

- by J. Latacz. (Wege der Forschung 463). Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1979. 118-52.
- Murko, M. *La Poésie populaire épique en Yougoslavie au début du XX^e siècle*. Paris, 1929.
- Murko, M. "Nouvelles observations sur l'état actuel de la poésie épique en Yougoslavie." *Revue des Études Slaves* 13 (1933): 31ff.
- Murko, M. *Tragom srpsko-hrvatske narodne epike: Putovanja u godinama 1930-1932*. Zagreb: Jugoslavenska Akademija Znanosti i Umjetnosti, 1951 (Djela Jugoslavenske Akademije Znanosti i Umjetnosti, knj. 41-42).
- Palmer, L.R. "The Language of Homer." *A Companion to Homer*. Eds. A. J. B. Wace and F. H. Stubbings. London: Macmillan, 1962.
- Palmer, L.R. *Descriptive and Comparative Linguistics: A Critical Introduction*. London: Faber & Faber, 1972 (1978).
- Parry, A. "Cor Huso: A Study of South Slavic Song." Parry 1971.
- Parry, A., ed. *The Making of Homeric Verse*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1971 (the passage about Murko already in *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 43 (1932): 15 n. 3).
- Pennington, A., ed. *Marko the Prince. Serbo-Croatian Heroic Song*. London: Duckworth, 1984.
- Pfeiffer, R. *History of Classical Scholarship from the Beginning to the End of the Hellenistic Age*. Oxford: Clarendon P., 1968.
- Rehder, P. "Murko, Matija (Matthias)." *Bibliographisches Lexikon zur Geschichte Südosteuropas* (Hrsg. v. M. Bernath u. F. v. Schroeder). München, 1970. 3: 260-61.
- Sandys, Sir J.E. *A History of Classical Scholarship*. Vol. I, 3rd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1921.
- Sievers, E. *Metrische Studien* IV. *Abh. d. sächs. Akad. d. Wiss.* 35, 1918-1919.
- Sievers, E. *Deutsche Sag-Dichtungen des 9.-11. Jahrhunderts*. 1924.
- Subotić, D. *Yugoslav Popular Ballads: Their Origin and Development*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1932.
- Temir, A. "Leben und Schaffen von Friedrich Wilhelm Radloff (1837-1918): Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Türkologie." *Oriens* 8 (1955): 51-93.
- Thorp, M. *The Study of the Nibelungenlied*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1940.
- Trautmann, R. *Die Volksdichtung der Grossrussen. I. Das Heldenlied (Die Byline)*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1935.
- Williams, G. "The Genesis of Poetry in Rome." *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature*. Vol. II. *Latin Literature*. Eds. E. J. Kenney and W. V. Clausen. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1982.
- Wilpert, G. von. *Sachwörterbuch der Literatur*, 7. Aufl., Stuttgart: A. Kröner Verlag, 1989.
- Wilson, D. *The Life and Times of Vuk Stefanović Karadžić*. Oxford: Clarendon P., 1970.

*STEVEN TÖTÖSY DE ZEPETNEK, MILAN V. DIMIĆ with IRENE SYWENKY, eds. *Comparative Literature Now: Theories and Practice*. Paris: Honoré Champion Éditeur, 1999. Pp. 935. FF 670,06; EUR 102,15, hard cover.

Scholars seeking to inform themselves about the nature and range of comparative literature today, as well as about the discipline's likely future, could not find a more representative and comprehensive guide than this volume. Consisting of 77 papers selected from the 1994 ICLA Congress at the University of Alberta, the volume includes a 58-page bibliography of theories, methods and histories prepared by its co-editor Professor Tötösy de Zepetnek. On the whole, the contributors move beyond the familiar complaints about the crises besetting comparative literature to reveal a discipline in the process of redefining itself.

As the subtitle suggests, the volume's seven sections are roughly divided between theoretical considerations and practical criticism. By far the most frequently cited theorist is Mikhail Bakhtin whose concepts of dialogism, polyphony, and heteroglossia are repeatedly invoked. The more provocative theoretical essays suggest new regional, geographic, and global contexts for approaching literary works beyond traditional national and linguistic categories. Thus Amiya Dev debates the value of the concept "Indian literature" given that country's 22 major languages and literatures and 221 language groups, while Sylvie André and Walter F. Veit respectively insist that the concepts of African and Australian literature are only meaningful when, in Veit's words, not only their "intra-cultural strands" are "intertwined," but their "extra-cultural interrelations" are recognized (430). The equally problematic notion of "European literature" is tackled by Jacques Dugast who sees a need to discern "une dimension européenne, afin de dépasser les représentations passionnelles qui animent souvent les comportements identitaires collectifs" (80).

The Goethean ideal of *Weltliteratur* comes in for a good deal of rethinking. It is critiqued as a culturally specific — and thus a culturally exclusive — category by Marián Gálik (102), who instead proposes the concept of "interliterariness" as a rationale for comparatist study, with its focus on trans-ethnic, trans-national, and ultimately on "geoliterary development as a whole." (Supposedly, the Bible's "high level of interliterariness" enabled it to become "the 'book of books' in Western literature" [97-98]). And instead of prophesying a global literature that would supersede

national literatures, Hendrik Birus perceives a dialectical process at work involving "the rapid blossoming of a multitude of European and non-European literatures and the simultaneous emergence of a world literature (mostly in English translations)" (40). The consensus among the contributors is that a growing diversity of literatures is not only welcome but inevitable. Jola Škulj finds the "the professed fear of European cultures — especially now with the extension of the European Union — that they will lose their distinct cultural identities" to be "groundless" (215-16), while Eva Kushner detects "a whole aesthetic dialogue ... being learned" in response to the growing "number of cultural identities" arising from the fragmentation of former political empires (137). Whether film shares this multicultural tendency is not as clear; hence Marine Danan's call for a new transnational "prestige model" to replace the "prestige global urban culture embodied by American cinema ... which strives to render national cultures obsolete" (771).

Among the specific regional and hybrid literatures discussed in the collection are early twentieth-century Catalan translations (Assumpta Camps), Arab-Canadian literature (F. Elizabeth Dahab), nineteenth-century Québécois poetry (Vincent Dubost), Canadian women writers (Karin Beeler), and Belgian Symbolists (Christian Berg and Donald Flanell Friedman). Of course, these "newly emerging, non-established literatures" do not arise naturally or fortuitously; rather, as Joep Leerssen observes in an especially insightful piece, such literary "traditions" are retroactively "conjured up from the past as soon as there is an ideological need" for them (395).

When read together, several of the essays offer a fascinating global perspective on postmodernism. Douwe Fokkema's claim that this is a culturally specific concept, originating in North America and subsequently adopted and transformed by other nations as a way of enhancing their respective cultural identities, is borne out by other contributors. Luiza Lobo depicts Brazil as a "receiving culture" without a perception of its own cultural identity; here the false representations of reality that abound in contemporary literature "become twice as deceiving, since they are the simulacrum of a foreign simulacrum" (402). In contrast, Wang Ning finds the impact of Western postmodernism on China to have been a liberating influence in the "Post-New Period" since 1990, as it entails a challenge (or threat) by the "global phenomenon" of consumer/ popular culture to the elitism of "highbrow Chinese literature" (447, 444). Despite their differences, these specific instances of postmodernism's cross-cultural reception themselves exemplify what Leerssen describes as a general postmodern tendency whereby authors choose foreign precursors and construct alternative traditions in order "to establish a more cosmopolitan root system for their cultural imagination to tap into" (394). Thus, Greek dramatists after World War II were inspired by American theater, as Theodore Grammatas shows, but the situation is more complicated in modern Indian drama which, according to Rakesh H. Solomon,

entails collisions between imperialist and nationalist ideologies as well as a collusion between Western melodramas and indigenous theatrical conventions. In the case of the contemporary Congolese novel, André insists that the key influence is not Euro-American postmodernism but Latin American magic realism. The North American export of postmodernism may well turn out to be part of a larger process of global exchange in which First World writers will increasingly adopt Third World personas, and Western writers will invent Eastern genealogies.

Since literature is "an intercultural historical phenomenon" informed by difference and otherness (Škulj 210), and interculturality is "constitutive of any culture" (Veit 433) — insights Christian Moser traces back to Herder — it is not surprising that comparatist critics are typically drawn to works that foreground cultural encounters with (or inventions of) the Other. Thus, in a study of English and French writers' use of the "Black Legend" of Spanish cruelty for the purpose of legitimating their own nations' colonizing ventures, Jonathan Hart notes that the contrast between civilized France and the savage New World in Montaigne's "Des Cannibales" itself "becomes part of French 'identity'" (377). Not only does the comparatist "compare" literary works, but each work compared is itself a comparative study of cultural difference and identity in its own right. Manfred Engel explores "poetic interculturalism" in Eliot's *Waste Land* and Rilke's *Duineser Elegien*, while Manfred Schmelz reveals otherness to be a function of narrative point of view in intercultural novels like Montesquieu's *Les Lettres Persanes*, James's *The Ambassadors*, and Grass's *Der Butt*. Steven F. Walker compares xenophobic motifs in Joyce's *Ulysses* and Rushdie's *The Satanic Verses*; Sirkku Aaltonen finds Finnish writers making the foreign "more familiar and less threatening" in their translations of Irish realist dramas (646), and Katalin Kürtösi considers bilingual code-switching to be the primary feature of Canadian drama. Shorter fictional narratives like Kafka's "Gemeinschaft" and Poe's "The Mask of the Red Death" are read by Thomas Wägenbaur as parables of racist ethnocentrism. Wägenbaur's call for an "ethnocritical turn," and his invocation of Arnold Krupat's figure of the "ethnocratic" (245), echo Antony Tatlow's view that ethnographic anthropologists have written "some of the most interesting recent 'literary' criticism" (221).

If anthropologists make great critics, however, they pale beside great authors. Thus, Moser shows "Rousseau the anthropologist ... helplessly entangled" by language which "Rousseau the autobiographer deliberately exploits" (502), and Engel contrasts Weston's and Frazer's search for a single "authoritative arch-myth" with Eliot's use of "accumulated alien voices of the past" in the *Waste Land* (468). Yet for all his or her technical subtlety and cultural sensitivity, the author's identity "has become more and more dubious," observes Monika Schmitz-Emans, to the point of becoming a kind of "literary machine" (845). Novelist José Saramago makes an avowedly "démoté" plea to scholars to return to the author — "la personne invisible" hidden in his or her

fiction (191, 189). Against this specter of the alienated writer, John Burt Foster, Jr. presents the case of highly visible, "transnational authors" like Nietzsche and Nabokov, while Tatlow envisions a more creative role for the critic as a kind of anthropologist "in flight from his own culture, searching abroad for what he lacks at home" and "invent[ing] the culture which [he] studies" (220). As Leerseen usefully reminds us, "authors and scholars alike" articulate cultural identity through the "construction and invention of tradition" — "an ideological process" that is an essential "part of literary praxis" itself (395).

The volume's later sections move beyond influence and genre studies to address interdisciplinary issues like the relation between literature and music (Judith Barban on composer Ned Rorem's musical adaptations of French Renaissance peace poetry, and Alberto Caprioli on Schumann's writings on Romantic authors and on *Dichtkunst* and *Tonkunst*), literature and law (Mary Polito's Foucauldian analysis of governmentality in Shakespeare), literature and film (William H. Thornton on polyphonic films, and Lilia Avrutin on the movement in post-Soviet cinema from "narrativity as a mythologizing structure to anti-narrative metatextuality" [747]), and literature and the visual arts (Hans-Günther Schwartz on the anti-mimetic role of ornament, and Donald Barrett on pictorial references in Joan Lindsay's novel *Picnic at Hanging Rock*).

The final section on literature and technology usefully complements the more traditional approaches represented earlier in the volume. Even Paul Cornea's innovative treatment of contemporary anthologies and literary histories as literary genres neglects the impact of the Internet which overshadows any attempt to revamp these genres in the print medium. This is not to say that the new technologies promise to enrich comparative literary studies. An illuminating literary historical perspective on the Information Age is offered by Schmitz-Emans and Rüdiger Campe who cite works by E. T. A. Hoffmann and Villiers de l'Isle-Adam in which poetry and language appear as mechanical operations at the very moment that the representational arts are losing ground to the new reproductive and reproducible recording media. For the most part, however, computers are either extolled in this section as valuable research tools (in essays that are inevitably outdated), or they are hailed as agents of a profound technological and textual revolution. In Benzi Zhang's words, the printed text is being superseded by an electronic hypertext that "highlights the inner sub-texts or sub-stories that are habitually 'lost' in our epistemological scotoma" (852). Rather than having this be the last word on the subject, one would like to hear from one of the growing number of skeptics in the high-tech community itself who find that critical thinking and understanding are not enhanced, but are actually dulled by computers. In the end, the question remains whether the radically decentered, nonlinear, intertextuality made possible by Internet technology promotes or pre-empts the

interculturality so prized by comparatists. (JOEL BLACK, UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA)

"STEVEN TÖTÖSY DE ZEPETNEK. *Comparative Literature: Theory, Method, Application*. Amsterdam-Atlanta: Editions Rodopi B. V., 1998. Pp. 297. US \$47.00.

Comparative Literature: Theory, Method, Application by Steven Tötösy de Zepetnek is a tremendously ambitious book. Zepetnek is a true comparatist, displaying an admirable knowledge of many national literary traditions: Canadian, American, Western European as well as a much less well known Eastern European tradition. The book's enormous theoretical range is also impressive, particularly in these postmodern times when theoretical rigor is not necessarily the order of the day. The seriousness with which Tötösy views his task can be gathered in the initial chapter where he provides the reader with a "Manifesto for a 'New' Comparative Literature." This, in his own words, is a "hard-hitting" statement about the discipline, and one which has rather strict notions about how the discipline can be productively practiced. If one suspects they hear the resonance of a somewhat orthodox Marxism, this in fact is not at all the case. Tötösy is an adherent of "The Systemic and Empirical Approach to Literature and Culture," a methodology which draws from many intellectual sources, perhaps most important among them the systems theorist Niklas Luhmann.

At a time when a sense of playfulness, humor and inconclusiveness humbles most attempts at Truth or high-seriousness, Tötösy can certainly be praised for his independence of thought. As one reads on however, his very single-minded effort does seem to take place at the expense of a broader cultural and intellectual sensitivity. Tötösy argues that his approach to Comparative Literature is preferable to "the usual problematization resulting in tentatives and hypotheses" (14). Yet, the "tentatives and hypotheses" with which Comparative Literature is today approached, are not evidence of shallow or lazy thinking, but rather indications of a discipline very much in crisis. Accusations of Comparative Literature's eurocentrism and elitism, for example, are not easy to resolve. As the anthropological self-interrogations of established disciplinary practices and norms that took place during the eighties and nineties demonstrate however, such a crisis is not necessarily crippling, but on the contrary can lead to an immensely productive, if difficult, debate. One suspects that Tötösy's "Manifesto" and subsequent analyses are in part efforts to quiet this debate or in some sense overcome rather than confront this particularly slippery juncture in literary and cultural studies. Tötösy's tendency to sidestep genuine, not to mention interesting, intellectual concerns is evident in a rather revealing defense of his chosen methodology. He writes: "First, scholarship should be performed in the form and content of 'high' science and only

after that should popularization occur" (22). The issue here isn't so much a preference for an elite or popular literary scholarship, but rather Tötösy's choice of analogy. The vast and important scholarship dedicated to the critique of science which has taken place over the past two decades is conveniently eclipsed. The term "science," instead of opening a space of debate, curiosity and uncertainty fulfills instead its traditionally legitimizing function.

Clearly, I am not entirely sympathetic with "The Systemic and Empirical Approach to Literature and Culture." I can't help but concur with a critic who commented on an earlier work by Tötösy (cited by the author himself) that this work is likewise "an awkward and perplexing study, at least to scholars unfamiliar with ETL (Empirical Theory of Literature) ideology (sic) and methodology." (28) This is problematic because *Comparative Literature*, I believe wishes to make that methodology accessible to a broader public. I must confess that my confusion was not abated by Tötösy's explanation of this methodology in the first chapter, nor by subsequent case studies or applications. After an introductory chapter on "Theory and Method" chapter two is dedicated to "Literature and Cultural Participation." The chapter deals with cannon formation in Hungary and Canada, and the cultural practices of Hungarian-Canadians. After a very involved discussion of these matters, the chapter then focuses on "the question of authorial voice and the reading of pornographic literature by men versus women" (69). Both I gather are applications of "The Systemic and Empirical Approach," yet the chapter doesn't offer a strong enough argumentative line within which to subsume, or make sense of these particular applications, and they strike as radically disparate digressions. Similarly in chapter three, I wasn't aware of how a comparison of realism in literature and film had anything to do with Tötösy's stated methodology or the chapter title's expressed subject matter: "Comparative Literature as/and Interdisciplinarity." When in chapter four Tötösy begins with a very fascinating discussion of the many changes Europe underwent in the eighties and nineties, and follows it with a paragraph beginning, "The notion of multiculturalism and cultural diversity is a specifically Canadian construct and differs in many aspects from the American concept" (122) — I confess that I fail to grasp this as anything but a non-sequitor. At one point Tötösy again cites a negative reaction to his work, where readers comment that a grant proposal which he submitted contains "no clear methodology" (45). Oddly, since Tötösy is so clearly dedicated to the task of demonstrating the methodological soundness of "The Systemic and Empirical Approach," I can't help but concur. In general, I found *Comparative Literature* deeply frustrating. One senses that Tötösy has important things to say, but does not manage to convey them to the reader. As the quotes above by Tötösy that refer to comments about his previous work indicate, there is a self-referential quality to *Comparative Literature*. For a book that begins with a manifesto, it is remarkable how

often the word "I" appears. It is not so much narcissism which I am alluding to, but rather a certain prematurity about the book. In *Comparative Literature* one senses that one has been thrown in the middle of a fast and furious creative process where anything, including past remarks on a rejected grant proposal, is relevant. The book calls out for one more draft.

Perhaps I am simply not inclined to see literary and cultural criticism as science. For what I couldn't help but think when reading *Comparative Literature* was what an interesting book Tötösy could have written. Few scholars have access to so many cultural traditions, and access to the intricate negotiations which cultural encounters inevitably produce. In the opening pages of *Comparative Literature*, when Tötösy writes about the "ability to translate one culture into another by the exercise and love of dialogue between cultures" (14), he holds out the promise of a decidedly humanistic adventure. Though certainly utopian, particularly when we think of First and Third World cultures, or text and oral-based ones, where the unproblematic use of the term "dialogue" does not accurately describe the asymmetrical nature of their encounter, this statement nevertheless suggests why one would want to engage *Comparative Literature* in the first place, and perhaps most simply where an investigation of the discipline might begin. (PRISCILLA ARCHIBALD, CORNELL UNIVERSITY)

*DAVID BOYD and IMRE SALUSINSZKY, eds. *Rereading Frye: The Published and Unpublished Works*. Toronto, Buffalo, London: University of Toronto Press, 1999. CAN \$45.00.

Never a follower of academic fashion, Northrop Frye provided one of the most vital challenges to social, religious, cultural and critical orthodoxies within the humanities. Alvin A. Lee's preface declares the publication of *Rereading Frye* as the beginning of a new phase in the understanding of Frye's life and works. Frye has been a victim of post-modern misunderstanding and mistrust; a backlash in the 70s and 80s followed his heyday in the 50s and 60s. Now, according to the essayists in this collection, he is emerging as the most important critic of the twentieth century, an accolade that is not without justification.

According to Lee, we should all be 'rereading Frye' because he has important things to say to us as we go forward into the new millennium. Moreover, the ever-increasing body of archive material necessitates some revision, or at least expansion, of ideas about Frye. In his lifetime, Frye published thirty-three books, but this is only the tip of the iceberg. Underneath are scores of papers and addresses, some published, others currently being compiled, and below this, the awesome mass of jottings taking up twenty-three metres of library shelf space at the University of Toronto. As more

manuscripts, notebooks, diaries, letters, student papers and diagrams are unearthed, edited and published, the ever-growing body of Frye's work needs reassessment.

The eight essays that comprise *Rereading Frye* draw on this new material in order to reappraise Frye's contribution to our understanding of literature. One could be cynical about the "Frye industry," where researchers, totally immersed in Frye's life and works, spend their lives chasing the ghost of a man who spent his life writing about other writers. The body of Frye's writing is like a gigantic puzzle or detective story to these researchers; reading their essays, one can imagine them wading through the masses of papers in the Frye archives, then suddenly being dazzled by a passage: "Another clue; eureka!"

It would be all too easy to mock this sort of obsessive research activity, if it were not the case that *Rereading Frye* keeps dazzling its reader with little flashes of insight. This is especially true if that reader is also a Frye scholar. *Rereading Frye* is in part a reassessment of Frye's work, but it is also a meditation on the process of lifelong devotion to the world of Frye, and what this has meant for the contributors. Each researcher is a person overwhelmed, but determined, and led by a vision, rather like Frye himself.

Fifty years of writing in notebooks gave Frye clarity. The notebooks were somewhere private where Frye could address no one other than himself, and try to tease out what was looking more and more like a convoluted thread that could be disentangled. The impression is of a man who, on a daily basis, got glimpses or intimations of some big picture behind everything he was doing, whether it was attending board meetings or working on his latest book. The Frye we find in the excerpts from the unpublished material, if more judgmental and straight talking, is still recognisable to us as the man we know and love from his published work. The essays that make up *Rereading Frye* show us the toil behind the published works, which now appear as distilled brilliance extracted from the daily grind.

To say that Frye was prolific does not do him justice; the awesome quantity and quality of private writings beneath the impressive array of public, published material suggest that he was driven by some vision. This is the subject of Michael Dolzani's essay, which sees Frye's work as one big lifelong project. Taking an approach to Frye's writing that resembles Frye's own approach to literature, Dolzani suggests that each piece of writing by Frye has autonomy, but at the same time, everything he ever wrote interconnects and interpenetrates, forming one massive narrative.

For Frye, articulating this massive narrative necessitated the organisation of human imaginative outpourings into manageable categories. Imre Salusinszky suggests that Frye used his structural, archetypal approach to literature as a mnemonic device, a sort of filing system wherein the vast quantity of literature he consumed could be ordered, organised and contained, granting him easy and instant access to everything

he read, learned and thought about. Likewise, Robert D. Denham's essay claims that Frye was not attempting to force human creations into pigeonholes, but arranging them for future use. The system that gradually revealed itself to Frye was not a rigid schema, but was itself the *expression* of the vision that drove him.

The first of the two essays by Denham gives an overview of the most important new material to have surfaced to date. Student papers show Frye circling over the literary puzzles and clues that were to keep him sniffing along the same trails until his death decades later. The letters from the same period show him looking outwards through friends and colleagues and beyond to a world collapsing into fascism and on the brink of war. In this can be seen the familiar Janus-faced Frye, looking into the order of words that is literature and out into the world at the same time.

Jonathan Hart's essay discusses the novel Frye always wanted to write, and how the traces of these abandoned novels illuminate his critical writings. Plans, synopses and false starts, usually for detective stories, ghost stories or satires are scattered throughout the notebooks. All show a remarkable degree of overlap between Frye's critical and creative writings. This is not surprising, as Frye always maintained that criticism was a creative act in its own right. Hart's essay complements Dolzani's, as it also suggests that every piece of writing undertaken by Frye was part of a much larger work revealing itself over the author's lifetime.

A.C. Hamilton discusses Frye's place in the world of literary criticism. On the one hand we can see similarities between Frye's work and that of Leavis and Arnold, and on the other between his work and that of Marx and Rousseau. Hamilton's essay shows us the balance or negotiation in Frye's work between such extreme positions — his "critical path." Contemporary approaches to the study of literature marked by distrust, power and conflict are essentially political campaigns, and not the study of literature. Frye's preference for dialectic over argument avoids worldly biases and preoccupations, allowing for endless, open-ended and disinterested debate.

Frye's insistence that literature was disinterested made him almost unique in twentieth century criticism. Virtually any other critical school or individual has assumed that the use of language is interested. Reclaiming the imagination as a radical, revolutionary force that has greater authority than ideological, social or historical contexts and considerations, says Joseph Adamson, is what makes Frye so important today. The imagination can transcend cultural boundaries, allowing for a "re-cognition" of our common humanity. In our multi-cultural tower of Babel, this is something that can give us hope.

Péter Pásztor sees Frye as vital to multicultural harmony. In his essay he details his ten-year struggle to get Frye translated and published in Hungary. In academia, the norm was either the assimilation of all non-Marxist thinking into Marxist critical practice, or deliberate misreading. Longstanding animosity between Protestants and

Catholics presented the problem of how to avoid making Frye seem partisan to Hungarian readers. Pásztor sees Frye's critical path as much needed space between all the complicated warring factions, and his eventual translation into Hungarian as a hopeful new beginning.

The final essay by Denham deals with the subject of interpenetration: every poem is the centre of the poetic universe, and every individual's experience at the centre of all human experience. To express it as a typically Frygian paradox, all structures of thought and imagination interpenetrate, yet are completely unique. Like religious belief, my faith may not be your faith, but my god and your god are one and the same. Unity is the goal and dialectic the means of achieving it.

Literature is a disinterested order of words that is nevertheless still socially useful, in that it is a product of the human imagination, which, for Frye, was a radical transforming power, and criticism is part of the process of liberating this energy. *Rereading Frye* reveals this to be central to the grand narrative that informs Frye's work. *Rereading Frye* gives the reader ideas, glimpses of the big picture, intuitions, not just about Frye, but about literature and life and the connection between the two. These inspiring visions are something of which Frye would surely have approved. The book reads like a lure; it makes the reader want to pick up Frye and start rereading him. The unpublished writings do undoubtedly illuminate the published writings. The essays that argue for Frye's contemporary importance as a thinker present a thoroughly convincing case. In *Rereading Frye*, we are not chasing Frye's ghost, but the vision that drove him. (DIANE DUBOIS, UNIVERSITY OF LINCOLNSHIRE and HUMBERSIDE)

JULIANA DE NOOY. *Derrida, Kristeva, and the Dividing Line: An Articulation of Two Theories of Difference*. New York: Garland Publishing, 1998. US \$75.00.

The reader coming to Juliana de Nooy's book on Derrida and Kristeva expecting to find a straightforward comparative analysis of these thinkers' respective "theories of difference" will be disappointed. The book does not offer, and does not claim to offer, a comprehensive reading of each writer's "theory of difference" which is then, in turn, compared to the other's. That this expectation (perhaps suggested by the book's title) is *not* met, however, constitutes the book's most serious potential contribution to the study of the relation between Derrida and Kristeva. Apart from the impracticality of individually articulating two massive "theories of difference," a comparative analysis must eventually face the question of its criterion of comparison, its own theory of "difference" which it employs in order to compare and contrast, to articulate a difference or a sameness between the two writers it is comparing. That de Nooy's

analysis calls into question a place of neutrality from which such an analysis might proceed, and that it avoids the prevailing tendencies either to lump the thought of Derrida and Kristeva together under the banner of "poststructuralism" (as being the same) or to separate them along the divide of psychoanalysis (as being different) constitutes the beginning of an advance in the attempt to think the relation between these two enormous and difficult oeuvres. The book proceeds by foregoing a determined model for analyzing the relation between Derrida and Kristeva, preferring to read certain selected texts together in the hopes of articulating a "series of active engagements between the theories" (xii). In de Nooy's words, the book "aims at establishing precisely how Kristeva's and Derrida's writings may be articulated, tracing intersections and divergences, parallels and discontinuities between them" (xii). The book's goal, according to de Nooy, is to open up the space where the *possibility* of articulating the similarities and differences of the two might be thought. However, if this description of the methodology of the book sounds oddly familiar, that is, if it sounds like a description of the prototypical comparative project (in its use of its language, with terms like "intersections," "divergences"), then one has, I think, hit on the fundamental ambivalence of de Nooy's study. Put simply, de Nooy's book is caught between two irreconcilable approaches: a comparative analysis which would attempt to stand outside the two theories, articulate and then compare them to each other, and an analysis which puts this basis of comparison into question from the outset. The tension between these two tendencies in de Nooy's book is what makes it both productive and problematic.

The book is structured in three parts, each of which attempt to pose in different ways the question of how to conceive of a relation between Derrida and Kristeva. Part One attempts, quite ambitiously, to articulate a conception of each writer's notion of heterogeneity. Part two articulates each's "methodology" with regard to this heterogeneity or how each attempts to account for this difference, and part three looks at how both theorists read certain texts of literature, that is, how they read the same text differently.

In the first chapter of the book, de Nooy returns to Derrida's famous "critique" of Levinas in "Violence and Metaphysics" and uncovers there the aporia of a respect for the other which is both impossible and necessary. Going back simultaneously to Kristeva's reading of Freud in "Place Names," she finds a parallel between Derrida and Kristeva in their conception of the threshold which separates other and same. She argues that both conceive of otherness not as marking an inside and an outside, but rather as an *internal* heterogeneity which divides the same from itself. She argues that, for both Derrida and Kristeva, the other is never directly accessible; what both propose is a response to this internal heterogeneity as a different relation to the same. Though highly general (one wonders why this conception of an "internal difference"

or heterogeneity could not as easily be attributed to Hegel, for instance), the chapter does set the scene for what follows in much of the book. While de Nooy finds several affinities between Derrida and Kristeva early on, the major difference between them which she finds rests on the *stability* of this internal boundary of reason. For Derrida, the boundary between reason and its other (the irrational) is one of opposition and so for him it is a form, albeit a negative one, of the same. For Derrida, de Nooy suggests, "What disconcerts reason cannot, therefore, be its opposite but perhaps its shadow, its double" (16). For Kristeva, however, this internal boundary of reason must remain, to a certain extent, oppositional in its structure. For Kristeva, according to de Nooy, reason is other to itself by being inhabited by drives which rupture reason's unity from within. The divided line between the symbolic (the level of language) and the semiotic (the level of the drives) is understood in Kristeva as a fundamental rupture or break; an *opposition*.

This minimal difference which de Nooy finds between Derrida and Kristeva's "theories" of heterogeneity is at the root of much of the comparison that follows. De Nooy's turn, in the second chapter, to a more detailed exegesis of the Kristevan notion of the process of signification alongside the Derridean notion of the "movement of difference" revisits in a more detailed manner what the first chapter is only able to hint at. In the process of clearly and patiently explaining Kristeva's distinction between the symbolic and the semiotic and their relation in terms of conflict or rupture, de Nooy notes that the semiotic, or the level of instinctual drives, must be thought as always already engaged in the process of signification. Though seemingly initially posited in Kristeva as a pre-linguistic level which disrupts the order of the symbolic, de Nooy astutely points out that the semiotic is approached in Kristeva from the side of the *symbolic*, as it were; it is only from the perspective of the symbolic, or language, that one could *read* the ruptures of the semiotic drives. The opposition between the semiotic and the symbolic (termed the *thetic phase*) entails two moments: a moment of positing or positioning, and a moment of negativity or rupture. As De Nooy insists:

Not only does the symbolic therefore provide the place and the opportunity for symbolic/semiotic confrontation but it manages to incorporate semiotic heterogeneity without recuperating it. The semiotic functions within language without being reduced to language. It is integrated as a permanent disturbance, as irreducible otherness within identity, renewing it. (42)

What is dispensed with in her careful exegesis of Kristeva is a straightforward separation of Kristeva and Derrida on the grounds of a disagreement over pre-linguistic drives. She provides a strong reading of Kristeva, one which allows her to more closely articulate a real disagreement of method between her and Derrida.

De Nooy's reading of Derrida's "Structure, Sign and Play in the Discourse of the Human Sciences" which follows is equally careful, though again somewhat general. De Nooy carefully skirts the problem of dealing with the question of whether deconstruction can be treated as a determined "methodology," choosing this early text which is perhaps one of Derrida's most programmatic. Out of it she derives the notion of Derrida as "bricoleur," that is, as one who uses the tools of a tradition which one is simultaneously attempting to call into question. As Derrida argues in that essay, for instance, a critique of the sign cannot forgo the opposition (of signifier and signified) which determines it. What it seeks, rather, is the difference, the movement of differing and deferral which makes possible this opposition. While de Nooy's analysis attempts to avoid attributing to Derrida a straightforward "theory" of difference (such an approach would be inherently foreign to the "method" she is analyzing) she nevertheless is constrained to generalize the Derridean strategy of difference when she compares his work to Kristeva. Again she finds general similarities: a conception of unity which is always already divided, the inextricability of binary oppositions and the refusal of a third term which would capture these in the form of a synthesis. And again, the difference between them in terms of the oppositional nature of this divide is raised: Kristeva's notion of difference is said to remain inherently conflictual, Derrida's notion of difference is oblique, non-oppositional. Having articulated a more detailed exploration of the notion of heterogeneity in both, De Nooy returns to the same problematic, the question of the quasi-oppositional nature of the divide in Derrida and Kristeva, but this time with a more detailed reading of the two under her belt. Her analyses at this point are close to the text, and the question of *how* this "divided line" as articulated in Kristeva (as a moment of positing followed by a moment of its negation) might be fruitfully brought into contact with the Derridean notion of difference, is nicely delineated and quite suggestive.

Thus ends part one of the book, which follows in its format and its exegeses of Derrida and Kristeva the expectations of a comparative analysis: it provides a careful if somewhat general outline of the two "theories" of difference, their methodology, and suggests several places of contestation between the two. The question of the basis of comparison, however, inevitably returns at the end of this section at the point where the two writers will be treated more closely in terms of their *difference* to and from each other. Here de Nooy again faces the question of the principle of difference which her own study will employ, and again she chooses to disavow "an independent position of impartiality midway between the two" (70). "Instead", she writes "I propose to explore the nature of the 'between' from both sides of the divide, by borrowing from each practice without definitively adopting the strategies of either" (70). It is here that the book becomes problematic.

