematic selectiveness of Fawaz's examples. Within his close readings, Fawaz routinely chooses to ignore readily available counter-evidence. In order to read the Fantastic Four's Sue Storm/the Invisible Girl as a feminist character, Fawaz declines to mention a great many stories in which she is sidelined and objectified in very obviously sexist ways. Similarly, in his discussions of *X-Men* comics, Fawaz does not meaningfully address common criticisms of the "mutant metaphor" as a double-edged sword which, as a fantastical and all-encompassing form of difference, can devalue the experiences of real-life minorities and enable readers to misidentify themselves as the other.

194

These are just two of many instances in which Fawaz's book could have benefited from more interaction with existing scholarship on comics and superheroes. Certainly, those with a background in superhero studies or comics studies will be disappointed by how seldom Fawaz references other work within these fields; he prefers to situate his analysis within broader theories of race, gender, and sexuality and more general historical contexts. There are ways and moments in which Fawaz's analysis profits from breaking with the conventions of superhero comics scholarship; this reviewer particularly appreciated the fact that Fawaz largely eschews the developmental, and arguably reductionist, model of genre reflected in the common organization of superhero comics into various "ages" (Golden, Silver, Bronze, etc.). There is a difference, however, between breaking with tradition and denying its existence. Too often, Fawaz takes the latter approach; while comics studies remains a relatively new field, and the push to cash in on the current vogue of superhero blockbusters has produced some uneven scholarship, both comics studies and superhero studies are much richer than Fawaz's paucity of citations would suggest.

Despite its flaws, *The New Mutants* has enough ingenuity and verve to make it a valuable contribution to scholarship on superheroes and American comics; its broad scope and theoretical framework should make it additionally appealing to the wider field of American cultural studies, while its engaging writing may also grant it a degree of popular appeal. It is, to be fair, partly this book's considerable promise that makes its lapses so glaring. Fawaz's stylish, passionate writing makes you want to believe in the triumph of the mutant counterculture, and it is almost as difficult to root against that vision as it would be to side against the Fantastic Four in a pitched battle with the Hate-Monger. Yet like the comic books he loves, Fawaz amplifies by simplifying; some readers will wish he loved these comics a bit less unreservedly.