

REVIEWS

* K.M. NEWTON. *Twentieth-Century Literary Theory: A Reader*. New York: St. Martin's Press 1988. Pp. 282

At first, readers of this anthology will feel they have been thrust into the impossible position of playing Dupin to Newton's Prefect, who announces fifty mysteries on successive nights. Not only is the sheer quantity and diversity daunting, the technical language in many of the selections, their abstraction (all theory and no praxis), and the predominance of excerpts (though few as drastically abbreviated as those in Raman Selden's *The Theory of Criticism: From Plato to the Present*) make this collection very difficult to read even for graduate students. Add to these difficulties a second text that applies theories to texts, which seems a necessity, and you have a full semester. For an undergraduate course in criticism, Shirley Staton's *Literary Theories in Praxis* is preferable, since it focuses its theoretical selections upon a half-dozen specific poems and short stories. Her selections are mainly excerpts also, however. For complete essays combined with praxis, there is Donald Keese's *Contexts for Criticism*. But Newton has several advantages, at least as an introduction to modern criticism for graduate students. Particularly, in relatively brief space, through judicious editing, Newton presents seventeen theories in roughly chronological order to reveal the momentous shift of emphasis away from the world, the author, and the text and "towards the reader" (219). For a long time the dominant norms were historical scholarship ("the text in relation to its time, what the author intended, generic considerations") and New Criticism (anti-intentionalist, emphasizing "the text as a self-contained structure"), but recently this "two-party dominance" has been challenged by many other "parties" in a "struggle for power" (17) in which the reader party (composed of contending splinter groups) is gaining strength. (Rejecting Stanley Fish's model of "interpretive communities," Newton compares current literary criticism to a "parliament" in turmoil with all readers having "no option but to [debate and] vote.")

The seventeen selections are divided into two sections: I. "the major approaches from Russian Formalism up to and including French Structuralism," and II. "post-structuralism and beyond." In section one: 1. "Russian

Formalism and Prague Structuralism" (Shklovsky, Jakobson, Medvedev/Bakhtin, Mukarovsky); 2. "The New Criticism" (Richards, Brooks, Burke, Ellis); 3. "Chicago Aristotelianism" (Crane, Booth); 4. "Leavisite Criticism" (Leavis, Casey); 5. "Phenomenological Criticism" (Ingarden, Poulet); 6. "Marxist Criticism" (Caudwell, Lukács, Benjamin); 7. "Archetypal Criticism" (Frye); 8. "Hermeneutics" (Gadamer, Hirsch, Juhl); 9. "Linguistic Criticism" (Jakobson, Fowler); 10. "French Structuralism" (Todorov, Genette, Barthes). In section two: 11. "Post-Structuralism" (Derrida, Barthes, de Man, Said); 12. "Semiotics" (Culler, Lotman, Kristeva, Peckham); 13. "Negative Hermeneutics" (Ricoeur, Spanos); 14. "Psychoanalytic Criticism" (Holland, Bloom, Felman); 15. "Reception Theory and Reader-Response Criticism" (Jauss, Coward and Ellis, Jameson); and 17. "Feminist Criticism" (Donovan, Showalter, Meese). It is a richly diverse collection containing some of the most notable representatives of each of the perspectives. Newton has further exhibited the exciting debate in his "parliament" by choosing texts "which highlight the debate" not only between perspectives but "within them" (12). For example, in chapter 11, Said's extract makes a critique of Derrida by way of Foucault; in chapter 8, Gadamer's hermeneutics contrasts to that of Hirsch and Juhl, who also differ. A further complication is the movement from the "fairly clear-cut distinctions between different approaches" in the first section to the section in which "such distinctions are less easy to draw" (12).

An especially fascinating attraction of the collection is its exhibition of the deepening questioning and skepticism about texts, intentionality, and referentiality. From the political certitude of Caudwell, the moral certitude of Leavis, the authorial certitude of Hirsch, Poulet, Bloom, and Juhl, the textual certitude of Shklovsky, Jakobson, Brooks, Frye, and others, the anthology moves to the perspective of the reader in Ingarden, Iser, Gadamer, Derrida, Holland, Jauss, and others, and radically in Ricoeur and Spanos. It is no simple linear development: Ellis is defending formalist principles in 1974; Juhl is finding a solid center of meaning in authors in 1980; but in the 1960s, 1970s, and 1980s the possibility of reconstructing the world of the past, the author's intentions, and the sure meaning of a text receded before an increasing agreement that these old realities can never be entirely known because no reader is ideologically neutral (Gadamer, Bloom, Donovan — the conviction cuts across many theories), or even that they cannot be known at all (Ricoeur, Spanos, Barthes: "writing ceaselessly posits meaning ceaselessly to evaporate it" 157). But these strengths are vitiated by the liabilities stated earlier. My graduate level students found the book too difficult: too abstract, too fragmented, too incoherent, in short, distressing. The book might become an adequate single text were it expanded to remedy these problems by adding key texts for practical application and by more connective

introductions. A discussion of the basic theories of meaning and value that undergird and relate the diverse theories and individual theorists would be especially helpful. What are the contexts essential to meaning, and what values other than meaning justify our attention to literature? Is meaning located in the referential world, the constructed culture, authors in culture, authors and their texts, texts and readers, or readers? Keesey, for example, focuses upon five bases of meaning (genetic, formal, affective, mimetic, and intertextual), another reasonable way to relate seventeen theories and fifty texts. And is meaning or the questioning of meaning enough? What is at stake in addition to meaning? Truth? Pleasure? Beauty? The survival of the planet?

A less comprehensive but highly illuminating formulation might be the categorization of the seventeen theories and fifty excerpts according to their centripetal or centrifugal tendency, whether they move away from some center, thereby affirming some kind or degree of freedom, or whether they move toward some center, affirming order and unity. The selections could be categorized by a scale extending from certitude to radical skepticism — for example, 1) the past, an author, a text can be reconstituted, 2) the past, an author, a text can never be wholly known because readers always necessarily project their present perspectives into the past, and 3) the past, author, or text cannot be known except as a recreation by the reader. For example, the selection by Ricoeur advocates skepticism, iconoclasm, demystification, a "school of suspicion," opposition to the "sacred," and destruction, against the will to believe, the "school of reminiscence," false consciousness, and illusion. In contrast, Poulet advocates the self-denial of the critic, beginning "at zero," in order to find "his point of departure in the 'cogito' of the author.

In these and in other ways might Newton have given greater coherence to his anthology, had he truly wanted it to be read and understood. But I do not mean to suggest the book is devoid of historical and conceptual structure. It focuses our awareness on seventeen ways of reading divided into two overlapping groups. The first part "Russian Formalism to French Structuralism" covers sixty-five years from 1917 to 1982 (123 pp. with 26 selections); the second part, "Post-Structuralism and After," covers sixteen years from 1970 to 1986 (130 pp. with 24 selections). The first section ("the wider context of twentieth-century theory") offers selections that are "fairly clear-cut distinctions between different approaches"; the second section ("current theory") offers selections in which "such distinctions are less easy to draw" (12). This arrangement dramatizes the intensifying critique of formalism, a shift from the text as center of meaning to the reader. The linguistic focus on language connects many chapters (in I: 1-4, 8-10; in II: 11-15, at least); chapters 9 and 10 on linguistics and French Structuralism

refer directly back to chapters 1 and 2 on Russian and Prague schools and the New Criticism and forward to chapter 11 on semiotics. The continuity of individual theories is further clarified by offering other closely related chapters that connect the two sections: hermeneutics and negative hermeneutics, Marxist and Post-Althusserian Marxism. The ending of Part I on French Structuralism and the beginning of Part II on "Post-Structuralism" are linked by selections by Barthes. And other structural techniques enforce continuity and connection to create another unique contribution to making sense of the revolution in reading that characterizes our epoch. (JAMES R. BENNETT, UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS)

*THOMAS M. LEITCH. *What Stories Are: Narrative Theory and Interpretation*. Pennsylvania State University Press 1986. Pp. 222.

Although structuralism has by now been more or less superseded by post-structuralism, narratology remains one structuralist enclave that continues to attract much attention. Recent work has tended either to refine the categories and terminology used by the "fathers" of narratology (Greimas, Todorov, Barthes, Genette) or to incorporate the poststructuralist stress on the radical undecidability of all texts (Culler, Chambers). Clearly conversant with, but not overwhelmed by, the French tradition, Thomas M. Leitch's *What Stories Are* must be considered a major contribution to narrative theory. Unlike so many other theorists, Leitch mercifully decided not to "survey or impose order on recent work in narrative theory" (ix), turning instead to the "regrettably modest task" (x) of studying narrative as a context-dependent of discursive category. *What Stories Are* is, in fact, a sophisticated pragmatic analysis in the best of American tradition (whatever one may feel about that). Above all, Leitch avoids the structuralist pitfalls of heavy-handed jargon and reductive argument; at the same time, he refrains from oversimplified genuflections toward poststructuralist undecidability. The result is a highly readable book whose commonsensical approach nevertheless tends to foreclose some of the more radical implications of its findings.

In his pursuit "of narrative ontology, of what makes stories stories" (4), Leitch quickly dismisses story as a prediscursive phenomenon since "there is no way of distinguishing between stories and nonstories without reference to the discourses which present them" (16). The argument that "story is indeed a discursive category" (16) may not be new, but Leitch provides useful insights into "the needs and desires stories fulfill for their audiences" (23). However, although his approach helps us appreciate the performative effects of narrative, it stops short of investigating the more psychoanalytical and radically hermeneutical implications of narrative desire.

In "Narrative Ontology," the first and stronger part of *What Stories Are*, Leitch tactfully aligns himself with the hermeneutic stance of Wolfgang Iser, whose liberal humanist stamp is so congenial to North American critics. Leitch contends that the audience deciphers the narrativity each story displays at the same time as "the audience's narrativity is in turn enabled and constrained by the qualities a given text displays" (40). This comfortable, if theoretically suspect, position facilitates some impressive analyses of what makes stories tellable. In particular, Leitch shows that tellability, being context-dependent, involves three reader skills he identifies as "the ability to defer one's desire for gratification," "the ability to supply connections among the material a story presents," and "the ability to perceive discursive events as significantly related to the point of a given story or sequence" (34). This transactional emphasis is a salutary corrective to the conception of narrative as a self-contained sequence of events.

Leitch is undoubtedly at his best in his discussion of teleology. Although other critics (notably Frank Kermode and Barbara Herrnstein-Smith) have successfully dealt with this topic, Leitch's analysis of three interdependent principles (teleological, discursive, polytropic) represents a most welcome contribution. The teleological principle reminds us that the ending of story provides a retrospective rationale for events. In contrast, the discursive principle foregrounds the resistance of narrative to closure, especially in the form of digression. And, finally, the polytropic principle seeks to explain "the claims of both kinds of discursiveness [teleology and resistance to it] without seeing digression as simply the antithesis of teleology" (83). In his impressive discussion of polytropy, Leitch seems uncomfortable with poststructuralist implications. For him the contradictory impulses of narrative need to be integrated "in a governing principle of narrative ontology" (83) instead of leading to the recognition that all narratives are fundamentally incoherent.

In the second part of *What Stories Are*, Leitch is at his most Aristotelian, applying the concept of narrative polytropy to the familiar categories of "Narrative World," "Plot," and "Character." Since these categories function discursively, Leitch is intent on determining how narrative tropes connect with conceptions of human experience. He contends that narratives display a logic of implication, compelling the reader to complete narrative worlds thriving on "incomplete patterns" (123), to process the "frustrated potential" (158) of characters, and to make sense of events that are "both contingent and inherently ordered" (147). Although Leitch illustrates his points with some excellent readings of both classical and contemporary narratives, the relationship between tropes and human experience remains theoretically fuzzy. In the last two chapters he therefore returns to the story/nonstory distinction, asking himself whether fiction and nonfiction incur different commitments. The conclusion that neither the historical novel (Chapter

Nine) nor documentary film (Chapter Tén) escapes certain degrees of fictionality is, of course, not exactly new. Less predictable and hence more promising is the suggestion that stories can be identified as stories only "on the basis of cultural and institutional presupposition" (201).

Even though Leitch cannot avoid going over some old ground, *What Stories Are* constitutes a refreshing departure from the many surveys of narratological categories that crowd our bookshelves. However, the book rewards more with isolated observations and strong readings of texts than with rigorous theoretical articulations. Leitch's concrete illustrations, taken from different kinds of narrative (novel, short story, autobiography, drama, sonnet, film, soap opera) and from different time periods (from Homer to Donald Barthelme), make for stimulating reading. On the negative side, *What Stories Are* is rather disconnected and lacks a clear line of argument. But the theoretical and organizational weaknesses seem to me far outweighed by insights into the context-dependent way narratives operate. All those interested in narrative literature will find *What Stories Are* a most informative, enjoyable, and eminently readable book. (EVELYN COBLEY, UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA)

*Communications 47 (1988) "Variations sur le thème."