Part two consists of chapters which attempt to read Kristeva through the lens of Derrida, followed by a chapter, written in the form of a mock dialogue between the two, which is an attempt to write what *should have been* Kristeva's reply. De Nooy, in other words, trades masks, playing Derrida in one chapter giving a reading of Kristeva, and then in the following one playing both, providing responses in a mock debate culled from various parts of each writer's oeuvre, giving "voice" to each. De Nooy's justification of her methodology seems to derive from a principle of fairness; the attempt to write a comparative analysis through the "theory" of difference of each is an attempt to avoid both asserting a *third* theory of difference which would remain uncontaminated by the two and which would prove capable of synthesizing them (i.e. preparing a basis of comparison for them which is not contained *in* them), and to avoid privileging or determining the place of disagreement between the two in terms of only *one* theory of difference. This of course, assumes that a definitive "theory" of difference has been worked out for each in the previous section, which is far from the case. As de Nooy herself points out, each "theory" of difference is itself more than one; the "theories" are internally divided — a point which, in my mind, takes us back to the question of an unfolding of difference in the work, and away from a set of propositions which form a "theory" of difference for either author. De Nooy, nevertheless, in avoiding a position of neutrality which would stand outside each theory, relies on the version of them that she has sketched out in the first section. Within this version, the two theories are analogously related, primarily around the question of the nature of heterogeneity. They are differentiated in that version primarily around the issue of the oppositional nature of that heterogeneity. What take place in section two is less an encounter between the two theorists than a repetition of De Nooy's version of their analogous conceptions of heterogeneity which she relies on, though she claims initially in the first section to have begun not by putting the theories in contact but by concentrating "... on the way each functions on its own terms, taking the line of least resistance to the texts" (29). That this "involves a certain pretense, in that the orientation of the analysis will always be determined by the articulation to follow..." (29) does not emerge as a problem until the second section when that orientation becomes retrospectively the implied basis for the reading of each theory by the other. The general or neutral position which would be necessary to *undo* initial analogies or differences in their theories articulated independently, is again implied in the analysis when those analogies are made the basis of an attempt to put them into contact with each other. One indication of this is the number of themes de Nooy draws on in order to begin her "cross-reading." The fourth chapter, for instance, which interrogates Kristeva through Derrida on at least seven major themes from his oeuvre (non self-presence, the trace, the division between speech and writing, the question of origin, singularity and the concept of the unique, the relation binary

oppositions, and the notion of affirmation) is so burdened with the range of possibilities of thematic contact with the writings of the other that it never moves beyond the major theses of the first two chapters.

The mock dialogue between Derrida and Kristeva of chapter 5, however, is perhaps the best example of the latent recapitulation of the "theories" which de Nooy performs precisely where she wants to articulate a difference. Here, having abandoned the usual steps of comparative analysis, she actually puts words in the mouths of her two protagonists, contextualized around a vast plethora of quotations from their own work and from an extremely wide selection of their texts. The result, is a vast decontextualization or leveling off of the "theories"; the expanse of over thirty years of Derrida's work in particular is made relatively unitary and uniform in the attempt to have it enter the "debate." De Nooy's justification for this method is less than convincing: she argues among other things that *any* reading or citation implies a certain form of decontextualization (139). While I would not argue with this principle in general, the decontextualization she is referring to in order to justify the method of the dialogue takes place when one text cites another text, and thus both decontextualizes the citation and recontextualizes it in the movement of a text which is not "its own". Here, a ventriloquized Derrida and Kristeva are made to say their *own* quotations without their being recontextualized. They are made to stand *for* the text which is being commented on as representatives of it, which they can only fail to be; the result is a progressive and irreducible decontextualization of the more standard type.

The problematic nature of this section of the book, however, should not deter the reader from exploring the careful and illuminating exegeses of more specific texts by Derrida and Kristeva in the first section nor the attentive reading of each writer's relation to literature in the third. De Nooy's argument in the third section is suggestive and grounded in a reading of each writer's approach to specific texts of literature. She argues that Kristeva's relation to literature or the text privileges the question of its production (through the relation between language and the instinctual drives) whereas Derrida insists that a text *cannot* be read according to its modes of production alone but must also be understood in terms of its "generalized citationality". However, what keeps intervening throughout, and which is highlighted by the problematic nature of the second section of the book, is the question de Nooy poses at the beginning: the question of the theory of difference which would provide a basis of comparison. De Nooy's constant references to this problem throughout the book are never very helpful or satisfying. In the middle of the mock dialogue of chapter 5, for instance, she describes her approach thus: "Although it doesn't take sides, it participates in a structure and a dynamic that has an effect" (166). What "effect" this would be is never made very clear and is never really called into question. The penultimate chapter of the book (the final chapter is a kind of encyclopedia co-written with Peter Cowley on the

various "uses" to which Derrida and Kristeva texts have been put to by others), leaves open the question of whether and by what means Derrida and Kristeva have been placed, in de Nooy's words, on "speaking terms" (250) at all. What de Nooy does not take into account here is that the question of the notion of difference which would decide the difference between Derrida and Kristeva cannot be put off, that one cannot simply call this into question and then proceed as if nothing has happened. In attempting to ward off the prejudice of deciding the difference, de Nooy cannot see that she has already brought them into contact *in advance*: that deciding not to decide on the form of their difference falls prey to the "neutral" position of a more standard comparative project even against its own protests. And here, in particular places, it is one which eschews the standard methodologies necessary to such a project on the grounds that it is attempting to be something else. Unable to disavow completely the comparative project or to articulate a counter-methodology appropriate to a study which would refuse an external basis of comparison, de Nooy's book is both and neither. Not surprisingly, since the book ends up, in the absence of a more careful articulation of an alternative route, being the comparative project which it had called into question, it is where the book is most wedded to the more straightforward comparative techniques that it is the most interesting and useful. (KIR KUIJEN, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, IRVINE)

MARTIN KREISWIRTH and THOMAS CARMICHAEL (eds.). *Constructive Criticism: The Human Sciences in the Age of Theory*. Toronto, Buffalo, London: University of Toronto Press, 1995. Pp. 223. CAN \$17.95.

Ever since the publication of seminal works by David Harvey (*The Condition of Postmodernity*, 1990), Fredric Jameson (*Postmodernism, or, The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*, 1991), and in particular Krishan Kumar (*From Post-Industrial to Post-Modern Society*, 1995), the insuperable understanding in almost all the corners of the ongoing discourse seemed to be that Postmodernism might as well be compared to a black whole that devours each and every cultural foundation and value. Truth, as shown by an abundance of examples, is in effect a purely rhetorical construct in a social space where language must be accepted as the ultimate cognitive horizon. *Cynicism and Postmodernity* (1977), the title of an intriguing book by Timothy Bewes proposes that in the aftermath of Peter Sloterdijk's influential work *Kritik der zynischen Vernunft* (1983), these two words have indeed almost turned into synonyms. Now the time has come to clarify, if at all possible, this cognitive horizon, and to find out if indeed (or at least to what extent) the truth-claims of philosophy are merely discursively negotiated constructs assembled under the watchful eye of the power establishment. Questions

such as the following need to be raised: Are there sets of workable "foundational concepts" (Harvey) for understanding the socio-cultural space, the human environment and nature, political commitments and social justice? How are social differences produced through human activities? And, on a more abstract level, what kind of cultural narratives, as understood by culture as text, do our systems, practices, and history of theory represent today? In other words, what are the specifics of their signifying vectors; and whereto do they point?

In order to find answers to many of these problems, it is necessary for an individual critically to analyze and investigate the parameters, conditions, and prerequisites of his or her own theoretical position before it made sense to engage further in any far reaching conclusions regarding social implications and cognitive status of our postmodern culture. In this context, the collection of essays at hand aims to participate in this important discussion, as it attempts to review, rethink, and re-evaluate some of the epistemological foundations of postmodern intellectual environment in the present "age of theory."

First of all, it should be said that this collection of essays can be considered a rare and remarkable accomplishment, when compared with many similar projects on the market. Its contributors, fourteen in total, succeed in selecting and problematizing a number of significant, central and highly interesting topics. Furthermore, most of the twelve essays are also written in such a way that it was a pleasure to read the book. I am referring specifically to the meticulous and precise presentation of the arguments in a fluid and clear style.

The editors, Martin Kreiswirth and Thomas Carmichael of the University of Western Ontario, group the essays in four sections: "Rethinking Theorists," "The Theorizing of Theory," "Theory and Representation" and "Situating Theory." In other words, the set of perspectives of their "constructively critical" or analytical "gaze" is directed towards theoretical discourses in the recent past, the present, and a possible future. In this context, I would like to refer to at least a few of the major discussion points, keeping in mind, however, that in this forum it is not possible to address all of the essays in the detail they deserve.

Following an informative introduction by the editors, Christopher Norris suggests in the first essay "The Undefined Work of Freedom": On Foucault and Philosophy," a rethinking of the later work of Michel Foucault which serves as a point of departure towards the aim of this collection. The author's problem involves the question as to what extent Foucault can be situated in the tradition of Nietzschean scepticism. Norris posits that Foucault's later work showed signs of moving away from Nietzschean "ethicopolitical" principles as they would lead to an inescapable "terminal aporia" (21), which is, no doubt, an interesting thesis. However, throughout his life and in many interviews, Foucault refused to be caught in the deductive limitations of his work when

it was interpreted by others as a philosophical system, more over, as the "narrator" of his various investigations, he considered it his privilege to contradict any earlier positions. Indeed, he did this to quite some extent in his later works as shifts of perspectives can readily be observed throughout.

The following two superbly crafted essays, Tilottama Rajan's "Radical Phenomenology: Hegel and the (Dis)placement of Art" and Victor Li's "Habermas and the Ethnocentric Discourse of Modernity," continue to rethink fundamental theorems of the postmodern discourse as they investigate aesthetic consequences of Hegel's phenomenology and epistemological repercussions of Habermas's continuation of the Enlightenment project. Rajan, who understands Hegel's *Aesthetics* as "a *summa* of romantic phenomenology" (28), develops the rather problematic thesis that we need to approach romantic theory in "phenomenological as well as deconstructive terms" (25). Motivated by fundamentally humanistic intentions, Li argues for a return to Habermas's theory of modernity, but in this case under the auspices of a "hard ethnographic look at our own heterogeneous society" (56).

In "Tell Me a Story: The Narrativist Turn in the Human Sciences," Martin Kreiswirth addresses the "narrative mode of representation" (63) in the human sciences and how it is "configured and described from diverse disciplinary and methodological positions" (61). This article is followed by Diane Elam's "Getting into Theory," a provocative investigation of the theoretical status of feminism and deconstruction. She proposes "to understand deconstruction and feminism not as theories or systems of rules but as an endless *search* for rules" (97), because, as she argues, "the age of theory begins when theories fail, when no single theoretical discourse is possible any longer" (89). This notion of theories as forms of representation or narratives is also dealt with by Gary Wihl in "Novels as Theories in a Liberal Society," which suggests that novels and social theories are two sides of the same coin belonging to the same genre of writing.

The articles contained in the last two sections, "Theory and Representation" and "Situating Theory" deal with very specific problems. Richard Dellamora investigates "the implications of AIDS for truth in moral philosophy" in his undoubtedly brilliant contribution "The Ends of Man: AIDS, Kant, and Derrida." Linda Hutcheon and Michael Hutcheon in "Interdisciplinary Possibilities: Opera and Medicine?" investigate "the operatic representation of disease in conjunction with desire over the last two centuries" (139). And Janet Wolff in "Dance Criticism: Feminism, Theory, and Choreography," explores the dance metaphor and the belief in the equation "dance equals freedom" (149) in the realm of cultural and gender theory. Finally, the authors of the concluding section (Bill Readings's "For a Heteronomous Cultural Politics: The University, Culture, and the State," L.M. Findlay's, "A Way Ahead for the Human Sciences: Paul Ricoeur's *Lectures on Ideology and Utopia*," and John Fekete,

"Postmodernism and Cultural Studies: On the Utopianization of Heterotopia") speculate about the possible developments and conditions in the human sciences, cultural theory, and academia in the face of the "irrelevance of the human sciences in a university" (9).

"Taken together," the editors justifiably claim, "the essays in this volume represent the current age of theory in the human sciences." A few lines further they suggest that this "age of theory" is engaged "in the difficult task of renegotiating, of establishing the terms and the conditions of the return of the now-qualified subject to the human sciences" (10). In this respect, however, a mild form of scepticism seems to be permitted, because the dynamics of culture have not yet exhibited any signs or implications that they are at least beginning to lose their by now famous pale and bloodless shade of inconsequentiality in the social, economic, and academic realm. Nevertheless, all the essays at hand do make a very salutary point in case that such a possibility is not only, and not necessarily, a hopeless utopia at this time. (HOLGER A. PAUSCH, UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA)

H. WAYNE BALLARD, JR. and W. DENNIS TUCKER, JR., eds. *An Introduction to Wisdom Literature and the Psalms: Festschrift Marvin E. Tate*. Macon, Georgia: Mercer University Press, 2000. Pp. xi + 242. US\$ 19.95, paper.

The cover of this collection of fourteen essays by the friends, colleagues and, in most cases, former students of Marvin E. Tate, senior professor of Old Testament studies at Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, features "The Judgment of Solomon" by Sir John Edward Poynter (1836-1919). This oil painting of Solomon's discrimination between the two women claiming to be the mother of the live infant, adduced as proof for "all Israel . . . that the wisdom of God was in [Solomon] to do judgment" (1 Kings 3: 28), is both an apt and a revealing choice for a festschrift on the Wisdom tradition. Curiously, the painting and its provenance are not identified, nor is this type scene of wisdom-in-action ever commented on in the text. The omission of identifying information on the cover art was inadvertent; a helpful note from Marc Jolley, assistant publisher at Mercer, clarified that the line was lost when the colophon was removed (e-mail correspondence, 10 May 2000). But the lack of any discursive commentary on the masculocentrism of the scene in the biblical and illustrated narratives, the demonization of one woman to the point of welcoming infanticide and the polarization of good and bad mothers is more troubling and symptomatic. For me such a missed opportunity to challenge or engage characterizes many contributions to the volume.

it was interpreted by others as a philosophical system, more over, as the "narrator" of his various investigations, he considered it his privilege to contradict any earlier positions. Indeed, he did this to quite some extent in his later works as shifts of perspectives can readily be observed throughout.

The following two superbly crafted essays, Tilottama Rajan's "Radical Phenomenology: Hegel and the (Dis)placement of Art" and Victor Li's "Habermas and the Ethnocentric Discourse of Modernity," continue to rethink fundamental theorems of the postmodern discourse as they investigate aesthetic consequences of Hegel's phenomenology and epistemological repercussions of Habermas's continuation of the Enlightenment project. Rajan, who understands Hegel's *Aesthetics* as "a *summa* of romantic phenomenology" (28), develops the rather problematic thesis that we need to approach romantic theory in "phenomenological as well as deconstructive terms" (25). Motivated by fundamentally humanistic intentions, Li argues for a return to Habermas's theory of modernity, but in this case under the auspices of a "hard ethnographic look at our own heterogeneous society" (56).

In "Tell Me a Story: The Narrativist Turn in the Human Sciences," Martin Kreiswirth addresses the "narrative mode of representation" (63) in the human sciences and how it is "configured and described from diverse disciplinary and methodological positions" (61). This article is followed by Diane Elam's "Getting into Theory," a provocative investigation of the theoretical status of feminism and deconstruction. She proposes "to understand deconstruction and feminism not as theories or systems of rules but as an endless *search* for rules" (97), because, as she argues, "the age of theory begins when theories fail, when no single theoretical discourse is possible any longer" (89). This notion of theories as forms of representation or narratives is also dealt with by Gary Wihl in "Novels as Theories in a Liberal Society," which suggests that novels and social theories are two sides of the same coin belonging to the same genre of writing.

The articles contained in the last two sections, "Theory and Representation" and "Situating Theory" deal with very specific problems. Richard Dellamora investigates "the implications of AIDS for truth in moral philosophy" in his undoubtedly brilliant contribution "The Ends of Man: AIDS, Kant, and Derrida." Linda Hutcheon and Michael Hutcheon in "Interdisciplinary Possibilities: Opera and Medicine" investigate "the operatic representation of disease in conjunction with desire over the last two centuries" (139). And Janet Wolff in "Dance Criticism: Feminism, Theory, and Choreography," explores the dance metaphor and the belief in the equation "dance equals freedom" (149) in the realm of cultural and gender theory. Finally, the authors of the concluding section (Bill Readings's "For a Heteronomous Cultural Politics: The University, Culture, and the State," L.M. Findlay's, "A Way Ahead for the Human Sciences: Paul Ricoeur's *Lectures on Ideology and Utopia*," and John Fekete,

"Postmodernism and Cultural Studies: On the Utopianization of Heterotopia") speculate about the possible developments and conditions in the human sciences, cultural theory, and academia in the face of the "irrelevance of the human sciences in a university" (9).

"Taken together," the editors justifiably claim, "the essays in this volume represent the current age of theory in the human sciences." A few lines further they suggest that this "age of theory" is engaged "in the difficult task of renegotiating, of establishing the terms and the conditions of the return of the now-qualified subject to the human sciences" (10). In this respect, however, a mild form of scepticism seems to be permitted, because the dynamics of culture have not yet exhibited any signs or implications that they are at least beginning to lose their by now famous pale and bloodless shade of inconsequentiality in the social, economic, and academic realm. Nevertheless, all the essays at hand do make a very salutary point in case that such a possibility is not only, and not necessarily, a hopeless utopia at this time. (HOLGER A. PAUSCH, UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA)

H. WAYNE BALLARD, JR. and W. DENNIS TUCKER, JR., eds. *An Introduction to Wisdom Literature and the Psalms; Festschrift Marvin E. Tate*. Macon, Georgia: Mercer University Press, 2000. Pp. xi + 242. US\$ 19.95, paper.

The cover of this collection of fourteen essays by the friends, colleagues and, in most cases, former students of Marvin E. Tate, senior professor of Old Testament studies at Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, features "The Judgment of Solomon" by Sir John Edward Poynter (1836-1919). This oil painting of Solomon's discrimination between the two women claiming to be the mother of the live infant, adduced as proof for "all Israel . . . that the wisdom of God was in [Solomon] to do judgment" (1 Kings 3, 28), is both an apt and a revealing choice for a festschrift on the Wisdom tradition. Curiously, the painting and its provenance are not identified, nor is this type scene of wisdom-in-action ever commented on in the text. The omission of identifying information on the cover art was inadvertent; a helpful note from Marc Jolley, assistant publisher at Mercer, clarified that the line was lost when the colophon was removed (e-mail correspondence, 10 May 2000). But the lack of any discursive commentary on the masculocentrism of the scene in the biblical and illustrated narratives, the demonization of one woman to the point of welcoming infanticide and the polarization of good and bad mothers is more troubling and symptomatic. For me such a missed opportunity to challenge or engage characterizes many contributions to the volume.

As with any collection, *An Introduction to Wisdom Literature and the Psalms* presents a range of stylistic competency and maturity. Following an introduction on Wisdom literature and a biographical sketch of Marvin Tate, the essays "from leading Baptist scholars" (3) are in two sections: six on the Psalms and six on Wisdom literature (Proverbs, Ecclesiastes and Job). Designed for university and ministry students, the collection offers an impressive array of information on Psalm scholarship, sapiential theology and, especially, on the Ancient Near Eastern context of Wisdom writing. But perhaps because of repeated mention of reading the Psalter through "the lens of wisdom" (110), seeing the texts as "pilgrimage songs of faith" (111) and maintaining an unproblematic goal "to understand and master life in all its complexities" (180), there is a certain blitheness allied with staying within the confines of a Protestant faith discourse. The primary audience, clearly, is divinity students and not students of philosophy, literature, or the Hebrew Bible. Consequently there are very few theory-inflected forays into the complexities and contingency of language, the contrastive folds of discourse, or the spaces between knowing and not knowing. Most of the information is either factual or doctrinally declarative; hence, it is not concerned with aspects of the mysterious and the numinous, or with permeations and displacements of theology. The strict purposiveness of the exposition in most of these essays and the unquestioned contexts for processes of mutual understanding mean that this text does not anticipate a reaction beyond absorption from its readers. That is, it is not organized around the "interaction" and "intersubjective recognition" Jürgen Habermas associated with "communicative reason," through whose "argumentative procedures" we may "directly or indirectly redeem claims to propositional truth, normative rightness, subjective truthfulness, and aesthetic harmony" (Habermas 314). Moreover, although recognition of feminist scholarship is evident, with citations referring to Claudia V. Camp, Carole R. Fontaine, Carol A. Newsom and Athalya Brenner, there is no thoroughgoing acknowledgement of the countertraditions and diversity of antithetical texts and voices such as Ilana Pades uses to explore the role of Job's wife in calling "into question the predominantly patriarchal base of monotheism" (Pades 144).

The essays on the Psalms are undeniably rich troves of information. They touch on the position of the Psalter in worship, with several recastings of the pioneering "form criticism" of Hermann Gunkel and Sigmund Mowinckel around the settings in life (*Sitz im Leben*) and genres (*Gattung*) of psalmic texts. They explicate forms of medieval Jewish scholarship — the *derash* ("applied meaning"), *midrash* ("free exposition") and *peshat* ("meaning in context") — in the commentaries of Abraham Ibn Ezra, Rabbi Solomon ben Isaac or Rashi and Qimhi, the "series of interrelated doxologies which appear at the end of Psalms 41, 72, 89 and 106" (47) effectively creating the distinctions of five books (1-41; 42-72; 73-89; 90-106; 107-50), and the

types of poetic parallelism (synonymous, antithetic, synthetic and climatic) along with allusions to the studies of James Kugel and Robert Alter.

Yet the huge scope and sheer copiousness of these essays mean that many glances are cursory. To be told simply that the "religious revivals of St. Bernard and St. Francis were inspired by and shaped by the recitation of psalms" (26) with no comment on the resultant characteristics of Cistercian or Franciscan spirituality, or to be informed, after precise and repeated allusions to Luther and Calvin, that "the Psalms were also on the lips of martyrs like Thomas More and John Fisher" (28) with no allusion to Richard Rex's penetrating study of Bishop Fisher's Psalms or to the 15-volume Yale set of More's Works could account for the impression of simultaneous breathlessness and perfunctoriness. With all the attention to Calvin, I was struck that there was no mention at all of early modern women translators, many of whom espoused reform principles and whose work is now available in standard critical editions. Especially surprising was the omission of the English emigrée to Geneva, follower of Knox and translator of Calvin, Anne Vaughan Lock, who also created a 21-sonnet sequence on the fourth Penitential Psalm, "A Meditation of a Penitent Sinner: Written in Maner of a Paraphrase upon the 51. Psalm of David" (1560). Another startling absence was Lady Mary Sidney Herbert, who mined Calvin, Bèze and Marot, among others, to fashion the metrically brilliant Sidney Psalter, which she presented in 1599 to Queen Elizabeth in her own name and that of her late brother, who had begun the translation project and completed the first third before his death in the war in the Netherlands. As spotty as a 14-page "history" of the interpretation of the Psalms must inevitably be, it is also curious that this essay makes slight mention of the extensive English literary tradition of psalmic paraphrase, as anthologized by the poet Donald Davie in *The Psalms in English* (Penguin, 1996) — from Milton, Watts and Wesley to Thomas Hardy, T. S. Eliot and David Jones — and no mention of such contemporary work as Daniel Berrigan's *Uncommon Prayer: A Book of Psalms* (1978), illustrated by Robert McGovern, or the experiments in inclusive language of Nancy Schreck and Maureen Leech in *Psalms Anew* (St. Mary's Press, 1986). The topic of psalmic interpretation is so voluminous that it is a pity the editors did not include an annotated bibliography of further readings or additional sources.

The inclusions can be as perplexing as the exclusions. Is there sufficient evidence of a "preponderance of complaint psalms" in the first part of the psalter in contrast to "more positively oriented psalms" in the latter portion to "suggest an organizational principle at work" (51-52)? How would such a principle explain the early hymns of exuberance and the sixth and seventh penitential? What interpretive benefits emerge from the attempt to tell "the Psalter's story" (99)? How helpful or limiting is the putative five-book structure? Is it a sufficient or a time-bound synopsis to relate that the Psalter "celebrates the reigns of David and Solomon in books 1 and 2; laments the

dark days of oppression during the divided kingdoms and the Babylonian exile in book 3; and looks forward to and rejoices in Israel's restoration to the land and in the reign of YHWH as king in books 4 and 5" (99)? Is a thorough grounding in ancient Israelite history an indispensable prerequisite for reading and understanding the Psalter? Such a circumscribed, foreclosed narrative seems to me to deny the genuine space of story and what Catherine Pickstock has called "the process at work in non-identical repetition by which that which is repeated is not unmediably different, but analogously the same" (Pickstock 265). Although Pickstock is addressing the topics of the theological imagination and the restoration of the liturgical order, the terms through which she sets out "the impossible story which never ends" might also apply as correctives to a reading of the Psalms dependent on and informed mainly by Israelite history; Pickstock argues, compellingly, I would say, for "a constitutive incompleteness which genuinely welcomes the other in an ecstatic presence, ... [an] analogous identity ... always transcendent, ... always to be completed, but not thereby rendered incoherent" (Pickstock 266).

The half of this collection devoted to the contexts and conundrums of Wisdom literature offers less prescriptive clues for reading and following some suggested traces of meaning. How welcome is Gerald Keown's admission that "there is no simple summary statement which can possibly encompass the dilemmas facing the interpreter of the wisdom literature" (193). Recognizing the cross-cultural sweep and individual orientation of wisdom literature, Carol Grizzard dares to pose "the most basic" questions: "how do we learn?" what "sources" can we trust? and, how can we "develop the framework that enables us to interpret our lives?" (197). The final essay, James Crenshaw's "Unresolved Issues in Wisdom Literature," is the most captivating and far-reaching of the whole collection. Acknowledging that "this literature assisted in the formation of character and the socialization process, ... shaping a worldview, making explicit the things to cultivate and those to avoid" (218-19), Crenshaw faces the anomalies of the differences between Wisdom and Torah, and the possible gaps between traditional Yahwism and wisdom texts. He goes as far as to admit that the fear of Yahweh "seems to function almost as a buzzword" (223). His concluding speculations about the inclusive or exclusive nature of the class of professional sages and the relation of the specific corpus of Wisdom Literature to the rest of the Old Testament are clear, logical and convincing. According to Crenshaw,

the scant evidence seems to point to gifted individuals who combined the earlier product of instruction in the family with intellectual pursuits of a quite different kind. Eventually such individuals may have functioned as teachers in schools.... Can one really imagine the first stages of philosophy that occur in Ecclesiastes, or even the intellectual dispute in the Book of Job, apart from a circle of advanced thinkers? (227)

Such informed, refined inquiry, deftly braiding multiple readings and alert to the presence of inconsistencies, allows Crenshaw's exploration of "the social setting of wisdom over the years" to resonate for postmodern readers. Through its rhetorical practice, this final essay actually exemplifies the continuing importance of the wisdom tradition. (PATRICIA DEMERS, UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA)

Works Cited

- Habermas, Jürgen. *The Philosophical Discourse of Modernity: Twelve Lectures*. Trans. Frederick Lawrence. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1987.
 Pardes, Ilana. *Countertraditions in the Bible: A Feminist Approach*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1992.
 Pickstock, Catherine. *After Writing: On the Liturgical Consummation of Philosophy*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1998.

*ANDREW SPRAGUE BECKER. *The Shield of Achilles and the Poetics of Ekphrasis*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 1995. Pp. 191. US\$ 52.50 cloth, \$ 21.95 paper.

Readers of this volume will learn much about how *ekphrasis* functions as a poetical device because its author skilfully reveals the processes by which verbal may represent visual art. Becker applies precise interdisciplinary perspectives to the ways in which Homer celebrates the work of Hephaestus, the maker of the Shield of Achilles. Homer's ways of celebrating the work of the artificer are many and complex, but their intricacies are directed, in Becker's intensive analysis, by a single, lucid rhetorical aim: the poet enacts a manifold responsiveness to the Shield — its maker, material, design and representativeness — so as to produce a model that enables, shapes and heightens audiences' responses to the *Iliad* itself.

In Homer's epic, the description of the visual art of the Shield is a *tour de force*, but the visual art described is not limited to the surface appearance of the Shield because the poet intends to give his audience the illusion that it experiences the Shield's diverse representative functions. To Becker, Homer's *ekphrasis* is not simple description because it refers to the visible surface of the Shield in modes of discourse that are variable but conceptually and imaginatively integrated. When *ekphrasis* goes beyond the surface of the Shield, it neither focusses on psychological effects in the audience (as Edmund Burke prescribed), nor narrates the production of art in time (as Lessing stipulated), since it remains occupied with the spatial disposition of objects. The factious single-mindedness of modern theories of *ekphrasis* leads Becker to find in early

Homer represents the visual medium and the world the medium depicts in the same sentences and poetic enunciations, thereby unproblematically generating by his descriptions both illusion and defamiliarization. Since Homer sees images as images and reacts to their referents as if they were unmediated (71), he shows that *ekphrasis* attempts to borrow, not defeat, the power of the visual arts, while adding to them the power of the word (83). Far from working within the assumptions of modernist poetics which sever reference and reflexivity (99), Becker maintains that Homer enhances the audience's engagement by drawing attention to the medium and the role of the mediator.

For Becker, Homer exemplifies the way in which *ekphrasis* may be taken literally even as it recalls mediation, epic song and the worked metal of Hephaestus's Shield. Encouraging readers to adopt inclusivity, Homer takes *ekphrasis* literally, then as descriptive response to an image, and finally as a poetic process. He conflates the world represented and visual imagery in his language of description, so that the *ekphrasis* appropriates and is appropriated by the work of art: the *ekphrasis* surrenders to the depicted world without forgetting that it is illusionary (104). Homer moves readers gradually into the referent of his illusion, passing from the workshop of Hephaestus to the Shield itself, to the decoration on the Shield, to the images constituting the decoration, and then to "the cosmic and terrestrial setting of the scenes to come." Homer's text emphasizes thus the levels of mediation heightens the depicted world and the audience, yet the attention to mediation heightens the audience's trust in the epic representation because it stresses the parallels between those levels. The audience is enabled by the *ekphrasis* to see analogies between Homer and Hephaestus, between the *Iliad* and the Shield, between the bard's and its responses to the Shield. This appreciation of mediation is analogous to the larger process of the audience's being appropriated by and appropriating the *Iliad*, that is to say, being drawn into the poem's distinct world and pulling that world into its own. Homer's achievement is to turn his description so much toward the referent of visual art that it represents the referent as if not depicted, suggesting that description surrenders to the illusion of the image. This focus on the Shield as thing enacts respect for the illusionistic qualities and the evocative powers of works of visual art: it implies that by iconic relations to referents, images do capture parts of the world. Yet when the processing of these images is turned into stories, it defamiliarizes the world, emphasizing the instrumental and complementary functions of viewer, describer, mediator of story and image. Yet this complementarity, the completion of the defamiliarization, paradoxically fortifies the bridges that connect the audience to the represented world of the Shield.

Greek literary critics a concept of this phenomenon which accepts the illusion it generates and rejects it at the same time (24).

For Becker, Homer offers readers the illusion of unmediated access to the Shield along with his reactions as describer to the thing described and to the process of making the description. That is to say, *ekphrasis* is a complex mixture of mimesis, interpretation and mediation because, even as the audience accepts the illusion, it knows the source, the context and the production of the illusion (37). Besides relating this complex mixture to Paul Ricoeur's dynamic ideas of appropriation and divestiture, Becker turns to Kenneth Burke's levels of attention. The Shield is an imagined-referent which pulls the audience's imagination into a realm of imagined story. The Shield has a surface as a physical medium that draws attention to the frame through which the imagined world is depicted. The Shield is a creation and has a creator so that the making of the work of art is inseparable from the referent and medium. The fourth level involves the bard's reactions to the Shield: his descriptions and reactions to his images constitute the role of an animadversor, an interpreter between the Shield and audience who conveys the synthetic functions of the verbal medium.

Through this typology of readerly attention, Becker inductively makes the case that within phrases and clauses Homer's readers enjoy a systematic play of the relations between audience, bard, artistry, object and referent (43). *Ekphrasis* in Homer less involves fixed patterns of synaesthesia and sense transference than subtle and precise movements of verbal images that enact the epic's own poetics, thereby training the audience. The stress on syntactical, lexical and etymological aspects of Homer's words lets Becker show that *ekphrasis* is not a unique type of visual poetry since it trains its audience to the manner in which art in general works (51).

To prepare for his reading of the Shield of Achilles, Becker explains how Homer establishes patterns and expectations for *ekphrasis* by describing how art works throughout the *Iliad*. Agamemnon's sceptre the bard turns into a story by presenting its manufacture, use and history: it is not pictured but translated into mixed actions in time. Helen's tapestry is a paradigm for the Shield of Achilles because there is progress in the rendering — from the artist making the work, to the work as object, to the referent of the representation (57). What Becker establishes in his early analyses is that Homer's modes of discourse are strands which, as in rope, gather strength by entwining themselves. Acting as congenial audience, Homer responds to his own images with engagement and detachment: his descriptions represent and supplement his imagined visual images without displacing poetic modes or without presuming the primacy of verbal representation (64). As in the passage about Nestor's cup, the poet combines different levels of aesthetic response: he elides work and thing depicted and draws attention to the art-maker and to commentator on the art (67); conceptually distinct kinds of representation are, thus, not rendered by separate discursive modes.

