

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)