Between 1984 and 1988 a series of three conferences took place in Paris, the aim of which was to renew the study of thematics. This issue of *Communications* presents papers given at the second (1986) of these conferences. Selected papers from the first conference were published in *Poétique* 64 (novembre 1985); selected papers of the third conference will be published in *Strumenti Critici*/n.s. IV.2 (maggio 1989).

Taken as a whole these three volumes represent a significant step towards redefining the traditional notion of "theme." The last twenty five years in literary studies have not been very kind to analyses which aim at treating content: indeed, thematics has been one of the major casualties of the theoretical displacement towards formalist analysis, as has semantics in general. Though partially addressed and theorized by narratology (notably in the writings of V. Propp, C. Bremond, C. Lévi-Strauss), theme has none the less received scant attention from modern theorists and these papers seek to redress the situation.

Of the two volumes thus far published (*Poétique* 64 and *Communications* 47), the first is probably the best in terms of overall quality. However, the second volume has a number of things to recommend it. The articles cover a wide variety of questions and perspectives, but two major themes (if I dare use the term) seem to dominate: one is the attempt to deal with theme in terms of a phenomenology of reading rather than in terms of a poetics of

plot; the other is the recognition of the fundamentally dynamic nature of the concept itself. Proteus-like, the notion of theme takes on one definition only to abandon it all too rapidly for another. The very title of the collection ("Variations sur le thème") uses a musical metaphor to underscore this: whereas "thème" once tended to be seen as a static, easily determined textual "content," these papers cast doubt on any hope of developing some sort of unitary definition. We no longer regard theme with the same taxonomical assurance as the Rhetoricians of the past: we find ourselves very much in need of a re-theorization of the problematic, one which would approach the quality of work done in narratology, text linguistics, and other formalist-oriented areas of literary studies.

Those who have attempted to actually define the notion of theme have generally done so from either a structural or an intentional point of view. Few have spoken of theme as a "material," as is done in music, as well as in the work of the "thematic critics" (e.g. Bachelard, Poulet, Richard). In this volume, L. Doležel relates theme to semantic invariants; G. Prince conceives of theme as a "cadre-idée" which arises from the macrostructural level; and M.-L. Ryan sees theme as defined by narrative structure, on the one hand, and defining the strategic choices of the characters on the other. She classifies two types of models in thematic analysis: substitutive (Chomsky, Lévi-Strauss, Greimas) and combinatory (Propp, Bremond, Todorov), and analyses the idea of "plot unit" as it is developed in American artificial intelligence research.

Other critics see thematics as being a part of interpretive activity. C. Bremond develops this notion in an analysis of two La Fontaine fables and states that "le lieu du thème, tel qu'il nous apparaît, n'est pas le texte, mais l'activité interprétatrice qui se développe sur le texte, à l'occasion du texte: dans notre perspective, ce n'est pas le texte qui est écrit à propos du thème, mais le thème qui est conçu à propos du texte" (55). For I. Crossman Wimmers "le thème est une 'construction conceptuelle' qui exige de la part du lecteur un travail d'assemblage, d'«généralisation» et d'«étiquetage»" (63). J.-M. Schaeffer examines the interplay of theme, genre and text in the development of the Faust legend. In the same vein, two musicologists, F. Escal and J.-Y. Bosseur show that a semantic approach is substituting itself to earlier formulations of theme in music. It is not clear, however, from these analyses just how hermeneutic activity will be able to distinguish methodologically between different levels of referentiality which are inherent in sensation and perception. Where, how and under what conditions will themes (or one theme rather than another) be realized in a text?

The notion of textual "aboutness," as Bremond and Pavel make quite clear, has been "expulsed" from the text and our "thematic attention" is in search of an object upon which to fix itself. Distinctions between

"thème/rhème," "topic/comment," "theme/motif," or the attempt to isolate themes in terms of a "grammar of the text" often pose more problems than they resolve. Pavel and Bremond conclude by suggesting a possible itinerary for the re-establishment of thematic studies. As Pavel and Bremond put it, "la thématisation ainsi entendue n'est ni un inventaire de thèmes préexistants ni leur création *ex nihilo*, mais l'actualisation méthodique de virtualités non encore exploitées" (217). In particular, Prince emphasizes the socio-historical nature of themes, their existence being circumscribed much less by their nature, their richness, or their flexibility than by their socio-historical situation. All of the contributions in this volume underscore the variability of the notion of theme, and refuse to enclose it within a single formal/functional definition, though at the same time maintaining the notion itself as an analytical category.

What is evident from these articles is the still rather unsatisfactorily explained theorization of thematics as well as the attendant problems of taxonomy. In addition, with the emphasis placed on the role of reception and reading as being constitutive mechanisms of textual themes, scholars could perhaps make use of the findings of empirical analyses undertaken within the realm of psychology in order better to develop theoretical models of thematics. The current renewed interest in semantics, evaluation and contextualization may well bring about a more complete and theoretically sound reformulation of the problematics of theme. Though these two volumes certainly do not answer all the questions which they ask, any scholar working in the area of thematics would be well advised to consult them for they delineate the main parameters of the overall discussion. It is with considerable interest that we can await the publication of the papers of the third conference on the notion of theme. (DONALD BRUCE, UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA)

*VINCENT YANG. *Nature and Self: A Study of the Poetry of Su Dongpo with Comparison to the Poetry of William Wordsworth*. New York: Peter Lang 1989. Pp. 216. US\$38.50

Breaking out of the ghetto of Chinese literature is not easy: the rich corpus of classical prose and poetry from China's long tradition should be part of the comparative study of literatures, yet we have made little progress in making that tradition accessible. Vincent Yang's *Nature and Self: A Study of the Poetry of Su Dongpo with Comparison to the Poetry of William Wordsworth* is a pioneering work in the difficult project of integrating Chinese poetry into comparative analysis.

Su Shi (1037-1101) was a preeminent figure in late Northern Song (960-1126) culture. Arguably the best writer of the dynasty and one of the

great poets of the classical tradition, Su Shi was also a widely learned scholar and a leading government official of broad competence. Yang's approach to Su Shi is a diachronic analysis of the role of Nature in Su's poetry supported by close reading of many of Su Shi's best-known poems. Yang further attempts to provide an accessible context by comparing Su Shi's development from a "this-worldly" to an "other-worldly" view with a parallel development in the poetry of William Wordsworth.

Having great sympathy for the project, I wish the book were better and its flaws not so deep. Problems arise at three, ever more general, levels of analysis. First, despite Yang's manifest talent for close reading and analysis, his command of classical Chinese poetry is not yet adequate. He makes significant mistakes in translation that could have been avoided, but to be fair, he also is led *into* mistakes by following the allegorizing tendencies of some modern Chinese commentaries. Indeed, Yang's large adherence to the conceptual framework of the modern Chinese study of the classical tradition introduces a second level of difficulty. Like many of his contemporaries, Yang practices the game of pigeon-holing Su Shi's thought: this part is Taoist, that part Confucian, this part Neo-Confucian, and that part Buddhist. Su Shi is far too sophisticated, learned, and coherent a writer to be approached through such broad and painfully anachronistic categories. The result is merely confusion — Su Shi does not fit in. It is doubly unfortunate that Yang's thesis in this study depends on his claiming Su Shi for the Buddhists: many have tried this before, never with very persuasive results. The central issues of Mahayana Buddhism had long been assimilated into the broader discourse of Chinese literati culture, and to articulate the actual character of the debates of Su Shi's times requires finer tools than the usual set of the *san jia*, "three schools," of most current analyses. Thus, the conceptual categories that Yang uses for his account of Su Shi's place in the Chinese context simply do not work.

The third level at which problems arise is that of conceptual generalization abstracted away from the Chinese. If meaningful comparative analysis is to be possible, we need abstract categories through which to approach the literatures of disparate cultures. Yet Yang never quite rises to the level of reflection necessary for his study to succeed. For example, "Nature" itself seems hypostasized as an understood given. In modern Mandarin, the phrase is *da ziran*, "the Great Thus-of-Itself." The "thus-of-itself," however, is very tricky, and indeed it was the locus of much debate in the Northern Song dynasty. Yang intuits the issues when he seeks to compare Su Shi's Nature with Wordsworth's, but he rarely pushes beyond the clichés of East/West comparisons to do justice to the real issues.

Yang's analysis is a revision of his doctoral thesis, so it ought to be viewed as the beginning of a larger comparative study. I criticize this first

work, then, in the hope that as Yang's experience with the Chinese classical tradition deepens, he may become an important and trustworthy guide in the comparative study of the classical Chinese and Western literary traditions. (MICHAEL FULLER, HARVARD UNIVERSITY)

*PETER RUPPERT: *Reader in a Strange Land: The Activity of Reading Literary Utopias*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press 1986. Pp. xvi + 193.

*PETER KUON: *Utopischer Entwurf und fiktionale Vermittlung: Studien zum Gattungswandel der literarischen Utopie zwischen Humanismus und Frühaufklärung*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter 1986. Pp. 536.

Hardly any genre's political and aesthetic value has been as frequently and heatedly disputed as that of the literary utopia. A prime instance in the long and lasting tradition of censuring utopian models on the grounds of their practicality is, of course, Aristotle's critique of Plato's *Republic* as unrealizable. Karl Popper's famous contention that utopianism necessarily leads to violence, and the designation of the genre by Arnheim Neüss, Hans Freyer, and others as "Denkform des Autoritären" represent the equally common view that any implementation of utopian "blueprints" would also be supremely undesirable. And Karl von Mohl, the founder of modern literary *Utopieforschung*, was neither the first nor last to find the genre "poetically" wanting. Against such opposition, formidable in name if not always in argument, the two studies reviewed here set out to vindicate the literary utopia's claim to a more positive critical appreciation.

In his *Reader in a Strange Land*, Peter Ruppert contends that the essential value of utopias is neither practical/political nor aesthetic (indeed, he shares the opinion that they are deficient on these planes), but rather rests in their startling, provocative effects on readers. An utopian text functions to defamiliarize the historical here and now, he says, thereby increasing "our awareness of the historicity of all values and their human origin" (6). Ruppert attempts to provide a theoretical basis for these tenets in Chapter One ("Readers in Utopia") and Three ("The Role of the Reader: Between Possibility and Necessity") of his book. A brief typology and critique of the main approaches to utopianism, first presented in the introduction, is extended in Chapter Two, entitled "Disputed Boundaries: Defining the Utopian Terrain"; parts of this chapter are also devoted to problems of generic determination. The positive utopia is treated in Chapter Four ("More's *Utopia*: The Logic of Contradictions"), the negative utopia in Chapter Five ("The Anti-Utopia: The Necessity of History") which focuses upon the classical Zamyatin/Huxley/Orwell triad. Chapter Six addresses the ambiguous utopia ("A Third Alternative"), analyzing Wells's *Modern Utopia*, Huxley's *Island*, Ernest Callenbach's *Ecotopia*, Marge Piercy's *Woman on the*

Edge of Time, and Ursula Le Guin's *The Dispossessed*. Ruppert concludes his book by reiterating his main contentions in Chapter Seven ("The Efficacy of Contradictions"), and appends twelve pages of notes, an up-to-date bibliography, and an index of names, terms, primary and some secondary sources.

A central problem plaguing *Reader in a Strange Land* becomes apparent already in the study's initial chapters. Ruppert begins by arguing that utopian literature is best understood in the context of a general dialectical model of the reader/text relationship wherein, initially, clear priority is given to the reader (as site of productive activity) over the text. Consequently, the reader is also assumed to determine "to a large extent the kinds of effects that are realized in the act of reading" (6). In other words, the meaning, function, and "value" attributed to utopian (and other) texts are seen here to depend to a greater degree on the reader's ideological, aesthetic, etc. predilections than on textual features. The variety of actual performances of utopias have hence to be considered equally legitimate or text appropriate (open to ideological questioning only), a view that Ruppert mainly subscribes to when discussing and classifying critical approaches to utopianism (cf. 150 and 155). Yet, the author intends to investigate the extent to which utopian literature "invites the dialectical involvement of its readers, the extent to which it relies, for its full realization, on the responses of readers to the dialectical structures embedded in the texts themselves" (x. My emphases). When modelling the "text/(ideal) reader" relationship, Ruppert's reasoning is hence anchored in a poetics of reading that assumes the priority of textual signals over reader choice, and thus a hierarchy of actual text performances, the zenith of this hierarchy being a full reading.