This patient, elaborate and intelligent grammar of illusion and mediation is a major contribution to aesthetic theory and to the history of the sister arts. (ROBERT JAMES MERRETT, UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA)

*GARTH TISSOL. *The Face of Nature: Wit, Narrative, and Cosmic Origins in Ovid's Metamorphoses*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997. US \$50.00.

In the film *Mr. and Mrs. Bridge*, one of Mr. Bridge's rich business-associates tells the following joke to his male companions: Just as the Greek god Zeus, so the Germanic god Thor liked his flings with mortals. After such a one-night-stand he decided to reveal his true identity. So he told the young female: "Honey, I'm really Thor!" To which she replied: "Tho am I, but it wath worth it." Mr. Bridge considers this joke to be smut.

In this handsomely produced volume, Garth Tissol sets out initially to defend Ovidian jokes along this line against scholars and critics like Mr. Bridge. In his first chapter he analyses paradox, pun, syllepsis (note the distinction from zeugma in appendix B), personification and divinatory wordplay with admirable subtlety and in great depth. Rather than finding these stylistic features merely funny or in bad taste, he presents them as patterns that transform their subjects verbally, thus providing verbal metamorphoses analogous to the changes that form the theme of the poem. His thesis is basically that there is a "fluid interchange of literal and metaphorical, physical and conceptual" (36). Again and again he finds Ovid "blurring" literal and figurative meanings thereby "destabilizing" the reader's perception and stressing the fact that, as Heraclitus had pointed out centuries before Ovid "everything flows" (*cuncta fluunt*, *Met.* XV 178).

The second chapter, introduced by an anecdote about Demosthenes (Zenobius VI 28 adapted by Erasmus *Adagia* I 3,52) grabbing his judges' attention by narrating, but never finishing a mind-teasing legal problem, deals with narrative disruption. Tissol here discusses the "structural disruption of the continuity of the reader's experience" as "parallel to the disruptive impact of witicism" and an embodiment of the "themes of the work in the experience of reading." "While wit enacts transformation, narrative disruption makes flux as much a feature of Ovidian style as of Ovidian perspectives on the nature of things" (96-70). Part of this investigation is a 20 page analysis of the story of the cyclops Polyphemus (*Met.* XIII 750-897) with reference to Ovid's models in Homer's *Odyssey*, Theocritus 11 and Vergil's second *Eclogue*. For Tissol, Ovid excels in shocking his audience with sudden violence after first lulling them into a false sense of "facile amusement" (121). Rather than being detached, the reader is drawn into the

narrative only to be shocked and disturbed by it. The third chapter traces this disruptive narrative technique back to Callimachus's *Hecale* and Propertius IV 4.

In his final chapter Tissol devotes himself to the pervasive theme of *aetia*, the mythical causes for features in the contemporary world, which to him reveal the largely human origins of nature. Here one finally catches a glimpse of why the book is called *The Face of Nature*. Part of the discussion is a detailed evaluation of Ovid's version of the events covered in Vergil's *Aeneid*. He finds humour in the telescoped retelling of lengthy Vergilian passages and in Ovid's liberalizing tendencies. Tissol reads Ovid's "little Aeneid" as a reaction to Vergil's providential view of the world. Ovid emphasizes *inconstantia* and flux over a teleological view of history. In his *aetia* he also tries to go chronologically further back than Vergil and Homer thus explaining points that were glibly assumed by his predecessors. Teleological conclusion of the tenet that everything is always changing is the mutability and eventual decline of Rome itself. Ovid's view of the world is offered as an alternative to Vergil's; ironically, this constitutes an "ultimately bleaker view" (197) than that of the *Aeneid* since individual appearances in nature remind us of the changes that have occurred and the violence with which these have been brought about. In this view, "chaos still prevails in the forms of nature, and its violence seems to become more deeply embedded in the cosmos with each new change" (195). "Permanence is illusory if thought to be absolute; what appears permanent is a reminder of change" (195). After briefly comparing some passages in the *Fasts* with their counterparts in the *Metamorphoses*, Tissol reaches his conclusion (215-16) and the contemporary relevance of his interpretation: "Ovid's lack of sentimentality, and his ability to engage his readers' emotions without inviting complacency and intellectual slumber, make his work particularly precious and remarkable. It is tempting to suppose that he wrote for a time not unlike our own: aesthetically awash in sentimentality and nostalgia, with audiences unwilling or unable to bear the taste of even a little artistic accommodation to contemporary realities" (216). What Ovid tries to evoke is astonishment and wonder (Aristotle's "thauma"!) at natural phenomena quite unlike our own romantically prejudiced perspective.

At the very end of the book, there are three appendices concerning syllepsis, one quoting Voss's theory, one citing ancient and modern definitions of this figure and finally one giving a list of examples from the *Metamorphoses*. There is a pretty full bibliography, an index locorum and a general index.

Tissol makes a significant contribution to our understanding of how wit works in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. His book is very readable, his style quite free of ideological jargon. All Latin and Greek passages are translated; his renderings are close to the original without sounding stilted. Footnotes are moderate and uncluttered by research bibliography. Tissol has obviously gone beyond the Ph.D. dissertation as which this

work started. While the book does not constitute a general introduction to Ovid or the *Metamorphoses*, it still ought to be recommended to undergraduates with or without Latin as the second book they read on Ovid simply because Tissol goes beyond the technical aspects of Ovid's poetry to get to a meaning.

The message that Tissol recovers, namely that Ovid presents the world as constantly changing rather than heading towards a climax, driven by chaos rather than order (191), is quite convincing to me. In his first chapter he had insisted that wit, "funny as it is, ... has an intellectual seriousness and a relevance to its larger context that deserve to be recognized" (21) or, to say it with an Ovidian paradox, wit is serious! However, I am not so sure if "blurring the distinction between conceptual and physical" (41) is the right term (the same verb, e.g., 19, 20, 25); rather, in puns and syllepsis two senses are equally present at the same time thus making the reader question (this verb is preferable to the trendy "disturb," e.g., 15, 127) what is real and what is not. While this distinction between appearance and reality is quite vital to our lives, it also makes the jokester Ovid sound Platonic! This is exactly where I am beginning to have my doubts about Tissol's overall thesis: is he not taking a Leavisite position, trying to prove that a great author is great because of his deep moral concern? Is pure jeu d'esprit *ipso facto* something inferior?

Returning to the theme of distinguishing between appearance and reality, I also feel that a connection could be made to the political circumstances of the day where the appearance of Rome still being a Republic was fostered by its autocratic ruler. Was Augustus really a *paterfamilias* or was he just a dictator like his great uncle and adoptive father Julius Caesar? Similarly, political significance could be gained from the discussion of Ovid's descriptions of violence on p. 128. If his gory bits are "typically deprived of comforting and comprehensible circumstances" does this not reflect the world in which he lived? In this context Tissol should also have considered J. K. Newman's remarks about the influence of the gladiator-games on Roman artistic expression in *The Classical Epic Tradition*, Madison/ Wisc. 1986 (e.g., 182).

In his second chapter Tissol adeptly uses Iser's and Jauss's reception criticism to interpret the Daedalus and Perdix narratives. Tissol never really discusses his methodology at length. Although I love to hate literary theory, a little more could have been said about Tissol's "audience-oriented critical affiliations" than is found on pp. 7-8 and in the footnote on p. 94. Nonetheless, I am totally convinced by his conclusion that "Ovid does sometimes encourage facile responses, but only to wrench his readers out of their easy entertainment by some shock" (105). Somehow I miss some such conclusion at the end of the 20 page discussion of Polyphemus that follows. I also miss a reference to Joseph Farrell, "Dialogue of Genres in Ovid's Lovesong of Polyphemus," *AJP* 102 (1992). At this point in the book, I occasionally

feel that Tissol is doing little more than (of necessity) fill in the reader about the progress of Ovid's Homer's and Theocritus's narrative.

Chapter three then traces Ovid's disruptive narrative technique back to Callimachus's Hecale and Propertius's fourth book. As Classicists and especially Latinists, we are obsessed with sources. If you are dealing with jerky transitions, Propertius is an obvious precedent. Callimachus also comes as no surprise as a model for Ovid. Nonetheless, Ovid takes these occasional precedents and forges his own, almost 12000 verse long poem which is a great deal more readable than either Callimachus or Propertius. I would therefore downplay any possible models and stress Ovid's originality in (superficial) lightness of tone and meter combined with an unmatched scope.

The final chapter pulls all the strings together and gives a thorough evaluation of Ovid's "Weltbild" in the *Metamorphoses*. Tissol here really covers everything, even the socio-historical background for *aetia* in Callimachus's Alexandria (199-200) as well as in Rome (201-02). I am not sure that the comparisons with the *Fasti* add much (202-09); why not save it for the next book? However, the main strength of the chapter as well as Tissol's main problem lies in the comparison between Ovid's world view and that of Vergil's *Aeneid*. It is quite clear from his summary of Vergilian scholarship on p. 179 that he considers the "Harvard School's" pessimistic reading of the *Aeneid* as more sophisticated, while the optimists are relegated to being intellectual complacent and conceptually simple. This air of intellectual superiority is quite uncalled for and otherwise uncharacteristic of his argument. It also presents Tissol with a huge problem: his reading of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* depends on an optimistic reading of the *Aeneid* to which it is seen as a reaction. Tissol therefore has to postulate that Ovid seized upon part of the audience's "simplification and reduction" (179) of the *Aeneid* in order to drive his point home. The assumption is that Ovid is a clever man. No clever man could possibly take the *Aeneid* as an attempt to present an optimistic view of Roman history. Therefore Ovid is reacting to an anonymous, simplistic, reductionist contemporary reader of Vergil's epic. This is obviously quite far-fetched and solely designed to save present-day American readings of the *Aeneid*. What Tissol has actually uncovered is Ovid's understanding of his epic predecessor. The flux of the *Metamorphoses* is a direct reaction and correction of Vergil's teleological presentation of the way the world works. Ovid thus becomes one of the earliest readers of the *Aeneid*. Quite significantly, he reads Vergil in a positive way, not exaggerating, as Tissol claims, the optimistic tendencies of the *Aeneid*, but simply leaving out, as he does elsewhere (cf. e.g., 98), the notes of deep sadness that Vergil's work undoubtedly contains.

One more note about Ovidian chaos and flux: after just spending a semester teaching Latin verse-composition to a very able and very motivated student, I have to point out that the demands of the dactylic hexameter, in which the *Metamorphoses* are

refers to exclusively non-sexual same-sex friendships — relations that Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick usefully termed “homosocial.”

Frantzen, however, dismisses the work both of Sedgwick and of Judith Butler, the other best-known queer theorist, as largely irrelevant, even dangerous, to the medievalist, since “Butler does not write about literary texts, and Sedgwick does not write queer studies of premodern or early-modern material” (7). Strictly speaking, this is untrue: Sedgwick devotes an entire chapter of *Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosexual Desire* (1985) to Shakespeare’s sonnets (and another to Wycherley’s *The Country Wife*), and in *Bodies That Matter* (1993) Butler takes on the fiction of Willa Cather and Nella Larsen, as well as Plato’s *Timaeus*. More importantly, though, Butler is primarily a philosopher and cultural theorist, not a literary critic, and Sedgwick’s work as a literary critic is — rightly, I think — far less influential than her more strictly theoretical writing. Frantzen is confusing scholarly disciplines, yet goes on to complain that medievalists who use queer theory are abandoning disciplinary — the discipline of historiography in particular — and thereby “that long conversation that is scholarship” (19). Frantzen also argues, conversely, that the work of queer medievalists tends to be overly traditional in its “closely textual examinations” and “accounts of medieval cultures [that] are often isolated from evidence offered by other kinds of texts” (16) — that is, it is insufficiently interdisciplinary. This is hardly the corrective that Frantzen promises “to the lack of critical rigor that obscures many queer readings” of medieval and other texts (25).

What Frantzen seems most to want, typically enough, is for others to read the texts he reads, the way he reads them. And his reading of medieval books of penance, the core of the book, is mostly convincing. This is familiar ground for Frantzen, whose dissertation was revised and published as *The Literature of Penance in Anglo-Saxon England* in 1983, and it provides the most successful material here, in the central portion of the book. Despite its title, “Part II: The Anglo-Saxons” is not the only portion of the book that deals with early medieval English culture and society; however, it is more clearly aimed at scholars working in that particular field than is the rest of the book. This is particularly true of Chapter 4, on “The Sociology of Sex in Anglo-Saxon Laws and Penitentials,” with its two appendixes, three tables, and complex linguistic and historical arguments regarding Old English and Latin handbooks of confession and penance; this is the best chapter in the book, but likely also the least accessible to the non-specialist. Chapter 3 provides a readable and entertaining, if biased, critical survey of previous work on “Same-Sex Relations in the Early Middle Ages,” and Chapter 5, “The Shadow of Sodom,” usefully examines representations of Sodom in Anglo-Saxon pastoral literature. Frantzen amply describes the surprising candour of Anglo-Saxon books of penance and, to a far lesser degree, other sources in relation to sexual acts that would later be deemed unspeakable. This is a valuable revelation.

written, in itself imposes its order on the written word and therefore restrains and counteracts the message of permanent flux and chaos.

Notwithstanding a little trick to save a cherished view, Tissol has made a very valuable contribution to our understanding of the *Metamorphoses* and to how humour and rhetoric can be evaluated. He has made me think about my assumptions about Ovid and paved the way for not just enjoying what we thought was just “superficial and meaningless” (to quote an anonymous friend), but also learning something from the chuckles that we all get out of Ovid. (MARTIN HELZLE, CASE WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY)

* ALLEN J. FRANTZEN. *Before the Closet: Same-Sex Love from Beowulf to Angels in America*. Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press, 1998. Pp. x + 369. US \$35.00 cloth, \$17.00 paper.

Allen Frantzen’s most recent book is, in more ways than one, very queer. Its author would not consider that a compliment, which is in part why it is not one: much of what is or could have been most valuable here is undercut or simply contradicted at the outset by Frantzen’s oddly convoluted “Introduction: Straightforward,” which, despite his explicit assertion to the contrary (25), constitutes an attack on “queer theory.” The book as a whole is an interesting but uneven collection of sometimes disparate essays, not the unified survey of “Same-Sex Love from *Beowulf* to *Angels in America*” that the book’s subtitle might seem to promise. Individual essays are not merely more successful than others, but successful in different ways, and apparently geared to different audiences, from the scholarly specialist to a more general readership. The danger is that readers who would find one portion valuable will be alienated entirely by another.

On his first page Frantzen states, “I call this a book about ‘same-sex love’ because the obvious choice, ‘homosexuality,’ is, for periods before the modern era, inaccurate” (1). The argument, uncredited here, is of course based on one that Michel Foucault famously outlined in the first volume of *The History of Sexuality*, and thus constitutes the same sort of uncritical nod to Foucault that he condemns a few pages later as problematically characteristic of, even foundational to, “queer medieval studies” (7-8). Yet Foucault himself did not abstain from using the term “homosexuality” in regard to early and pre-modern same-sex relations, and Frantzen himself regularly refers to “homosexual” acts or behaviour in reference to Anglo-Saxon culture (and even to “medieval homosexuality” on p. 123). He sometimes distinguishes these from “same-sex relations,” (see especially p. 294), a phrase that sometimes, but not consistently,

I remain, though, unconvinced that this candour justifies the book's title, "Before the Closet." Frantzen writes, "This evidence identifies same-sex relations of many kinds and unambiguously condemns them. That is what I mean when I argue that there was no closet — no sexual closet at least — in this culture" (113). By the same criteria, there is no closet in contemporary North American culture, either, given the explicit condemnatory descriptions of homosexual activity one can find anywhere, from Fred Phelps's infamous picket signs at funerals of gay men and his website (www.godhatesfags.com) to the remarkably persistent stories of "gerbiling." The latter phenomenon also points to a very real problem for the historian of sexuality with dependence on apparently straightforward documentary evidence: no amount of written assertion regarding a given sexual practice proves in itself the truth of such assertion; and no lack of such assertion necessarily proves otherwise. Queer theory attempts to deal less with claims of historical veracity — with proving that a particular historical figure did or did not have sexual relations with another — than with the meaning of particular assertions and types of assertions regarding sexuality, as well as with the ways in which sexuality and sexual attitudes (or indeed social dissidence more generally) can be read into and out of a wide variety of cultural materials, and with the relation of such attitudes and materials to a perceived social norm. "Queer" is always relative, and the ground is constantly shifting.

The term "closet" implies a static relation — one is either "in" or "out" — that strikes me as both unrealistic and theoretically problematic. As Frantzen rightly notes, "It is always a problem to know where a closet is located, except on some metaphorical margin" (24). His solution is to substitute the figure of "the shadow," noting that "It is never a problem to locate a shadow, since shadows are closely connected to objects in the way that I see same-sex relations connected to heterosexual institutions" (24). Just before this, though, he writes, "A closet is made by somebody, usually for somebody else; a shadow simply is" (24). Yet its metaphoric existence is not simple: as Frantzen himself notes in his initial discussion of the term, the word is associated with "gloom, sadness, depression" (14) and other negative qualities, and with little that is positive; its use buys into homophobic discourse — both contemporary and medieval (see especially the discussion of Pope Gregory on pp. 276-77) — even more than the often-despised word "queer" itself. Moreover, the chief advantage it offers has already been exploited in other ways, using other terminology, within queer theory. When Frantzen writes that "a secondary or counter-discourse ... can be seen as performing the indispensable role of defining or outlining the discourse that dominates it" (24), he effectively describes what Jonathan Dollimore has termed "the perverse dynamic." Dollimore outlines the concept at length in his book *Sexual Dissidence* (1991), noting in particular the necessary and socially-troubling proximity between perceived

norms and the realm of the perverse to which Frantzen likewise draws attention (15, and throughout).

"The shadow" is simply unnecessary as a figure, neither substituting for "the closet" nor doing anything new. And sometimes it is simply misleading. "Part 1: 'Trousers Roles and Transvestites'" opens with a chapter centered on three works especially far removed from Anglo-Saxon penitentials: Wharton's novel *The Age of Innocence*, Strauss's opera *Der Rosenkavalier*, and two ballets by Mark Morris. Despite Frantzen's efforts, these works and this chapter remain, for me at least, largely unrelated to the rest of the book, including the discussion of cross-dressed saints in the subsequent chapter. He attempts to demonstrate how, "through cross-dressing and gender-crossing conventions, the same-sex shadows of these works might stand out — to us, if to nobody else" (64). Frantzen tells us that when the Marschallin and Octavian — both played by women — sing to each other in *Der Rosenkavalier*, we should "close our eyes to imagine that it is ... an opera about people like us ... to permit the ear to hear what the eye is not allowed to see" (52). This hardly suggests a visible "shadow" of same-sex love.

Just as problematic is the reference here to imagining, "people like us," given Frantzen's stated disdain for such "historical imaginings" (20). He particularly denigrates "attempts to claim medieval authors and characters for queerness" (20): "I find it sad," he writes, "and not a little pathetic, that so much energy should be expended by queer critics on reassuring each other (and their readers) that medieval people were, in some ways, as tolerant and queer as we could wish them to be" (20). Yet only a few pages later he reassures us that "At some moments ... readers will find the Anglo-Saxons surprisingly open to same-sex love" (26).

Frantzen does, however, draw a firm distinction here between "love" and "sex." Indeed, the ostensible purpose of these first two chapters, according to this same paragraph, is to "propose a variety of paradigms for sexualized relations that are not specific to genital sex" (26). His insistence on this distinction again stems from his misunderstanding of queer theory, and from "queer" not as relative but as an absolute. Frantzen defines "queer sexuality," as used within queer studies, as "promiscuity, lots of sex with lots of people, either endorsed as one's own practice or recognized with approval as the preferred practice of one's community" (22) — what he later refers to as a long-standing feature of homophobic discourse, now "a stigma elevated to a lifestyle" by some gay men (203). Yet promiscuity is no more inherently "queer" than celibacy, or monogamous same-sex relationships. And again, "sexualized relations that are not specific to genital sex" sounds a great deal like Sedgwick's concept of the homosocial.

In his nostalgic, autobiographical "Afterward: Me and My Shadows," Frantzen describes a variety of experiences, from his youth and from his years in the U.S. army,

that he considers in some sense sexual, although they specifically excluded genital sex. He decries critical work that "crudely reduces the range of human sexual experience to categories that cannot accommodate the same-sex relations I have recalled here" and throughout the book — work that defines persons as "either straight or gay" (306). I would heartily agree, and so would most self-described queer theorists; what he describes here is the sort of essentialist work that queer theory critiques. Had Frantzen been able to align himself with the existing, if amorphous, discipline of queer studies and its critical vocabulary, rather than defining himself and his work against it, this book could potentially have had far more to offer, more clearly. Still, the central section of the book, at least, should prove a highly valuable resource to a variety of scholars, working in and across a variety of disciplines. I look forward to seeing what other queer theorists, especially, might do with the materials Frantzen has offered us here. (GARRETT P. J. EPP, UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA)

*ALEXANDER LEGGATT. *English Stage Comedy 1490-1990: Five Centuries of a Genre*. London and New York: Routledge, 1998. Pp. x + 182. CAN \$105.99 cloth; \$34.99 paper.

Stage comedy, claims Alexander Leggatt, is an ideal site for genre study because comedy is both of its particular time, yet also highly formalized across time. This combination of a remarkably coherent, diachronic set of character types, plot devices and typical broad grounding in marriage, family and other domestic and public anxieties links with the synchronic, the way that particular comedies connect with the social modes and pressures of their times. The result, Leggatt suggests, is a "remarkably healthy organism," well adapted for survival.

Leggatt does not build his study chronologically, but more usefully assesses the evolution of the forms and practices against a set of seven concerns: 1) "Getting Control," which looks at how comedy allows the writer and audience to gain or experience some sense of control over ambient anxieties; 2) "Watching Society," which considers how comedy allows us to watch people "in the social arena," engaged in the various forms of human commodification (of self and of other) that are part of the accumulation of "credit," a term that seems aligned with Bourdieu's ideas of symbolic and cultural capital, though the latter might in this context be better understood as "social" capital; 3) "Loners," which looks at a variety of outsiders who find themselves on public display or involved in public matters they had hoped to stay aloof from: tricksters who direct the comedy's laughter; fops who are the butt of such laughter; and misanthropes, who fulfill both functions; 4) "Other Places," which considers the setting outside normal society or "home," and its contradictory nature as a place of

license, of nightmare and of dream, of confusion, deception and truth-telling that confronts anxieties about how close to "normal" some unsettled and unsettling other possibilities actually are; 5) "Parents and Children," which deals with the quite different preferences and interests that exist within the different generations in a family or in a society. Here, Leggatt looks at how different periods have dealt with the complicated paired issues of youthful independence and filial duty — the 18th century, which promoted respect for parental feeling while in some instances still incorporating the problem of the standard blocking father; 6) "Negotiations," which explores the fundamental conflict of comedy — that it works towards a happy ending usually expressed as a marriage, yet at the same time often ridicules the marriage practices and conditions of the day, warning against all sorts of malpractices. It is no accident, he says, that the drama and the laughter end when the lovers get what they want: the standard negotiations towards marriage typically involve much role-playing and other brands of falsehood and deception in order to create the conditions for this bedrock, foundation-of-society institution; 7) finally, "Comedy Against Itself," which examines how laughter, again in a typically contradictory way, leads comedy to work against itself by ridiculing the concord the drama seeks to achieve.

Depending on the reader, this slim but complex study can serve as a primer or as a timely reminder, given the theoretical summaries involved in the introduction and embedded within the individual chapters, and on the wealth of evidence from well-know works, augmented by others from less well-known pieces.

Leggatt also opens for discussion, but does not begin to explore, the question of why comedy has so far, on the English stage at least, largely been a male-dominated genre. He looks to some recent developments, but since comedy by Leggatt's definition is a "big house," public mode, he does not create space to consider that historically, there may have been dramatic practices and situations other than the mainstream stage — tableaux, closet drama, — where women have worked their own versions of comic work more privately or covertly.

In considering some of his general discussion of the place of comedy and critical attitudes towards it another matter comes to mind. There seem to be significant parallels between comedy and the world and work of the literature of popular culture. Both by reputation are treated as at best secondary genres less serious and worthy than tragedy, yet both fundamentally work as windows on social anxieties. Subgenres of fiction such as the romance novel, the western and sometimes the detective, typically look at issues related to survival in society and have stock characters who work through problems and roadblocks to happy endings or restorations of "normal" that are notoriously contrived and at best temporary. What is at the root of attitudes that sniff dismissively at genres that look at, mediate, moderate, and try to provide windows

of self-defensive opportunity on, social anxieties? (DON PERKINS, UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA)

*GARRETT A. SULLIVAN, JR. *The Drama of Landscape: Land, Property, and Social Relations on the Early Modern Stage*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998. US \$40.50.

"Landscape," as Sullivan uses this word in his title and text, refers not to our sense of a painterly, outdoor vista, or even to the poetic *descriptio* of such poems as *Poly-Olbia* or *Windsor Forest*. Sullivan instead means "landscape" to gather the topics (land, property, social relations) mentioned in his subtitle. As he puts it in this study's introduction, landscape is "a materialization of the external world, a way by which topography is brought into discourse and into knowledge" (2). That is, Sullivan means by "landscape" not land seen or described or even the thing itself — not, that is, soil, trees, rocks, and streams — but land as an idea with consequences, land subordinated within systems of social hierarchy, and the concomitant transformation of land into property.

Offering readings of *Arden of Faversham*, *Woodstock*, *A Jovial Crew*, and *1 Edward IV*, as well as of Shakespeare's *Richard II*, *1 Henry IV*, *King Lear*, *Cymbeline*, and *2 Henry IV*, Sullivan traces various (and sometimes competing) modes of thinking about land, and about one's relationship to it, and to others, throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries in England. By examining these "landscapes" in certain dramas of this period, Sullivan argues, we stand to "catch a crucial glimpse of the conceptual struggles attendant upon the uneasy emergence of private property" (16).

Sullivan divides his "landscapes" into three kinds: "landscapes of custom," which typically involve folk practices and rituals; "landscapes of stewardship," which usually reflect "a land-based moral order at the center of which stands the beneficent landlord" (12); and "landscapes of absolute property," in which the land is seen as an exploitable commodity to be bought and sold like other commodities. Because this threefold division does not account for all the topics which Sullivan wants to address, he adds two more: the "landscape of imagined community," which allows him to discuss nationalism; and "the landscape of sovereignty," which allows Sullivan to talk about the relations among place, property, and monarchical power.

The center of this book, and the strongest chapter in it, consists of a revised version of Sullivan's 1994 *ELH* essay on *Arden of Faversham*. Everything in this book overlaps in some way with this play, from its diverse models of land, and potential connections to the land, to its relation to contemporary historical energies (in this case, developments in the craft of surveying). It is the virtue of *Arden* as a play that is so full of "landscape" thinking. The other plays that Sullivan examines here present more of

a challenge: in them, land or "landscape" is not nearly as central as in *Arden of Faversham*. There is thus something of a let-down when Sullivan puts pressure on such texts as *1 Edward IV* and *Cymbeline*. Not that these plays lack a concern for issues of topography, mapping, property, or social relations. To the contrary. My point is that *Arden* offers so sustained, and so revealing, a focus on such issues that Sullivan is forced to work considerably harder when discussing these other plays.

This hard work pays off to a degree, for the strengths of this book are clear. It brings to bear, upon early modern drama, a version of the topographical analysis that Richard Helgerson advanced in *Forms of Nationhood* (1992). Where Helgerson was interested mainly in prose forms and in narrative poetry, Sullivan's book makes it possible to think about early modern drama as made in which topography, mapping, property, and persons were interrelated, and sometimes consciously handled not only as elements of the plot, but as pressing subjects of inquiry. Sullivan shows that there were competing models of "landscape" in early modern England, and in its drama, and that the landscape of absolute property — the form of landscape with which we are most familiar, today — was by no means the dominant model in the period. Refreshing also is Sullivan's willingness to examine non-Shakespearean plays; although his remarks on the latter are interesting, most valuable, perhaps, is what he has to say about the lesser-read dramatic texts examined in this study. This is also a carefully argued book. I cannot recall reading a study more conscious of its argument, tying together points made previously with insights offered later in the study, looking both backward and forward as it goes.

Yet some of the weaknesses of *The Drama of Landscape* are also related to how it is written, and, in particular, to Sullivan's attempts to control his readers' responses. Sometimes this overwriting is a matter of too much "packaging," as when Sullivan editorializes in the midst of quotations from critics (102) and primary texts (183) alike, or when Sullivan puffs critics as he quotes them. Surely we all praise too much when it comes to criticism, and we all need to do less of it; in Sullivan's book there is a great deal of it: books and critics are routinely "superb," "crucial," "definitive," "compelling," and so forth. (On one occasion, Sullivan's critics even collide in their exemplarity (53)). Oddly, Sullivan is much stingier with his praise for the literary works themselves. John Taylor, of all writers, is credited for a "shrewd representation" (179), but this seems to be because Taylor, in the passage quoted, anticipates this study's own sentiments regarding "landscape." Indeed, Sullivan at times seems to read literature the way a teacher reads student essays — hence Taylor's "shrewd" here may be the equivalent of an "A."

I have complimented Sullivan for his control of his argument. But sometimes this desire for control leads him to coerce his readers, as when he juggles the pronouns in saying "However, I want us to think of Rome's..." (156). I have no objection (as some

do) to switching pronouns within paragraphs — as when, for example, an author wishes to distinguish his or her own contributions (“I have”) from the mission of a larger group (“We all need to”). But to collapse this distinction within four words (“I want us to”) is to take the liberties of the pedagogue, displaying an impatient desire to master the free will of one’s readers. A similar disregard of the reader occurs in the following, almost archaeological instance of 1980s-style jargon: “A landscape of custom, understood in terms of both intersubjectivity and the collective negotiations inherent in custom, constitutes a theory of location and identity that exists as and at the nexus of practice and topography” (134–35). Here Sullivan creates an abstraction (“A landscape of custom”), watches as it somehow “constitutes” a theory, then helpfully notes that it “exists” both “as and at” a particular nexus of two topics. Sentences like this sound impressive, of course, but do not help the reader very much, and they can even signal a critic trying to write (rather than think) himself out of predicament.

My greatest problems with this book were more foundational in nature. Clearly a scholar interested in issues of materialism in history is going to be attracted to Raymond Williams — this much goes without saying. It also goes without saying that those who have read Williams the most intensively are typically those so taken with his voice that they do not heed his warnings about nostalgia. Even granting a certain level of Hundred-Acre-Woodism to any study of “landscape,” however, there is a surprising lack of support here to Sullivan’s fantasies about the local and the customary in England. His primal scene of the good community seems to derive, in fact, from a single secondary source that describes a Rogationtide ceremony and then comments on its social function. It would be easier to credit Sullivan’s belief that such ceremonies introduce “a range of people to what is in a sense *their* land” (45, emphasis in the original) if instead of merely hedging his claim with “in a sense,” he specified in *what* sense, if any, such people themselves could have proprietarily conceived the land demarcated in these ceremonies.

Sullivan’s explanation as to why he takes up the drama of this period is spectacularly unpersuasive. He says on page 20 that it has to do with the personnel (landlords, players, audience members) related to the theater, and with their backgrounds, but none of his explanations as to the links among those persons and the topic at hand is compelling. It would have been more accurate, perhaps, to say that early modern drama seems interested in almost every topic under the sun, and insofar as this topic has also interested the critic and may well interest the reader, it is worth exploring. So great are the pressures upon us to adduce compelling reasons for our critical passions, however, that it is unlikely we will hear this kind of admission anytime soon.

Finally, there is the problem of the term “landscape” itself. I believe this word is too fixed in usage for Sullivan’s book to change the way people define it. If this book depends for its success on the general redefinition of the term, then it is not likely to succeed. However, if readers can look past the stubbornness of Sullivan’s terminology to the ideas it relays, they may well find themselves benefiting from his argument. (DOUGLAS S. BRUSTER, UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS)

TRINA REYFMAN. *Ritualized Violence Russian Style: The Duel in Russian Culture and Literature*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1999. Pp. xiv + 364. Index. Illustrations. US \$49.50, hard cover.

Slaps, bites, beard-pulling, punches, slashes, bullies, billets, bullets, interpersonal violence, including its socially ritualized version, the duel, is a striking feature of Russian literature. Irina Reyfman has offered us, in this investigation, the first full-blown study in English of this phenomenon. Her meticulously researched book blends social history and literary analysis to tell us, on the factual level, everything we could possibly want to know — or in some cases can know — about the subject.

In the first three chapters of the book Reyfman concentrates on duelling as a social phenomenon that appeared in the eighteenth century and was slowly and reluctantly adopted by Russians, and which then reached its heyday in the early nineteenth century. Though hampered by the lack of reliable information, she constructs a working hypothesis, namely that the duel entered Russian society as a response to the hierarchical structure of Russian society that permitted physical abuse of social inferiors by their superiors. The duel, she argues, rises out of the search for respect for the private space of the individual and the need for equality between members of the nobility, whether of the newer, *aristocrate* variety, or scions of the older families. Since it insisted on the right of the individual to defend himself, and since it was predicated on the equality of the parties, the duel was essentially a subversive activity that was discouraged and at times suppressed by the tsarist authorities, and then, later, repudiated by the collectivist, socialist wing of Russian thought. As Reyfman shows, it was among the Decembrists that the phenomenon of the *bretteur*, the punctilious and ruthless practitioner of the art, reached its apogee. At the same time, although in a sense an affirmation of the individual, the ritual of the duel, once begun, imposed its own iron logic on the participants, who were obliged to follow it through to its conclusion, or face the loss of honour and social status that a rupture of the proceedings entailed.