Ruppert is generally unclear on this point, as is especially evident in his presentation and use of Umberto Eco's semiotic and Wolfgang Iser's phenomenological models of reading (Chapter Three). "Eco and Iser," he alleges,

see [the text/reader] relationship as a dialectical partnership ... in which neither textual structure nor reader's performance has priority. ... In Iser's model, a text encodes an "implied reader," who is anticipated by the text and whose responses are "prestructured" to some extent; Eco acknowledges similar constraints in the "discursive structures" of a text, whose "Model Reader" is to a significant extent the product of textual processing. (59)

These statements are factually wrong. Neither Iser nor Eco are concerned with a specific individual or collective readership, as Ruppert's synopsis suggests; rather, their (implied, Model) reader — an "it," not a "s/he" — is a "strukturierte Hohlform" (Iser), firmly embedded in the reconstruction-inviting structures of a text. As precondition for an appropriate empirical

performance, Eco and Iser hence assume text, not reader priority, nor a dialectics of both. It is unfortunate that Ruppert — perhaps unwilling to present his claim for a specific structural description of utopianism too forcefully — oscillates between the mutually exclusive assumptions of reader versus text precedence throughout his book, as this renders his argument at times extremely contradictory (cf. 24 and 67, for example).

Ruppert proposes to conceive of literary utopias as "dialogical structures" typically evoking two discrete, but mutually informing pictures of social life: the explicit or implicit *mundus idem* that envisions contemporary actuality, and the utopian *mundus alter*, a fictive permutation of contemporary social problems into a static picture (cf. 28). The relationship established between these two images by the empirical reader, he justly maintains, crucially determines the meaning and value ascribed to utopian literature. If the vision of the *hic et nunc* is seen as the statement of the problem and the utopian design as its solution, then readers will treat an utopian text as "blueprint" (pragmatic effect) and, in most cases, devalue it as impractical or undesirable; Karl Mannheim and Karl Popper are briefly mentioned in this context. Should the two regions instead be regarded as incongruous, then the utopian solution is not seen as a conclusive answer, but as a symbolic displacement of social conflict within the author's society into an imaginary realm; utopias may then be valued for their therapeutic (Northrop Frye), anticipatory (Alvin Toffler, Ernst Bloch, Louis Marin), or their general cognitive effects (Darko Suvin).

Allying himself to the last mentioned view, Ruppert further contends that the reader is systematically prevented from simply embracing (or rejecting) utopian values by such textual strategies as double (why not multiple, as in More?) ideological perspectivity, the various contradictions and inconsistencies built into every utopian model, and by the very incompatibility between utopian dream and history, the genre's central paradox. In a full realization of an utopian text, the reader remains suspended between utopian vision, the image of social fact, and actuality itself, transcending them all in his own act of utopian endeavour that, according to Ruppert, fills the "extratextual gap" (meant in the sense of Iser) created by the work. In sum: the author regards the contrasts emerging from the interplay of these regions as the "essential 'conditions in the text' that shape or 'prestructure' the experience of reading utopias" (67). These propositions form the basis for the author's general description of literary utopias as playful and inconclusive intellectual experiments, conducted entirely in the imagination. In a series of observations, Ruppert further qualifies the genre as: both critical and affirmative; simultaneously positive and negative in Iser's terminology (22); combining the strategies of open and closed texts in

Eco's sense (73); both denotative and connotative like a symbol (89); and — ominously — also as structurally and semantically complete (50).

Before remarking on Ruppert's statements, a general query should be raised. It is obvious that, in functional terms, Ruppert's approach is most closely related to Suvin's concept of utopianism as literature of cognitive estrangement. Suvin's influence on *Reader in a Strange Land* does not end here, however. Indeed, it seems to this reviewer that a substantial number of Ruppert's tenets are borrowed, without proper acknowledgement, from Suvin. For instance, Suvin writes in *Metamorphosis of Science Fiction*: "Though formally closed, significant utopia is thematically open: its pointings reflect back upon the reader's 'topia'" (*On the Poetics and History of a Literary Genre* (New Haven: Yale UP, 1979, 51)). This observation reappears almost literally — and, unfortunately, generalized — in Chapter Three:

Formally, all utopias ... are structured like Eco's closed texts ... At the same time, however, all utopias ... produce the disturbing effects of Eco's open texts: ... they force us to rethink our relationship to history and to the sociopolitical system in which we live. (62)

Despite the new theoretical cloak he is trying to hang around Suvin's insights, Ruppert should have owned his indebtedness to Suvin here and elsewhere, as a matter of scholarly etiquette.

As to the central descriptive terms Ruppert applies to utopianism, his characterization of the genre with ever opposing notions (critical/affirmative, positive/negative) defeats all attempts at criticizing any single one of these propositions, as each is immediately taken back and substituted by its counterpole. To mention just one example: the author seems undecided whether to group utopias among Eco's open or closed texts. At times, all works belonging to the genre are seen as open (21 and 51), closed (69), or combining the strategies of both (72). Contradicting all of these statements, however, the author undertakes in his critical chapters a differentiation between "more closed" (e.g. Bellamy) and "more open" (e.g. Le Guin) individual texts. In view of the general ambiguity pervading his argument, it also seems futile to take Ruppert to task for other moot points in his reasoning, especially his application of Iser's notions of "Leerstelle" and "Negativität" to utopianism, and his attendant contention that the utopian genre is akin to, and hence as "valuable" as, modernism in "reader-orientedness" and "ideological effect" (cf. 60).

Finally, it is to be regretted that the critical chapters of *Reader in a Strange Land*, relying on a fairly standard sample of texts and serving mainly to support the author's generalizations, add little to redeem the study. Perhaps most unsatisfactory here is Ruppert's a-historical treatment of

More's *Utopia* which mainly follows Louis Marin's 1978 reading; in my opinion, the author's interpretation of *Utopia* could have been considerably strengthened by taking more of the existing Moreana into account (e.g. A.R. Heiserman, Ludwig Stockinger, George Logan).

More generally, then, Ruppert's investigation suffers from a lack of theoretical rigor and clarity in presentation. His three-step argument, encompassing a description of approaches to utopianism (empirical reader; text pragmatics), an analysis of the texts' encoded reader (text syntax), and a proposal for a proper reading of utopianism derived from the latter analysis (pragmatic prescription) remains unconvincing as it moves to and fro between text and text use, description and prescription. More specifically, there are many good reasons to doubt that all utopias can be meaningfully described as thought experiments, and that their main function and merit should accordingly be sought in their raising a reader's consciousness. It is probable that there are not only important textual (and, of course, extratextual) differences between philosophical utopias and those written for immediate implementation, but that these differences are period-specific. Consequently, functions (and perhaps even value) are likely to vary for individual texts and/or groups of texts over time. To ascertain these differences would require closer synchronic and diachronic investigations of the compository in their interrelation with the thematic aspects of a significant number of utopian works in various periods (e.g. perspectivity, hierarchy of textual norms). Since, at present, thematics and *Ideologiekritik* are still dominating scholarship on utopianism and compositional studies are scarce, Ruppert's broad generalizations seem not only problematic in detail, but also precipitous.

Peter Kuon's *Utopischer Entwurf und fiktionale Vermittlung* represents a very welcome addition to the relatively small body of studies that insist on the unity of form and content in literary utopianism, thereby rescuing utopian texts from treatment as documents in the history of ideas only, and vindicating their aesthetic coherence as works of art. Kuon concentrates on five early works of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. His book is perfectly clear in presentation and argument, methodologically well-founded, and provides interesting new insights into the individual utopias considered as well as into the general evolution of the genre from late Humanism to the early Enlightenment.¹

Kuon's organization of materials reflects the chronology of his sample. The author — after having surveyed the state of research and specified his methodology ("Einleitung") — analyzes More's *Utopia* (1516), Campanella's *Città del Sole* (1602), Andreae's *Christianopolis* (1619), Foigny's *Terre Australe Connue* (1679), and Veiras's *Histoire des Sévarambes* (1677-79) in five consecutive chapters. Subsequently, he summarizes his interpretative

results in a concluding chapter, and evaluates them in regard to their genre-historical relevance. The study is completed by more than seventy pages of footnotes and an extensive bibliography, but is not indexed.

Kuon begins with some general metacritical remarks. He argues convincingly that the dismissal of the diverse strategies of fictional mediation employed in utopias as mere sugar-coating of the pill, and the attendant myopic — and frequently a-historical — focus on the utopian design alone, are the two prime causes of the omnipresent aesthetic devaluation of the genre, and have hindered an adequate reconstruction of the meaning, underlying *Wirkungsintention* and *Dichtungskonzeption* of individual, particularly early works. Kuon aims at overcoming these problems in his own exemplary text analyses which are meant to resurrect both the literariness and historicity of each text considered by identifying its immanent structure as well as its communicative function in its contemporary poetological and ideological context. He thereby intends to contribute to a future, truly literary history of utopianism.

For his textual investigations, Kuon adopts a semiotic communication model deriving from Polish structuralism that posits three intratextual and two extratextual levels of communication: sender and receiver roles are symmetrically assigned to each level. Intratextually, the model encompasses the levels of the narrated world (characters as senders/addressees); narration (narrator/narratee); and narrative concept (implied author/implied reader). Extratextually, the realm of literary production and reception (actual author/actual reader) is distinguished from that of the historical context of production and reception (author/ reader as historical *personae*). This maximal, hierarchical communication schema is well-suited for an inquiry into the textual norms and intentionality of utopian texts, to be reconstructed with the help of indirect textual signals (title, chapter segmentation, character configuration, narrative perspective, spatial and temporal organization, etc.) on the abstract level of the narrative concept.

In this theoretical framework, Kuon provides schematic representations of both the communicative structure ("Strukturmodell") and fictional progression ("Verlaufsmodell") for each of the utopias analyzed, and subsequently presents in-depth interpretations of these works. His text exegeses proper centre around questions concerning the degree of perceptibility and general shape of the narrator; the integration of the utopian traveller into the utopian world; the inner-utopian communication; the "conversion" and return of the traveller; the role of the narrator in translating the fictional utopian world into fictional actuality; the explicit commentary on the utopian world by narrator, listener, and editor figures; the implicit commentary on other narrative levels; the specific signals guiding contemporary reception; etc. This immanent narratological inquiry

is, whenever appropriate, supplemented with external information such as the authors' biographies, oeuvres and poetics; the generic, literary, and social context; the contemporary world view and norms; and intertextual relations.

It is evident that, in a short review, justice cannot be done to the critical part of Kuon's book in all its detail. Kuon's meticulous interpretations are admirably executed and densely packed with thought provoking insights. Every interested reader is recommended to study them with care. Here, all one can do is to indicate where the author's approach and findings are most original, and to comment briefly upon his concluding generalizations.

In his analysis of More's *Utopia* (Chapter One: "Der Dialog im Dialog im Dialog, oder: Multiple Wertungsperspektiven und Leserintelligenz"), Kuon moves on relatively well-trodden ground. However, the author successfully systematizes and at times qualifies previous, mainly intuitive interpretations of the text (Ludwig Stockinger, André Prévost, George Logan, and others). Kuon is innovative insofar as he re-defines the textual object itself, including the *parerga* (epistolary material and poetry accompanying *Utopia* in the last authorized edition, November 1518), as well as all marginal glosses into the work *sensu stricto*. It has to be mentioned here that, by an unfortunate printing error, eight pages of Kuon's Chapter One are left blank (102-03, 110-11, 114-15). This is particularly regrettable as part of the discussion of the *parerga* is thus rendered virtually unintelligible — at least in this reviewer's copy of the book.

Campanella's *Città del Sole*, Andreae's *Christianopolis*, and — astonishingly — also Foigny's *Terre Australe Connue*, are designated by Kuon as *Staatsallegorien*. These works are investigated, respectively, in Chapters Two ("Die Dominanz des Erzählers, oder: Dialogische Verständigung und Handlungsappell"), Three ("Die Allmacht des Erzählers, oder: Wirklichkeit, Allegorie und Allegorese"), and Four ("Der weise Führer, oder: Die Verlagerung der Wertung in den utopischen Innenraum"). The author proposes to consider Campanella's and Andreae's texts as allegories in the Medieval sense, requiring a conventional theological exegesis which, in *Christianopolis*, is partly inscribed into the utopia itself. His hypothesis of the allegoricity of these two texts is well borne out by his analysis of their central symbols and topoi.

More exceptional than Kuon's interpretations of Campanella and Andreae, however, is his valid allegoresis of Foigny which certainly constitutes his book's most original critical contribution to scholarship on utopianism. Following up some pointers by Pierre Bayle, Kuon takes recourse to such external systems of reference as the contemporary pre-Adamite hypothesis and the Medieval *Navigatio Sancti Brendani* to complement his immanent analysis of *Terre Australe Connue*, and is able to decode the work's non-conventional symbolism in a consistent and

convincing allegorical reading. That Kuon succeeds in affirming the aesthetic and ideational coherence of Foigny's utopia is all the more noteworthy as this text has previously been found enigmatic and incomprehensible even by the most distinguished critics working in this area, among them Raymond Trousson, the author of the best history of utopianism presently available.