In the last three chapters, Reyfman examines the duel as a theme in Russian literature, beginning in the late eighteenth century and concluding in the post-Soviet

minor works by Marinskii and others. Those interested in the duel in Russian literature will find it necessary to consult the volume, but they should be warned that not all the answers are to be found here, and they should be prepared to skip the more tedious analyses and take Reyfman's argument with a grain of salt. J. DOUGLAS CLAYTON, UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA

WITTE, BERND, THEO BUCK, HANSDIETRICH DAHNKE, REGINE OTTO and PETER SCHMIDT (†), eds. *Goethe Handbuch*. Stuttgart: Verlag J. B. Metzler, 1996-98. Vol. 1: *Gedichte*. Ed. by Regine Otto and Bernd Witte. Pp. 571. Vol. 2: *Dramen*. Ed. by Theo Buck. Pp. 553. Vol. 3: *Prosa*. Ed. by Bernd Witte, Peter Schmidt (†), and Gernot Böhme. Pp. 854. Vol. 4/1: *Personen, Sachen, Begriffe A-K*. Ed. by Hans-Dietrich Dahnke and Regine Otto. Vol. 4/2: *Personen, Sachen, Begriffe L-Z*. Ed. by Hans-Dietrich Dahnke and Regine Otto. Pp. 1270. Total pages 3330. DM 998.00. ISBN: 3-476-00923-8.

Timely for the Goethe year in 1999, celebrating the 250th anniversary of the author's death, and the approaching 21st century, the last volumes of the five volume set of the new *Goethe Handbuch* appeared in 1998. Among the flood of Goethe editions and publications, honouring the self-confessed "citizen of the world," this set distinguishes itself by being extremely useful, informative, and readable. In keeping with the new age, this new edition of the *Goethe Handbuch* intends to serve a twofold purpose: 1) to present Goethe's life and work as a writer, scholar, scientist and statesman in the context of the current discourse and research and 2) to make the information also accessible to the non-expert. It seems fitting that this new and updated look at Goethe should appear at the turn of the 21st century since Goethe himself was very much, as a writer and as a scientist, at the threshold of two ages. Also in keeping with the new political reality in Europe, Goethe is presented less within the confines of German culture but he and his work are seen more in a cosmopolitan and European context. Thus Goethe, his work, and his age are presented in a way that would be of interest to the reader of the 21st century. This approach has to be lauded.

In its conception, the new *Goethe Handbuch* diverts from the two earlier editions of which the first appeared 1916-18 and the second was started in the 1950s but eventually abandoned in 1965, partly due to the fact that it had aimed at meticulous and encyclopaedic completeness. In contrast, the new edition places the text first and concentrates on commenting, analyzing, and evaluating Goethe's writings from a contemporary point of view.

The first volume concentrates on Goethe's lyric and epic works by presenting a selection of one hundred poems, his lyrical cycles, and epic works. The reader is first

period. Unfortunately, Reyfman's approach to the duel as a theme in Russian literature is quirky and lop-sided, since it goes lightly on Pushkin, Lermontov, and Turgenev (who are mentioned more or less in passing) and heavily on Bestuzhev-Marinskii and Dostoevskii. What she does have to say about the latter two is interesting as far as it goes, with some shrewd commentary on the duel as a central theme in their work. She shows, for instance, how Marinskii rings the changes on the code of the duel in story after story, examining such issues as backing out of the duel, leaving the site of the duel, the severity of the conditions agreed upon, cases of breaking the rules, inequality between combatants, and, the crucial question, how to break free of the duel's iron logic yet retain one's honour. Thus, in the story "The Test," it is the intervention of a woman, the sister of one of the combatants, that breaks the spell. Reyfman's comment sets the scene for the discussion of Dostoevskii: "Only special people — those with an intuitive sense of right and wrong — are exempt from its tyranny" (182). If it is here someone outside the combat who intervenes, Reyfman shows in the chapter on Dostoevskii that at least two of his heroes — Prince Myshkin and Zosima — manage to extricate themselves from duels in which they are participant: they are, in that sense, very special people.

Is there something that Reyfman has left out of the equation? The nature of Myshkin and Zosima, as well as Artsybashev's hero Lande, whom Reyfman discusses in her summing-up chapter, point to another dimension to the question of the duel, one that Reyfman seems, almost perversely, to ignore, namely the duel as an expression of the sexual competition between males. Duelling, to put it bluntly, is a macho activity, as Pushkin makes clear in *Evgenie Onegin*, when he describes the pleasure to be gained in first cuckolding a husband, and then consigning him to oblivion in a duel. Beyond the concepts of honour or personal space, here is a more powerful motor for the phenomenon of the duel. What Myshkin, Zosima, and Lande have in common is that they are all pointedly asexual, and thus out of the game. Their asexuality is the price they pay for their free will. By ignoring completely this aspect of the duel, Reyfman seriously vitiates her argument (repeated again and again almost ad nauseam) about the duel as a technique for respecting the personal space of the individual. This may be the defense argument, but the offense aspect is totally ignored, and her study loses an important (arguably, the most important) dimension. Had she included in her literary analysis a detailed study of such texts as *Evgenie Onegin*, *The Shot*, *A Hero of Our Time*, and *Fathers and Sons*, this aspect would surely have come through much more clearly.

The inevitable conclusion is that although she has written an important study, Reyfman's work is far from definitive, both in the theoretical underpinning, and in the choice of material for analysis. Moreover, the one-dimensional nature of her argument makes the reading at times tedious and repetitive, as we plod through analyses of

allowing quick and easy access to a particular element or characteristic of the novel or engaging the reader by pursuing a particular argument or motif. In its scope, this volume is unique in that it deals for the first time with the entire spectrum of Goethe's prose writings and includes not only his literary and scientific prose but also his writings as a statesman. Still, one misses Goethe's story *Die guten Weiber* which first appeared in 1801 and which largely has been ignored but has received some critical attention lately. Interestingly, it has not yet been discovered by feminist literary criticism.

The fourth volume is subdivided into two volumes and arranged in alphabetical order (4/1: A-K and 4/2: L-Z), with approximately 400 articles on a selection of key terms, categories, names, and places which are relevant to Goethe and his writings and deal with such topics as art, nature, society, science, and ethics. In their critical assessment, the commentaries go beyond a mere enumeration of factual information on a particular issue or name but treat the topic in a critical way and place it in a contemporary context. It contains such names as Byron, Raffael, and Spinoza and such terms as absolutism, the Koran, and tradition.

The volumes are very user-friendly. Each volume contains a detailed table of contents and begins with an explanatory note to the volume's layout, lists abbreviations, and names of the contributors. All volumes contain interesting illustrations covering a wide range of subjects, such as examples of Goethe's handwriting and drawings, illustrations of texts, title pages, diagrams, illustrations from Goethe's scientific writings, and illustrations of stage productions. The introductory essays and the essays on individual works, genres, periods as well as those on individual terms are written by an international team of about 200 scholars and Goethe experts. The collaborative nature of the edition guarantees that the breadth and width of Goethe scholarship is represented as well as a variety of methodological approaches is used. The articles are very informative and provide helpful additional source material in their bibliographies. The information has been gathered with great care and attention to accuracy. The editorial work has been done with the utmost circumspection.

Because of the overall excellent impression of the *Goethe Handbuch*, one inaccuracy is unfortunate since it appears in all four volumes. It is an error that has endured in Goethe editions and Goethe scholarship for some time now. It concerns the publisher Weygandsche Buchhandlung which was founded by Christian Friedrich Weygand in 1723 in Helmstedt. After his death in 1764, his son Johann Friedrich Weygand moved the publishing house to Leipzig in 1767. It was Johann Friedrich Weygand who published Goethe's *Die Leiden des jungen Werthers*, *Clavigo*, and *Neu eröffnetes moralisch-politisches Puppenspiel* in 1774. After his death in 1806, the publishing house was bequeathed to his appointed heirs, the sons of a cousin. They sold the publishing

provided with an introduction to Goethe, the lyricist, which is followed by an overview of Goethe's lyrical editions from 1789-1827. The discussion of the poetry is divided into several periods (such as early poetry, Storm and Stress, early Weimar period, classical period, late lyrical works), each of which starts with an introductory essay to this particular phase of Goethe's lyrical activities. This is followed by in-depth essays of individual works which consist of the genesis of the work, a text history, an analysis of its structure and content, its reception, an interpretation based on the individual methodological approach of the contributor, and concludes with the most important bibliographical information. This basic division of the commentaries is also followed in volumes two and three.

The second volume is devoted to the plays of Goethe. It begins with illuminating introductory articles on Goethe the dramatist, as well as Goethe the dramaturge during his career as director of the Weimar Court Theatre which lasted for over 25 years. In the practical aspect of theatre Goethe was involved as actor of an amateur theatre (*Liebhaftheater*) and especially in his role as director of the court theatre. The latter role included various aspects of production, theatre management, stage acting, status of actors, and the livelihood for actors. This volume includes Goethe's dramatic fragments, minor dramas, his dramas on the French Revolution, translations of plays (e.g., by Voltaire), prologues and epilogues for the theatre ("Theaterreden"), as well as articles on his major dramas from *Götz von Berlichingen* to *Faust*. The commentary on such major works as *Faust*, for example, are invaluable and range in its almost 200 pages from information on the sources and the various phases of development of the play to its stage history from the beginning to recent productions in the 1990s. Beside their individual importance as plays, the commentaries provide a history of German drama and theatre and its unique contribution to the development of modern drama and theatre in general. Although the analyses of the works and bibliographical information are quite thorough and include mostly the pertinent major works and articles on a work, in the case of Goethe's *Stella* one misses the article by David John (mit Stefan Endres und Gabriele Franke), "Ein neuer Schluß für Goethes *Stella*," *Goethe-Jahrbuch* 111 (1994): 91-101.

The third volume is dedicated to Goethe's prose writings and contains not only articles on his major novels and shorter prose works but also articles on his autobiographical writings, his maxims and reflections, his essays on literature, theatre, and art, his scientific writings, his official writings in the service of the Principality of Saxony-Weimar-Eisenach, his official speeches, as well as on Goethe as translator and correspondent. As with the other volumes, there is a highly informative introductory article on Goethe the prose writer, providing general characteristics of his prose works as well as observations on writing in general. All articles, including those on the major novels, such as *Werther* or *Wilhelm Meister*, are divided in clear segments with subtitles

house to Johann Christoph Jaspas in 1812 who continued it under its original name (see Koch). It is he then who published in 1825 the anniversary edition of Goethe's *Die Leiden des jungen Werthers*. The Weygandsche Buchhandlung existed until 1838. The name of the publisher as it appears in the indices of volumes 1, 2, 3, and 4/2 of the *Goethe Handbuch* need to read "Weygand, Johann Friedrich" instead of "Weygand, Christian Friedrich". The same applies to articles on p. 481 (vol. 1), p. 60 (vol. 2), and p. 1085 (vol. 4/2).

The five volumes of the *Goethe Handbuch* contain a wealth of information on Goethe, his works, his activities, and the entire Age of Goethe. As a reference work it is invaluable for Goethe scholars and students alike and it is also of interest to anyone seeking information on Goethe and his time, a particular work, genre or subject of the period. (MARIANNE HENN, UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA)

Works Cited

- Koch, Herbert. "Johann Friedrich Weygand, Buchhändler in Leipzig," *Archiv für Geschichte des Buchwesens* 9 (1967/68): 433-48.
- *CYNDY HENDERSHOT. *The Animal Within: Masculinity and the Gothic*. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1998. Pp. 281. US \$44.95.
- DANIEL COLEMAN. *Masculine Migrations: Reading the Postcolonial Male in 'New Canadian' Narratives*. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1998. Pp. xvi + 201. CAN \$16.95.
- Cyndy Hendershot's *The Animal Within* and Daniel Coleman's *Masculine Migrations* discuss dissimilar authors, but share a common project: a critique of the concept of autonomous heterosexual masculinity. For Hendershot, an assistant professor at Arkansas State University, the key contribution of the Gothic is its "revelation of traditional heterosexual masculinity as a veneer that conceals multiplicity and fragmentation" (1). For Coleman, an assistant professor at McMaster University, the "instability" of the migrant narrative is valuable "because it contradicts the illusion of masculine permanence and uniformity that founds male dominance" (xii). Examining these first books by younger scholars allows us to see, however, that this apparent consensus around the aims of current academic studies of masculinity can lead to quite different undertakings.
- The Animal Within* takes a contemporary approach to the Gothic, defining it neither by its period nor by its familiar machinery, but rather "as a mode that circulates throughout literature and (later) film from the mid-eighteenth century to the present, as a particular means of resisting and/or revealing the (ideological) 'reality' of modern

culture" (1). The implications of this definition are explored in Gothic texts in three areas: masculinity and the body, masculinity and science, and masculinity and imperialism.

A key player in popular conceptions of the Gothic is the vampire, and, in discussing masculinity and the body, Hendershot explores the disorientating way the vampire introduces the one-sex body into the two-sex world, evoking the terrors of the French revolutionary mob in *The Monk* (1796), and making full heterosexuality impossible for Jonathan Harkin, the "normal" male in *Dracula* (1897). In a startling leap, Hendershot then associates the one-sex body with the threatening plant body in *Invasion of the Body Snatchers* (1956, 1978). An equally interesting juxtaposition is that of *The Italian* (1793), Hitchcock's *Psycho* (1960) and de Palma's *Dressed to Kill* (1980), as a trio of disparaging Gothic portrayals of the feminized male subject, the body which is possessed rather than self-possessed.

If the Gothic shows that a unified masculinity cannot be grounded in the male body, can it then be grounded in science? The second section of *The Animal Within* argues that, if the male scientist is a recurrent image of a self-sufficient masculinity troped as rationality, the Gothic reveals his dark double: the murdering Mr Hyde, or figures like Victor Frankenstein or Hawthorne's Aylmer, whose Baconian or alchemical science is directed to destruction of the feminine. Darwinian evolutionary theory, on the other hand, represents not containment but a threat to masculinity and its unified masculine deity.

Imperialism can be seen as a third ground on which a unified masculinity tries to stand, and yet, according to Hendershot, the Gothic reveals that this ground too is saturated with ambivalences. For if imperialism is claimed as the producer of manliness, as it often was, there is also the "threat of losing British masculine civilization through degeneration produced by the imperial Other" (123). Hendershot examines the treatment of this threatening imperial Other in the portrayals of the Beast people in Wells's *The Island of Doctor Moreau*, of Roylett and Holmes in Doyle's "The Speckled Band," and of the Africans in Conrad's *Heart of Darkness*, texts which she claims show the "machinery necessary to sustain imperial manliness" (164). A further discussion focusses on the problematic attractiveness of the eroticized imperial male, an attractiveness endorsed by *Jane Eyre* and Jean Rhys's *Wide Sargasso Sea*, and only successfully resisted in Jane Campion's film set in New Zealand, *The Piano*.

What contribution is Hendershot making to our understanding of masculinity and the Gothic? She is certainly not making an original one in terms of theory. In defining the Gothic as a mode for critiquing the fragmented subject, she builds, as she acknowledges, on the work of critics like David Punter and Robert Miles, and her claims concerning fragmented masculinity owe an equal debt to critics like Kaja Silverman. The bringing together of these two conceptual fireworks. The success of

The Animal Within instead lies in Hendershot's assured handling of detail, notably in her often startling segues (from *Dracula* to *Invasion of the Body Snatchers*, from *The Italian to Dressed to Kill*), but also in her linkings of text and historical moment (as, for example in her recognition that film noir and *The Invasion of the Body Snatchers* reflect the reconstruction of a conservative fifties masculinity). Her detailed studies, at least, do validate her claim that the Gothic is "a particularly powerful mode" for revealing "the machinations underlying Western masculinity and the extreme fragility of these machinations" (217).

Is revealing the machinations by which Western masculinity composes itself a sufficient project for a critic? Cyndy Hendershot does not reflect on the politics of her textual choices, or on the situatedness of her relation to the subject of masculinity. Such considerations are, on the other hand, central to Daniel Coleman's *Masculine Migrations*. *Migrations* assumes that "masculine gender codes" (xii) do not become as visible in texts entrenched in a single culture as in texts informed by the "cross-cultural refraction" (3, author's italics) that happens when an immigrant's masculine codes meet the masculine codes of the culture he is entering. The book is, then, a study of six "new Canadian" authors. It is also, to some extent, a study of Coleman himself, for he insists that a stance of "objective rationalism" (xi) is itself an evasive masculine code, and thus that he needs to show how "the masculinities under scrutiny [are] related in some way to [his] own life and history" (xi). The solution he comes up with is to insert short italicized paragraphs reflecting on his own cross-cultural upbringing at various places in the study as a whole.

If *The Animal Within* makes denial of the Other the key process by which conventional masculinity struggles against fragmentation, *Masculine Migrations* give pride of place to performance for achieving this effect, drawing on the work of Theresa de Lauretis, Robert Connell and Judith Butler to present masculinity as a practice in constant but precarious motion. This framework has immediate application to two stories by Barbadian-Canadian Austin Clarke in which the same hero, Joshua Miller Corbaine, performs the masculine image of the Bay Street lawyer while actually being kept by his wife and various wealthy mistresses. Coleman shows how the mixture of codes in Joshua's performance decant that performance into parody, exposing the flaws of the code of corporate masculinity, and of the "category of manhood" (51) as well.

Clarke's stories constitute fairly obvious subjects for performative analysis, but Coleman's next two chapters tackle more complex cases: Quebec black writer Dany Laferrière's *How to Make Love to a Negro*, and Caribbean-Canadian Neil Bissoondath's *A Casual Brutality*. It would be hard to imagine two more tonally different heroes than Laferrière's Vieux, with his "rudeness, licence, gregariousness and super phallicism" (53), and Bissoondath's Dr Rajnath Ramsingh, whose speciality appears to be "a

retiring masculinity: one which distances itself from the prescribed rituals of aggressive masculine performance" (82). In his chapter on Laferrière, Coleman struggles — should I say manfully? — with the difficulty of evaluating a form of metaparody that both "exposes and ridicules the discursive system that produces the racist stereotypes which degrade men of African ancestry, and ... recycles and recommodifies those very stereotypes in the process" (53), in the end finding the evaluative question "unresolvable" (79). In dealing with the "retiring masculinity" of *A Casual Brutality*, on the other hand, the author seems to move much more sure-footedly, producing a nuanced judgement that insists that the withdrawal of the passive male still performs a (negative) social role, but also finds that the book establishes the value of a man "learn[ing] to live with his own lack" (104).

The last two chapters of *Masculine Migrations* extend this alternative image of masculinity through examining the mechanisms of what Freud called the family romance. The family romance of Michael Ondaatje's *Running in the Family* consists of stories with which his Sri Lanka family members build up the drama of their significance, stories which, though, are, as Coleman convincingly argues, informed by an Orientalist perspective which prevents any real contact between family and place, or even family and the narrator who seeks, in particular, his father. Yet, though the romance is flawed and the quest for father a failure, the book itself is valuable in posing an alternative masculinity, in presenting a "male subject ... [who] breaks with the tradition of autonomous masculinity and instead celebrates an interdependency" (130) in his quest for connection. This seems definite enough, but Coleman's judgement is more muted concerning Rohinton Mistry's *Such a Long Journey* and Ven Begum's *Van de Graaff Days*, where the quests for fathers are for men who have turned the family romance into a romance of family progress. In both novels the sons refuse to be the instruments of upward mobility; in both there is a rapprochement between son and father which leaves the relationship unresolved; and, with respect to both novels, Coleman acknowledges he cannot decide whether the narratives are subverting or reinscribing the Lacanian Name-of-the-Father.

Given the ambivalence of Coleman's judgments, it is not surprising that many of his conclusions are ambivalent too. Granted, he takes *Migrations* to have shown "how the disruptions of cross-cultural refraction *denaturalize* the notion of a coherent, authoritative, biologically based masculine gender" (159, author's italics). But he also notes that "each chapter of *Masculine Migrations* unsettles certain assumptions or values in other chapters" (163) and his final comments are on loss as a masculine theme and on "the difficult work of realizing the contingencies and limits of our own archives, our own discursive histories" (169).

Coleman's emphasis on ambivalence, complexity and limits contrasts sharply with the assuredness with which Cyndy Hendershot maps the field of the Gothic, and it

might inspire impatience in a reader desiring simpler and more obviously polemical evaluations. However what this contrast most suggests to me is that the project of arguing against autonomous heterosexual masculinity is affected by the gender of the scholar pursuing the argument. For Hendershot, masculinity seems an external category which remains, through the detail of its textual treatments, pretty consistently the performance of a denial of the Other; the one embodiment of alternative masculinity she discusses, the figure of Barnes in Campion's *The Piano*, remains an "impossible" character" (213). Assuredness in judgment and description here rests, in my view, on the simplicity of the case. Coleman's method, on the other hand, insists on his situatedness within the category of masculinity, and since he also has the desire that his project contribute "to the slow process of social change" (164) from within this situation, he is perforce committed to a more complex task: to discerning the play between negative and positive in the intricate cross-cultural performances of masculinity he examines. The value and virtues of the feminist and more external approach to masculinity, value and virtues well represented in *The Animal Within*, are probably those still most recognizable by academic readers; in this situation, it seems worth insisting on the value and virtues of works like *Masculine Migrations*, which, while sharing certain goals with feminism, work their way towards these goals from within the problematics of contemporary masculinity. (CHRIS BULLOCK, UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA)

*RICHARD DELLAMORA, ed. *Victorian Sexual Dissidence*. Chicago: Chicago UP, 1999. Pp. 329. US \$50.00 cloth, \$20.00 paper.

In reading scholarship on Victorian sexuality, there often surfaces the dim regret that the sex was probably better done than it is usually written about, and like all remarks freighted with nostalgia (and melodrama), the evidence of the past is never as compelling as the modern desire that endlessly generates a fantasy of its own making. The distance between these two preferred activities — the choice between having sex or simply assuming the less physically interesting, erotic position of the scholar — would appear to underwrite the loss of pleasure, rather than signal its perpetuation in the present. And yet, as long distance relationships often instruct, it is precisely the sexy aura of past desires that brings about their contemporary fascination. What does it mean to enjoy Victorian sexuality when our understanding of the topic is relegated to scholarship and memory, rather than experience? In other words, what does it mean to appreciate and find pleasure in a sexuality of an extinct period? And why does specifically *Victorian* sexuality continue to impress upon us at times our own stunning erotic poverties?

The vast circulation of significant critical discussions around the subject has come to incite a safe desire for those Victorian texts and artifacts that arouse pleasures peculiar to a lost age known for its heavy breathing. Richard Dellamora's collection of essays, *Victorian Sexual Dissidence*, which came to fruition initially as a panel discussion at the MLA in 1997, seeks to extend such pleasures through a variety of literary essays on subjects ranging from maenads, George Santayana, bathing boys, and twentieth-century dance. I emphasise *literary* because Dellamora's collection remains primarily interested in textual encounters of an unorthodox variety, and it is therein that the book is invariably limited in its critical scope and appeal. Without charting a broad, culturally inter-disciplinary excursion into the innumerable expressions and manifestations of sexual dissidence during the Victorian period, the book remains modestly inclined towards *aesthetic* elaborations of sexual non-conformity and posture. Despite some unevenness in the collection, however, the book is a helpful supplement to the ongoing academic romance with Victorian sexualities and serves as a provocative introduction and anticipation of work to come from many of its contributors. Dellamora's introduction attempts to provide a broad and thoughtful consideration of contemporary concerns in gay studies and queer theory, thus situating his own collection in a continuing dialogue within these fields of study. He begins by describing how the "gaying" of Victorian studies by a variety of prominent critics (Miller, Sedgwick, Craft, Cohen) has contributed to an intellectual expansion in the sexual, cultural, and social dimensions of the discipline. In contrast to earlier critics from the 1970s who were initially interested in introducing an "explicitly gay" thematics into literary criticism" (4), Dellamora points out that the new critical approaches share an interest in developing what Eve Sedgwick has described as an "anti-homophobic inquiry": a strategy of locating "the overt homophobia of traditional literary criticism while specifying an agenda of undoing such effects" (4). Such a strategy would foreground a distinctly queer critical sensibility, although, as Dellamora notes, even such enquiry is potentially lacking in focus: "Anti-homophobic inquiry tends to ignore other aspects of dissidence; for example, the connections between sexual and cultural dissidence in cultural production in women" (5). It also conceptually depends upon the structure of Sedgwick's well-known formulation in *Epistemology of the Closet* that knowledge in the twentieth century has been promoted within the confines of a heterosexual/homosexual binary (4-5), thereby mooring theoretical discussion in the acknowledgement of the very binarism that undermines the possibility of a more radical critique. For Dellamora, sexual dissidence does not necessarily base itself in such binary terms; rather, its strongest imaginative powers are registered in the desire to expand and express itself beyond the limitations of mere oppositions and distinctions. It is thus the premise (and promise) of *Victorian Sexual Dissidence* that its

essays gesture toward possibilities of style, thought, and embodiment that disrupt our more readily accepted structures of sexual discourse.

What I find lacking in Dellamora's introduction is a sense of specific argument and debate — in other words, an engagement that does not simply intrude into the prevailing academic issues at hand, but one that willfully departs from the status quo to pursue an originality of design, and a risk of thought and practice. His discussion is succinctly generalised and has popular currency, although it does not appear to contribute anything new towards notions of Victorian sexuality or sexual practices. Moreover, the book does not adequately present any eloquent reasoning for the diversity of its essays apart from the possibility that their common point of interest lies in a meagre theoretical disagreement, rather than any kind of intricate sense of interdisciplinary scholarship. Reading the essays, one can perceive that this is certainly not the case, but the introduction does not sufficiently address their pertinence. If anything, it seems as if Dellamora offers an introductory summary, rather than a new step into the thick of things.

With the title of his collection provocatively alluding to Jonathan Dollimore's study *Sexual Dissidence: Augustine to Wilde, Freud to Foucault* (1991), Dellamora sets up what appears to be an interesting intellectual debate, although the terms of that debate remain somewhat reduced in scope and especially bland. For Dollimore, Wilde's dissidence is typically postmodern — he represents a dispersed subject in opposition to the kind of unified self championed by modernist aesthetics, whose inclinations towards abstraction signal, according to Sedgwick, a more egregious exemption: "the 'figuration' that had to be abjected from modernist self-reflexive abstraction was not the figuration of just *any* body, the figuration of figurality itself, but, rather, that represented in a very particular body, the desired male body" (see Sedgwick 167). Dellamora believes that as attractive as Dollimore's characterisation of Wilde's transgressiveness may be, it still circulates speculation around a binarism between modernist and postmodernist aesthetics, or centred/decentred positions, which replicates further binary structures — the very structures that measure the impasse of current sexual theories. Dellamora wishes to reevaluate and overcome these terms insofar as they are inadequate for characterising texts, sexualities, and realities that disprove Dollimore's schema (as an example, he posits Radclyffe Hall's Stephen Gordon as an example of a schizophrenic subject *avant la lettre*). This sets the stage for the essays in *Victorian Sexual Dissidence*, which presumably are meant to offer reparative readings in the face of this disagreement with Dollimore's theoretical position. Yet Dellamora's own theoretical arguments never gain the necessary momentum to prove the originality of his own intentions, regardless of the intrigue they generate. One cannot help but feel that Dellamora's commitment is weak or uninspired, hovering at the level of response rather than assertion.

The essays taken as a whole provide not so much a sense of a common perspective, as they suggest a general tendency amongst all the writers to foreground sexuality as a luminous subject, boiling beneath the constraints of repressed social and aesthetic settings. The first part, "Re-gendering Aestheticism," deals explicitly with issues of Victorian gender subversion: Kathy Psomiades's essay "Still Burning from this Strangling Embrace": Vernon Lee on Desire and Aesthetics," describes how Lee's initial satire on male heterosexual aestheticism in her novel *Miss Brown* is transvalued, through a fascination for the Pre-Raphaelite desire for the female body, into an erotic/aesthetic form of Paterian impressionism, one which becomes distinctly lesbian for Lee. Yopie Prins's marvellous piece "Greek Maenads, Victorian Spinsters," charts the entry of women into Greek studies by focussing on the way in which the writing couple of Katherine Bradley and Edith Cooper, a.k.a. "Michael Field," and the classicist Jane Harrison, managed to reformulate the oppressive masculinity of Victorian Hellenism. Prins is attentive to literary and historical nuances, and neatly shifts from lucid cultural explorations to rich literary observations, as in her description of how Walter Pater's appreciation of Dionysus not only subverted contemporary representations of masculinity, but also provided a stimulus for imagining same-sex desires between women. Martha Vicinus's "The Adolescent Boy: Fin-de-Siècle Femme Fatale?" interestingly examines the cultural image of the teenage boy as symbol for not only homosexual transgression, but lesbian fascination as well. Vicinus is at her best when she follows the image of the boy through various literary representations, building multi-layers of complexity to unfold his marginalised character, but the essay seems more of a summary, if not a preparatory excursion into, an even larger argument surrounding the image of the boy at the end of the nineteenth century.

The second part of the book, "Revisionary Decadence," brings together essays that describe shifting attitudes towards manifestations of the late nineteenth-century sexual subject. Thais Morgan's essay "Victorian Effeminacies," reads the famous 1872 attack by the literary critic Robert Buchanan on what he called the "Fleshy School" of poetry — Morris, Swinburne, and Rossetti — as reflecting the contemporary Victorian discourse surrounding the security of the heterosexual male. She traces the mobility of the word "effeminacy" as it migrates into the shadow of the love that dare not speak its name, and accumulates via its metaphorical transformation a perverse mark of its own frailty and disgust. Morgan's essay is certainly thoughtful and lucid, especially in its range of examples from Pre-Raphaelitism to two young men arrested for crossdressing in London's West End. But the essay appears somewhat matter-of-fact and uncomplicated in its assertions, lacking some of the wonder and nuances of some of her other writings on the period.

In a similar vein, Denis Denisoff's piece "Men of My Own Sex": Genius, Sexuality, and George Du Maurier's Artists," describes Du Maurier's attitudes toward

effeminate aesthetes as constituting an argument in support of the heterosexual male who stands to be challenged by a corrupting homosexual adversary, one who by way of contrast, brings the identity of the former into focus as his own is viciously slighted according to the terms of a homophobic discourse. Regenia Gagnier continues her work in aligning aesthetics, desire, posture, and consumption in the essay "Production, Reproduction, and Pleasure in Victorian Aesthetics and Economics," while Oliver Buckton's strong concluding essay to the section, "'Desire without Limit': Dissident Confession in Oscar Wilde's *De Profundis*," offers an unique revision of common readings of Wilde's final epistolary masterpiece that identify it as an indication of his eleventh-hour lapse into conventionality and religion. Buckton maintains that Wilde conceives of *De Profundis* as yet another fiction that challenges and complicates his endless shifts between faces and forms, masks and postures. Agency in the letter — more specifically, the distinct roles played by Wilde and Bosie in Wilde's downfall — is complicated as the letter "demonstrates Wilde's resistance rather than capitulation to those coercive pressures of ideology with which he was confronted. The prison letter destabilizes the confessional integrity of the individual (sexual) subject by splitting its characteristics between Wilde himself and the figure of 'Bosie,' thereby revealing the autobiographical critique of a 'past self' as an ideological fiction, while also making manifest the desiring intersubjectivity of 'author' and 'reader'" (176).

The third and final part of the collection, "Dissident Aesthetics," brings together perhaps the most eclectic and provocative of the essays in the volume, which move from literature and philosophy, to painting and dance. Eric Haralson's "The Elusive Queerness of Henry James's 'Queer Comrade': Reading Gabriel Nash of *The Tragic Muse*," examines the life of a queer character in one of James's fiction as both a representation and de-articulation of the emerging body of the homosexual in fin-de-siècle Europe — an entrance that both signals exposure and surveillance of that performance's eventual downfall and punishment. Christopher Lane's "George Santayana and the Beauty of Friendship" helpfully reexamines selections from the neglected philosopher's work in an effort to discuss a complex tension in his writings between sexuality and aesthetics. Lane's most explicit intention here appears to be a desire to reintroduce and literally bring "out" Santayana into contemporary discussions of sexuality, as well as to properly contextualise his work as anticipating and indeed operating within many of the erotic discourses of his period. His introduction of Santayana into such debates is both lucid and instructive, although Santayana does often seem to be inadequate and out of league in terms of sophistication and refinement when compared to figures like Pater or Wilde, not to mention his own Harvard pupil Wallace Stevens. Robert Sulcer's essay "Ten Percent: Poetry and Pathology" attempts to draw a relationship between the emergence of the homosexual with the parallel development of literary close reading in the academy, while Andrew

Hewitt's final essay "The Dance of Life: Choreographing Sexual Dissidence in the Early Twentieth Century" marks an intriguing trajectory through Havelock Ellis and T.H. Hulme in order to elucidate how images of dance in the late nineteenth century were recuperated in the early years of modernism with their full, conflicting aspects of sexual dissidence. I reserve particular praise for Julia Saville's penultimate piece, "The Romance of Boys Bathing: Poetic Precedents and Respondents to the Paintings of Henry Scott Tuke," which brilliantly analyses a recurring motif in Victorian poetry and painting as not only a site for dissent sexuality, but also as a theoretical argument about the genre of romance. Saville (and here she follows Patricia Parker) posits painting against literature as the medium capable of stalling narrative progress in favour of the type of endless postponements and deferrals that romance manifests. Tuke's paintings become covertly transgressive canvasses that betray and seduce acceptable social subjects: superficially innocuous and hence publicly acceptable, they also contain those perversities consigned by society to the levels of rumour, if not extinction.