Kuon's last critical chapter which focuses on Veiras's *Histoire des Sévarambes* (Chapter Five: "Die Erzählung in der Erzählung in der Erzählung, oder: Die Narrativierung multipler Wertungsperspektiven") is designed — as Chapter One — to give theoretical substance to prior, unsystematic criticism, and to provide a thorough narratological analysis of the compositional strategies employed in Veiras's work. It is interesting to note that Veiras's travelogue is the first utopia which was found to be of aesthetic value by its contemporary readers as well as by early researchers of the utopian genre.

Surveying his individual interpretations, Kuon observes an evolution in the form of fictional mediation, taking its course from More's complex, dialogic web of multiple, unresolved external commentary upon the narrated utopian world; to a simpler dialogic (Campanella) or monologic (Andreae) external evaluation of the utopian nucleus on the level of narration; to Foigny's first person narration in which commentary is mostly transferred to the narrated world; and finally to Veiras's polyphonic network of controversial evaluations situated exclusively within the narrated world. He states that this progressive interiorization of the textual commentary surrounding the utopian societal model corresponds to a functional development in classical utopianism, from the axiological openness of the ludic Humanist dialogue which presents an utopian counter-image of actuality as heuristic foil for disputation in the "respublica litteraria," to the closedness of the Baroque *Staatsallegorie* which upholds to the fellow Christian a counter-image of reality as true, binding religious norm; to the secular openness of the Enlightenment utopia in which a realistically conceived social order is proposed as possible historical alternative. The author rightly reminds us here that the criterion of the immediate "realizability" of utopias is not (and cannot be) applicable to late Renaissance and Baroque utopianism which is still informed by the Augustinian theology of history, but becomes relevant only with the ascent of Enlightenment philosophy of history.

Overall, the achievements of Kuon's inquiry are particularly remarkable in two respects. Firstly, the author closes a gap in our knowledge about the form and function of mediatory strategies in early utopianism. Studies of the specific interplay between composition and thematics had previously been available only for the works of More, Fontanelle, and to some extent Foigny — and then for those of Sinold, Schnabel, Wieland, Bellamy, etc. The particular aesthetics of Campanella and Veiras, however, were virtually

uninvestigated. Secondly, Kuon's focus on Campanella's, Andreae's, and Foigny's allegorical texts rather than on Bacon's, Gott's, or Fontanelle's more "realistic" utopias allows for a correction of the frequently held opinion (e.g. Victor Dupont) that the development of classical utopianism has to be understood as a strictly linear progression from sixteenth-century dialogic to seventeenth-century epic/novelistic forms. Kuon shows that an intermediate generic state can be demarcated between late Renaissance and late Baroque — the *Staatsallegorie* — which cannot be teleologically conceived of as a precursor of the utopian travel novel of the Enlightenment, but follows its own, unique poetics.

The book's promise to contribute to a literary history of utopianism is hence fulfilled. However, the sample of texts taken into consideration by Kuon is (necessarily) small, so that future inquiries will have to establish more firmly the validity of Kuon's periodization of early utopianism by investigating other texts possibly open to exegesis as *Staatsallegorien*, such as Doni's *I Mondi* (1552) or Stiblin's *Commentariolus de Eudaemonismo Republica* (1555). At any rate, it is to be hoped that Kuon's excellent book will set a new standard for research on literary utopias. (ANNEGRET J. WIEMER, UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA)

*DAVID TROTT et NICOLE BOURSIER, éds. *L'Âge du Théâtre en France/The Age of Theatre in France*. Edmonton: Academic Printing and Publishing 1988. Pp. 374.

Ce volume replet — plus de 370 pages d'écriture serrée — rassemble les textes révisés des conférences sur la littérature dramatique et les mises en scène de Corneille à Beaumarchais présentées lors d'un colloque tenu à l'Université de Toronto du 14 au 16 mai 1987, augmentés d'un essai de Timothy Reiss. Avant de saluer l'excellent travail d'édition des professeurs Boursier et Trott dont témoigne la présentation de ces actes,¹ il faut d'abord savoir gré à ces deux éminents spécialistes, respectivement du XVII^e et du XVIII^e siècles, d'avoir eu l'initiative de cette rencontre internationale qui proclamait un "âge du théâtre" s'étalant sur deux siècles de création littéraire et artistique qu'on a souvent tendance à revisiter séparément. Pour donner plus de

piquant et de vérité à ce parcours-exploration de la théâtralité, ils avaient su regrouper tout un aéroportage de critiques littéraires, de théoriciens et d'historiens du théâtre, tout en privilégiant les "travaux de nombreux chercheurs canadiens" à qui ils offraient ainsi un "forum" à la fois pluridisciplinaire et international représentatif des recherches et pratiques de pointe dans le domaine" (Introduction). Ceci nous vaut un ouvrage riche de perspectives variées, "ouvert, sans exclusive méthodologique," pour citer Anne Ubersfeld dont la brillante synthèse couronne le tout d'une méditation en apothéose sur l'orientation actuelle des études théâtrales (366-69).

À l'instar des intendants des Menus Plaisirs versaillais, les deux organisateurs ont pensé leur ouvrage selon une ordonnance toute classique. Nous sommes conviés à une vaste chorégraphie en deux grandes parties consacrées, l'une aux "Problèmes textuels et méthodologiques," l'autre aux "Conditions de la représentation: histoire, théorie, pratique et réception"; chacun de ces mouvements se compose de quatre entrées de ballets: 1. "Un foisonnement de dramaturgies: baroque, classique, philosophiques et psychologiques du théâtre de Molière"; 2. "Approches sémiotiques et psycho-critiques; 4. "Théâtre et idéologie"; — voilà pour la première moitié — 5. "Au delà du texte"; 6. Décors et pièces à machines; 7. Mime, musique, danse et le théâtre; 8. Analyse et perception du spectacle théâtral; — voilà pour la deuxième. Pour corser cette habile arithmétique, chacun de ces ballets s'exécute en quadrilles ou plus souvent en doubles pas de deux (une fois pour le XVII^e, une fois pour le XVIII^e) avec agrément d'un ou deux solos que rompent avec dextérité la raideur d'une trop grande symétrie. Enfin, notons que les Grands de cet âge du théâtre (Corneille, Racine, Molière, Marivaux) sont certes en force sans que soient négligés pour autant les moins connus, les méconnus (Du Ryer, Quinault), les anonymes (le *Recueil* de Gherardi). On comprendra qu'il est impossible de recenser en détail les quelque vingt-huit essais drapés dans cet ample manteau d'Arlequin dont certaines pièces pourront sembler à quelques lecteurs jurer un peu sur les couleurs chatoyantes de l'ensemble, irrégularités baroques mêlées à l'harmonie générale en quelque sorte; on voudra bien nous pardonner notre lecture laconique du programme sous forme d'une succincte anthologie de citations à laquelle nous astreignent les limites de ces pages. Nous comptons sur l'audition éloquente de cette musique de scène bilingue pour faire apprécier la variété du recueil.

C'est Antoine Soare qui ouvre la danse en sondant le motif dramatique des amours d'Oreste et d'Hermione "avant *Andromaque*," pour démontrer avec subtilité que "la vengeance de la mal aimée ne donne lieu que dans *Andromaque* à une véritable tragédie, et c'est une tragédie inventée de toutes pièces par ceux qu'elle broie" (8-9). Marie-Odile Sweetser décèle "les premières orientations de la dramaturgie de Racine" dans *La Thébaïde*.

1 J'ai relevé quatre coquilles, ce qui, pour un ouvrage de cette taille est quantité négligeable. Par souci d'exactitude, je les signale: à la page 68, à propos de *L'Avarice*, on nous parle de la "soubrette Frosine"; c'est faire bien de l'honneur à cette vieille entremetteuse! À la page 131, note 24, une bavure de traitement de texte, sans doute, nous vaut cet intrigant "désingénu" glissé dans une syntaxe déroutante. À la page 161, l'auteur de *La Constance* est Pierre de Larivey et non Charles; enfin p. 165, il faut lire "1654" et non 1554 comme date de *L'Eunuque*.

L'exégète émérite des théories dramatiques de Corneille² renouvelle la problématique de l'éternel parallèle en se demandant si, en fin de compte nous sommes "tellement loin de la dramaturgie cornélienne" (23). Pierre Gobin s'arme de Todorov et de Bakhtine pour pénétrer dans les arcanes du "laboratoire dramatique" de Diderot, en l'occurrence la comédie *Est-il bon, est-il méchant*, et y étudier la "métathéâtralité dialogique" qui, selon lui, "se manifeste à travers des modalités d'écriture (lesquelles 'recouvrent' et 'actualisent' des stratégies discursives, des 'structures dramatiques' et des 'techniques de mystification'" 29). Julie C. Hayes tente de définir le "double plan" de Beaumarchais, ses liens moins serviles qu'on le pense avec la poétique de Diderot, et le lit comme "an attempt to recuperate and pin down what Diderot proposed as a moving 'identity' of interaction and differentiation" (49).

Il était de mise qu'une session complète fût consacrée à Molière; l'auteur/acteur a donc droit à un quadrille pour lui tout seul et c'est tant mieux. Micheline Bourbeau-Walker part des prémisses de Northrop Frye dont l'ombre critique se profile magistralement sur la toile de fond de cette célébration torontoise pour nous proposer une très fine analyse du "Misanthrope" ou la comédie éclatée; elle y voit Alceste faire figure de "Pharmakos" volontaire et, dit-elle, "c'est à cette réversibilité du personnage — et ce faisant du schéma comique tout entier — que tiendrait la problématique de la pièce" (54). John Rowe, autre disciple de N. Frye, présente "une étude des images archétypes dans trois pièces de Molière" situant *Le Malade imaginaire*, *Tartuffe* et *L'Avare* sur une gamme que va du mode romanesque au mode réaliste et/ou ironique, se rapportant, selon Frye, l'un au démoniaque, l'autre à l'apocalyptique (63). Cette intéressante étude insiste sur la nécessité de repenser les mises en scène du génial aventurier théâtral en donnant à certains objets toute la signification dramaturgique et idéologique qu'ils renferment. Dominique Lafon se livre à une étude de dramaturgie comparée et informatique des *Sosies* à *Amphitryon* (73) qui s'ouvre, elle aussi, sur une invitation à reconsidérer la mise en scène de cette éblouissante comédie de dédoublement en tenant compte de cette précision des calculs procurés par l'ordinateur. Max Vernet réunit un ensemble de textes visant à dégager la polysémie de la notion de reconnaissance au temps où les dramaturges dépendaient du bon vouloir des princes. "L'horizon lointain de cet essai [ardu à focaliser parfois] est de voir comment dans la rencontre d'une pratique théâtre qu'on appelle Molière" (91). Nous reverrons Molière venir hanter les tréteaux de ce colloque un peu plus tard.

Le XVIII^e siècle fournit plus de matière que ce colloque un peu plus tard. "approches sémiotiques et psychanalytiques": Georges Bérubé démontre que,

dans *Don Pedre*, "Voltaire dramaturge tâche par une construction littéraire ... de corriger la référence historique" (117). À propos du *Prince Travesi*, Robert Tomlinson met en oeuvre le carré sémiotique de Greimas pour "constater comment le récit essaie de défaire une antinomie Amour/Politique proprement 'impensable'" (121) et il voit chez Marivaux "un de ces moralistes ironiques qui prennent plaisir à démonter la machine du monde" (129). Constant Venesoen quant à lui aborde *La Thébaïde* par le biais des frères ennemis, l'incidence du moi et du sur-moi sur le traitement de "l'usurpation, de l'illégitimité, du vice et de la culpabilité" et il prouve que la psychocritique "peut faire bon ménage avec la mythocritique" (141). Marivaux, encore lui — mais on était à l'aube du tricentenaire de sa naissance — Marivaux donc inspire à Raymond Joly "l'esquisse d'une lecture psychocritique" (145) de *La Fausse Suivante*, démonstration un peu besogneuse et, somme toute, pas très neuve dans ses aboutissements.

Comme pour rétablir la symétrie historique un moment bousculée, le dernier morceau en quatre figures avant l'entracte s'adresse en majorité au XVII^e siècle. Michel L. Bareau fait "l'anatomie du capitaine" à travers ses divers avatars dramatiques, "figure politiques à deux visages" (159), lieu d'un réseau métaphorique et satirique brûlant, depuis ses sources lointaines jusqu'à sa décadence vers la fin du siècle. Il est regrettable que cette intéressante rétrospective historique et dramaturgique ne comporte pas d'annotations qui pourraient être utiles aux chercheurs. James F. Gaines, dont on connaît l'intelligente lecture sociocritique de Molière,³ se fait ici l'avocat d'un Pierre Du Ryer champion d'une Rome républicaine et critique convaincu de l'autocratie, se situant dans *Lucrèce* et *Scevole* à l'encontre de l'absolutisme prôné par le Corneille de *Cinna* et d'*Horace*, option que l'on aurait tort de considérer comme la seule éthique politique triomphante sur la scène française: "Du Ryer's Roman masterpiece corresponds with a moment in French history that never happened, the triumph of the Fronde Parlementaire, and its eclipse duplicates that of bourgeois hopes for a constitutional government under the 'ancien régime'" (179). La première partie s'achève sur le bel essai de Timothy Reiss sur *La Thébaïde*. L'auteur fait appel à certains textes fondamentaux (la *République* de J. Bodin, *De la souveraineté* du Roy de Cardin Le Bret, le *Léviathan* de Hobbes) pour étayer avec une sagace persuasion sa thèse audacieuse, à savoir que Racine "a mis en scène une situation et des personnages qui lui permettaient de mettre à l'épreuve certains aspects de la théorie de la souveraineté généralement acceptée à son époque" (201).