Victorian Sexual Dissidence is best read as introducing a varied selection of essays that forecast works in progress in an ever increasing area of intellectual research. One could compare Dellamora's volume to another similar collection, *Sexualities in Victorian Britain*, edited by Andrew H. Miller and James Eli Adams (1996), although it significantly lacks the latter's extraordinary cultural range and wonderful curiosity. And yet, read as another contribution to the field, *Victorian Sexual Dissidence* is a rich reminder of how deviant sexuality, despite its ostensible resistance to progress and procreation, finds its necessary bloom not merely in carnal knowledge, but in textual promiscuity and the lures of a disruptive aesthetic tradition. It is as a result of the kindness of present critics and strangers, readily turning the covers for the past, that the robust memory of Victorian sexualities can be brought out as something infinitely more splendid than mere innuendo or scandal. (JACQUES KHALIP, DUKE UNIVERSITY)

Works Cited

- Dollimore, Jonathan. *Sexual Dissidence: Augustine to Wilde, Freud to Foucault*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1991.
- Miller, Andrew H., and James Eli Adams, eds. *Sexualities in Victorian Britain*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1996.
- Sedgwick, Eve Kosofsky. *Epistemology of the Closet*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1990.

"R. W. FRANKLIN, ed. *The Poems of Emily Dickinson*. Variorum Edition. The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press. 3 vols. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1998. Pp. 1664. US \$125.00 cloth; *The Poems of Emily Dickinson*. Reading Edition. The Belknap Press. 1 vol. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1999. Pp. 704. US \$29.95 cloth.

In 1955, prefacing Thomas H. Johnson's first variorum Dickinson (also three volumes, and under the same imprint), the publisher wrote "Harvard University, through its Press, is proud to publish Mr. Johnson's definitive edition...." It is perhaps hubristic to call any edition "definitive," and although Johnson's entailed a great deal of painstaking labour, it was not beyond criticism. In 1967, The University of Wisconsin Press published R. W. Franklin's *The Editing of Emily Dickinson: Reconsideration*, which bears all the marks of having begun life as a doctoral dissertation.

Franklin, who acknowledged that "for patience and expertise I owe much to the University of Massachusetts Photograph Centre and the Wisconsin State Crime Laboratory," presented himself as a formidable if respectful critic; but whatever notice his book attracted did not reach as far as Harvard Yard. In another dozen years, things were to change.

I should declare an interest here. I had myself begun to take an interest in editing Dickinson and in the late seventies began preparing a text for a "Selected Poems," working from microfilm courteously supplied by Harvard's Houghton Library. In 1980, when I visited Harvard hoping to proceed with this relatively modest undertaking, I found that textual work on Dickinson was shut down till Franklin had re-edited the variorum, which, the Harvard University Press Permissions Officer to whom I spoke told me, would probably be in about six years' time.

In 1981, the first fruits of Franklin's editorship appeared, *The Manuscript Books of Emily Dickinson*, two fat volumes from Belknap which offer in facsimile what we might call Dickinson's own file copy of her poems — in manuscript, of course. There are nearly a thousand poems here, and, if less than a complete resource, they give the armchair critic an unmatched insight into the quandaries of editing from mss. (following Franklin, I shall refer to these volumes simply as MB with page number — the pagination of the two volumes is sequential). After this, apart from a few frustrated letters in the *TLS* — and no doubt elsewhere — in the eighties, silence prevailed till late in 1998, when the first advertisements appeared for Franklin's new variorum.

Was it worth the wait? That rather depends on what one might have been waiting for, as shall emerge in what follows. It certainly looks as if Franklin had done enough work to fill the intervening years, and some sense of his industry might be conveyed by glancing at his fourteen appendices. Appendix 11, for example, lists emendations. From it, we learn that Franklin has not only changed the possessive "its" to

Dickinson's habitual "it's" when the text comes from "secondary sources" (poems which survive only in other people's transcripts or as printed), but four times in poems from her own mss. On the other hand, while he has twenty-four times changed "upon" to "o'pon" in secondary sources, the holographs are apparently perfectly consistent in this idiosyncrasy (certainly the spelling is clear in every instance I have noticed in MB) until, apparently, 1880. There are other, singular cases where Franklin has emended a holograph's normal form to an eccentric one — so "hadst," for example, becomes "had'st," "theirs," "their's"; more beguilingly, "emphazized" is emended to "emphacized." These emendations are apparently made for the sake of consistency; but why should consistency of this kind be imposed? Most of Franklin's listed emendations, it should be said at once, are proper and kindly corrections of momentary lapses. So, for instance, in Franklin's poem 645 (in Franklin's variorum the poems are numbered sequentially throughout the three volumes, as they had been in Johnson's; F645 — as I shall give Franklin's numbers — had been J383), "Exhilaration is within," "visitor" is emended to "visor." I choose this example because on another occasion Franklin apparently emends "visitors" to "visitors," but does not register it as an emendation at all. This is in "I dwell in possibility" (F466, J657, MB495). Perhaps it is not an emendation at all? The "e" in "visitors" in F466 is quite different in form from the "e" in "visitor" in "Exhilaration is within" (see MB751). Both forms are used indiscriminately by Dickinson, but where Franklin notes himself as emending in F645, the "e" could not possibly be taken for an "o" (see MB751); the form in "I dwell in possibility," however, is not *utterly* unlike some of Dickinson's "o's" — indeed, in "Occupation" in the very next line of the poem, the reader can see an "o" that looks very similar (MB495). Trivial in itself, this will serve to draw attention to a kind of difficulty with Dickinson's handwriting conceded by neither Johnson nor Franklin, a matter to which I shall return.

Other appendices are more or less interesting. On the face of it, the most important appendix is 9, "Additional Poems, Separate Poems, Excluded Texts." Here we find that Franklin has seventeen poems not appearing in Johnson; that what were five poems in Johnson have now become twelve in Franklin; and that "Five texts treated as poems" by Johnson are excluded, three of them, however, happily reappearing in appendix 13, which offers "some prose passages in Emily Dickinson's early letters and notes [which] exhibit characteristics of verse without being so written." None of this turns out to be very significant: if you want to consider the aphorism "Life is death we're lengthy at, / Death is the hinge to life" a poem, it is probably the best of the new inclusions ("Fly - fly - but as you fly" at seven lines is the longest, but seems of interest only as Franklin's re-construction as verse of scribble on the back of a flyer: this is another question to which I must return). The disjoining and rejoining of poems affect no significant work, and merely stress how little Dickinson

had prepared her mss for other eyes: readers may check MB3 and decide whether they are looking at one poem (Johnson) or three (Franklin) — not altogether frivolously, I would suggest two. Finally, two “poems” that Franklin has excluded turn out to be variant fragments of other poems included in letters; Johnson seems to have been perfectly aware of this, but to have thought that variance and difference in date justified separate entries. Franklin’s decision that they don’t seem obviously the correct one.

Pointing to the over-elaboration of appendices is the simplest way to suggest Franklin’s scrupulosity and attention to detail. It is impossible in a review, however, seriously to consider the real weight of Franklin’s work. Like Johnson, he has arranged the poems in their chronological order as he understands it. As readers will have noticed from the few examples I have given, the disparity in sequence between the two editors is very marked: clearly Franklin has been at great pains to establish all that can be established about Dickinson’s “workshop procedures” from exhaustive examination — though this time without the help of the Wisconsin State Crime Laboratory — of every relevant scrap of paper; his generous acknowledgments at the back of the third volume give some idea of how widely he trawled for material. In the nature of things, Franklin’s sequencing of the poems is likely to be subject to correction here and there, but it is hard to imagine that much of his work will be subverted. On the other hand, so far as I can see, this re-ordering of the poems throws no new light on their nature.

I have not yet pointed out that the closing chapter of Franklin’s *The Editing of Emily Dickinson* is called “The Present: The Question of a Reader’s Edition.” Johnson, in introducing his own variorum, had written:

The problem of reproducing her capital letters is complicated by the manner in which she formed them...[Many] are simply enlargements, and decisions about them often had to be made on the basis of probability...She herself was arbitrary and inconsistent in her use of capitals; some poems use none within a line except for proper nouns; others are freighted heavily with them...Her use of the dash is especially capricious. Often it substitutes for a period and may in fact have been a hasty, lengthened dot intended for one. On occasion, her dashes and commas are indistinguishable. Within lines she uses dashes with no grammatical function whatsoever. *They frequently become visual representations of a musical beat.* Quite properly such “punctuation” can be omitted in later editions, and the spelling and capitalization regularized, as surely she would have expected had her poems been published in her lifetime. Here however the literal rendering is demanded. [emphasis added]

Most literary academics, I think, regard the editors of their texts as highly-qualified experts and do not question their procedures; few would so much as have read the editorial “Notes on the Present Text” from which I have just quoted. At any rate,

when in 1960 Johnson published a one-volume *Complete Poems* “intended as a reading text,” i.e., absolutely free of the massive apparatus of the variorum, he quietly abandoned his earlier good intentions, falling back on the dotty notion — so different in tenor from everything surrounding it — I italicised in the passage just quoted: “Punctuation and capitalization remain unaltered,” Johnson now writes:

Dickinson used dashes as a musical device, and though some may be elongated end-stops, any “correction” would be gratuitous. Capitalization, though often capricious, is likewise untouched.

I called the idea that Dickinson’s dashes are a musical notation “dotty,” but in one form or another it became widespread: an account of some of its manifestations is offered in Franklin’s chapter “The Present: The Question of a Reader’s Edition” before he makes three points against it which seem unanswerable. First, Dickinson’s markings vary from copy to copy of the same poem: thus, it is only Johnson’s arbitrary — one might say wrong-headed — rule that “Where there is a choice among texts for principal representation, the earliest fair copy is selected” which yields us a copy of the well-known poem “Success is counted sweetest” with only two perfectly functional dashes in its twelve lines rather than, say, the text Johnson gives in his notes which has fifteen dashes (actually, a text of intermediate merit, which Johnson says in his notes was “written at the same time,” could as easily have been chosen, and is supposed by Franklin to be the earliest copy — J67 of F112); Franklin produces other instances, and indeed they could be multiplied indefinitely. Second, “a free use of capitals, but more particularly of dashes, is frequently found in nineteenth century hand writing, particularly that of women” — and this, he points out, can be documented from the letters etc. of Dickinson’s own circle.

Finally, “Dickinson used her characteristic habits of writing whenever she wrote. Examples have survived wherein she copied passages from Swinburne, Emerson, George Herbert, and the Bible. In these copies she translated type into her own peculiar writing, complete with capitals and dashes where they had not been.” More humble is Dickinson’s transcription of a neighbour’s recipe for coconut cake, the facsimile reproduction of which affords Franklin a rare accession of high spirits:

If we follow John Crowe Ransom’s theory, the capitals are Emily’s “way of conferring dignity” upon the ingredients of Mrs. Carmichael’s cake, or are her “mythopoetic device” for pushing Butter, Flour, 6 Eggs, and a Cocoa Nut (grated) into “the fertile domain of myth.” At the same time, according to Charles R. Anderson, we are asked to use the punctuation here as “a new system of musical notation for reading” the recipe. Or, applying Miss Stamm’s theory, Emily Dickinson has not only got the recipe, but has

indicated how one is to declaim it, though in this case since the dashes are nearly level, a monotone should be used — even on Mrs. Carmichael's name.

Franklin calls of course for a proper reader's text: "the editor will have to work over the manuscripts in a sensitive endeavor to determine where amid Emily Dickinson's inconsistency he can find clues to help him along. The task is difficult, but possible."

There is no clear consensus about what a "variorum" should be. I lean towards the idea of a copy text arrived at by careful collation, with full annotation; the copy text shorn of the apparatus would provide the "reader's edition." Johnson's is an edition of record: the copy text is the result of arbitrary choice among disparate texts, all editorial labour beyond transcription (not itself an easy task of course) having gone into the apparatus. Given the task of re-editing the variorum, Franklin apparently abandoned thoughts of a readers' text. Having criticised Johnson's choice of copy texts as arbitrary, he evaded that charge by simply presenting *all* texts without preference. On the vexed questions of capitalisation and punctuation, Franklin is now more brusque than Johnson ever was, saying bluntly that "this edition follows... within the capacity of standard type, her capitalization and punctuation." But this is not transparently true.

Johnson, we will remember, did say that dashes often "may in fact have been a hasty lengthened dot intended for [a period]," and "on occasion her dashes and commas are indistinguishable." It always amazed me — this is a criticism never made by Franklin — that he never took into consideration whether the marks under scrutiny were, so to speak, at ground-level or waist-high, and always leaned to the dash though it is often the less plausible alternative. In the new variorum, Franklin appears to outdo Johnson in this respect: I shall point to just one example turned up while idly checking poems mentioned — for whatever reason — in Franklin's introduction. Comparing their transcriptions of the version of "The soul that hath a guest" found at MB592 (J674, F592), we find that in punctuating the third line Johnson offers only a comma at the end; Franklin replaces this comma with a dash, and adds a dash half-way along. What the facsimile reveals are two downward, backward sloping flecks (in my own notes I used to call these "reverse commas") *millimetres below the line*. Franklin's representation of these marks as dashes seems to me as misleading as anything of this kind perpetrated by Johnson, and I think it not atypical.

I pointed out earlier that Dickinson's "e's" and "o's" are confusable. These are not the only ambiguous letters. So, in "Doom is the House without the Door" (F710, MB802), Franklin reads as "dye" what all previous editors have read as "die." Either word makes sense, and Franklin's "dye," if less obvious, seems to me finer. Against "die" is the lack of anything like a dot above it, and an undotted "i" would be very rare in Dickinson; against "dye" is simply the fact that what we have does not resemble

most "y's" by Dickinson (or anybody else). But there *are* very similar "y's" to be found, for example in "syllable" on MB808 and in "delayed" on MB 809. Franklin, who shows unfailing respect for Johnson's decipherment, surpasses him here. For all their prowess, though, neither Johnson nor Franklin appears to have recognised a graver source of potential ambiguity than we have yet looked at. If we turn again to "I dwell in possibility" (MB495) and look at "Paradise" in the last line, we will notice that the first "a" is properly closed at the top, but the second is not. This is not uncommon, and when Dickinson's "a's" gape, they look much like her "u's". So, looking at the holograph copy of "The birds began at four o'clock" (MB965), it seems more reasonable to read it as "The birds began at four o'clock" (comically enough, in his other text, taken from a transcript by one of Dickinson's cousins, Franklin emends "began" to "began," noting that Frances Norcross had first written "began" and then changed it to "began": our scholarly editors are quick to assume that the amateurs who went before were meddling "improvers"; it seems as likely in this case that Frances decided that her initial transcription was incorrect.) Obversely, in "I was just this time, last year, I died" (J445, F344, MB349-50), in line 18 the past tense "hung" seems preferable to the "hang" offered by both Johnson and Franklin, and just as plausible as a decipherment of the facsimile.

Franklin's variorum was the original subject of this review, and my initial conclusion was that it made a reader's edition seem remoter than ever. It was then a surprise to find, belatedly, that Belknap had published a Reading Edition within a year. This was enabled by shunning the thousands of editorial decisions I had envisaged in favour of a few general rules. "About three fourths of the poems exist in a single source. For the rest, with from two to seven sources," Franklin writes, "the policy has been to choose the latest version of the entire poem, thereby giving to the poet, rather than the editor, the ownership of change." Prima facie, this is a great improvement on Johnson's principle of choosing the *earliest* text; but the "integrity" of individual texts is the same as Johnson's, and since a large part of what's at issue is most sensibly supposed accidental, a simple change of rule of this kind is no substitute for collation.

More draconian is his policy with variants. In her own fascicles, Dickinson recorded a great many alternative readings for words, phrases or lines, most commonly at the bottom of the page. It is the scrupulous task of choosing among these that Franklin, following Johnson, has evaded. "The policy has been to retain the primary readings," he writes, "unless Dickinson indicated a different preference. Revisions have been adopted when Dickinson cancelled the primary readings in favour of change." He adds, "Sometimes in lieu of cancellation, Dickinson underscored her preferred reading... underscoring expressed her will, much as cancellation did, and has been similarly followed."

The only bit of this I find really cogent is the reference to "cancellation": when Dickinson actually crosses out her original words, there can be no doubt about her intention; underlining a variant at the foot of the page seems to me hardly comparable. But it is the blanket dismissal of all other alternatives that I find indefensible: their very existence suggests at least passing dissatisfaction with the original, and often they offer increased clarity or vigour.

Not always of course. Franklin gives as an example of his policy "the famous poem 'I'm nobody! Who are you?' (F260, J288), which read originally, as Franklin transcribes it,

I'm Nobody! Who are you?
Are you - Nobody - too?
Then there's a pair of us!
Don't tell! they'd banish us - you know!

How dreary - to be - Somebody!
How public - like a Frog -
To tell your name - the livelong June -
To an admiring Bog!

Because they are underscored, Franklin accepts the two alternatives offered, "advertise" for "banish us" in l.4 and "one's" for "your" in l.7. To me, "banish us" seems much clearer and stronger than "advertise," and "one's" not a clear improvement on "your." It seems more than chance that Franklin here has ended up with a text identical, including accidentals, with Johnson's: plodding along comparing texts in their "reader's editions," it occurred to me that I might most simply convey my growing sense of how little change had been wrought by Franklin's decades of labour by enumerating Franklin's differences from Johnson in a run of twenty poems. I happened to start with J577 and went on to J596, just because that was where I was up to when the notion struck me.

In these twenty poems Franklin has reduced five of Johnson's capital letters to lower-case, but also promoted three new ones (to put this in perspective, we should notice that there are thirty-five gratuitous capitals in the first poem alone); thrown in two dashes and one comma that Johnson had spared us; six times restored Dickinson's apostrophe to possessive "its" — and once each to "ours" and "yours"; once run two quatrains together to form a block of eight lines; once restored Dickinson's spelling "upon" for "up"; and corrected one misprint. There are in these twenty poems over sixty places where Dickinson offers alternative readings. "It ceased to hurt me, though so slow" (J584, F421) offers the only "underscored" alternative, so both editors substitute "benumbed" for "obscured" in l.4. For Johnson, this apparently entailed,

logically, the acceptance of "feel" for "see" and "Anguish" for "trouble" (both in l.2) though Dickinson had underlined neither. Franklin is made of sterner stuff, preferring his principles to the poem's sense. Actually, there are five other places in these twenty poems where Johnson, against his declared policy, has accepted variants for no better reason than that they are improvements! Franklin is undeviating.

The last subject to which I promised to return concerns the representation of Dickinson's manuscripts as verse. This could be argued about at enormous length; here, I can only suggest the kinds of problem presented. J1645 presents "a draft jotted down on the inside of a slit-open envelope" as eight lines of straightforward verse:

The Ditch is dear to the Drunken man
for is it not his Bed -
his Advocate - his Edifice -
How safe his fallen Head
In her disheveled Sanctity -
Above him is the sky -
Oblivion bending over him
And Honor leagues away

This is reconstituted from jottings which according to Franklin's apparatus (F1679, variorum) are as broken as this: "The Ditch/ is dear to the/ Drunken man/ for is it not / his Bed - his / Advocate - his/ Edifice - / How safe his / fallen Head/ In her disheveled / Sanctity - / above him / is the sky - / Oblivion bending / over him // and Honor / leagues / away." Franklin reproduces this as *seven* lines, conflating Johnson's second and third lines because this is one place where the exigencies of her scrap of paper *don't* impose a break.

In her more orderly manuscripts there are similar problems: she used paper which frequently forced her to break lines, and she had a tendency to break lines phrasally, which with her erratic capitalisation often gives an appearance of deliberate lineation. These traits together afford Johnson, and Franklin even more, the opportunity to display scrupulous fidelity to the manuscripts' accidentals, manifesting scorn for those earlier editors who strait-jacketed Dickinson into regular quatrains. Alas, one of Dickinson's strengths is her ear for clear simple rhythms — and yes, usually quatrains — which these editions do what they can to obscure. (EVAN JONES, UNIVERSITY OF MELBOURNE)

*GERALDILEROY and JULIE BERTRAND-SABIANI. *La Vie littéraire à la Belle Époque*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1998. Pp. 382. FF 158; EUR 24.09.

The authors of *La Vie littéraire à la Belle Époque* acknowledge that innumerable books have been devoted to this period, but claim their work differs by avoiding the usual focus on major artists and works and instead using a liberal adaptation of Pierre Bourdieu's notion of the *champ littéraire* to create a detailed exposition of the literary environment that determined how writers of the period, major or minor, practiced their craft. Their considerable success is the result of the energy and industry they apply to the task — especially their unusual attention to periodicals whose number and range give a refreshed vision of the whole literary scene of the period from the 1880s to 1914. Overall, this is a valuable background study, as I found myself while working through its dense statistical data. At the same time, I was reading or rereading Maupassant's *Bel-Ami*, the parts of Arnold Bennett's *Journals* covering his extensive sojourns in Paris from 1897 on and Michel Picard's recent docu-novel, *Freud à Nancy* (Éditions Autrement, Paris, 1997). The chapters in *La Vie littéraire* covering the popular and literary press usefully filled out the context of journalistic life in Paris which is one of the most interesting elements of *Bel-Ami*. Picard's detailed recreation of the literary/political scene in Nancy during Barrès's promotion of anti-Semitic nationalism there, during Freud's visit in 1888, is usefully expanded by the Parisian literary/political background supplied by Leroy and Bertrand-Sabiani. The wide and detailed coverage of the theatre in Paris nicely answers some of the questions raised by Arnold Bennett in his fascinated efforts to explore the minutiae of literary life in Paris at the time.

Similarly, the early chapter dealing with the literary salon will be of value to any reader of Proust. It both validates the delicate nuances of Proust's social differentiations within the salon class and places his work in the context of a whole genre of salon literature. The interaction between this literature and the actual salons is shown to create a sort of self-referential *mise-en-abyme* in which the admission of artists into the salon enables them to study the salon and its *habitués* and reflect the results back to the socially-privileged members, who are then delighted or chagrined to recognize themselves in works that may also expose them to the vulgar gaze of the excluded masses. The range of works surveyed runs from the sychophantic and flattering in Bourget to the savage ridicule of Hervieu and Hermant, with Proust falling somewhere in between — more ironic than aggressive.

Other chapters cover theatre, newspapers and periodic press, academic institutions, avant-gardes, women, literary criticism, writers' revenues and literary geography, all pretty much confined to the Paris scene. The strategy of coverage is simple and effective. Each chapter gives a broad overview of its subject to emphasize the range and diversity typical of the period. This is supported with a quite remarkable

range of statistical data: tables of theatres with genres of works presented, lists of plays performed, of literary prizes presented, of little reviews published, of incomes of *femmes de lettres*, and so on. The focus then narrows to between two and four contrasting examples that represent in detail the range of material in the period. For example, the chapter on mainstream reviews, while noting that 257 reviews were published between 1890 and 1914, concentrates on *Revue des Deux-Mondes*, *Mercur de France*, *NRF* and *Cahiers de la quinzaine*. The chapter on the avant-garde pays special attention to *La Revue blanche*, *L'Humanité* and *L'Effort*, without ignoring the huge number of ephemeral which multiplied like web-pages with similar hopes for the permanence of ephemeral movements: "le Vers-librisme, le Décadence, le Magnificisme, le Magisme, le Naturisme, le Jammisme, le Synchrisme, le Somptuarisme, l'Intégralisme, l'Impulsionnisme, l'Umanisme, le Futurisme, le Dramatisme, le Simultanisme, le Druidisme et bien d'autres encore" (252). When André Salmon, in 1903, tried to get his first poems published in *Mercur de France* he was told they had a three-year backlog. They suggested that he publish a journal of his own — all he would have to do was to find a voice that was different from the other 1748 journals then being published in Paris! Valéry is quoted as recalling the rich diversity: "Une foule de publications éphémères de libelles singuliers, d'opuscules où l'oeil, l'oreille, l'esprit trouvaient des surprises extrêmes.... Des groupes naissant et mourant, renaissant, s'absorbant l'un l'autre ou se disaient à chaque instant, témoignant d'une vitalité océanique dans les profondeurs de la littérature imminente" (234). The detailed coverage of the periodical press over several chapters is one of the main strengths of this book. Among other things, it provides a broader sense than is usually given of the literary context of *l'Affaire Dreyfus* and it shows that the publication of major new foreign writers in translation was much more extensive than a list of published books would suggest.

In the chapter on the popular press and extending into the chapters on periodicals and on "Les femmes et la littérature" the phenomenon of the *feuilleton* is examined as it extends over several areas, from the daily papers to literary journals, including feminist journals and the attempts by *L'Humanité* to promote an educative form of *roman-feuilleton* for workers. Though it gave publishing opportunities to new writers, including women, the voracious appetite of the popular *feuilleton* was scorned by many critics much as TV series are now — as a pernicious trap demanding formulaic writing and stifling promising talents. The sheer volume and popularity of the genre even led some critics to predict the death of the book (*plus ça change...*). André Salmon again provides an example of the young writer's experience. He recalls writing at two sous a line, governed by his editor's instructions, "Donnez-nous du passionnel, mais chaste quand même" modified after a test period by, "J'ai remarqué que vous aviez du tact. Alors je vous permets un peu d'adultère" — upon which the gleeful Salmon rushed home to make his chaste heroine, a *baronne*, who had incarnated the highest virtues claimed by the Faubourg Saint-Germaine, "se diriger en vitesse sur l'atelier d'Alcide le séduisant peintre mondain" (111-

12). This field, as many others, was governed by hierarchy. Writers of *feuilletons* could not aspire to election by the Academy, but members of the Academy could write *feuilletons*.

The genre of work to be presented in a given theatre determined the dress to be worn by the audience. On page 73, the authors reprint a list from the *Paris-Parisien* of 1896 specifying in Proustian detail the code of male and female dress suitable for each of eight levels of theatre — a code whose precision could have given Barthes a new passage for his *Mythologies*. In the chapters on theatre and the avant-gardes, the book shows the breakdown of generic hierarchy within drama, as naturalistic drama, thesis-drama and other avant-gardes make their way into the fashionable theatres and change the onstage mirror of the elegant audience from a flattering reflection to a satirical or scandalous one. In the process, the war between the theories of naturalism and symbolism in poetry and theatre is chronicled.

Other chapters deal informatively with the academies and prizes and with literary criticism — largely focussing on a contrasting study of Brunetière, Lanson and Maurras. The chapter on "literary geography" deals entirely with Paris as the unquestioned centre and surveys literary districts, location of publishers, literary cabarets and clubs (including the *Club des hydropathes* and the *Concert des Décadents dans la décennie* important to the Decadent movement detailed in the chapter on *Avant-gardes politico-littéraire*). The chapter on writers' incomes sets forth the usual contrast between the wealth of the few "stars" and the general penury of others.

The position of women is touched on in many places, but principally in the chapters on Salons and on women and literature. The movement between these chapters is from women as *égéries*, furthering the careers of male writers and their entry into the Academy, to a major primary role — so that, by 1894, Octave Uzanne could number 2133 women as "*femmes de lettres*" (264). This figure rises to 5000 by 1907 though statistical sources are unreliable. At a time when the salary of a female elementary school teacher was similar to that of a laundress, writing offered a possible alternative. The chapter lists feminist journals, including the women's political journal wittily named *La Fronde*, and the establishment of prizes such as the *prix "Vie heureuse"* and the "*Femina*." But it also shows the ambiguities of female successes in the face of intransigent male prejudice, epitomized by Émile Faguet in *Je sais tout* of September, 1907: "*Partant de ce point de vue que le roman — sauf, bien entendu le roman de haute portée sociale ou de très large thèse philosophique — est indigne de l'homme que son intelligence réserve à d'autres travaux, je trouve logique et bon que les femmes s'y adonnent*" (284-85). The related opinion that "*Les femmes n'ont aucun don pour l'art dramatique*" (256) was denied by the evidence of seven plays by women presented in major theatres in the year 1907 alone and by the founding of a feminist theatre on rue Blanche in 1897 and a theatre of ideas by Hélène Slatof in 1909 (286-87). In a debate that recalls the recent arguments over

"le ministre" or "la ministre" for female members of cabinet, the journal *La Vie heureuse* noted in 1906 that there was still no accepted term for women writers and set the most eminent philologists to find one. *Auteuse, autrice, autresse, auteresse, autresse*, were all rejected in favor of "*femme-auteur*" (266).

Informative as it is, *La Vie littéraire à la Belle Époque* is cruelly diminished by the lack of an index. As shown above, there is constant cross-reference of subjects between chapters. It is essential to be able to link the many references to journals, to women's writing, even to individuals. For example, one of the main subjects in the chapter on "*Tradition et innovation*" in journals is Péguy and the *Cahiers de la quinzaine*, but Péguy recurs importantly in the chapters on the academies, on literary criticism and on literary geography. This happens again and again, making reference back to the book on specific subjects an unnecessarily arduous chore. The authors are hardworking and meticulous researchers and the only explanation I can think of for the missing index is that the series of which the book is a part (*Perspectives Littéraires*) has made one of those lunatic editorial decisions, dictating that all books in the series must follow a norm that excludes indices. The cost of a few pages is saved and a useful book loses half its value.

As for overall content, what the book communicates more than anything else is a fever of cultural activity, remarkable for the sheer volume of enterprises in each category and at least partly driven by the great wound of the defeat of 1870 and a sense of German superiority in conventional areas that builds desire for a French alternative. The resulting surge in cultural activity is supported by avant-garde reviews that create, educate and inform audiences which come largely from the much-maligned bourgeoisie. The book makes it clear why Paris was the centre of artistic innovation for the years 1880-1914. Others had powerful movements, but not the volume of interdisciplinary ferment fuelled by a public interested in the avant-garde nor the driving desire of the *Tout-Paris* not to miss out on the latest *prodigue*. (FRED RADFORD, UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA)

URSULA BÄHLER. *Gaston Paris dreyfusard. Le serviteur dans la cité*. Préface de Michel Zink. Paris: CNRS (CNRS Histoire), 1999. Pp. 226. FF 140.

Si le nom de Gaston Paris est connu des historiens depuis leurs premiers travaux sur l'Affaire Dreyfus, il demeure en arrière-plan dans les discussions, et le rôle du médiéviste n'a jamais été étudié de près. Ce manque d'intérêt, de la part des historiens, ne concerne pas spécifiquement Gaston Paris mais s'étend, comme l'observe Ursula Bähler, à la plupart des "dreyfusard[s] modéré[s]" (11), l'attention ayant porté surtout sur les cas les plus "extrêmes des deux camps" (12). L'ouvrage de Bähler donne à

Gaston Paris la reconnaissance que ses activités, privées plus que publiques, appellent entre 1897 et 1899, c'est-à-dire du moment où les efforts des dreyfusards vont vers l'ouverture d'un second procès, en passant par la condamnation de Zola (46) et la fondation des ligues, Ligue de la patrie française et Ligue des droits de l'homme (113). L'absence de Paris au sein de la Ligue des droits de l'homme, que ses amis dreyfusards Paul Meyer et Paul Desjardins ont énergiquement contribué à fonder, suscite "une question dérangeante" (176) sur laquelle termine Bähler.

Bähler situe son étude dans la constellation de travaux parus depuis vingt-cinq ans sur le peu de support à la cause dreyfusarde chez les historiens et les philologues, dont les chartistes, que l'article de 1989 de Bertrand Joly, "L'École des chartes et l'affaire Dreyfus", étudie dans leur ensemble, article avec lequel les mises au point de Bähler forment une sorte de dialogue tout au long de l'ouvrage. Les interventions en faveur de Dreyfus par Gaston Paris comme par l'historien Gabriel Monod — correspondant cher à Paris, ce qui le rend très présent dans les documents et discussions — sont à relier, selon Bähler, aux pratiques en vigueur dès les premières années d'existence de "l'École" [l'École] des [autres] [Études]" (174). Bähler relève, à ce sujet, l'importance des "principes scientifiques" (168) ramenés d'Allemagne (170), notamment par Gaston Paris, et mêlés aux valeurs universalistes (168) issues des Lumières. Les méthodes historico-comparatives qui recoupent "l'esprit" (168) de l'École auraient fourni un cadre à partir duquel la vision des chercheurs peut passer de l'objet d'étude donné par leur discipline aux questions sociales et politiques de leur temps. La philologie aurait, depuis, perdu de vue le terrain social, délaissé au profit de "travaux hyperspécialisés" (175, note 18), point qui mériterait d'être poursuivi par une réflexion sur la redistribution des intérêts des disciplines, la sociologie, entre autres, qui a largement récupéré le champ social.

L'expertise reconnue à la philologie à la fin du dix-neuvième siècle donne à l'intervention de Paul Meyer et d'autres chartistes au procès Zola (42-44), de même que dans la révision du procès de Dreyfus à Rennes (137-40), une autorité pour se prononcer sur le particulier, par exemple sur l'état de documents contestés. Un souci pour la justice comme valeur fondatrice de la République, ce qui s'exprime sous la forme d'un impératif de recherche de la vérité (32), anime les déclarations dans la presse écrite, desquelles Gaston Paris est fréquemment absent bien que certains de ses amis et collègues lui demandent de joindre son nom à leurs actions (voir, par exemple, 39-44). Le grand intérêt du travail de Bähler tient donc dans la mise à jour des lettres échangées entre Gaston Paris et ses correspondants autour de l'Affaire et conservées, pour l'essentiel, au département des manuscrits occidentaux de la Bibliothèque nationale de France (12). La présentation des lettres, des manifestes pour lesquels la signature de Paris a été sollicitée, et ses interventions dans la presse, comme sa lettre ouverte à Albert Sorel dans *Le Figaro* qui relève les "lacunes" et les "obscurités" (119)

du manifeste fondateur de la Ligue de la patrie française, est assortie de commentaires et introductions de Bähler qui permettent de s'y retrouver dans les événements et de connaître un peu mieux les personnages évoqués tout en offrant une lecture de ce qui peut motiver Gaston Paris dans ses choix de soutien officiel au camp dreyfusard ou dans sa décision de n'encourager que de loin certaines actions.