2 M.-O. Sweetser, *La Dramaturgie de Corneille* (Genève: Droz, 1977).

3 James F. Gaines, *Social Structures in Molière's Theater* (Columbus: Ohio State UP, 1984).

Pour ouvrir la deuxième partie, David Trott, qui travaille sur les scénarios manuscrits de Louis Fuzelier, l'un des auteurs les plus prolifiques du Théâtre de la Foire, présente ceux-ci comme des non-textes qu'il faudrait se garder de négliger et qui devraient susciter la mise au point d'une méthodologie de l'exploitation de telles données; le critique appelle l'établissement de modèles des conditions de représentation d'une "dramaturgy of floating fragments" (216). Frances M. Wilshire développe et nuance la contribution du grand acteur Garrick à la cause de Shakespeare en France, "the impact of his acting" autant que "the easy dialogue he established with so many French literary figures" (228). Ces pages savamment documentées mettent non seulement en valeur l'importance déterminante des grands interprètes dans la diffusion des oeuvres dramatiques mais elles apportent aux comparatistes historiens du théâtre un complément intéressant à d'autres ouvrages, tel celui de Marion Monaco,⁴ auquel, à notre étonnement du reste, F. Wilkinson ne se réfère pas.

Après cette brève mais dense intrusion "au-delà du texte," nous retournons à la magie du spectacle avec trois études passionnantes des décors de théâtre. Perry Gethner répertorie et analyse avec minutie les décors des tragédies à machines louis-quatorziennes qui ont prélué à l'avènement de l'opéra et il approfondit leurs résonances esthétiques baroques, "the fascination with the instability of all earthly things and the difficulty of distinguishing between illusion and reality" (240). Roger Herzel dont les travaux sur la scénographie moliéresque sont notables,⁵ se concentre sur la puissance d'illusion du décor de la production originale de *Dom Juan*; il la confronte avec la nudité de la scène élisabéthaine qui servait de cadre à la descente aux enfers du *Faust* de Marlowe: "When he [Molière] ended the play by making a spectacular show of the punishment of a sinner, that too was a pleasing illusion" (255). François Moureau dont la thèse sur Dufresny⁶ fait autorité dans le domaine de la vie dramatique de l'entre-deux-siècles, nous fournit ici le dossier d'"Arlequin architecte," une étude des "décors et mises en scène chez les Italiens de Paris avant 1697," complétée par une iconographie érudite; il partage avec nous un document de travail précieux dont le trait le plus significatif réside dans la "digestion du décor par le spectacle" (264) et qui prouve que "la montée en puissance de l'invention décorative au cours des dernières années du XVII^e siècle est l'un des caractères les plus intéressants de la troupe italienne à Paris (265).

Harold C. Knutson qui appliqua naguère à Molière l'approche archétypale de N. Frye et vient de publier un deuxième hommage au premier farceur de France en dégagant son influence sur la comédie de la Restauration anglaise,⁷ Knutson se tourne cette fois vers l'Italie, s'interroge sur la nature et la fonction des "lazzis" et l'usage qu'en fait Molière; ce faisant il pose les problèmes d'une étude restant à développer qui porterait sur Molière et la comédie italienne, vaste sujet partiellement traité dans quelques ouvrages vieillissants ou trop généraux, enquête — "a vast and daunting one" (278) — qu'il appelle de toute la force de son enthousiasme de moliériste chevronné. Dans cette section consacrée au mime, à la musique et à la danse, on se devait de parler de l'opéra, ce que fait Buford Norman. Son analyse systématique du vocabulaire des onze "libretti" écrits par Quinault pour les opéras de Lulli révèle que la beauté et la puissance émotive de ces oeuvres appelées par leurs auteurs "tragédies lyriques" n'a rien à voir avec la variété du lexique mais doit se chercher dans la phonologie. Et B. Norman de lancer ce cri passionné: "Can we have drama without drama?" (294). Judith Chazin-Bennahum, praticienne de la danse, dégage l'influence radicale exercée par le théâtre du XVII^e sur le ballet: "With a freer body, no longer restricted by corsets, brocades, wigs, and high heels, broader possibilities for dramatic and dance expression emerged" (309).

Pour que le tour d'horizon de cette enquête fût complet, il ne manquait plus que l'optique du spectateur qui fait l'objet de l'ultime section de ce vaste et multicolore ensemble. Derrick de Kerckhove explique comment les conditions matérielles de réception du spectacle dramatique ont été modifiées au cours du XVIII^e siècle et ont contribué à libérer la scène, c'est à dire en définitive... à libérer le spectateur" (324). Abby Elizabeth Zanger sonde les possibilités dramaturgiques de l'*Amphitryon* de Molière en démontrant qu'en homme de théâtre consommé, Molière "staged Chaplain's ideal theatrical performance" (327) telle qu'il l'avait définie dans son bref essai sur l'unité de temps. Françoise Siguret évoque quelques comptes rendus de spectacle de l'époque Louis XIII et nous narre avec verve certaines des "extases de la Gazette" pour défendre éloquentement l'idée que "la Gazette officielle ne peut s'écrire qu'en trompe-l'oeuil" car "il s'agit moins de raconter un événement qu'un règne" (346). Avec Patrice Pavis dont on connaît le *Marivaux à l'épreuve de la scène*,⁸ c'est le panache triomphal de la fin, sous forme d'une passionnante descente en flèche de la mise en scène

4 Marion Monaco, *Shakespeare on the French Stage in the Eighteenth Century* (Paris: Didier, 1974).

5 Roger Herzel, *The Original Casting of Molière's Plays* (Ann Arbor: UMI Research Center, 1981).

6 François Moureau, *Dufresny, auteur dramatique: 1657-1724* (Paris: Klincksieck, 1979).

7 Harold C. Knutson, *Molière, an Archetypal Approach* (Toronto: Toronto UP, 1976) et *The Triumph of Wit: Molière and Restoration Comedy* (Columbus: Ohio State UP, 1988).

8 Patrice Pavis, *Marivaux à l'épreuve de la scène* (Paris: Sorbonne, 1986).

d'Alfredo Arias: "Le jeu de l'amour et du hasard: une singerie post-moderne en trois bonds" (349). La question est posée "de savoir si une oeuvre présentée de manière purement divertissante ne risque pas de perdre de son âme dans l'opération" (359).

Pour conclure, dix-septiémistes et dix-huitiémistes, historiens et praticiens du théâtre tout aussi bien, accueilleront ce livre avec reconnaissance et le liront avec profit: il représente une somme de réflexions fécondes sur un art complexe et fascinant, une invite à sonder plus avant le concept de théâtre dans sa totalité. (NICOLE MALLET, UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA)

*JOSEPH FRANK *Through the Russian Prism: Essays on Literature and Culture*. Princeton: Princeton University Press 1990. Pp. xii + 237. Hardcover US\$29.50. Paper US\$9.95

One of the major scholarly landmarks of the late twentieth century will undoubtedly be Joseph Frank's multi-volume life of Dostoevsky. With three volumes published and two to go, it has the amplitude of a late nineteenth-century study in the "l'homme et l'oeuvre" mode, and this sense of continuity with the best of that period's historical and critical writing is a key to Frank's characteristic strengths. These are evident not only in the biography itself, but also in the twenty essays and reviews collected here, which are mostly spin-offs of the major work. They range from essays on modern Russian critics such as Bakhtin, Jakobson, and Nabokov, through essays on the social and intellectual backgrounds of Dostoevsky's novels, to studies of nineteenth century Russian radicals, including Chernyshevsky, Bakunin, and Herzen.

Frank's central theme is comparative: he examines how European ideas are changed when taken up in the Russian context, and how those ideas return to Europe and expand into the rest of the world in their changed (usually radicalized) form. The "Russian prism" of Frank's title creates a two-way refraction; though the first direction occupies most of his attention here, he often ends his essays with reflections on how the Russian radicalism, formed out of European ideas, has in turn widely influenced both European and Third World intellectuals and leaders.

Another "refraction" Frank is always conscious of is the Western image of Dostoevsky as a half-crazed religious zealot and uncontrolled genius, whereas in fact, as Frank constantly shows, he was very involved in the politics and journalism of his country. Dostoevsky was in some ways a "moderate," who was satirizing his extremist heroes rather than identifying with them. These kinds of "prismatic refractions" mostly stem from the failure to take into account the social and cultural context of an idea, a

work, or an author. In contrast, careful contextualization is the key to Frank's own method.

"Method" is perhaps too formal a concept to apply to Frank's work. The inspiration of his writing lies in a central cluster of values that may fairly be termed humanist. He rightly deplores the fact that "the Western avant-garde ... is busily engaged in turning the word 'humanism' into a term of opprobrium" (82), and finds that the humanism of much dissident Soviet literature is a timely reminder of these values for Western intellectuals, who tend to take them for granted because they have not directly experienced their absence.

For Frank, the key to what goes wrong in the relationship of thought and society is the isolation of ideas in their purely theoretical form and the consequent temptation of ruthlessly applying them in practice. Neglecting the original context of an idea can often lead to neglecting or oversimplifying the context in which it is to be applied. The equivalent in individual terms is isolating the intellect from the wholeness of the human being, which includes feeling. Frank quotes Porfiry Petrovich's diagnosis of Raskolnikov as "a heart unhinged by theories" (135). Turgenev's Bazarov is another fictional case of this discussed by Frank, while real-life examples include Bakunin, Nechaev and Chernyshevsky. All of these men were liable to give total allegiance to an ideology, to the exclusion not only of other ideas, but to other aspects of their own and others' humanity as well. To see this self-dehumanization as a virtue, however just the cause it is supposed to serve, is for Frank the cardinal error behind many of the atrocities of our century.

Frank shows how this desire for rapid, dramatic impact can vitiate critical writing as well as politics. A distorted understanding of a text results when the critic prefers intensity of effect, dramatic provocation, lyrical effusion, or theoretical consistency, to patient, open-minded elucidation. Frank spends twelve pages painstakingly exposing the selective and distorted treatment of the biographical data in Freud's essay on Dostoevsky, as well as reproving Stefan Zweig's high-pitched portrait of Dostoevsky as a mad Russian. In contrast to these and other critics, Frank assumes that, in biography or history, one has a duty to work with all the available facts, even, or especially, with those which are inconvenient to one's theory. In literary criticism, he assumes that there are degrees of "validity in interpretation," depending on the extent to which the critic works from a preconceived approach, commitment, system or method, or conducts a patient, thorough, and open investigation. The critic should take into account the author's original intention as contextualized, though not determined, by his or her historical, social and cultural setting. The author's psychology is relevant to

understanding the work, but is not the sole factor or even necessarily the central one.

Frank, of course, is not alone in these assumptions, and other critics (not necessarily the best-known or most-cited at present) exemplify this approach: in Slavonic studies Frank cites with admiration the work of Victor Terras, *Belinskij and Russian Literary Criticism*, Franco Venturi, *Roots of Revolution* and Rufus Mathewson, *The Positive Hero in Russian Literature*. These, along with Sir Isaiah Berlin and Frank himself, are cultural critics in the true sense: their readings of Russian texts are set within a rich context of psychological, historical, and political knowledge, rather than being simply exhibitions of a general theory about the nature of textuality, or literature, or society. For Frank, there is a vital connection between cultural complexity and human wholeness, and like Dostoevsky himself, he affirms both values against the dogmatists and sensation-seekers, past or present, and political or academic. (GRAHAM GOOD, UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA)

*VINCENT FOURNIER. *L'Utopie ambiguë: la Suède et la Norvège chez les voyageurs et essayistes français (1882-1914)*. Clermont-Ferrand: ADOSA, 1989. FF260.00

L'acte imaginaire axé sur l'Autre se réduit trop facilement à deux pôles, même chez les plus avertis. Après tout, c'est la figure binaire qui s'imposa à notre précurseur Madame de Staël quand elle fonda sa typologie littéraire sur les termes nord / sud.

Or le nord dont elle parlait se limitait à l'Allemagne. Ses lecteurs sont d'ailleurs obligés de partager sa perspective, pieds plantés fermement en Allemagne, visage tourné vers l'Italie et le midi. Mais si Madame de Staël s'était retournée vers le grand nord, vers l'Hyperborée dont la légende remonte aux Grecs? Dans son étude classique, Vincent Fournier nous propose d'énumérer les thèmes, les idées reçues, les figures et les stéréotypes qui définissent le domaine idéologique situé derrière le dos de Madame de Staël, si l'on peut dire. Il s'agit aussi d'un moment historique postérieur, 1882-1914, période où commencèrent à proliférer les récits de voyages et les essais sur ce qui n'était à l'époque que la seule Suède-Norvège.

Mil neuf cent quatorze se comprend, mais pourquoi 1882? Bien sûr, c'est à partir d'une typologie textuelle et d'une "sociologie des auteurs" que Fournier fixe cette date. Il signale pourtant qu'une transformation technologique marque ce tournant: l'avènement du chemin de fer et des hôtels d'un certain confort attirent vers la Suède-Norvège des voyageurs-dilettantes qui ont le loisir et le goût de manier la plume (35). Ce développement des moyens modernes de communication tend aussi à distiller deux sous-genres autrefois confondus: d'un côté, le récit de voyage qui

s'occupe de plus en plus de l'agencement du déplacement lui-même (et qui suit parfois les tracés recommandés par le Baedeker Suède-Norvège, publié en 1890 [63]); de l'autre, l'essai sur l'étranger, c'est-à-dire l'ethnographie en herbe. Plusieurs sciences ont émergé pendant la période que traite Vincent Fournier: la géographie, la sociologie, et l'ethnologie 'interfèrent' toutes avec le récit de voyage et l'essai sur l'étranger (14). Mais en retour, de toute évidence, les récits et les essais de voyage interfèrent aussi avec ces sciences adolescentes.

A l'intérieur de son cadre général, Fournier établit trois volets: 1882-1889, 1890-1899, 1900-1914. Le second sera le plus familier, car il reflète l'influence du théâtre d'Ibsen, de Strindberg et de Björnson sur l'image française de la Suède et la Norvège, l'auteur ayant écarté le Danemark, la Finlande, l'Islande et la Laponie pour des raisons qu'il explique soigneusement au début (21-28). Ibsen joua un rôle prépondérant dans la critique théâtrale des années 1890, mais Fournier soutient que les critiques ont puisé leurs images de ce dramaturge dans le même stock que les voyageurs-dilettantes et les sociologues apprentis, de sorte que la critique théâtrale constitue un genre de voyage presque à part entière. Ainsi, Ernest Tisot, selon qui Hedda Gabler est le type même de la femme norvégienne (30), appliqua à Ibsen les épithètes usuelles du Viking: "grand rebelle," "penseur exalté par la solitude." Trois ans plus tôt, Alcanter de Brahm avait imaginé que l'oeuvre d'Ibsen s'adressait en première instance à une "minorité de silencieux, d'isolés, dont les âmes se correspondent à des distances infinies, dans le temps et dans l'espace" — condensé des métaphores et codes culturels que Fournier repère à maintes reprises dans son corpus (135).

Pour Fournier, la rhétorique du récit de voyage sur la Scandinavie relève d'un procédé formel précis:

Les rapports de l'homme et de l'espace sont évoqués à travers des références culturelles qui postulent, plus ou moins explicitement, le "reflet" de la nature sur l'homme, l'influence de l'un sur l'autre, l'échange entre les deux — où l'identité des attributs de la pensée et de ceux de l'étendue.... Nous désignerons donc sous le nom de *syllapse*, ou de rapport de consubstantialité, toute notation ... qui confond en termes identiques, sinon communs, ce qui a trait à l'homme (voyageur ou étranger) et ce qui a trait à la nature. (87)

Les figures mythiques nordiques, comme le Viking héroïque lié par le biais du motif animus / anima à la femme suédoise chaste et fraîche mais vitale, ainsi que les personnages dramatiques ibsénien devenus quasi-mythiques, le vagabond délirant Peer Gynt, et le pasteur fanatique Brand (149), ne seraient donc que des instances d'un jeu binaire de structures complémentaires qui engendreraient par extension d'autres séries: Suédois / civilisation

/ Norvégien / solitude. Ou encore, couplant des valeurs déjà sôres, du moins dans l'esprit du Français moyen: le je-ne-sais-quoi d'anglais (solitaire et flegmatique) chez le Norvégien, par rapport à la francité (civilisée et raffinée) du Suédois (174).

Il convient de noter dans cette revue *canadienne* que les auteurs, et Fournier lui-même à quelques exceptions près, passent sous silence la crise qui traversa l'Union Suède-Norvège et qui aboutit à leur séparation en 1905. Fournier note un léger fléchissement subséquent dans l'intérêt manifesté à l'égard de la Norvège indépendante, ce qui se traduit par une redistribution générique. La Norvège quitte la mouvance des critiques et des voyageurs pour gagner celle des universitaires (247). Il en reste que les mêmes oppositions figurales qu'auparavant ont été invoquées pour décrire la scission elle-même (210). Qui plus est, quand l'évolution politique domestique de la Scandinavie finit par attirer l'attention du public français (le poids croissant des syndicats, l'impact de la social-démocratie à partir de 1897, l'influence du féminisme et d'autres réformes libérales), ces événements ont été aussi coulés dans le moule que l'on connaît. Même un essai exceptionnel et "inclassable" comme *Suédois et Norvégiens chez eux* présente des "notations, voire de motifs et de thèmes, appartenant au substrat du discours collectif" (232).

Dans sa conclusion, Fournier rappelle que le discours en question est bien français, ce qui explique les accents renaniens (270) ou barrésiens (302) que l'on y trouve. Le mouvement idéologique apparent qu'il décrit (du scandinavisme romantique à l'utopie ambiguë) découle moins d'une transformation vécue sur terre scandinave que d'une nouvelle disposition des termes déjà sur place dans le champ discursif français.

Vincent Fournier ne monte jamais sur les grands chevaux de la théorie. Il se contente de recueillir des data et de constater ce que d'autres disent plus bruyamment, mais en négligeant parfois d'appuyer leurs affirmations sur une recherche empirique aussi complète. À défaut de critique préalable de la culture de départ, suggère-t-il, l'histoire littéraire ne fait que reprendre les stéréotypes et les ethnotypes qui prévalent. (GEORGE LANG, UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA)

*DANIEL J. BROOKS. *Musil's Socratic Discourse in 'Der Mann ohne Eigenschaften': A Comparative Study of Ulrich and Socrates*. New York: Peter Lang 1989. Pp. 163.

This book is a welcome enlargement on Brooks's recent article, "Der Mann ohne Eigenschaften with Constant Reference to Socrates," in *Modern Austrian Literature* 22 (1989). The author expands here informatively on the image of Socrates that develops in nineteenth-century Western thought. He devotes

special attention to Kierkegaard and Nietzsche, noting parallels that reveal striking similarities in the philosophies of the two (Chapter One). He also shows in greater detail how the reflections and development of Musil's title-figure have much in common with those images of Socrates (Chapters Two and Three). Brooks does this primarily to shed light on important ideas and developments in *Der Mann ohne Eigenschaften*. He succeeds in several instances. The comments on the shift that Ulrich undergoes from Book One to Book Two are insightful. So are those on Ulrich's "artistic" approach to life, on his "dynamic" morality, and on the much debated "anderer Zustand." On these points the similarities both to Kierkegaard's dualism of the Socratic and Platonic approaches and to Nietzsche's thoughts on the "artistic Socrates" are especially striking. Brooks also shows how this reading of the novel coincides with Musil's theoretical writings on morality, ethics and aesthetics (Chapter Four). This all proves illuminating as to Musil's place in the emergence of trends in thought and philosophy important for the early twentieth century.

The book is relatively free of *errata*. I encountered fewer than a dozen slips (and would correct as follows: p. 23, line 12: "an" instead of "a"; p. 27, line 8: "surprise" instead of "suprise"; p. 46, line 23: underline "Macht"; p. 79, line 3; "in play" instead of "at play"; p. 87, last line: "must either" instead of "either must"; p. 97, line 21: "align" instead of "allign"; p. 106, line 1: closed quotation marks after "qualities."; p. 114, line 24: "whom" instead of "who"; p. 134, line 9: "live" instead of "living").

With respect to style and organization the book reads well — much to its credit, considering the subject matter. Only occasionally does a tendency to overly long sentences impede clarity. Semi-colons too often link main clauses where a full stop would serve better. To cite one example for many: the sentence opening the first new paragraph on p. 135.

The flaws of method and approach are minor. They tend to limit the study's scope and cause some unnecessary repetition. They are not a major impediment to the book's clear progression toward its stated goal.

One recurring problem emerges at the outset. Brooks is overly cautious about the possibilities of influence and parody. He is too apologetic about the scant evidence linking Musil to Socrates and Kierkegaard. In a "Preface" and an "Introduction" — one wonders if they could not have been fused — Brooks presents ample textual and extra-textual grounds for seeing Ulrich as a Socrates-"type" and comparing that link to ideas of Kierkegaard and Nietzsche. Yet here and repeatedly he backs away from considering the positive possibilities of influence, mediated or otherwise. Granted, both author and figure reflect little on Socrates or Kierkegaard. Nor does concrete proof link Musil and Kierkegaard's *The Concept of Irony with Constant Reference to Socrates*. Thus caution might seem the best tack,

especially for facing a dissertation committee or for forestalling unjust implications that Musil's novel is a product of "mere influence." Yet Brooks's recurring rearguard action against speculation on influence over-emphasizes the negative and ignores decades of theory that have dispelled the purely negative implications of influence. More important, it keeps him from using his well-researched findings to follow through on further insights. These might concern the complex background of Musil's ideas, the way he uses citation, allusion or even parody. They might concern how the evocations of Socrates, Kierkegaard, and Nietzsche weave both Ulrich and the novel's narrator into an ongoing sequence of "theoretical men" who struggle to relate their "rational" approach to an existence that also entails another "non-rational" side.

Brooks shows that the novel does allude to Socrates. Socrates is evoked repeatedly by the references to "Diotima." He is also fleetingly but significantly present in the father's study as a plaster bust. This latter link to the pivotal sequence of episodes surrounding the step from Book I to II Brooks brings to light but then ignores. These allusions by themselves invite the knowing reader to compare Ulrich and Socrates more extensively — as Brooks does so fruitfully. They also make the novel's text a central piece of evidence that Musil's view of Socrates was likely influenced by Nietzsche, perhaps also by Kierkegaard, or perhaps by some combination of the two. It is at least as persuasive as any remote extra-textual indication that Musil had read Kierkegaard. Combined with Brooks's findings regarding changes to the novel that Musil made after the German edition of *The Concept of Irony* (61-63) it is very compelling. An approach to *Der Mann ohne Eigenschaft* as a text that not only resembles Kierkegaard and Nietzsche on this point but also acknowledges their influence could have augmented Brooks's findings. It could have pondered not simply the *similarity* of Musil's novel to these two philosophical projects, but also the *continuation* of their ideas through a complex *parody* that changes as it pays homage. It might have considered the ironic distance to Ulrich and his predecessors born of the novel's narrative structure. For Ulrich is indeed a Socratic type, a man mistrustful of book-writing — in a book, by a writer.

Such an admission of influence might have eliminated a second minor problem evident in Chapters Two and Three. They become repetitious. They look again first at Kierkegaard, then at Nietzsche. They expand on the Socrates-image of each outlined in Chapter One. Each then presents the parallels of Ulrich's development, looking closely at the chapters ending Book One and starting Book Two. Thus each chapter covers similar ground. None of it adds anything *particularly* new to the critical discussions of Musil's novel. Yet the suggestions on individual points such as "der andere Zustand" or the relationship to Nietzsche are fruitful, they are illuminating

on the ties to the earlier thinkers. Yet this positive impact might have been enhanced, the sense of repetition eliminated, by an approach proceeding chronologically from Kierkegaard to Musil, and noting, besides the similarities, the possibilities of influence and response. This also might have involved a more effective use of Musil's theoretical writings on morality. Those texts might have been considered as part of the major novel's genesis or background. They are a body of ideas generally similar to those of Kierkegaard and Nietzsche that the novel then expresses so as to underline that similarity.

I conclude by emphasizing the minor nature of these complaints and acknowledge again the positive essentials of Brooks's study. It offers a concise body of facts and insights in a way that provokes and inspires in a fruitful way. (RALEIGH WHITTINGER, UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA)

*MARC CHEYMOL. *Miguel Angel Asturias dans le Paris des «années folles»*. Grenoble: Presses Universitaires de Grenoble 1987. Pp. 228.