Une annexe rassemble un assez grand nombre de lettres reçues par Gaston Paris, auxquelles Bähler fait de temps en temps référence dans le corps de l'ouvrage. Parmi les documents en annexe figurent deux cartes postales rédigées en anglais par Paul Meyer (198-99), qui séjourne un temps à Londres comme il l'avait fait dans son auto-exil au moment de la Commune. L'usage de l'anglais peut suggérer que l'un et l'autre correspondants ont pu redouter une surveillance de la part des autorités, ainsi qu'il apparaît déjà dans ce que Paris écrit à Monod le 12 octobre 1898, "[...] j'ai craint que la lettre n'ait été interceptée" (103). On peut regretter que ne soit pas discuté plus avant le mystère de la "main inconnue" (36, note 35) qui a pris copie — sous la dictée de Paris? — de l'ensemble des lettres reçues par Monod de Gaston Paris; d'autant qu'une lettre de Monod, quelques mois avant la révélation du "faux Henry" (56-57), qui va contribuer à rendre possible la révision du procès, rappelle les philologues, Meyer et Paris compris, aux enseignements de leur propre discipline, c'est-à-dire au risque qu'il y a "se fier aux copies" et à la nécessité de privilégier l'original (185).

Le modèle de l'original et de la copie, à cette différence près qu'ici la copie devance l'original (18) ou fait même rupture avec lui (35), se reforme dans l'évocation que fait Bähler du couple père-fils, Paulin et Gaston. Dans son portrait d'un jeune Gaston Paris hésitant sur la voie à suivre professionnellement, Bähler quitte ponctuellement son étude de cas pour recourir à une vérité générale — procédé qui se répète à un autre endroit de l'ouvrage, voir p. 163 — qui tient mal au regard critique: "[...] rien, pourtant, n'indique qu[e Gaston Paris] va se consacrer un jour entièrement à l'étude de la littérature (française) du Moyen Âge, bien que l'idée même d'une telle carrière ait dû lui être naturellement familière, comme l'est toujours, pour l'enfant, la profession du père" (15). Les rapports de "succession" (18) entre Gaston Paris et Paulin Paris devraient trouver une place dans l'ouvrage en préparation de Bähler sur "la pensée scientifique de G. Paris" (125, note 247).

En conclusion, et pour se replonger dans le sujet principal du livre, l'Affaire Dreyfus, le ralliement de Gaston Paris à la cause dreyfusarde est, comme le précise Bähler, une question "de justice et non pas de religion" (150; voir aussi 37). C'est dans cette optique qu'est discutée une "remarque explicitement antisémite" (149) de Paris relevée dans une lettre adressée à Paul Meyer et tout à fait exceptionnelle dans la correspondance consultée par Bähler. L'explication qu'elle en tire suggérerait un désir de mise en contexte historique si ce n'est que Bähler se tourne vers A. Compagnon et ce qu'il dit du sujet dans son ouvrage sur *Brunetière* (1997), où il argumente pour une

étude de l'antisémitisme comme phénomène tout compte fait synchronique, sans passé ni devenir à considérer, et surtout sans la perspective des camps. Or, pour prendre la mesure de ce que peut être la violence antisémite dans les remous de l'Affaire Dreyfus, il n'est pas nécessaire d'anticiper sur l'histoire du vingtième siècle, ni même de remonter de quelques années jusqu'à *La France juive* de Drumont, le moment où s'exprime Gaston Paris rappelant aussi à la mémoire les pogroms de l'Europe de l'Est. (STEPHEN STEELE, SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY)

PETER EDGERLY FIRCHOW. *Emissioning Africa: Racism and Imperialism in Conrad's Heart of Darkness*. Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky, 2000. Pp. xvi + 258. US \$34.95.

When Conrad's *Heart of Darkness* appeared in the February, March and April issues of *Blackwood's Magazine* in 1899, it was indeed timely, coming upon the exotic stories of Burton, Speke, Livingstone and Stanley in Africa and appealing to a very strong European interest in matters of imperialism and empire. Two years earlier, Queen Victoria had celebrated her Diamond Jubilee; Queen of England, Empress of India, monarch of the British Empire, she was "rule" of about one-quarter of the world's people.¹ Imbued with the highly ambiguous rhetoric of "enlightenment" and "progress," colonialist doctrines of power, profit and civilisation were widely entrenched in British imagination and practice, the legacy of centuries of European adventuring and widespread fascination in exploration, the unknown and those activities of intrepid white travellers in the world's "dark" places. Indeed, there was included in *Blackwood's Magazine* itself, in the June 1898 issue and six months before *Heart of Darkness*, an article about the Elizabethan adventurers, Drake, Raleigh and Co, those referred to by Conrad's frame narrator as "great knights-errant of the sea" (8), and the April 1898 issue included "Life and Death in the River Niger," an article about an up-river steamer trip in Africa.² In 1899, the year of Conrad's own journey into the Belgian Congo, the explorer Stanley published *In Darkest Africa*, the account of his Congo expedition to rescue Emin Pasha, a text that uses the metaphors of light and

darkness so common in imperialist discourse³ and so important in Conrad's short novel.

Heart of Darkness is one of the most widely read and discussed novellas in world literature.⁴ Following the varieties of early response, from Garnett's enthusiasm for a "psychological masterpiece" to Leavis's famous misgivings, later readings frequently locate Marlow as a spokesman for British imperialism, for a system dedicated to efficiency, work and restraint, suggesting thereby that the text's criticism is directed not so much at imperialism in general as at the Belgian administration for falling short of the "civilising" ideal. Achebe's strident attack upset the appellation. When he declared Conrad a "thoroughgoing racist" and *Heart of Darkness* "an offensive and deplorable book," he set the postcolonialists scrambling.⁵ Perhaps the most accurate de-termination comes from Said in *Culture and Imperialism* in which, with careful definition, he suggests that Conrad was both anti-imperialist and imperialist, able to denounce the corruptions of overseas domination but unable to concede the independent history and culture of African and South American countries.

Coming into this debate, Firchow's research is exact and interesting. He locates *Heart of Darkness* within the cultural poetics of its production and within the later history of its reception, a history inseparable from developments in postcolonial theory and practice. Using "imagology," or what might also be defined as ideological analysis, he looks again at the procession of images of race, nation and imperialism, taking issue with Achebe to argue that Conrad's repeated attention to ambiguities, ironies and contradictions resists Achebe's denunciation of the book and its author. Understandably, given Marlow's insistent emphasis upon cultural position and perspective and upon the difficulties of seeing and understanding, this is a common line in Conrad criticism. Whatever else it is about, *Heart of Darkness* is about the complexities of human action and, like *Lord Jim*, it offers a case for careful consideration before any rush to judgement. As Firchow points out, its analogues are many and they are important not only aesthetically but also in terms of the text's political and cultural value. He presents a salutary reminder too of the place of the

3 In *Conrad's Western World*, Norman Sherry traces the possible influences of Stanley's expedition and writings upon Conrad's work. Whether or not this influence was direct, Stanley's exploits were so celebrated in the British press that they become part of the context of production. Stanley's books were all bestsellers; *In Darkest Africa* sold 150,000 copies in England and was translated often.

4 I have addressed some of the critical history in a short article "Conrad's *Heart of Darkness*: History and the Politics of Reception." In addition to Achebe's controversial critique, some of the most significant 'postcolonial' responses are those by Brantlinger, Burden and Said.

5 See, for example, the responses from Frances Singh of India and C.P. Sarvan of the University of Zambia.

1 An estimate provided by Cedric Watts in his introduction to Conrad 1990, p. viii. According to Harry Magdoff, western powers in 1878 held 67 per cent of the earth's surface and 85 per cent in 1914 (Magdoff 1978, 29, 35.)

2 See Hampson's discussion of resemblances between this article and *Heart of Darkness*.

comic, of the interplay of the farcical and the serious in Conrad's work, as further evidence of its complexity.

Taking Marlow's expression of feelings of kinship with the black Africans, Firchow links this with Conrad's claim that he was transformed by his Congo experience. Whereas Achebe accuses Conrad of depriving the Africans of language, and therefore of culture and dignity, of reducing their speech to gibberish, Firchow emphasizes "kinship," reinterprets the meaning of grunts and suggests that if Conrad is racist it is only in a "weak" or superficial sense. His post-Darwinian reading includes effective attention to anthropological writings and to Stanley's cultural relativism in *Through the Dark Continent* as one other indication of a contemporary's self-conscious emphasis upon perspective. Furthermore, he is correct in drawing attention to the fact that Conrad does not focus upon any deficiencies in the Africans' language but, rather, upon narrator Marlow's newness and limitations. Even so, as he points out, Marlow is shown to be responsive to the Africans' modes of communication, attempting to understand them across the barrier of his own ignorance as visitor to another culture. It was historically the case that many British explorers tried to learn the languages of African peoples and Firchow offers examples from Livingstone, Glave and Stanley.

What about Kurtz, the universal genius gone mad in the jungle, this alleged paradigm of civilization's regression in the face of the primitive? Firchow examines the models from history (including Norman Sherry's preferred candidate, Arthur Hodister), none of whom quite fits the character, and focuses rather upon questions of function and mediation, upon what Kurtz signifies and the processes by which he is realized in the fiction. Mediated by Marlow, Kurtz is a phantom figure, not only imperialism's Faust but also, in Marlow's analysis, the composite of an original and a sham, this conception that addresses context and holds truth *sous rature*. If Kurtz is a bearer of the sacred fire, he is also the charismatic figure as victim, the one who succumbs to temptations that are held to be both contextual and personal. The context of appreciation is varied, including material from late nineteenth-century newspapers and journals, Conrad's essays and letters, and a century of critical history. Thus Firchow suggests that "unspeakable rites" more likely includes religious rituals and ceremonial human sacrifice than the popular emphasis on exotic sexuality. It is a line supported with reference to Edward Glave's writing, another fascinating first-hand source about life in the Congo, and with Captain Rom, a station chief at Stanley Falls, as another possible model for Conrad's portrait of Kurtz.

There is a lot of information available about the Belgian administration in the Congo. Leopold II of Belgium was proclaimed "Sovereign of the Congo Independent State" in July 1885 and his high-minded assurances about the development of civilization were based upon a perception of Europeans facing the dire challenges in Africa of "primitive barbarism." Denunciations of the regime are common and Glave's

accounts take their place alongside those from Edmund Morel and Roger Casement that have featured prominently in Conrad criticism. Firchow's review is close-checking and suitably alert to matters of influence, rhetoric, and perspective. His analysis of links between Glave, Marlow and Kurtz is speculative. He makes allowance, for example, for the social and economic transformation of the mid 1890s in the Congo, the defeat of the Arabs and the shift, with increasing atrocities, from ivory to rubber production. Concluding that there is no evidence of systematic genocide while acknowledging the severity of conditions and the fact that black Africans died horrifically from starvation and disease, he holds that "some contemporary critics lie about Conrad and his celebrated novel because they find his depiction of the Western imperialist treatment of Africans to be insufficiently 'dark' to satisfy their sense of what 'really' occurred in the Congo Free State (and in Africa generally) at the close of the last century." So, Firchow suggests, they darken the "dark" text further, in acts of interpretation that emphasize the charge of racism at some cost to Conrad's use of Marlow, the notion of kinship and the challenge of understanding.

It is very likely that *Heart of Darkness* will remain a site for contentious rereadings and "extra-literary" discussion. Specific and mythic, based upon and yet transcending actual experience, it invites further attention not only to the history of European imperialism but also to those processes, exchanges and negotiations involved in discussions of identity, politics, power and understanding. Peter Firchow's study makes an important contribution to Conrad criticism. Attentive to main movements in the interpretation of *Heart of Darkness*, he brings these together with particular interest in possible connections and displacements between Conrad's experience, life in the Belgian Congo, and the fiction. His case for continuing research and self-conscious analysis is impressive. *Envisioning Africa* offers a cautionary note against reductive readings by demonstrating the interplay of contexts operative in all such acts of criticism. (BRIAN EDWARDS, DEAKIN UNIVERSITY)

Works Cited

- Achebe, Chinua. "An Image of Africa: Racism in Conrad's *Heart of Darkness*." *The Massachusetts Review*, 18 (1977): 782-94, reprinted in Conrad 1988, 251-62.
- Brantlinger, Patrick. "Victorians and Africans: The Genealogy of the Myth of the Dark Continent." *Critical Inquiry* 12 (Autumn 1985): 166-203.
- . *Rule of Darkness: British Literature and Imperialism, 1830-1914*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1988.
- Burden, Robert. "Conrad's *Heart of Darkness*: The Critique of Imperialism and the Post-Colonial Reader." *L'Époque Conradienne* 18 (1988): 63-83.
- Conrad, Joseph. *Heart of Darkness*. Ed. Robert Kimbrough. New York: W.W. Norton, 1988.

....*Heart of Darkness and Other Tales*. World Classics edn. Ed. C. Watts. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1990.

Edwards, Brian. "Conrad's *Heart of Darkness*: History and the Politics of Reception." *Appreciating Difference: Writing Postcolonial Literary History*. Eds. B. Edwards & W. Ommundsen. Geelong: Deakin UP, 1998.

Said, Edward. *Culture and Imperialism*. London: Chatto and Windus, 1993.

Sarvan, C.P. "Racism and the *Heart of Darkness*." *The International Fiction Review* 7 (1980): 6-10.

Sherry, Norman. *Conrad's Western World*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1971.

Singh, Frances. "The Colonialistic Bias of *Heart of Darkness*." *Conradiana* 10 (1978): 41-54.

*STEFANIA MICHELUCCI. *L'orizzonte mobile: Spazio e luoghi nella narrativa di D.H. Lawrence*. Alessandria: Edizioni dell' Orso, 1998. Pp. 245. ITL 30.000.

Stefania Michelucci's book *L'orizzonte Mobile: Spazio e luoghi nella narrativa di D.H. Lawrence (Movable Horizons: Space and Places in the Narrative of D.H. Lawrence)* is one of those works which have the tendency to leave its readers both impressed and confused at the same time. Impressed because after a careful reading of her book, one can hardly fail to recognize it for what it is: an admirable, and important contribution to Lawrence studies. Nonetheless, we are also left somewhat mystified by the book's apparent familiarity. This is so because much of *L'orizzonte mobile* is a masterful accumulation of ideas that have been circulating in Lawrence criticism chiefly within the past two decades.

Seen in this light, Professor Michelucci may be regarded as a kind of Isis figure, tirelessly gathering the many parts which have been scattered about in order to restore them to a whole. And this, it should be added, is no mean achievement. For, like her mythical counterpart, Professor Michelucci has had to employ a great deal of creative acumen in order to achieve her goal.

What is the goal of *L'orizzonte mobile*? The answer is expressed most succinctly for us on page 18:

Anche la letteratura...organizza gli spazi e i luoghi, li carica di significati relazionali, il che ci permette di affermare che, per lo meno in molto casi, la geografia (o topografia) dell'opera letteraria costituisce un sistema di relazioni significative.

(Literature too...organizes spaces and places, charging them with significant relationships, which in turn allow us to affirm that, at least in most cases, geography (or topography) in works of literature comprises a system of significant relationships.)

The more attentive Lawrence scholar will undoubtedly recognize that in the above quotation, Professor Michelucci is not so much referring to Lawrence's famous, and often over-used phrase "the spirit of place," but rather to something a little more direct, and in some ways more personally driven. Professor Michelucci is alluding to the complex, yet all too crucial interplay between individuals and the places which they inhabit. It is a subject which has been raised by numerous commentators, yet surprisingly, no major study exists which allows us to fully acknowledge its importance within the Lawrence canon. Moreover, Professor Michelucci achieves this feat within barely two hundred pages, and after covering nearly every relevant piece of fiction written by Lawrence.

L'orizzonte mobile breaks down this plenitude of works in chiefly four groups or phases. The method is chronological in nature, but by the end of her book, she will have accomplished a good deal more than simply provide an historical guide to Lawrence's opus. Instead, one of the strengths of the book is precisely the way she skillfully demonstrates how Lawrence's works increase in technique and sophistication while pointing out some of the thematic features they share in common. Having accomplished this task, she continues to relate these works to each other so as to increase the reader's appreciation of Lawrence as an artist.

The first of these phases or groups of works examined by Professor Michelucci in *L'orizzonte mobile* is comprised of Lawrence's early efforts: *The White Peacock* (1911), *The Trespasser* (1912), and *Sons and Lovers* (1913). Already in the first two books, Professor Michelucci clearly shows Lawrence's concern, visible throughout much of his career, with duality: nature versus culture, senses versus intellect, town and country, north and south etc. And she is undoubtedly correct to suggest (as others have before her) that the breakthrough work for Lawrence is without question *Sons and Lovers*. The earlier works had been essentially dead ends, with their respective heroes either remaining in a static environment (*The White Peacock*) or regressing to the nineteenth-century tendency of the romantic, melodramatic act of suicide as in the case of *The Trespasser*. In *Sons and Lovers* however, Lawrence presents a hero, Paul Morel, whose connection with his milieu is alive, as well as forward looking.

More than a straight forward *Buildingsroman*, *Sons and Lovers* charts Paul's complicated and often painful journey between nature and culture. These two spaces within the book are occupied by Miriam (nature, and Willey Farm), and Clara, (culture, and the town). The young man's more sensitive moments undoubtedly take place during his long-standing relationship with Miriam (her rival, Paul's mother Gertrude, becomes a third member of a rather complicated *ménage à trois*). As expected, much of the action takes place in the countryside in and around Willey Farm, showing Lawrence at the height of his descriptive powers. Clara, on the other hand, initiates Paul into the world of culture, and in due course, provides him with his first satisfying sexual

experience. Here Professor Michelucci's explanation of the boundaries separating town and country does justice to Lawrence's own delicate treatment of the subject.

But it would be an oversimplification, if not an error, to suggest either nature or culture as supreme. Rather, it is more correct to suggest that the two should be seen as an inevitable and natural process. In fact, the sexual encounter between Paul and Clara found in the chapter "Passion" takes place in the country within much the same 'natural' milieu as the lovemaking between Paul and Miriam. Moreover, if Miriam and Willey Farm represent a kind of limitation which Paul must in time overcome, the town also is not without its own kind of limitation. We need but remember the memorable chapter "The Pompador" in *Women in Love* (1916; 1920) which reminds us of the over-refined, and claustrophobic life in the city of London:

Gudrun hated the Café [Pompador], yet she always went back to it, as did most of the artists of her acquaintance...It was as if she *had* to return to this small, slow, central whirlpool of disintegration and dissolution... (WIL, 380).

The picture one forms from this passage is similar to that of a seedy, half-lit, bar which often served as the setting for some Post-Impressionist painters.

Both *The Lost Girl* (1920), and *Aaron's Rod* (1922) comprise the next group in Professor Michelucci's study. The novels are usually referred to as the 'Italian novels' as their respective protagonists leave England for more fulfilling lives on the continent in the years following the Great War. The chapter is called "L'inizio della quest" (the beginning of the quest), and with good reason. The books, as Professor Michelucci explains, initiate the long drawn-out debate of North and South which stimulated, as well as bewildered Lawrence through much of his literary life. The pattern established in these two books — that of the protagonist's initial contact with the Other, and the eventual repudiation of such a life — is one that would be repeated in many other works written by Lawrence.

Not only does it prove impossible for these protagonists to "merge" with such foreign peoples, in later works they (usually heroines) meet with tragic consequences and even death when they attempt to cross cultural lines. One thinks for example of the titular heroine in "The Princess" whose search for adventure after a life of silent despair leads her to a calamitous end which is more desperate and pathetic than before her adventure. In another story written at about the same time, "The Woman Who Rode Away" (1925), the nameless heroine's search for a more spiritually-fulfilling life leads ultimately to her sacrificial death at the hands of the Chilchui Indians of the Sierra Madre in Mexico.

Thus, far from believing (as some critics would have it) that Lawrence encouraged such intimate union with the Other, there is more evidence to believe the opposite is true. Lawrence had never wavered since writing in *A Study of Thomas Hardy* (1914) that "merging" between races essentially different from each other would prove inimical to both sides in the long run, despite the best of intentions. Such a view found its way two years later into the pages of his first Italian travel book *Twilight in Italy*. Here Lawrence takes great pain to assert this position, outlining the philosophical as well as cultural differences which keep the English speaking people separate from the Italians (The North-South dialogue). Such point of view has strong echoes in Bakhtin's own work on the Other though the two men never knew of the other's existence. This, despite Lawrence's friendship with the Russian-born critic, S.S. Koteliansky. For instance, in *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays* (1929), Bakhtin goes on to say that "Such a dialogic encounter of two cultures does not result in merging or mixing. Each retains its own unity and open totality, but they are mutually enriched" (7, tr. Vern W. McGee). Realizing the relevance of Bakhtin's theories to Lawrence's travel literature, it is surprising nobody has yet explored such a coincidence at length.

Along with her chapter on *Sons and Lovers*, Professor Michelucci's most suggestive chapter is her penetrating analysis of *The Rainbow* (1915). Her description of the gradual decline of the Brangwens of Marsh Farm is as sensitive and moving as the book which she is writing about. And Professor Michelucci does not miss the irony of Lawrence's magnificent novel in the fact that though it opens with an extensive historical perspective, by the end we will have not only seen the farm washed away by flood, but also witness its slow and subtle metamorphosis from an agrarian, parochial setting, to one that is increasingly more aware of its place in the universe. Indeed, *L'orizzonte mobile* plots the almost imperceptible shift from a stagnant rural existence preserved chiefly by men, to a more dynamic and complicated life initiated primarily by women. As well, Professor Michelucci examines the way in which women achieve an increasingly important role between the sexes and become the catalysts for change on Marsh Farm. It is a modern world which, as Lawrence has said elsewhere, the men have lost their nerve and have been, temporarily at least, superseded by the more forward looking women. This point is especially evident in chapter VI of *The Rainbow* titled "Anna Victrix." Here Will's confusion and timidity as he watches his pregnant wife Anna dancing uncontrollably leaves little doubt that he himself is no longer the object of respect and veneration as had been the case in the past. Instead, she now gives her troth to something beyond the familiar spaces occupied by the men, to "The unseen Creator who had chosen her, to whom she had belonged" (183, Penguin). In turn, Anna will give birth to Ursula who will extend herself even further and attempt to separate herself from the Marsh Farm altogether. Her determination to become a teacher places her outside the typical experience, and the rainbow she witnesses at the

end of the story is the promise of a new dawn. A new kind of personal and social contract then develops between men and women which is not always appreciated in Lawrence but does not go unnoticed by Professor Michelucci. In one of the most astute observations made on Lawrence she concludes that

L'etica del rispetto nella polarità sulla quale Lawrence fonda le relazioni tra i sessi, costituisce anche per lui, il cardine di quelle tra diversi popoli e culture.

(The ethic of respect of polarity upon which Lawrence founds the relation between the sexes, for him also constitutes the key element that exists between diverse peoples and cultures; 171).

Professor Michelucci, I believe, has come closer than most in understanding the seemingly contradictory quality in the writing that in turn is responsible for the suggestive richness in Lawrence. In other words, his views on women and the Other should be seen as much more complementary than is usually the case. In fact, in a previous essay titled "D.H. Lawrence's Discovery of the Etruscans: A Pacific Challenge," Professor Michelucci brilliantly illustrates how Lawrence champions *difference* over brutal assimilation with respect to Roman expansion.

Ultimately then, it is the interplay, or the connection between the characters and their environment which holds readers of *The Rainbow* as if under a spell. Moreover, Professor Michelucci is surely correct to consider the book the most "Hardy-esque" of all the major novels written by Lawrence. And Lawrence's superb analysis of Hardy's *The Return of the Native* (1878) may be used to explain his own method in *The Rainbow*: "This is a constant revelation in Hardy's novels: that there exists a great background, vital and vivid, which matters more than the people who move upon it" (*Phoenix* 419).

But, as impressive as Professor Michelucci's study of the major novels undoubtedly is, another striking feature of *L'orizzonte mobile* is its handling of the "minor" works of fiction. Here Professor Michelucci carefully sketches the manner in which short stories are used by Lawrence either to "test" certain ideas before applying them to the more ambitious pieces of fiction, or to complement longer works which may have been written around the same time as a novel. For instance, she notes how some of the short stories in *The Prussian Officer* (1914) closely resemble what is found in *Sons and Lovers*. In the short story "Second Best," for instance, the heroine allows herself to be courted by the young peasant after her previous suitor establishes himself in the city and becomes engaged to a lady. This parallels almost perfectly the early life of Mrs. Morel in *Sons and Lovers*. Equally obvious is the case of another short story, "The Sick Collier," which presents the strife between the collier and his wife that

becomes such an important feature in the novel. Finally, it is also instructive to regard the figure of Mrs. Bates in "Odour of Chrysanthemums" in relation to that of Mrs. Morel in the more ambitious novel. *L'orizzonte mobile* also examines, to a more than satisfactory degree, how such stories as "The Woman Who Rode Away," and "The Princess," both anticipate and differ from the more ambitious work *The Plumed Serpent* (1926).

Throughout the whole of *L'orizzonte mobile*, Professor Michelucci's control of her sources is admirable, and the conclusions she draws from them are never simplistic or hurried. It is precisely this kind of thoughtfulness and lightness of hand which allows her to present a work that is as precise as it is suggestive. When moved to do so, her confidence in her subject matter leads her to question even the conclusions of an L. D. Clark with respect to *The Plumed Serpent*, cognizant of the fact he has spent most of his adult life reading Lawrence's "American Novel." But of course she does so with sufficient grace and tact.

L'orizzonte mobile has already begun to raise a few eyebrows within Lawrence studies. Indeed, another intelligent commentator of Lawrence, Jill Franks, is at present poised to produce an English translation of Professor Michelucci's book. There is little doubt that once this is done and greater access to the book becomes possible, even more admirers of Lawrence will come to recognize the value of *L'orizzonte mobile*. There is little doubt but that the book will remain the standard study on the subject for a long time to come. (ANTONIO TRAFICANTE, YORK UNIVERSITY)

*JAMES R. KINCAID. *Erotic Innocence: The Culture of Child Molesting*. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 1998. Pp xi + 352. 24 illustrations. Appendix. US \$24.95, cloth.

On the topic of sexual child abuse, books abound: books to help the survivors of molestation, books that tell children how to avoid pedophiles (and if need be, poke out their eyes and kneel them in the groin), and books that delineate the medical and/or psychological profiles of pedophiles. One question remains unanswered: Why all this talking in the first place? Why does our culture devour stories about sexual child abuse and kiddy-porn, maintain the discourse at a fever pitch, and cry out in unison for the chemical castration of convicted (and sometimes not yet convicted) pedophiles? For those who enjoyed James R. Kincaid's *Child-Loving: The Erotic Child and Victorian Culture* (Routledge, 1992), you will be happy to know that he has turned his perceptive, and delightfully irreverent, lenses on late twentieth century culture. In *Erotic Innocence: The Culture of Child Molesting*, Kincaid thoroughly examines contemporary America's predilection for talking about pedophilia and the sexuality of children. His method is,

as he says, to provoke scandal by way of "[s]ufficient rudeness, clamorous boorishness," "the disruptive pressure of simple nose thumbing," and "pies in the face" (26). Do not be misled by his unconventional method; Kincaid has done his homework. This book is intended for a general audience who do not require a barrage of footnotes to Philippe Ariès, Sigmund Freud or Michel Foucault. Picky academics will have to read *Child-Loving* for that. His style is playful, completely disrespectful of the "rules," and therefore utterly refreshing.

Kincaid draws his material from the popular cultural domain: a diverse sampling of actual cases featured extensively (nay, lavishly) in the media, as well as Hollywood movies, urban legends and milk-carton images that circulate in our daily psychic lives. Here is a man who appears to have watched every relevant film, read every newspaper and magazine article (and letters to the editor), every community anti-pedophile pamphlet and government study, and heard every report on the radio while eating his oatmeal in the morning. Unlike other studies on the topic of sexual child abuse, Kincaid examines the general story, the form that it takes, rather than the individualized or personalized accounts. Kincaid finds that the general story falls into the realm of the literary Gothic, replete with images of besieged innocence and panting monsters. This incredible cultural narrative gives shape to the way we perceive children, sexuality and transgression, and also fashions the way individual tales of abuse are told. In fact, the discourse has become so naturalized that we pay very little attention to our collective logical leaps and hysterical reactions. Such an assertion about a complex issue is reductive, but his cultural critique reaches beyond mere reductive reasoning. His study establishes the nature of the discourse surrounding sexual child abuse and pedophilia, along with a close examination of the various techniques we use to eroticise the body of the child, allow the Gothic tale to proliferate, while simultaneously disavowing the subject matter.

That both the "child" and "sexuality" are modern inventions are not beleaguered points in his inquiry, as they have been made time and time again. His main point is that these two constructs became hot-wired together in the nineteenth century. As he states: "Despite the loud official protestations about children's innocence, our Victorian ancestors managed to make their concept of the erotic depend on the child, just as their idea of the child was based on notions of sexual attraction" (52); this is a botched Victorian legacy that we have been dealing with ever since.

Central to Kincaid's argument is the idea that our culture "has enthusiastically sexualized the child while denying just as enthusiastically that it was doing any such thing. We have become so engaged with tales of childhood eroticism (molestation, incest, abduction, pornography) that we have come to take for granted the irrepressible allure of children" (13). Furthermore, he argues that the pedophile is a culturally constructed demon onto whom we pour our own revulsion and guilt. Of course, he

does not claim that pedophiles do not exist. Instead, he asks why a statistically minor problem has been transformed into one of grave cultural and societal import. He dares to ask what motives are satisfied in tales of sexual child abuse, and proposes that "what these stories do for us is keep the subject hot so we can disown it while welcoming it in the backdoor" (6). He opens his inquiry (and thus frames his analysis) with the true story of "Mary Baxter," a high school teacher who was accused of having sexual relations with a then 16-year-old student. He teases out various threads of the discourse, its sources, and the scripted roles played by both victim and accused. Even more interesting is Kincaid's assertion that our role in the story is that of disguised voyeurs (48) whose motives are more prurient than we may care to admit. Kincaid argues that we are feasting on monstrous pleasures while disguising our voyeurism with our self-righteous, table-thumping indignation.

Our indignation, Kincaid finds, is rather hypocritical. Everywhere in our culture, the erotic appeal of children is on display: advertising, the fashion industry, movies and, of course, the thousands of beauty pageant titles available to tots every year. This we take for granted. But in order to screen ourselves from the fact that we are loading sexuality onto the child, we, in perfect Gothic-melodrama-mode, create a hyperbolic threat to the child (a.k.a. "innocence") in the figure of the pedophile. Even more hyperbolic is our talk of child-defending, a talk that is borrowed from "warm-up-the-lynch-mobs harangues" (75). These "myths of protection" (76), as Kincaid calls them, are based on assurances that there really is a crisis of epidemic proportions, a crisis on the rise, threatening, no less, the very fabric of society. Kincaid's examination of the statistics aptly demonstrates that the epidemic does not, in fact, exist. But we bolster our talk by expanding the categories to create ever more potential pedophiles, as well as what constitutes sexual abuse. Crisis-mongering "is based entirely on making the definitions, like the ooze in *The Blob*, cover more and more territory" (79).

Amidst all the crisis-mongering and righteous protection, our iconic worship of the child is further reinforced by films that feature little cutie-pies such as Shirley Temple and Maureen O'Hara. Kincaid's incredible survey of Hollywood films "especially those with hearty pedo-plots" supports his argument that these films pander to our culture's need to project our nostalgia for the perfect childhood, a projection that is co-mingled with soft-eroticism. But there is an "agony that accompanies nostalgia, the pain we feel when we look at beautiful children" (140). This agony and pain is reflected in a resentment toward children so ferocious that we feed on tales of juvenile crime, toddler molesters, and on films that feature children so fiendish, audiences cheer when the little monsters are killed.

On the topic of monsters, readers will have the most fun in Chapter 6, "Myths, Legends, Folktales, and Lies" in which Kincaid's playful humour is permitted an unfettered romp through our culture's most bizarre story-telling landscapes. In the

1980s and early 1990s, fabulous tales of alien abductors, the "epidemic" of ritual abuse, the "multi-billion-dollar" kiddie-porn industry (a tale still very much with us), child kidnapping rings, and satanic daycares, produced the hottest chatter. "These folktales take such extraordinary forms," Kincaid believes, "because our wild panic on the subject of children and sex effectively rules out moderation and reason" (167). And this lack of moderation is even more pronounced in the way we execute "justice" in spectacular court cases, what Kincaid calls the "litigational Super Bowls" (205), such as the McMartin Daycare fiasco and the trial of the Menendez brothers. Our sex-talks of imperiled innocence also include prominent figures such as Woody Allen, Michael Jackson, Boy-Scout leaders, college presidents, priests and teachers. No Gothic tale is complete without a priest with broken celibacy vows, and we have to agree with Kincaid that there is something suspicious in the way we imagine "an ordinary classroom as a bordello, a place charged with erotic passion (rather than the smell of wet wool, peed pants and old uneaten lunches)" (218).

Kincaid devotes two chapters to the theory of repressed and recovered memory, in our tale of sexual child abuse, as it manifests in mainstream consciousness. In Kincaid's formulation, to recover a memory of childhood sexual abuse is to have memory conform to a set of shared cultural beliefs. And more importantly, it provides a simple, linear, causal narrative. "What we find when we ask whence we sprang and why we are the way we are is the child fashioned by our culture, a culture that seems to understand itself and formulate its fables of being in reference to child molesting" (240). Unfortunately, this plot looks less like the Greek tragedy that Freud imagined, and more like "sodomasochistic theatre" (251) or a "Gothic theatre of sin and punishment" (252).

"Other Stories, Other Kids" is an apt title for the final chapter. Kincaid offers possible escape routes from the Gothic nightmare of sexual child abuse. His conclusion seems so simple; that is, to tell "other stories" about childhood. In good self-help fashion, Kincaid draws up a list of seven bad habits we need to drop in order to fix our culture's psychic lives. I personally liked the suggestion that we stop "treating family life as if it originated in the House of Atreus" (285), but his other points are just as important: that we stop seeking monsters everywhere, finding the sinister in everything, and accepting such simpleminded, causal past-oriented narratives that require nothing but blind rage. He imagines a collaborative effort on the part of "storytellers charged with creating tales about the happiness of children, stories Blake would like and Lewis Carroll and Dostoevsky and Gandhi and Groucho Marx" (291).

Kincaid's playful style does not obscure his major point, which he states bluntly: children (REAL children) in our society are imperiled not by pedophiles, kiddie-porn rings, aliens, Catholic priests nor by satanic daycares. As in the days of Dickens, children are imperiled by poverty, hunger and neglect. His plea is an echo from

Blackhouse, that children are "[d]ying thus around us every day while we spend our energies chasing phantom abductors and trying cases of daddies photographing children in the tub" (291). We take perverse delight in stories of sexual child abuse (a relatively minor problem) because we can peek through our fingers and revel in tales of an allegedly "unspeakable" horror. The cyclic Gothic tale can end only when our culture is prepared to say that, yes, children are sensual and erotic beings. And yes, we have stuffed sexuality into them for our own soft-porn pleasure. Kincaid's work is scholarly and daring in its questioning of strategies we use to hide our eroticization, fetishization and ultimately our "molestation" of children. His study will, no doubt, provoke the scandal he hoped for from the outset. (BARBRA CHURCHILL, UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA)

ELENA M. MARTÍNEZ. *Lesbian Voices from Latin America: Breaking Ground*. New York: Garland Publishing Inc. 1996. Pp. 214. US \$50.00.

According to the author, the writings of Latin American lesbians reflects not only the writer's sexual preference but also reveals a network of cultural and social relations and thus needs to be studied from this perspective. The 1970s and 1980s witnessed the emergence and expansion of a body of work by gay and lesbian writers in the United States. At the same time, a critical theory to address this work also emerged. While the same decades saw the emergence and growth of gay and lesbian writing in Latin America, literary criticism of this work was carried on from the United States, so that the cultural manifestation of a theory to address this "separate entity and literary alternative" has yet to occur in Latin America.

In her introduction Martínez is careful to distinguish between Latin American writers and Latina writers. The latter category is made up of Latin American women who live in the United States or who see themselves as a marginalized minority. Another category, Chicana writers (Mexican-American women) are women who have traditionally been silenced, according to Martínez.

Claiming that lesbianism in both Latin America and the United States is still the "unspeakable" and suffers from a "practice of omission," in her introduction Martínez surveys what little has been written on the topic and hopes that her study will urge others to explore this neglected area.

Chapter One examines Magaly Alabau's poetry and Sylvia Molloy's novel *Certificate of Absence*, written in 1981 and translated into English in 1989. Martínez studies these two authors through the poetics of interior and exterior space, in which she sees a parallel in belonging/not belonging and the politics of lesbian exile, in which she reads a metaphor for exclusion and disfranchisement. Exile, of course has always been a

significant theme in Hispanic literature, but in the case of lesbian writing, the *topos* further articulates emotional and psychological attitudes.

Other chapters examine the textual representation of sexual love and emotional intimacy of lesbian relationships through the appropriation of classical Greek myths. Magaly Alabau's *Electra/Cлите́нестра* is a collection of nineteen dramatic, narrative, and circular poems in which female characters are masculinized and male characters are assigned roles which the patriarchy has traditionally imposed on women. Alabau's poetry is examined as part of a trend among women writers to re-write myths which were founded on what feminists have interpreted as patriarchal desire, and whose intention has been to silence and stereotype women as passive and submissive.

The works of Mexican authors Rosamaria Roffel and Nancy Cárdenas (to whom this book is written in memory of) are explored in terms of privileging lesbian eroticism which speaks to the emotional intimacy and solidarity among women. Roffel's poem "Gioconda" which had been introduced and translated into a previous collection, best embodies (no pun intended) what French feminist critic Cixous and Irigaray term "writing the body." "Gioconda," according to Martínez, "supposes a rupture with the phallogocentric views of our culture, in which women are objects for men" (126). I fail to see how this is so. When "Gioconda" was translated and included in the anthology *Pleasure in the Word: Erotic Writing by Latin American Women*, the dedication "to women" was left out, thus leaving out the lesbian perspective, according to Martínez. When I first encountered this poem in the aforementioned collection, it succeeded because it was a powerful poem which celebrated a taboo subject, the female sexual organ. Adding that "Gioconda" is dedicated to women does not change the meaning or the impact of this well-wrought, highly conceived piece of writing. The same can be said of the poetry of Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz, who some lesbians, Martínez included, insist on posthumously "outing" (see p. 12). Sor Juana's poetry works because she wrote exceptional love lyrics, as can be said of the poetry of some of the women Martínez introduces us to in this study.

Martínez has brought otherwise neglected or unfamiliar writers to our attention, but in analysing their works she draws some rather obvious and unconvincing conclusions. Discussing Alabau's poetry collection, *Hermana*, Martínez claims "It is not accidental that *Hermana* begins and ends with bedrooms. Being the site of lesbian passion, the bedroom links memories and provides space for the sexuality of the sisters and their emotional intimacy" (43). Describing a bedroom as a "site of lesbian passion" seems like a forced attempt to use the prescribed academic jargon. Are bedrooms not also the "sites" of heterosexual passion as well?

The author makes repeated references to the 70s and 80s as watershed decades for gay and lesbian writing. A tenuous argument is put forth which claims that lesbianism and madness are linked in our culture, but only one example of this linkage

is provided, and that occurred in the lesbian experience in Cuba during the 1960s, when lesbians were reportedly put in mental asylums and treated with electro-shock to change their sexual orientation (72).

Additional chapters are dedicated to "Lesbian Eroticism and the Act of Writing: Sylvia Molloy's Certificate of Absence." Molloy's work, examined in the first chapter is here hailed for creating new space and breaking ground for a lesbian Latin American perspective. "Sexual and Political Affirmation in Luz María Umpiérrez's *The Margarita Poems* and ... *Yotras desgracias*. And other misfortunes." is a discussion of the Puerto Rican writer, critic and social activist who positions herself, like many Chicana writers, to lesbian women of color, and who through her poetry criticizes Puerto Rico's colonial status and struggles for lesbian identity and female connectiveness.

This work includes an excellent bibliography of both primary and secondary sources. (ROSEANNA MUELLER, COLUMBIA COLLEGE CHICAGO)

ROMÁN DE LA CAMPA. *Latin Americanism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999. US \$47.95 cloth; \$18.95 paper..

As the title indicates, Román de la Campa's book presents an analysis of Latin Americanism in its Latin American and metropolitan versions. Unfortunately, this is not a critique of the origins of this concept and the discipline it names nor an explanation of its actual crisis. In general, it is a study about how poststructuralist, deconstructionist, postcolonial and cultural studies theories are applied to the field of Latin American studies and why one should prefer some of these theories over others. In spite of the lack of appropriate historical background, de la Campa's book deals in the essays collected here with a current and very important issue: the effect of theory on the construction of its object of study, in this case Latin American culture and history. The author is mainly interested in how contemporary literary criticism "constructs" Latin America, i.e. turns it into a disciplinary object, and in finding alternatives to this type of critical practice. In the first essay of this collection, de la Campa identifies poststructuralism, and specifically deconstruction, as the main culprit for this situation. For example, he argues that deconstructive criticism (two critics taken as main exponents of this type of criticism in the field of Latin American studies are Djelal Kadir and Roberto González Echevarría) wants to view Latin American literature as the "quintessence of non representational discourse" and, as a result, it tends to reduce five hundred years of history to one epoch: "All of Latin American textuality is ... reduced to a new periodicity, a free-floating epistemic big bang, according to which all writing since the conquest ... is discovered as having a 'raving polysemia'" (19). According to de la Campa this is the consequence of "positing the

literary as the matrix of all writing [and] all historical articulation" (25). Deconstruction, he explains, creates a new kind of essentialism, a "deconstructive master narrative" that erases the complexities of Latin American culture and history. Román de la Campa gives this tendency in contemporary criticism the name of "episthetics," which he defines in the preface to his book as the "uncertain interplay between epistemology and aesthetics, from which criticism turns into a writing, and language metaphors translate into an immanent sense of rhetorical praxis and agency" (vii).

The solution to this situation is not to reject deconstruction or poststructuralism and go back to traditional historical analyses, argues the author of this study, because deconstruction has provided a necessary (although insufficient) level of analysis (23). For de la Campa one of the solutions — that is to say, a better model for Latin American literary criticism — can be found in the new Latin American cultural, postcolonial and feminist studies, "that invest and critique the powerful tools of poststructuralism" (26). Thus the main purpose of this book is to search for critical methods that can "criticize the potential pitfalls of essentialism without trivializing historical claims" (39). Another example of this is de la Campa's attempt to rethink the theory of transculturation as an alternative to postmodern critiques of modernity. In the chapter "Of Border Artists and Transculturation" de la Campa traces back the history of the concept from what he sees as the most recent incarnations of the theory of transculturation (the work on hybridity by Néstor García Canclini), to the theories of narrative transculturation developed by Angel Rama in the seventies, and ending with the Cuban scholar who invented the concept, Fernando Ortiz. While summarizing and analyzing each one of these critics' writings he tries to show how transculturation is a more effective method for understanding modernity in Latin America than a postmodern critique that erases history and turns it into a "presentism."

The work of Angel Rama is of particular interest to de la Campa and he returns to his theories in a chapter devoted to the Uruguayan critic's posthumous book, *The Lettered City*. De la Campa is interested in reinterpreting Rama from a contemporary point of view. His intention is not only to show the relevance of Rama's theories for contemporary debates, but he also wants to propose his writings as a model of the research that can overcome the limitations of poststructuralism. In this chapter, de la Campa begins by comparing Rama's book to *Imagined Communities* by Benedict Anderson and *Orientalism* by Edward Said because they all received the influence of Foucault's theories. Rama, for example, employs the notion of epistemic breaks, although he does not apply it directly: "He understands the Foucauldian concept of episteme as a structuring map for our understanding of colonial relations" (124). However, de la Campa says, very few critics have been able to see the connection between Rama and poststructuralism. De la Campa's main objective, we will see, is to

read Rama as precursor of postcolonial studies. First, he identifies in *The Lettered City* an early critique of Derrida's theories. In opposition to Derrida's notion of speech as presence, Rama emphasizes a view of orality as "a site where the difficult crisscrossing of chronologies and discourses becomes history" (140). He then argues that this is the connection between Rama's work and current Latin American cultural and postcolonial studies: to prove this point, he associates Rama's use of orality with Walter Mignolo's well-known postcolonial critique of Derrida in *The Darker Side of the Renaissance*. De la Campa claims that Rama's main concern in *The Lettered City* was to "bring the social text and colonial residues within the range of poststructuralist theory" (141).

Thus Rama had apparently managed to detect the shortcomings of poststructural criticism fifteen years earlier (141). However, there are many reasons to doubt that this reinterpretation of Rama as postcolonial critic is correct: for instance, his theory about the evolution of the Latin American intellectual in *The Lettered City* is to a great extent the result of his research from the late sixties and early seventies and not of the influence of Foucault and Derrida, whose works he did not begin to study until the late seventies. It is true that other critics, like Walter Benjamin (who has been reinterpreted and appropriated by poststructuralism), influenced Rama from very early on: he began to read Benjamin in the mid sixties and continued doing so his entire life; he had even started to learn German to read Benjamin in the original when he was killed in a plane accident. But, again, I think that a careful reading of Rama would show that his interpretation of Benjamin's theories had little in common with the way he is read by poststructuralist critics.

Although Rama's work continues to be of importance today this is not because he was a post-colonial critic *avant la lettre*. There are two main reasons for the continuing relevance of Rama's writings: one is the extraordinary quality of his historical and sociological interpretations when he practiced a close reading of a text (as for example, his reading of Arguedas in *Transculturation narrativa en América Latina*). The second one is related to what his theories and views of Latin American literature can tell us about the status of Latin American culture and literary criticism during the seventies. If some of his theories are "outdated," it is not because Rama was wrong, but because the historical situation has changed dramatically in the last couple of decades. In the specific case of *The Lettered City*, Rama's description of the role of the intellectual is interesting to us because of the social changes that in the last twenty five years have eroded the traditional authority of the Latin American intellectual (e.g., the emergence of new social movements, the growing influence of the mass media, a new type of post-Fordist economy) which he takes for granted.

The main weakness of de la Campa's study is that it does not study the historical origins of the metropolitan university's Latin Americanism in the sixties and seventies

and especially its relation to the emergence of the third world theory. For example, the "gap" between scholars working in Latin America and the metropolitan Latin Americanist that de la Campa mentions often in his book can only be understood by analyzing the effects of what Aijaz Ahmad calls the Bandung period and the ideology of third world nationalism on the metropolitan intellectual (see Ahmad, *In Theory*). Differences in salaries and benefits among scholars in the United States and in Latin America are important issues to consider, but these are only secondary effects (although, no doubt extremely real and important ones) of historical events. (JOSÉ EDUARDO GONZÁLES, UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA – LINCOLN)

Works Cited

Ahmad, Aijaz. *In Theory: Classes, Nations, Literatures*. London: Verso, 1992.

"RACHEL FELDHA Y BRENNER. *Writing as Resistance: Four Women Confronting the Holocaust*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1997. Pp. vi + 216. Bibliography and Index. US \$26.50 cloth.

Writing, in 1944, about what she termed "the entire dilemma of the modern would-be assimilationist Jew," Hannah Arendt claimed that, with the Nazi terror, "the bottom [had] dropped out of the old ideology" of Jewish management of self. "Today," she proclaimed, "the truth has come home: there is no protection in heaven or earth against bare murder, and a man can be driven at any moment from the streets and broad places once open to all" (116). In her view, indeed, "the old escape-mechanisms" — the old choice between ethnic persistence and assimilation: between being "the pariah Jew and the *parvenu* Jew" — had so "broken down" that, for European Jews, there remained only Zionism, and the hope that "when a people lives and functions in consort with other peoples ... it [may then] contribute to the establishment upon earth of a commonly conditioned and controlled humanity" (see Arendt, 121-22).

Rachel Brenner's *Writing as Resistance* tests the veracity of Arendt's cultural and political pessimism against the autobiographic and diaristic writings of four, very-much-assimilated Jewish women. Edith Stein (b. 1891) studied at Göttingen and Freiburg and completed her doctorate under phenomenologist Edmund Husserl; she converted to Christianity in 1922 and, in 1933, became a Carmelite nun (and was recently beatified as a Christian martyr by the Catholic Church); she was gassed at Auschwitz in 1942. Simone Weil (b. 1909) studied philosophy at Lycée Henri IV and École Normale Supérieure in Paris. An unbaptized Christian, who reviled Judaism and

Jews, she fled France with her parents in 1942, and starved herself to death in London in 1943. Etty Hillesum (b. 1914) studied law and Slavonic languages at the University of Amsterdam in her native Holland, volunteered as a social worker at Westerbork transit camp, and was subsequently deported to Auschwitz where she died in 1943. Author of the famous diary written while her German Jewish family attempted to hide out the war in Holland, Ann Frank (b. 1929) died of starvation and typhus in Bergen-Belsen in 1943.

These four were, as Brenner puts it, "Christian by choice, Jews by decree" (57). Like most post-Emancipation Jews, they identified completely with the liberal political and Christian religious ethos of modern Europe. "Western European women" to their roots, they "saw Gentile society as their natural environment," "knew very little about Judaism," and "had no true sense of Jewishness" (8, 72). Nazi millenarianism, and the radical political evil which it mandated, came however to rupture their "enlightened world" and lives (29). "Branded" as Jews, their "persecution for an identity with which none of them had much sense of identification" (94, 152) involved each in what Brenner calls "the predicament of Jewish identity" (54). Decried Jews by reason of descent, "declared outcasts in their native social surroundings," their "abrupt, brutal social displacement" demanded of these women that they determine anew their place, not only in the world, but most especially within their very selves (54).

Brenner reports that "the moral collapse of the world they knew," caused "none of them [to] turn [...] to the Jewish religious tradition for solace and comfort," nor did any of them resort to the Zionism which Arendt would have thought their proper course (10, 55). These four "assimilated, enlightened Jews" instead clung to, and nurtured, their European selves (54). Faced with the Nazi appropriation of their identities, of their sense of self and place and purpose, they chose to maintain their "faith in humanistic, enlightened ideals" and in "the liberal ideal of human fellowship" in particular (28, 179). In so doing, all four women "insisted on disregarding that which it was impossible to disregard — a direct threat of annihilation" (181).

It is Brenner's overall purpose to explain this continuing "embrace" of liberal values and practices (29). In Parts I and II, she reads "the literary remains of Stein, Weil, Frank, and Hillesum" to document their robust liberal subjectivity, commitments, and practices. Part III is devoted to characterizing the women's insistence on their pre-war selves as a practice of what Brenner terms "intellectual resistance" (6). In Part IV, she pursues the question of "the function of femininity in [their] response to the rule of terror" (151). In a brief conclusion — "Legacies of Resistance" — Brenner attempts to trace "the pertinence of the four women's orientations in postwar feminist, theological, and ethical thought" (179). I shall pause briefly on the initiatives in Parts I, II, IV and the conclusion before dealing with Part

III and with what I take to be a fundamental flaw in this otherwise praiseworthy and, in some respects, seminal contribution to Holocaust studies.

In Part I, Brenner finds the women to be fully integrated, modern liberal persons. Each believed in personal autonomy through self-authorship, and in political freedom through shared legal subjectivity. Unhappily, her reading to these conclusions is often strained. Linkages and comparisons between the texts are forged more through simple declaration than by argument. One text "seems to corroborate" — or else: "displays important correspondences with," is "a particularly apt demonstration of," "corresponds in large measure to," is "remarkably similar to," "seem[s] to illustrate," "reechoes" or "seems to echo," "evokes," "exemplifies to a remarkable extent," "acts out," "puts into practice," or "seems to embody" — another (25-44). Matters, however, improve in Part II where Brenner moves from their credentials as political and personal liberals to the women's "confrontation ... with their official identification as Jews" and with "the searing identity crisis" which that identification caused in each of them (49). In concluding that "none of the women made their Jewishness the starting point or center" of her response and that all instead "emphasized their humanity," Brenner offers a finely-wrought, nuanced reading of the women's explorations of, and positions regarding, their imposed and enforced identities as Jews (49).

The place of Part IV — "Resistance and Womanhood" — in Brenner's overall project is uncertain. The three chapters, which occupy a mere twenty-two pages, explore the women's consciousness of themselves as gendered subjects and their views on such matters as women's inequality generally and the fate of Jewish women in particular. However, it is not at all clear whether Brenner intends this exploration as further demonstration of her theses regarding the nature and origins of her subjects' resistance to Nazi tyranny or as an excursus whose design is to set up her reflections on their feminist legacy which appears in the conclusion. In either event, in Part IV, Brenner does conclude that, though the matter remains "elusive" — and though "their perceptions of womanhood and of themselves as women vary considerably" — "the response of each woman was affected by consciousness of her female gender" (147, 151). But, to avoid being trivial, this conclusion must be made good in the details of an argument which Brenner fails to provide. Instead, as in Part I, she here offers a view built more on declaration than on analysis. That this is so might have everything to do with just how disparate were her subjects' views on women; but, in that case, the better course might have been to avoid making any claim about the relationship between these views and their resistance and to associate those views instead with the general liberal discourse on the status of women as it existed at the time.

The conclusion both ties together the project and attempts to interpret the works of Stein, Weil, Hillesum, and Frank as anticipations of post-Holocaust feminist,

theological, and ethical thought. In a short eight pages of text, Brenner associates the women's writing as a whole with the theological and ethical views of postwar theorists such as Emil Fackenheim, Emmanuel Levinas, and Paul Tillich, and with the contemporary feminism of Carol Gilligan, Sara Ruddick, Nancy Chodorow, and Nel Noddings. However, as is the case elsewhere in her text, Brenner accomplishes these associations more by suggestion than by argument. Her subjects' works "foreshadow [...] — or else: 'seem both to anticipate and to affirm,' 'become actual in,' 'reverberate[...]' in," "prefigure," "prefigure[...]" or "highlight [...]" — the works of these postwar authors. Brenner surely would have better served both her readers and her subjects had she devoted her conclusion to rendering a final, summative statement of her argument with respect to the continuing significance of the Holocaust experiences of these four, very exceptional women to human personal and political affairs.

It is in Part IV — "Autobiographical Acts of Resistance" — that Brenner attempts to make good her larger project of identifying, and then explaining, her subjects' texts as acts of resistance. And it here that her undertaking encounters the fundamental — though most illuminating — flaw to which I have referred. The Nazis used the alchemy of law to render European Jewry the defenceless object of murder as policy and manufacture. As Raul Hilberg takes pains to remind us, the way to Auschwitz began with legal definition. Subtracted first from the fellowship beyond difference of legal equality, Western Jews then became the object of legislative and judicial inquiry with respect to the nature and limits of rights which that special category of legal subject "Jew" might properly be thought to possess. The rights of Jews were *not* extinguished all at once. The cloth of rights, rather, was first tattered and frayed along the edges, and then progressively, and with a determination bred by the absence of opposition by those still fully clothed Gentile neighbours of the "Jews," removed one layer at a time. In the end, those decreed to be Jews were made nude at law: relieved finally of the right to own and live their very lives, they became flagrantly exposed and completely vulnerable to the claims of collective power calmly and deliberately raging against them.

Stein, Weil, Hillesum, and Frank lived through, and wrote about, these twinned processes of excommunication and diminishment. Brenner is right to characterize their response to this experience — so far as we know, even unto death — as resistance: these four women did indeed resist, and courageously so. But her appreciation of their resistance and its etiology is, in my view, mistaken. "Each woman [did] assert [...] her uniqueness under the rule that aimed first to dehumanize and then to annihilate its victims" (148), and this assertion of self did constitute "a supreme act of defiance" (146). But their resistance was not "intellectual" (6), no matter that its evidence is literary. Theirs, rather, was an existential resistance of unprecedented determination, cause, and significance. In the face of bureaucratic insistence on their extermination,

and despite their abandonment by others, these four women resisted by maintaining, nurturing, and persisting in, their own, at once intimate and public, cosmopolitan selves. Theirs, that is, was a resistance liberal both in purpose and in origin.

This is not to nitpick. That they stayed with their liberal selves, senses, and sensibilities, that they did not abandon the idea of Europe as did Arendt in her despair, means everything to us. What Habermas has called the project of "Learning By Disaster" is the unburdenable burden of we who live after Auschwitz (see Habermas). And among the engagements which the Holocaust requires of us is the integrity of the European dream of human unity. If, as Edward Said claims, "universality means taking a risk" (xiv), then these four women took a risk for all of us: they chose not "the easy certainties" of difference, but the much more complex and dangerous path of unity, and, in so doing, in the most extreme conditions humanly imaginable, they lived for us the view that a liberal life is a life worth living (see Said).

In this, I believe they spoke and acted on truth. But this particular truth is in decline, and no where more so than in the academy which has for some time been the captive of difference. One cannot tell where Brenner stands on this matter. One can, however, detect in *Writing as Resistance* a pervasive ambivalence both towards the liberal project and, in consequence, towards the attempts by these women to revive and recuperate it. Brenner writes of "the total fiasco of the liberal ideal," of "the discredited values and beliefs of humanism," of the women's "absurd faith that the world that 'ought to be, must and will be'" and of "their apparently absurd defiance" (29, 181, 178, 179). And though, at several points, she asks herself the question that most counts — Should we see "their intellectual engagement and spiritual sensitivity ... as vestiges of faith in humanistic, enlightened ideals that have proved empty of meaning? Or should we perceive these responses as serious attempts to restore meaning to humanism?" (179) — her ambivalence, and the mischaracterization of their resistance which follows from it, prevents her from ever directly responding.

Happily, these reservations, even if proper, do not at all diminish the importance of Brenner's contribution. Indeed, so far as I am aware, hers is the first work to examine, on close textual reading, the political and personal responses of assimilated Western Jews to the Holocaust at the time of the Holocaust. And for this, all of us who wish to learn from the disaster owe her a very great debt. (FREDERICK C. DECOSTE, UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA)

Works Cited

Arendt, Hannah. "The Jew as Pariah: A Hidden Tradition." *Jewish Social Studies* 6 (1944): 99-122.

Habermas, Jürgen. "Learning By Disaster? A Diagnostic Look Back on the Short 20th Century." *Constellations* 5(3) (1998): 306-20.

Said, Edward. *Representations of the Intellectual*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1994.

*STEVEN V. HUNSAKER. *Autobiography and National Identity in the Americas*. Charlottesville and London: University Press of Virginia, 1999. Pp. 148. US \$17.50 paper.

By definition, all autobiographical writing deals with the author's sense of his or her self. But this inward gaze shifts dramatically for many modern autobiographers because they wish to consider themselves in relation to a wider social and political community. This dual focus of who the autobiographer is combined with what role a nation or community plays in shaping and establishing his or her identity is what interests Steven Hunsaker. In his *Autobiography and National Identity in the Americas*, Hunsaker tackles nine autobiographical narratives from Central and South America, as well as Canada and the United States, in order to illustrate the potential of seeing a nation as the product of its citizens and also to show the instability that follows the creation of the boundaries in a community.

The heart of Hunsaker's book is his interpretation (and extension) of Benedict Anderson (*Imagined Communities*) and this theorist's model of national identity. Anderson sees a nation and an individual's relationship to it as largely imagined or created for he states that even in the smallest nation its members "will never know most of its fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion" (IC 6). Anderson, therefore, departs from the theories of national identity based on race or place of birth and shifts to the individual's ability to imagine him or herself as part of a community. Although Hunsaker finds Anderson's subjectivity helpful, he also finds the theorist problematic when the diversity of individuals and nations is considered. Hunsaker's goal, therefore, is not to demonstrate a "theoretical fit with Anderson from text to text" but rather to find evidence that his optimistic model is less than adequate and that national identity is more "idiosyncratic, complex, and diverse" than he acknowledges (4).

In his first and perhaps best chapter, Hunsaker discusses Rigoberta Menchú. (*Rigoberta Menchú: An Indian Woman in Guatemala*) as an example of subjectivity in the creation of national identity. This autobiography is contentious for its author won the Nobel Peace Prize in 1992 largely on the basis of this book but its authenticity has been widely questioned. Hunsaker sees the central concern of the text as a "staging" (14) or creation of an ethnic order to underline the author's conflict between her Quiché Maya nation and the Guatemalan state. For him, Menchú presents "an

innovative and hybrid community as if it were traditional by bridging the demands of survival and the desire for cultural continuity. It is not the return to tradition that counts but the rhetoric surrounding and giving meaning to that strategy" (19). This autobiography, for him, is an imaginative creation of a community or nation in which values are not stable or fixed but rather can be interpreted and used pragmatically to illustrate the constituent beliefs of that group. Hunsaker continues his interest in ancestral legacies by examining the autobiographies of Maria Campbell (*Halfbreed*), Caroline Maria de Jesus (*Child of the Dark: The Diary of Carolina Maria de Jesus*), and Domitila Barrios de Chungara (*Let Me Speak! Testimony of Domitila, a Woman of the Bolivian Mines*). All of them portray the relationship between an individual woman and a nation and highlight exclusion, hunger and violence. Campbell, for example, has little sense of group identity (she finds it difficult to associate comfortably with Métis) and describes herself as an isolated and angry woman within the Canadian state. This self-portrait of a woman unable to imagine a community without unpleasant associations is not the one exhibited by Jesus. Although she is also uncomfortable with her immediate surroundings and describes alarming poverty, hunger, and cynicism, this autobiographer identifies the sources of her poverty in the malice, incompetence and immorality of wealthy Brazilians. Domitila Chungara, a Bolivian miner's wife, differs from the other two autobiographers because she both draws strength from her people and devotes her strength to a struggle to re-make her country into a land of freedom and socialist equality. Only this last writer is in a viable political movement and presents herself and her people in roles of mutual dependence and concern.

Just as Domitila Chungara is committed to a political movement, so too are Québécois Pierre Vallières (*White Niggers of America: The Precocious Autobiography of a Quebec Terrorist*) and Nicaraguan Omar Cabezas (*Fire from the Mountain: The Making of a Sandinista*). Although both texts are explicitly Marxist in their sympathies, it is Hunsaker's contention that the authors use the concept of a national myth. This author is using this term to mean a sense of group identity derived from a shared sense of recent history rather than a sense of ancient blood relationship (63). Although their use of this myth differs slightly (Vallières is interested in political representation while Cabezas focuses on his country's cultural uniqueness), both authors tie the nation to revolution in their works.

In yet another variation in renditions of ancestral legacies, Hunsaker uses Victor Perera (*Rites: A Guatemalan Boyhood*) and Maxine Hong Kingston (*The Woman Warrior: Memoirs of a Girlhood among Ghosts*) to examine the ways in which migration complicates the imagination of a national community. He examines this area in order to refute at least partially Anderson's contention that national identity is easily accessed by the immigrant's child ("Exodus" 322). Hunsaker feels that a move from nation to nation and from language to language makes any sense of community exceedingly more

complex than Anderson allows. Although new ties in a new country often comes at the price of serious conflict between parents and their children over a sense of nation, this does not happen for Perera. This autobiographer feels little loyalty or sense of belonging to either his Palestinian past or his Guatemalan present. This pattern of displacement from all communities, however, is not reflected in Kingston's autobiography. She does not reject the nation which surrounds her in California and indeed attempts to fashion herself toward her own perception of what constitutes proper American behaviour. To state, however, that she abandons her Chinese culture would be a misrepresentation of her autobiography for indeed she breaks away only to return and reshape her heritage (specifically her rewriting of the woman warrior myth) in order to serve her needs as a woman of Chinese descent in the California of the 1950s and 1960s.

Hunsaker continues his discussion of the children of immigrants with an examination of Mexican Indian-American autobiographer Richard Rodriguez (*Hunger for Memory: The Education of Richard Rodriguez* and *Days of Obligation: An Argument with My Mexican Father*). Although Rodriguez does waver between independence from and belonging in America, he is valuable to Hunsaker because he is comfortable with the idea of mixture and change. Unlike Menchú's reverence for traditional values, this Mexican Indian exhibits a degree of distance from his heritage.

As Hunsaker points out in the conclusion, he is interested in the diversity of forms individual autobiographers have taken to describe national identity. As has been shown in this brief glimpse at his book, there is no single stance taken towards this topic: the children imagine their community differently than do their parents; indigenous groups emphasize their marginality within the dominant nation; and minority groups challenge the right of the state to represent the nation. Hunsaker's look into the diversity of viewpoints on the sense of nation makes his book a valuable contribution to this emerging critical field. (JEAN RICHARDSON, UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA)

Works Cited

- Anderson, Benedict. "Exodus." *Critical Inquiry* 20 (1994): 314-27.
 —. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. Rev. ed. New York: Verso, 1994.

BRUCE ZIFF and PRATIMA V. RAO, eds. *Borrowed Power: Essays on Cultural Appropriation*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1997. Pp. 338. US \$55.00 cloth; \$19.95 paper.

The cover design of *Borrowed Power: Essays on Cultural Appropriation* incorporates artwork by the contemporary Canadian First Nations visual artist Joane Cardinal-Schubert. Using mixed media, Cardinal-Schubert creates a collage to construct and represent the conflicting cultures that have shaped her experience. On a dark background the outlines of traditional garments are suspended from plain clothes hangers, evoking perhaps the many First Nations artefacts, which languish in museums, sometimes on display, sometimes filed away in drawers. Superimposed on these shapes are the ancient images of petroglyph drawings and totem animals. Alongside these figures, which reach back in time, are signs of the circulation of desire in the contemporary world: bingo cards (the individual longing for a "jackpot") and German currency (the accumulation of global capital). Within these contradictory significations of power, where traditional First Nations beliefs and shamanic energies vie with the imperial systems of European settlement and world finance, Cardinal-Schubert locates herself. *Borrowed Power*, the collection of essays brought together by Bruce Ziff and Pratima V. Rao, explores a wide range of issues arising from the pressures of cultural appropriation. Cardinal-Schubert depicts in her art.