The two epigraphs at the beginning of Marc Cheymol's study, one from Raymond Queneau's preface to the French edition of Faulkner's *Mosquitoes*, the other from Gérard Genette's *Figures III*, draw attention in different ways to the importance of the authors of literary works. The relevance of both epigraphs to Cheymol's undertaking is immediately apparent in the light of comments in his forward concerning his purpose:

Le but de ce livre n'est donc pas d'expliquer l'oeuvre par la biographie, ni de rechercher des influences françaises sur la création d'Asturias. J'ai voulu plutôt mettre en relation les anecdotes, les textes et les faits de la vie culturelle, sociale et politique de l'entre-deux guerres, afin de profiler quelle a pu être la "vérité" d'Asturias. (12-13)

True to this purpose, the book focuses on Asturias's formative period from 1924 to 1933, spent primarily in Paris. His early life in Guatemala and a brief sojourn in London before arriving in France are dealt with in the first chapter. But Cheymol's subsequent approach is not chronological. The body of his text is in three parts, each dedicated to a different aspect of his subject's involvement in the cultural life of Paris. The first includes an account of Latin American journalism in Paris in the twenties and early thirties as the context of Asturias's own work as a correspondent and his involvement in the journalistic milieu of the time. The key chapter to this part, however, is concerned with the activities of "Presse Latine," which had been founded in Lyon in 1923, the year before Asturias's arrival. His association with the organization was significant for his stay in Europe, brought him into direct contact with some of the leading figures of the day,

provided one of the major contexts of his cultural and political development, and, through annual international conferences, an opportunity for wide and frequent travel in Europe and beyond. In the second part of the book, Cheymol's attention is directed to the artistic and cultural milieu of Paris. He not only looks at its cosmopolitan character, but also at the world of the Hispanic exiles in the French capital and their contribution to the avant-garde movements in painting, sculpture and music. Asturias's reactions and affiliations are recorded, particularly his response to cubism and surrealism and the spreading interest in primitive art. Above all, Cheymol records Asturias's development as an Americanist under the tutelage of Georges Raynaud at a time when ethnology and anthropology were developing significantly. Finally, in the third part, he considers the literary products of Asturias's decade in Paris. These include a number of short stories, particularly several incorporated later into *Hombres de maíz* (1949), and two major works, *Leyendas de Guatemala* (1930) and *El señor presidente* (1946). There is some commentary on the content of these pieces, but Cheymol's primary concern is to show their emergence from the process of political, cultural and artistic maturation undergone by Asturias during his stay in Paris, a point that is especially important in the light of the decade of silence after his return to Guatemala in 1933 and the late publication of *El señor presidente*, notwithstanding completion of an earlier draft before he left Europe.

In his conclusion, Cheymol cites Goethe's reaction to his first sight of Rome, "Nun bin ich endlich geboren!" (215), suggesting that Asturias's encounter with Paris was a comparable rebirth. It not only brought him into contact with the European roots of part of his culture, but did so at a time when Europe itself was passing through a period of political and cultural ferment that had the effect of heightening awareness of his Guatemalan origins and his Indian heritage. As the case for other Latin Americans in exile, both before and after, the distance from the homeland, combined with an important evolution in thought and esthetics, gave the ability to see that homeland more clearly. Certainly, whatever Asturias might have produced had he not lived in France would have been profoundly different. Whether or not the portrait of him that emerges from Cheymol's book may be accepted as the "truth" about him is less convincing. Cheymol is a sympathetic biographer whose tone is often celebratory and who does not fully confront the ambiguities and controversies in literary and political circles that the man and his work have provoked. *Miguel Angel Asturias dans le Paris des «années folles»* is, however, a scholarly and valuable work, providing information and insights that future biographers will need to take into account. It is also the kind of study necessary to historians of Latin American literature wishing to investigate the tendency among writers to see

themselves, their history and their country from outside rather than from within. Although increasingly rejected by the younger writers of the "post-boom" era, this legacy of colonialism, with its origins in the conquest period, was as prevalent in the 1960s and 1970s as it was in Asturias's early days. It continues to warrant further investigation, but Marc Cheymol has contributed usefully to the study both of the general question and the case for Asturias. (RICHARD A. YOUNG, UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA)

*FRANÇOISE LIONNET. *Autobiographical Voices: Race, Gender, Self-Portraiture*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press 1989. Pp. 280. US\$29.95

"I confess," read the large black-and-white placard pasted several feet above my head in a New York subway car whizzing from Times Square to Queen's. Edging toward the poster, I imagined a Roman Catholic priest beneficently dispensing absolution at the end of a telephone line in a ramshackle rectory on the outskirts of Brooklyn. Not quite. Instructions in several languages urged me to dial a 900 number and, for the small sum of two dollars per minute, to "confess." (But what? Sins? Crimes and misdemeanors? Lascivious fantasies? Unpaid credit card bills?) Who, I wondered, could possibly limit this kind of auto-narrative to a sixty-second eruption? A true experience of catharsis would require endless hours of logorrhea and ego-massage, as the formless clay of anonymity were gradually sculpted into the illusion of a fabricated identity valorized by the shadowy auditor collecting cash at the other end of this technological umbilicus. Who of sound mind would squander valuable spiritual and financial resources on such an idiosyncratic project? The answer, of course, was not far to seek. My briefcase contained a copy of Françoise Lionnet's *Autobiographical Voices*.

Bereft of that magical phone line that purportedly connected Jim Bakker to God, Saint Augustine took pen in hand to construct himself as narrator and narratee, sinner and compassionate auditor. According to Françoise Lionnet, Augustine was plagued by those very dichotomies he so forcefully renounced as part of his Christian conversion. Writing in classical Latin, he longed for the ease of his mother tongue, New Punic, a North African patois. Uncomfortable with both Latin and Greek, he would search for a "silent resting point, a state of total metaphysical communion, where communication transcends language" (20). Circumscribed by his own phallogocentric cultural constructions, Augustine could only envisage woman as "the negative other of man" (52). "In Augustine's imagery, woman is to man what the bitter sea is to the dry land, the sinning self to the converted self, the wicked souls to the faithful, the darkness to light" (53). How intriguing, then, that Augustine's own momentous conversion was chronologically linked to the death of his pious mother Monica — as if

spiritual rebirth were contingent on the erasure of that primal sign of corporeal abjection, the womb/body/tomb of the engendering matriarch. Male scopophilia must give way to a feminine receptivity to the word of God, but a deity who, in Lionnet's analysis of the *Confessions*, doubles in the subject-position of "Eternal Phallic Mother" to evoke the orgasmic delights of spiritual *jouissance* (44-45). Lionnet forcefully rejects the patriarchal paradigms so often ascribed to Augustine through Julia Kristeva as a post-structuralist one profitably read Augustine through Julia Kristeva as a post-structuralist exercise in literary *métissage*? And what kind of Nietzschean figure emerges from *Ecce Homo* when the text is filtered through a Francophone Creole perspective "echoed in Aimée Césaire's poetry and Frantz Fanon's politics?" (68) Nietzsche the pregnant philosopher, "le penseur de la grossesse" (97), exposes a homeless, defiant and deracinated ego poignantly struggling to identify with the female in a mimetic process of intellectual parturition. "His maternal space is a 'biocentric' locus of energy and affirmation" (86) productive of a fertile topos for feminist reconstruction.

In *Autobiographical Voices*, Françoise Lionnet, a Francophone scholar from the Indian Ocean island-country of Mauritius, profitably appropriates the pivotal term *métissage* from Edouard Glissant's *Le Discours antillais*. The word *métis*, she explains, "derives etymologically from the Latin *mixtus*, 'mixed,' and its primary meaning refers to cloth made of two different fibers. "Furthermore, its homonym in ancient Greek, *métis*, is the allegorical 'figure of a function or a power' (14). But just as Zeus mythically swallowed his wife Métis to appropriate the birth of their daughter Athena and make himself the literal fountainhead of world wisdom, so Lionnet deconstructs the etymology of *métis* in order to reconstruct the notion of *métissage* as an all-devouring, subversively authoritative critical term. According to Lionnet's introduction, *métissage* denotes a "braiding of cultural forms" (4), "the site of undecidability and indeterminacy" (6), a "form of *bricolage*," and a praxis that "cannot be subsumed under a fully elaborated theoretical system" (8). As a reading practice, *métissage* evinces "the interreferential nature of a particular set of texts" (8) and functions as an "enabling metaphor of transculturation" (15). It may be construed as a paradigm of diversity, variety, and heterogeneity (17); and it becomes the "fertile ground of our heterogeneous and heterogeneous identities as postcolonial subjects" (8). Lionnet turns an acute critical gaze toward those enigmatic "intermediary spaces where boundaries become effaced and Manichean categories collapse" (18). But can one so readily assume that *métissage* and indeterminacy are "synonymous metaphors for our postmodern condition?" (17). The author's panglossian definition of terms may inadvertently breed its own exclusionary binary tactics in defense of Bakhtinian heteroglossia. The notion of *métissage* provides an excellent point of departure for an intellectually rigorous, often

riveting, analysis of five heterogeneous female authors. But the term itself is so multi-faceted and polyvalent, so all-consuming and potentially subversive, that it sometimes skids on protean linguistic practices. Lionnet admits that Augustine and Nietzsche make ostensibly strange bedfellows with Angelou and Hurston. Her effort, however, to recuperate the patriarchal origins of autobiography by clearing a matrifocal space, place, body, or intention at the heart of phallogocentric discourse seems, at times, a critical *tour de force*.

I must confess that I found Lionnet's chapters on the *Confessions* and on *Ecce Homo* fascinating, but not entirely convincing. In contrast, the book's second section, devoted exclusively to women authors, proved a scholarly delight. According to Lionnet, Zora Neale Hurston was an "auto-ethnographer" whose writing exemplifies a veritable *métissage* of self-representation, anthropological observation, folkloric investigation, and cultural ethnography. Using strategies of mythic displacement, Hurston depicts her own fluid and paradoxical personality filtered through the Eleusinian story of Demeter Persephone, as well as the Egyptian tale of Isis and Osiris. In Hurston's work, "the collective functions as a silverless mirror, capable of absorbing the self into a duplicitous game in which one code, singularity, is set aslant by another, syncretic unity with the universe" (115). Identifying with both Isis and Persephone as fictional alter-egos, the author explores the enabling and distorting mirrors of an an-archic culture always already bereft of its mythic maternal origins.

Maya Angelou's life-writing is markedly more personal but similarly polyphonic, incorporating shards of black fundamentalist religious influence alongside white western literary texts, southern folklore, and urban slang. Using menstruation as a paradigm for female creativity, Angelou exuberantly celebrates the creative legacy of maternal energy in touch with the pleasures of the body and the materiality of language. Unfolding with the fluidity and freedom of improvisational jazz, her multi-volume autobiography incorporates the lyrical techniques of song, the repetitions of fundamentalist preaching, and the linguistic play of folklore and dialect, ghost stories and "feigned speech." The adolescent Maya learns "how to swerve and to survive" through "an apprenticeship in dissimulation, a lesson in how to become a trickster, a manipulator of signs, a con artist and a writer" (162). "Hers is a *parole feinte* that mourns the loss of the illusory possibility of pure *parole récit*, of direct and unmediated communication with interlocutors who share the same referential and mythic world as she does" (166).

Many readers will be grateful to Lionnet for introducing them to such texts as Maryse Condé's *Herremakhonon*, an Antillean autopsy of one woman's narcissistic quest for a mythic, nurturing motherland in the heart

of Africa; and Marie-Thérèse Humbert's Mauritian novel, *À l'autre bout de moi*, with its more positive delineation of anamnesis and utopia through a complex interweaving of personal autobiography and the emerging island-nation's own self-portraiture. In the space between these anti-colonial evocations of the self, Lionnet examines Marie Cardinal's Algerian/French autograph, *The Words to Say It*. Unlike the psychoanalytic critics who interpret Cardinal's hysteria, logorrhea, and uncontrollable menstrual discharge in the Freudian context of maternal rejection/wounding/castration, Lionnet repositions this confessional text in the register of political protest. The protagonist has been wounded by those same patriarchal powers that have occupied nations and colonized the bodies of docile, subservient women. "The agony of the mother, the bleeding of the daughter, the torturing of Algeria — all collapse into one and the same image: that of pain inflicted on the female body of woman and the geographical body of Algeria by the discourses of patriarchy and colonialism" (205).

Françoise Lionnet's deft art of critical *métissage* is always theoretically provocative and wonderfully illuminating. *Autobiographical Voices* will surely become a classic text in the field of feminist and autobiographical studies. If confessional exposition has preoccupied contemporary consciousness (both scholarly and subterranean), then Lionnet's delineation and practice of *métissage* should prove a major contribution to current academic discourse. (SUZETTE A. HENKE, STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK)

*ROSMARIN HEIDENREICH. *The Postwar Novel in Canada: Narrative Patterns and Reader Response*. Library of/Bibliothèque de Canadian Review of Comparative Literature/Revue Canadienne de Littérature Comparée No. 8. Waterloo, Ont.: Wilfrid Laurier University Press 1989. Pp. xiv + 197. Cloth Cdn\$29.95

The chronologic of recent Canadian literary history is rather difficult to establish: *Beautiful Losers* and *The Second Scroll* will always be inconveniently early, and *Fifth Business* and *The Edible Woman* will always be embarrassingly late, tempting critics to neglect the anomalous Klein and Cohen and to analyze Davies and Atwood, procrusteanly, in terms of a postmodernism which they deploy, intermittently, in the service of an underlying traditionalism. Professor Heidenreich's very welcome addition to the slim library of Comparative Canadian studies, while not entirely avoiding these and other difficulties, and ambivalent about the "historical" approach, employs the more "rhetorical," "generic," "communicatory" model associated with the Iserian "reader response" school of criticism (with which she is very much at home) to discuss a mélange of texts in both French and English from the forties and fifties into the seventies, concentrating on seven, from

1951 to 1973. On the whole, the "earlier" or more "realistic" texts are, the more cursory and less enlightening the account; the "later" or more "postmodern" they are, the more effective. The author is at her best on Cohen's *Beautiful Losers* and Hubert Aquin's *Trou de mémoire* in the middle, and on Aquin's *Prochain épisode*, at the end, of her book.

The apparatus of "perspectival patterns," "literary norm repertoires," of "over-" and "in-determinacy," etc. weighs very heavily on the unaffectedly "realistic" texts of the early postwar period (1945-1952) glanced at briefly at the beginning — Callaghan, Buckler, Gabrielle Roy, MacLennan (whose *Two Solitudes* is an easy target, both critically and ideologically, but remains almost the only major Anglo-Canadian text with both Québécois and English characters, a point Heidenreich overlooks). "Graduated perspectives" seems a finicky way of looking at *The Edible Woman* (1969); the major problem of its shift in voice is largely shunted off to a footnote; only on Marie-Claire Blais (1965) does Heidenreich have enough elbow-room to develop her analysis, and one notes, not for the last time, that she seems more comfortable with Québec writers in each category — with the one exception of Cohen, arguably the "Frenchest" of Anglo-Canadians.

In Part One, Chapter Two, the most recent text, Réjean Ducharme's *L'Hiver de force* (1973), seems oddly bracketed by André Langevin's *Poussière sur la ville* (1953) and Davies' *Fifth Business* (1970); the discussion of Ducharme is the fullest and most useful, but its least useful features are those it supposedly shares with the other two novels. The "metafictionality" of Langevin and the "problematicizing of the Bildungsroman" in Davies are alike overstated, yet the potential for drawing Davies and Langevin closer together is left unrealized; Ducharme's parodistic inflation of the commercial culture, by way of its deformation of language, to stress the cultural alienation of his characters, surely also invites linking with the similar rhetorical strategies of *The Edible Woman*. Although the book is "comparative," opportunities for comparison are, perhaps on ideological grounds, widely and deliberately neglected.

Heidenreich makes very heavy weather of Dunstan Ramsay's common or garden unreliability as a narrator, of his half-conscious predispositions (inevitable in psychological realism), of Davies' "overdeterminacy as a strategy of defamiliarization," and of his allegedly postmodernist use of frames and prologues. But she is sound on such matters as the (albeit not terribly adventurous) strategy of significant proper names and on the status of the prologue as a "sort of miniature of the text," though this (as later, in the Klein and Aquin sections) seems an odd place *not* to say "mise en abyme." Langevin, Ducharme and Davies are, doubtless, all "draw[ing] attention to the problematic nature of communicatory process" — but to such different degrees! and in such different ways! No clear sense emerges, in Part

One, of either "evolution" or a helpful a-chronological grouping of texts. The section on Cohen and Aquin, under the rubric of "indeterminacy," the importance of the excluded, is much more satisfactory, even though Heidenreich shows no sign of "hearing" Cohen's black humour, even in the DV or the Charles Axis scenes (let alone Aquin's), nor of wishing to pull together Cohen and Aquin (the definitive comparison of these two most comparable of Canadian/Québec authors has yet to be made). When Heidenreich asserts that "readers will be left bewildered" by some fairly standard piece of postmodern slipperiness, one wonders which readers, and how much practice they have had: a problem with all critiques of (once) subversive literature is accounting for its continued fascination when it is no longer by any means as "bewildering" as it was at first. Altogether the paraphernalia of abstraction is deployed to much better advantage in this section. Rather too often, however, a combination of stylistic infelicity and the supposition that there is no time or space enough to be explicit, leaves us far short of where the author seemingly expects us to be. Heidenreich teases the reader of Ducharme rather circuitously by suggesting Fernand Dumont's work as "underlying" Ducharme's without specifying what, how, and to what extent. The "hermeneutic problem of any historical view as alluded to by the title of [Cohen's] novel," is not only awkwardly formulated, but another tease: what is the problem alluded to, and what, exactly, is the allusion in the title? Sometimes it is as simple as a misplaced modifier: on page 92, "In Cohen's work" is so placed as to make it appear that Cohen is *more* complex in his indeterminacy than Joyce; this may well be true, but it is neither argued nor self-evident. The author often expects the reader to have the text at hand, scorning to remind us of, for instance, Cohen's "Faustian" reference, although footnoting it with Goethe. On the other hand, she is clear and specific on Cohen's "chromatic metamorphosis" and interesting on prayer and the Greek phrase book as cases of the precariousness of language. More such details would strengthen her arguments throughout.

The chapter on *Trou de mémoire* suggests that the book's obvious parallels with Nabokov's *Pale Fire* have remained unexplored "until quite recently," but neither draws these parallels systematically itself nor cites which recent critics have performed this long-needed critical task. Heidenreich's point about Shade's "inventory of Aunt Maud's room" is only weakly linked to the anamorphic contents of Holbein's "Ambassadors," while her description of "Charles Xavier" as "the Zemblan alter ego of the poem's author, John Shade," is far too elliptical, and not even necessary to her useful argument that Magnan's alias is chosen in tribute to this Nabokovian character. Heidenreich is good on the convergence of identities between Olympe and Magnan, between Magnan and the Editor, as shown in (for instance) the convergence of their prose styles ("You can always count on

a murderer for a fancy prose style," as Humbert Humbert put it) — though all these convergences bear comparison with Cohen's not dissimilar convergence between I and F, rather than the casual parallels with the double ending of that King Charles' Head of postmodernist criticism, *The French Lieutenant's Woman*. The conclusion to this section suggests that, indeterminate though Cohen and Aquin are, Kroetsch [?], Findley [??], Ducharme, and Théoret may exceed them in this respect, that Aquin and Cohen play a "unique and possibly paradigmatic role in the formation of a Canadian post-modernist canon which is by no means unproblematic ideologically" and that, following Hutcheon, both books "require a participation that actively involves the reader in the creative process itself."

In Part Three, "Patterns of Allusion," the discussion of Klein turns out to be the weakest since the sketchy discussions of Part One. The Joycean palimpsest models, with a glance at Canadian palimpsests in Atwood and Findley, are a good start, but Heidenreich goes on to the specific epic allusions in *The Second Scroll* in a rather scrambled way, suggesting no very recent re-reading of the *Odyssey*. There are a great many biblical parallels interspersed, when we seem to have been promised Homeric, or at least Joycean (some confusion between the two) ones: epic messengers, compared to Old Testament prophets, and heroic catalogues, compared to the genealogies of the Old Testament, "defamiliarize" epic conventions perhaps more than was intended. The very broad topos of life as a quest or a journey is made much of, epically: Telemachus is to Odysseus as the narrator is to Melech. Heidenreich radically overestimates the space Homer gives to Odysseus' travels, relative to his arrival in Ithaca (which actually takes up over half of the poem); she radically underestimates the "multiplicity of allusive features" that the Homeric Odysseus, heroic epithets notwithstanding, wears. She is on much safer ground in pursuing the parallel with Bloom; Melech's Italian episode is seen, interestingly, as Aeolian, in the Joycean or Dedalian sense of "almosting it": all the events that "almost" happened. Here, as elsewhere, she is sounder on Joyce than on other intertexts, probably correct in noting that critics have underestimated Joyce as a source for Klein, and at her best in attempting to redress this balance.

Dr. Heidenreich's most satisfying analysis, in defiance of chronology or of the principle of ascending complexity, but in agreement with the rhetorical, "communicatory" principles that have shaped so much of her prior analysis, is left to last. On the allusive structural and rhetorical debt of *Prochain épisode* to the spy story ("generic parody"), the author is thorough, clear and apt, and the heavy indirection of her style is much less in evidence. She is good on the Balzacian intertext, on parallels between spying and reading a spy story, on the blurring and interpenetrating of the ontological levels of *Prochain épisode* (e.g. the imprisonment of the narrator, the hero,

and H. de Heutz on different narratological levels), on different readings of the dive into the Rhône (perhaps these could have been pulled together instead of interspersed?), on Mme de Staël placed under surveillance in her own château, on the Swiss watch as synecdoche for the temporal structures of the novel; perhaps more on Greene's ambivalent spy story as an inner duplication of Aquin's? or the ex-libris, the carved warriors, the engraved death scene, as ... (here there is another periphrasis for "mise en abyme").

The afterword offers a brief overview of criticism, with the easy targets of Moss, Atwood (*Survival*), and, alone among the comparatists, Sutherland (I would like to see her take on Stratford, whose book is not in the bibliography, or especially Blodgett). Her last word on the confusion of convergence and divergence in the two traditions is that postmodernism is "channeling in the same direction the highly divergent trends of mid-century." A quick glance at women writers, more radical in Québec, more realistic in English Canada, reminds us, usefully, that both literatures moved in twenty years from social realism to postmodernism, and suggests, less usefully, that such speed accounts for the continued reader resistance to the latter. But the last page needs checking, perhaps updating: what critics are still reluctant to canonize the postmodern? and who is it that "continues to [view postmodernist writing...] as a manifestation of loss?" Nobody I know.

The division of the book into three parts, subdivided into two chapters each (numbered from one to six), with chapters one and two further subdivided into three sections each, and with footnotes placed at the end of each chapter, including those for the introductory section of each part, is far from being the most convenient arrangement possible for a relatively short book; if anything, it emphasizes the ponderousness of the classificatory terms in Part One and the relative limberness of those applied to Cohen, Klein, and Aquin in Parts Two and Three. The bibliography is almost too thorough up through 1983 (see especially the Langevin references), but thins out markedly thereafter; though it may well be the case that the Gnarowski collection of 1976 and the Mayne collection of 1975 are the last major sets of criticisms on Cohen and Klein respectively, there is much, much more on Aquin (e.g. Ricou on General Wolfe, Söderlind on *Trou de mémoire*).

As for the problem at the heart of comparatist Canadian criticism (alluded to in Linda Hutcheon's generous and eloquent introduction), what are we to make of these two literatures in what is, at least for the moment, one country? Only the fact that Heidenreich has discussed both Québécois and English-Canadian novels between the same covers implies any kind of answer, but perhaps that is the only answer we need. (PATRICIA MERIVALE, UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA)

IN MEMORIAM Northrop Frye (1912-1991)

Professor Northrop Frye was a member of the Advisory Board of the *Canadian Review of Canadian Literature/Revue Canadienne de Littérature Comparée* and an early supporter of Comparative Literature in Canada. The founding chairman of the Comparative Literature Program at the University of Toronto, when prevented from attending an annual meeting of the Canadian Comparative Literature Association/Association Canadienne de Littérature Comparée, he sent a telegram to the executive on October 13, 1978: "Congratulations to the Canadian Comparative Literature Association for having made so remarkable an achievement in having brought the study of Comparative Literature to the centre of the Humanities stage in such a short time." Frye wrote about French- and English-Canadian literature when Canadians paid little attention to their literary production past and present. His *Anatomy of Criticism* displays a wide range of reference to several national literatures and in his teaching Frye always explored various European literatures.

Northrop Frye was a remarkable teacher and scholar. Perhaps his most enduring legacy will be his insistence on the autonomy and importance of criticism. He would not accept the accusation that criticism was parasitical. For Frye, criticism was a field of study like history, religion, or psychology and not slavish second words that followed in the wake of creative writing. The declaration of the autonomy of literature and criticism most distinguishes Frye from many of his predecessors and successors who think of them as expressing or serving politics, religion and ideology. He wanted criticism and literature to interact on their own grounds with other fields and did not wish to make his structural poetics a pale, longing imitation of other fields.

Although Frye's early interest was in William Blake, which affected his *Anatomy* and his view of the Bible, Shakespeare and moderns such as Yeats, Eliot and Joyce, he has exerted an influence in Comparative Literature, where he will be most remembered for his theory of literature. The mark of the power of Frye's systematic view of literature is that it is still being discovered. In Italy and in the Spanish-speaking world his influence is growing. Although for some Frye's use of "imagination" will seem romantic and marked with bourgeois individuality, his dream for literature is an important intellectual and social act. Through an understanding of myths and symbols, we can avoid the desert of alienation, no matter what country or social class we inhabit. He was a teacher to us all, especially when we disagreed with him. Northrop Frye wanted debate and not disciples. The longstanding debate between literature, philosophy, and history into which he entered will continue. Inevitably, it will not be the same without him.

Jonathan Hart (University of Alberta)