The articles collected in *Borrowed Power* address a number of areas in which questions about cultural appropriation have been focused: music, art and literature, popular culture, colonial and postcolonial studies, scientific property and indigenous cultural knowledges. Some of the most compelling discussions in the book are those of artists and writers who think through the implications of cultural appropriation for writing and creativity. Kwame Dawes, whose own creative practices embrace poetry, fiction and performance arts, locates the processes which have come to be called cultural appropriation in a "fundamental human trait." "We are social creatures," he writes, "who have consistently shown a propensity to adapt our values, our sense of beauty and art, and our concepts of identity and place according to the cultures and civilizations that we encounter. This kind of interaction and sharing of culture — whether it be exploitative or that of mutual respect and sharing — is something that is arguably inherent in human behaviour" (117-18). If interactions among cultures are an inescapable part of human activity, then it is crucial, Dawes suggests, to distinguish between exploitative representations of another's experience and those that arise out of genuine dialogue and open exchange. In such a situation the interventions against cultural appropriation most likely to be successful involve political education: on the one hand, concrete encouragement, grants and funding that allow non-white artists to tell their stories and to feel part of the mainstream; on the other hand, scrutiny and

discouragement of white artists who produce negative and stereotyped representations of non-white cultures. To those who would characterize the latter as close or equivalent to censorship, Dawes responds, "the rationale for such action is founded on the belief that white artists have been stealing from and misinterpreting non-white artists for too long" (114).

Similar questions arising from the accusation of a politically correct "censorship" of creativity are also taken up by the Caribbean-Canadian writer Marlene Nourbese Philip in "The Disappearing Debate; or, How the Discussion of Racism Has Been Taken Over by the Censorship Issue." Nourbese Philip begins from the 1988 incident which focused discussion on cultural appropriation in Canada: The Women's Press in Toronto rejected several stories because their white writers had created characters from other races and cultures; subsequently, the Writers' Union newsletter published a number of letters about appropriation, voice and imagination. In her view, the focus on the right of a writer to create freely across cultures without any self-imposed or socio-cultural restrictions deflected discussion of the systemic racism which The Women's Press — however misguidedly — had attempted to address. Situating assumptions about creativity historically within the western tradition, Nourbese Philip emphasizes the pre-eminent position of individual rights in Enlightenment political philosophy: John Locke had little trouble reconciling the "freedom of man" with slavery and lucrative trade it generated, nor did the American constitution. The varied movements of European romanticism extended similar claims of freedom to the writer's creative imagination. Yet, as Nourbese Philip points out, imagination is formed within human societies and is inevitably bound up with the assumptions and beliefs of those communities. "The imagination," she writes, "is both free and unfree. Free in that it can wander wheresoever it wishes; unfree in that it is profoundly affected and shaped by the societies in which we live" (103). The danger when writers claim imaginative freedom to represent another culture, especially a culture their own has oppressed, she argues, "is that without careful thought, they are likely to perpetuate stereotypical and one-dimensional views of this culture" (103). White writers, she suggests, must be especially vigilant in examining their motivations for writing about different societies; they must rigorously question how their own work might function to marginalize the voices of others. "The Disappearing Debate" offers a thoughtful and convincing analysis of these pressing issues.

While Joane Cardinal-Schubert's most extensive exploration of cultural appropriation can be found in her art, her essay in *Borrowed Power* adeptly examines the situation of First Nations peoples. The title, "In the Red" ironically underscores how Canadian Native peoples have been deprived of countless dollars as relentless national and global markets pirate their designs and properties. Cardinal-Schubert points out that the image of 'Indianness' has been used to market everything from tobacco and

fruit to Hollywood films and recreation. In addition, First Nations iconography and symbols are all too often simply stolen for a market which ranges from tourist trinkets to a multimillion dollar sale by a Japanese company of sweaters incorporating a traditional Kwakwaka'wakw design. A further issue is the transformation worked when an object itself is appropriated by another culture for its own institutions. Traditional garments, ceremonial reliquiae and the tools of daily life in First Nations cultures are functional parts of a living community. As Cardinal Schubert points out, many Native languages and cultures do not have a word for art, but once an object is displayed in a museum, it is separated from the ceremonies or daily activities which endowed it with life and is resituated within western categories of the aesthetic. Here the essay shifts into what is perhaps its most significant part: Cardinal Schubert's storytelling of how she and other Native artists have challenged and critiqued the appropriation of their cultures in exhibitions, in conferences, in publications and in their art. The theoretical questions raised by "In the Red" are concretized in two other essays which examine specific instances in which First Nations peoples have challenged the appropriation of their cultures. In "Memory and Misrepresentation" Nell Jessup Newton recounts how descendants of Crazy Horse worked through existing US laws to block the use of their ancestor's name to market bourbon whiskey. In "A Coming Together" Lynn S. Teague, Joseph T. Joaquin and Harman H. Lomawaima analyze the complex negotiations around a collection of ancient Hohokam pottery and shellwork which resulted in a co-operative long-term relationship between the Tohono O'odham Nation and the Arizona State Museum.

One of the most attractive aspects of *Borrowed Power* is the network of interconnections the reader is able to draw among articles which address theoretical and historical questions and those which analyze contemporary struggles over cultural appropriation. Jonathan Hart's extended examination of imperialism, colonization and resistance, "Translating and Resisting Empire: Cultural Appropriation and Postcolonial Studies," very usefully situates contemporary debates within their prehistory, that is, within the early modern periods of European colonial expansion. Drawing on Ross Chambers's theories about oppositional narrative, Hart argues for a concept of mediation which problematizes the interconnections between writer or speaker and reader or audience: "mediation in reading creates a conversion of a subject (a shifting), a room to manoeuvre between desire and power, a crossing over between them" (154). Such a provisional, unstable space remains open for a spectrum of political appropriations. In a telling example Hart, following Chambers, points out that the civil rights movement appropriated television coverage, gaining considerable political capital from news reportage of demonstrators dragged off to police vans. This tactic was subsequently reappropriated by the anti-abortion movement, and remains available for other strategic political usage, although with shifting effects because the more the

images become conventionalized the more audiences' reactions will alter. Hart stresses that cultural appropriation must be grasped as "an interaction between changing cultures over time and not simply as a static transaction between two sides" (157). His analyses trace the complex transfers of power within colonial projects and resistances, ending with an insightful discussion of Louis Riel.

Perhaps the most far-reaching implications of cultural appropriation are situated in the contemporary exploitation of traditional knowledges in local communities. As Naomi Roht-Arriaza documents in "Of Seeds and Shamans: The Appropriation of the Scientific and Technical Knowledge of Indigenous and Local Communities," multinational corporations, who stand to recoup huge profits, have eagerly developed an astonishing range of products using indigenous knowledge. Two examples from her extensive list are exemplary of the issues. For centuries indigenous communities in India have used leaves and seeds of the neem tree as a natural insecticide; the corporation which patented the active ingredient in neem has no intention of compensating anyone in India, least of all the peasants from whom the knowledge was appropriated. Traditional agriculture in Latin America cultivated naturally coloured cotton, but the US patent, given to an American scientist, makes no effort to direct any compensation to indigenous groups. In a detailed and thorough analysis, Roht-Arriaza outlines how the construction and understanding of "knowledge" works to exclude knowledges produced by local communities, peasant farmers and indigenous groups. The activities of a peasant, often an impoverished woman, who tends, compares and develops varieties of seeds is not readily recognized as producing knowledge in "plant breeding" in the way that the research of a scientist working for Monsanto would be. Furthermore, Roht-Arriaza, a legal scholar, points out that national laws and international agreements favour western assumptions about individual property rights and ownership of discoveries. While she critically assesses possible options within international law, she ultimately sees the "vibrancy, visibility and agency" of traditional communities as the precondition for ending appropriation of local knowledges and resources.

In *Borrowed Power* Ziff and Rao have collected a provocative and perceptive group of articles, which will prove to be equally useful to a research scholar seeking reflective and comprehensive discussions of cultural appropriation or to a student seeking an introduction to the complexities of the topic. No one who reads this book will fail to recognize the intricacies involved both in patterns of domination and in strategies of resistance. (AMELA McCALLUM, UNIVERSITY OF CALGARY)

LYNNE VANLUVEN, and PRISCILLA L. WALTON, eds. *Pop Can: Popular Culture in Canada*. Scarborough, Ont.: Prentice-Hall Canada Inc., 1999. Pp xii + 237. CAN \$25.00.

After the pleasures of Pevere and Dymond's *Mondo Canuck* (1996), the future of Canadian popular culture studies, it seemed, would resemble a razzle-dazzle celebration, or at least a joyous parka-clad group hug. Lynne Van Luven and Priscilla L. Walton have attempted to go "one step further" than *Mondo Canuck* by showing "critics, writers, journalists, and academics in the process of consuming, reacting to, and analysing Canadian popular culture..." (vii). The collection "sets out to 'write-in' some of the artifacts that have been written-off as Canadiana, and in so doing to expand definitions of 'Canadian'" (xi). The bumptious hopes of celebrants are precariously put on hold while header questions concerning the role of popular culture in Canada are posed.

Just as popular culture itself is marked by variety, so too is this collection of essays, which does not exclude the diversity found within each popular form's manifestations. Detective fiction, musicals, basketball and film are "popular," but what is interesting is the examination of how these principally American popular forms are shaped within a Canadian context, and the way they can give expression to various subjectivities often excluded from the mainstream. Van Luven and Walton deserve a warm and hearty handshake for their efforts to include those often neglected aspects of Canadian popular culture. Yet their compilation is lacking in certain respects which are too large to ignore.

One would get the impression from this anthology that all Canadian popular culture (in all its diversity, of course) originates in the east — specifically Ontario. Western Canada is reduced to West Edmonton Mall in all its semiotic majesty. And Quebec? Well, that is never addressed in the book due to, Walton claims, "the language barrier" (xii). Although it is possible to "swing a cat," as they say, and hit any number of Quebec academics, journalists and writers who are fluent in English, the Quebecois pop-culture tradition does not figure here. This is an unfortunate oversight (teetering on negligence) as Quebec has a thriving and very dynamic popular culture. In polite "Canadian" fashion, the introduction makes apologies for these absences, yet these sideward glances do not ameliorate an obvious problem with the compilation's aspirations.

That Canadian popular culture runs not only east and west, but north and south (between Canada and America) is a good point. This issue was already thoroughly (and theoretically) explored in *The Beaver Bites Back?* (1993). The question of Canadian popular culture is, perhaps, best articulated through the unwittingly clever grammatical slip-up in the introduction to the first section in which it is claimed that in Nova

Scotia, tourists can find "the graves of many Titanic survivors" (2). What an advantageous editorial accident, as this is the crux of the book's underlying thesis; that is, figuratively speaking of course, Canada does have a tendency to bury the living. Its wealth of talented artists in the pop-culture domain are either derided for their success in the US, completely erased from the popular landscape, or never discussed in a critical way. This has inspired Van Luven and Walton's attempt to address these hitherto omitted areas in Canadian pop-culture studies. And there is no doubt that the articles and essays contained in the volume are vital and lively. What is striking is the range and variety of theoretical models employed including deconstruction, feminism, post-colonial theory, as well as personal engagement. They range from theoretically informed articulations, to a kind of virtuosity and playfulness. The articles are divided between six somewhat loosely knit categories which supposedly illustrate William Gibson's term "cultural mongrelization" (vii) but which, unfortunately, only create a sense of disorientation and perplexity.

Part 1: The Popular Arts (by far the bulkiest section of the volume) contains articles that demonstrate the multifaceted nature of the pop-culture arena: everything from Atom Egoyan's *Exotica* to cyberpunk. Professor Rinaldo Walcott's "Keep on Movin': Rap, Black Atlantic Identities and the Problem of Nation" is an excellent analysis of rap artists' and dub poets' sense of fluidity within a larger black diasporic culture. Multiple border-crossings via trans-national intertextuality question the very notion of a stable, unified Canadian nation-state. This larger issue frames a discussion of the Somali immigrant/refugee scandal in Etobicoke. Walcott thus reveals that black identities may be more foreign to Canadian discourses about multiculturalism and nationalism than most Canadians would care to admit.

Part 2: Spending, Getting, Spending contains three articles that address "the way that merchandising — and purchasing — is part of Canadian life and has a force and scope that demand it be taken seriously as representing a subculture if not a culture unto itself" (74). Included is an amusing article "The Mystery of the Bathurst Street Elvis" (a cheap plaster bust of Elvis Presley that sells like hotcakes in Toronto), as well as reminiscences of girlhood trash-picking as a prototype for the thrill of shopping. But when it comes to shopping and pleasure, nothing is more archetypal than Alberta's West Edmonton Mall. Robert R. Wilson's essay "Playing and being Played: Experiencing West Edmonton Mall" presents two hypotheses. While West Edmonton Mall is a post-modern phenomenon of uncanny architecture which plays upon simulacra and disorientation, Wilson argues that the mall's appeal and commercial success is derived from the "universal human experience" (84) of crossing over a threshold and entering a room (similar to entering a sacred space). That this monstrous edifice, as well as other malls, can be read with new wonder and cautious playfulness is a revelation.

Part 3: The Many Forms of Media deals with the plural nature of media that "embrace many formats besides the obvious ones of newspapers, magazines, television, and radio" (91). The articles deal with Web sites, television mini-drama, journalism and film adaptation. Of particular interest is feminist critic Shirley Anne Off's article "The Women's Television Network: By, for, and about women ... or was that ratings?" WTN, a private commercial enterprise, was originally conceived of as a politically motivated broadcast service that would be "by, for, and about women" (108) as the station noted in its CRTC application. In its first two seasons, however, the station changed its tune to accommodate commercial interests. Innovative programming for women was quickly replaced by the usual line-up of vapid home decorating shows, as well as re-runs of dreary prime-time television entertainment with broader audience appeal. Commercial interests overran feminist innovation. What is not addressed (nor admitted) in Off's article is that Canadian female viewers' own expectations of television programming may have been reflected in WTN's altered format.

In *Part 4: The Sporting Life Lives*, writers and critics engage with football, basketball and, of course, hockey. Gary Genesco (a writer for the Canadian alternative press) has strung together short playful sketches on Canada's national pastime in "Hockey and Culture." For Genesco, hockey becomes "an all-terrain vehicle for [...] aesthetic explorations" and "a broader understanding of the subjectivities, cultures, and rituals of the game" (140). Genesco looks at such things as gay hockey opera, Thompson Highway's vision of women's hockey on the reserve, a lovely piece on athletes as pets, and suburban road hockey. Don Cherry will no doubt cringe as Genesco careens through the various (other) faces of this macho sport.

Part 5: The Visual and Its Popular Manifestations concentrates on "viewing, spectacles, and the interaction between the two [and] analyses areas like iconography, media art, and personal interrelations" (158). The Eli Langer child-porn law fiasco, the feminist web site Studio XX, and a working definition of "Gaydar" comprise some of the articles. In "The Death of Princess Diana: Mourning a 'Very British Girl,'" we find Ann Wilson claiming that one can read Diana's life as an "allegory of post-colonialism" (163), of Canada's own changing national identity. Diana's life is similar to Canada's movement from a young vibrant country, to one that later renegotiated its relationship with Britain. "And in the later stages of her life," Wilson claims, "Diana's identity seems compatible with English Canada's more recent, post-colonial sense of itself as a nation that [...] is now an autonomous player on the international stage, with a newly defined and wholly contemporary sense of national identity" (163). The article ends with the question: "How 'post' is our colonial identity?" (165). The reader, however, may be more concerned with how fast we are driving.

In the academically inevitable *Part 6: Border Transgressions and Interventions* the various contributors "reflect on the difficulties raised by boundaries and borders

themselves — their meanings, their uses, their practical applications, and their transgressions" (194). Here we find articles about the Bernardo-Homolka trial, the 1992 World Series, and Canadian queer identities. Jody Berland's "Weathering the North: Climate, Colonialism, and the Mediated Body" is a clever look at Canadian climate as an official discourse (complete with "silences"), and one which she claims "requires historical, psychoanalytic, semiotic, mythical, and political critique, and demands that these be deployed within a reflexive analytic mode prepared to recognize very complex strategies of repression, inversion, and displacement" (211). Although one is unsure whether or not sardonic mirth is the desired response, it must be admitted that her article is full of bright spots and brilliant critiques of early accounts of Canadian weather, its absence from mainstream representation, and weather reports as pathological attempts to control the climate.

Van Luven and Walton's volume, it is fair to say, is not necessarily essential reading for Canadian popular culture scholars and students, but it does contain within its pages some fodder for thought. As Walton claims, "*Pop Can* attempts to open the door to further explorations of Canadian popular forms, but it is just that: an opening of the door" (xii). It is probably a good thing that earlier studies already unlocked the door's deadbolt, or this volume barely would have made it past the doormat. Nonetheless, Canadian popular culture has received further critical attention. Regarding the future of studies in Canadian popular culture, scholars and/or pop-culture enthusiasts can express the sentiment best summed up by SCTV's Ed Grimley: "I couldn't be more excited, I must say. This anticipation — it's making me mental." (BARBRA CHURCHILL, UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA)

Works Cited

- Flaherty, David H. and Frank E. Manning. *The Beaver Bites Back?: American Popular Culture in Canada*. Montréal: McGill-Queen's UP, 1993.
- Pevere, Geoff and Greig Dymond. *Mondo Canuck: A Canadian Pop Culture Odyssey*. Scarborough, Ont.: Prentice Hall Canada, 1996.
- "THOMAS CARMICHAEL and ALISON LEE, eds. *Postmodern Times: A Critical Guide to the Contemporary*. DeKalb, IL: Northern Illinois University Press, 2000. Pp. 272. US \$36.00.

Postmodern Times brings together some thirteen essays by a distinguished body of scholars of the postmodern. Ranging over a variety of media, including digital culture, cinema, architecture, literature, TV, and opera, among others, as well as a number of

different disciplines — notably, psychology, politics, education, and science — this collection provides a highly readable retrospective on postmodernity as both a philosophical point of departure and a periodizing concept, at century's end. Concluding the volume is an interview with Christopher Jencks and, given the interview's focus on general defining properties of postmodernism, not to mention the compelling case Jencks makes for his reading of the latter, this document might well have served as introduction rather than as afterword. In any event, it is where I will begin here, and where readers may wish to begin their own reading of the collection.

Along with Ihab Hassan and Fredric Jameson, Christopher Jencks of course tendered one of the earliest takes on "postmodernism" as an integrated cultural period/school. In his influential *The Language of Post-Modern Architecture* (1977) and *What is Post-Modernism?* (1985), and both have gone through several editions, he develops a dialectical view of postmodernism, the burden of which resides in that persistent (and now orthogonally unorthodox) hyphen. As he discusses in the interview, "postmodernism" is a differential concept that embraces certain values of modernism and, concurrently, certain values that repudiate modernist axiology.

Unlike Jameson who is generally dismissive of postmodern culture and political praxis — they are after all the spawn of "late capitalism" — and who is collaterally nostalgic for the purportedly utopian sensibility of modernism, Jencks sees in postmodernism a force for positive political change. Identifying postmodern political philosophy as a refinement, or even a radicalization, of classical liberalism, Jencks attributes to it a paradoxical program that at once embraces Age-of-Enlightenment notions of equality and a sixties' commitment to identity/recognition politics. In short, Jencks's "post-modern liberalism" endorses the view that we are all equal because we are all the same *and* we are all different and our differences must be accepted and recognized (Various political theorists — Charles Taylor, Will Kymlicka, Richard Rorty, and Francis Fukuyama, for example — wrestle with this same paradox, in one way or another.) Or in his own words, "The post-modern liberal says we must have *both* [i.e., equality and difference], *and* we must balance the claims of both affirmative action *and* a kind of equality" (250). This is an excellent interview in which Alison Lee poses apposite questions and, fittingly, gets out of the way, allowing her subject to develop his thoughts on a variety of issues.

The Jencks interview provides a helpful backdrop against which to locate essays by Michael Zeitlin, Diane Elam, and Thomas Docherty, all of which, at least nominally, investigate postmodern politics and the modes of agency and subjectivity to which it gives rise. And if I attend more to these essays than to the others, it is because they deal with broader and less genre-specific issues, and hence may prove to be of relatively greater interest. The Zeitlin essay ostensibly deals with the "postmodern subject," but actually with an examination of Freudian and Lacanian psychoanalytical

theory. While the opening section offers some round commentary on the relationship between the individual subject and the masses, the essay quickly moves to a detailed discussion of Lacan. What we have here is less one essay, than in fact two. The first suggests, acutely enough, that a great deal is at stake as the subject negotiates a relationship with the collectivity/masses, while the latter moves within the rarefied air of Lacanian theory which, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, seems to have very little to do with the postmodern subject as, shall we say, a *zoon politikon*. While I will leave it to Lacanians to assess the cogency of Zeitlin's reading of Freud and Lacan, I find no clear link in the second section of the essay between the postmodern subject and actually existent forms of the "system or the machine or the totality" (20). Presumably, at some point, subjectivity needs to be situated socially, but this gesture is deferred here. Zeitlin might have profitably picked up on an earlier reference to DeLillo in order to place his views on Lacan within the existential context of, say, characters in *The Names of Mao II* or *Underworld*.

In a short essay, entitled "Lost in the Past? Feminism's Divided Relationship to Postmodernity," Diane Elam attempts a deconstructive critique of contemporary feminism, setting the latter's (modernist) progressivist yearnings in the context of postmodern relativism. In her view, essentialist notions of "rights," and hence of gender identity, threaten to reduce female identity to constructs of the liberal (and male) imagination. It is a "postmodern feminism" that will allow feminism to call into question established "gender hierarchies" and to re-examine the "[in]stability of gender as a category" (43). While one can perhaps, on an intellectual level, sympathize with Elam's efforts to posit, at once, "the simultaneous necessity and impossibility of a notion of gendered identity in the feminist struggle," Elam's essay contains a couple of unexamined ironies (43). First, notwithstanding that Age-of-Enlightenment liberalism is a male contrivance — though this position seems a disservice to Wollstonecraft and others — and one that brings with it a more or less essentialistic view of rights and political agency, the benefits of the (belated) extension of basic rights and freedoms to all members of society seem incontrovertible. In short, laws, of necessity, are based on certain codified notions of subjectivity, and one should presumably embrace on practical and moral grounds legal reforms in the area of, for example, gender rights, even if on philosophical grounds one might contest the inherently "biased," "essentialistic" nature of all laws. The appeals of epistemological relativism are likely to be lost on those enjoying the benefits of legal reforms. Second, irrespective of her intent to pursue a more de-certainized view of subjectivity, Elam focuses exclusively on gender and neglects the issue of multiple subjectivity which sees gender identity as only one of a myriad of predicates defining humankind. In so doing, she unnecessarily limits her own construction of political solidarity.

Like Elam, Thomas Docherty is concerned with the dangers of ossified notions of rights, though his discussion builds on the work of a more diverse body of theorists. At the outset, he points out certain foundationalist biases in the work of (post)Marxists such as Baudrillard and Bourdieu, with the latter in his view preoccupied with peeling away the "apparent" and "ideological" in order to reveal the "real" and "scientific." Docherty turns to the issues of time and appearance and the thought of Serres, Virilio, and André Gorz in order to develop a different view of political critique. Though somewhat inchoate in this essay, Docherty's theory of political agency embraces the Kantian ideal of "reflective judgment" — the latter appropriate in Kant's view for aesthetic evaluations — for it operates beyond the dominion of formal rules and protocols. Reflective judgment brings with it, consequently, a high degree of unpredictability and is therefore itself an "event" or, better, an interminable series of events. In language highly reminiscent of Sartre's, Docherty sees the "search for justice" as the political and ethical responsibility of the "Subject," of the "I," who is constituted as a "social," not "individual" being. The strength of Docherty's discussion of postmodern political agency resides in its rejection of "depth" metaphors for the "real" and the "true" — the basis of what he calls, generally, "psychopolitical" critique — and its collateral emphasis on justice as event and "enactment."

The remaining several essays examine a variety of genres in the context of postmodern issues and concerns. Space limitations permit no more than a passing mention of these, though the diversity of areas covered points to the richness of this collection. In "Postmodern Education in the Age of Border Youth," Henry Giroux considers what he calls the "modernist" biases of the North American educational establishment, and the need for educators to inform themselves of the role played by contemporary visual media, notably TV and cinema, in the development of hybrid identities and shifting cultural practices. The trivium of essays that follows the Giroux piece look at "Postmodern Art and Technoculture." Margot Lovejoy and Peter Lunenfeld examine the worlds of, respectively, "transaesthetics" and "hyperaesthetics" that digital technologies have now made possible/inevitable. In a quite intriguing essay written in 1991, though it would have benefited from updating given recent case-law history, Wendy Griesdorf discusses the legal limits of parody in the celebrated lawsuit brought against American artist Jeff Koons by a certain Mr. Rogers, a very serious, humorless even, photographer of kitsch. In other essays, Linda Hutcheon analyzes opera's "postmodern moment," and Glenn Handler investigates the greatest parlor game of the postmodern age, channel surfing. For their part, Bill Reading discusses the fashioning of a contemporary literary historiography and Susan Strehle negotiates some complicated twentieth-century scientific theory in her detailed examination of the latter's infiltration of postmodern fiction.

Finally, one of the most appealing essays here is the one that concludes the book. Paul Budra's "The Cilantro Cannot Hold: Postmodern Cuisine Beyond the Golden Arches." A happy combination of Lyotard and Martha Stewart, of semiotic inquiry and culinary tourism, this piece explores the contrasting, well, tastes of modernist and postmodern cuisine — briefly, Paul Bocuse and Julia Child vs. Emeril and Wolfgang Puck, ketchup and parsley vs. salsa and cilantro. One suspects that, given the aging of the professoriate, this is an area that is likely to get steadily increasing attention in the future. Is fusion cooking the culinary equivalent of pastiche? Does *Planet Hollywood* serve actual food or merely simulacra? Is, we wonder, *The Iron Chef* a solemn display of cooking expertise or another illustration of the sort of "foundationless [and here globalized] irony" that Linda Hutcheon sees as defining the postmodern? (A comparative study of golf semiotics cannot be far behind — Hogan vs. Payne Stewart, Nicklaus vs. Tiger Woods?) Thorstein Veblen cannot be resting comfortably in his grave.

Postmodern Times effectively represents the inordinate variety of debate over postmodern issues and aesthetics forms that the last several years have witnessed. This is a collection, whether wholly or in its parts, offers a good deal to all students of the postmodern. While a couple of areas might have received (more) attention, and I am thinking of postmodern political theory and the preeminent issue of our young millennium, globalization, the latter observation in no way diminishes the importance and appeal of this volume. The various contributors and especially editors Carmichael and Lee deserve our commendation for an insightful and very readable book. (JERRY A. VARSAVA, UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA)

WOLFGANG RÖSSIG. *Literaturen der Welt in deutscher Übersetzung. Eine chronologische Bibliographie*. Stuttgart: Metzler, 1997. Pp. 672. ISBN 3-476-00961-0.

In most cases, access to the multitude of literatures of the world is made possible through the publication of translations. Considering the fact that three to four thousand literary works are translated into German each year (statistical data can be found in the *Index translationum*), with virtually no easily accessible bibliographic listings on the market, Wolfgang Rössig's "chronological bibliography" can only be seen as an important and timely volume. The book lists, by year of publication, no less than 16,500 translations that have appeared in the German language from 1470 to 1990. Most entries contain more than the information necessary to locate a text in libraries or to find additional information on it elsewhere, including the author's full name, the dates of birth and death of the author, the title of the translation, the language from which the work was translated, the name and initials of the translator(s), and the place

and year of publication of the translated work, or the collection in which the translation appears. In addition, each entry includes the title, place, and year of the original's first publication. The index constitutes almost a third of Rössig's book and consists of five clearly marked sections which list, in alphabetical order: (1) authors' names; (2) authors' names listed by language (subdivided into headings of national affiliation, e.g., "engl.; Antigua," "engl.; Australien," "engl.; Barbados," etc.); (3) titles of the originals; (4) titles of the translations listed by language of the original; and (5) the names of all translators mentioned in the main part of the book.

Rössig's bibliography is undoubtedly a dependable and user-friendly reference tool that opens several windows into Germany's long and rich tradition of textual synchronization. However, the book's long outdated and therefore questionable criteria for selection greatly limit its general usefulness, most certainly to any comprehensive probing into the history of foreign language literary texts in German. Firstly, all so-called "Trivialliteratur" (7), that is, literature traditionally believed by Germanists to serve only entertainment purposes and to be unworthy of consideration and serious inquiry, has been intentionally omitted from the start. This, no doubt, distorts the clarity of the image "über die Art und Weise der Übersetzungstätigkeit" (7) the bibliography seeks to provide. Secondly, Rössig's reliance in his selection on national and international "Literaturlexika" (7), that is, on works highly sensitive to processes of canon formation, potentially rules out any listing of non-canonical texts, including women's and minority literature. This problem becomes particularly obvious in light of the success of newer (though arguably less conventional) types of literature, for example lesbian crime. Important authors such as Sarah Dreher or Katherine V. Forrest are not mentioned despite the fact that their works have not only revolutionized the genre but have also been enjoyed by hordes of German-speaking readers for well over a decade. Thirdly, many entries, even those of more recent translations, are lacking relevant bibliographical information (such as the original title), and while some works by a particular author may be listed, translations of other works by the same author have, for no apparent reason, been excluded. Furthermore, since Rössig did not consider anthologies, claiming a lack of space, the user of his bibliography is also bound to miss countless available translations of shorter works that often appear only in anthologies, including novellas, short stories, essays, and poems. This I find most unfortunate, since it is precisely these shorter texts that are among the most wanted and are usually the most difficult to locate.

Despite these shortcomings, Rössig's book should be praised for what it does provide: a quick and easy reference to an impressive selection of texts that have become available in German translation over the last 520 years. (CHRISTOPH LOREY, UNIVERSITY OF NEW BRUNSWICK)

*ROBIN HEALEY. *Twentieth-Century Italian Literature in English Translation: An Annotated Bibliography 1929-1997*. Toronto, Buffalo, London: University of Toronto Press, 1998. Pp. 605. CAN \$95.00.

This very useful book provides information on modern Italian writers, their translated works, their reception, and their translators. The study follows on the footsteps of Nancy C. Shields's *Italian Translations in America: A Bibliography* which covered the early years of printing in America to the end of 1928. Healey's work brings us up to date. The bibliography does not list all the translations from Italian since 1928, which would be unmanageable, it concentrate solely on the literature of the twentieth century. And by twentieth-century writers, it means writers writing and publishing in this period. Therefore editions of translations of nineteenth century writers are included if their works are published in 1929 or later. Likewise excluded are works of literary criticism, philosophy, social criticism and political writings. Further, the bibliography includes all works in English and not solely in American. "It includes as complete a record as possible of the distinct editions of published translations of Italian fiction, poetry, plays, screenplays, librettos, journals or diaries, correspondence, and some personal narrative, belles-lettres, and associated works, wherever these translations might have appeared" (Introduction). The work includes translations from Great Britain, the United States, Australia, Canada, Ireland, Italy, South Africa, and Switzerland. Also represented are France, India, Japan, Luxembourg and Sweden. It is concerned with publications mainly in book form, periodical issues principally devoted to twentieth-century Italian literature in English, and translations in anthologies. It includes drama and plays in general collections. Fiction of substantial length is included, or shorter but significant stories by important authors. The same applies to poetry. Further, only translations of works written originally in Italian are included, as are also English adaptations or translations from the authors themselves, as well as the works of Italian emigrants or foreign born writers, as long as they can be identified as translations from existing Italian edition or version.

But the best feature of this work, beside the precise bibliographical notations and the information given, are the notes which list contents, provide information about the texts, give some contemporary critical judgments, a brief biographical sketch of the author and, where available, some information on the translator. The biographical notes together with review extracts for some of the titles provide useful information to the reader who is not familiar with these works. Notes on translators also allow to follow the careers of individual translators from the prolific William Weaver to lesser known but still important translators.

Healey also provides some interesting statistics on the translations of Italian works into English: half of the fourteen hundred titles that appear in his bibliography are

novels or short story collections by individual authors, with Moravia's *The Woman of Rome* (1949) on top of the best-seller list; 250 are plays with Pirandello on top with 9 different translations of *Six Characters in Search of an Author*; poetry fewer than 200 with Montale on top with 26 book-length publications; the rest of the 250 titles are mostly screenplays and librettos. Healey also discusses briefly the economic factors of publishing literature in translation: the financial success of Eco's *The Name of the Rose*, the problem posed by the ongoing acquisition of publishing houses, the need for subsidization of both translation and its publication. Healey also touches on the large percentage of Italian novels that never find translators. Such a list includes most works of Capuana, D'Annunzio, Bernari, Soldati, Comisso, Arbasino, Meneghello, and many of the most prominent contemporary writers. The problem is more acute in the case of poetry and drama where very little finds its way into translation. Healey concludes his survey by touching upon the major issues and problems discussed at the 1982 Italian Book and American Publishing conference, held at the American Academy in Rome, namely, the difficulty of negotiating the sale or purchase of literary rights, securing funding for the translations and actually publishing them. The sad note, comments William Weaver, is that publishers decide what to publish and who they will publish. Publishers are more and more unwilling to risk on a work that is not going to sell or will not have prestige. All a translator can do is translate the book and send it around and hope that with some luck some publisher may be interested. For Weaver, this is less likely to happen than not. There are still scores of great writers that are waiting to be translated such as Carlo Bernari and Lalla Romano, but that are also many that have been translated and the reader of this bibliography can be pleasantly surprised by going through the title index of this excellent work. The annotated bibliography will point to more works of a particular author and should serve as stimulus for further reading. In case of omissions the author urges the reader to contact him at: healey@library.utoronto.ca

Healey, a librarian at the University of Toronto Library, concludes with the hope that his bibliography "will contribute to the growth of the English-speaking readership for modern Italian literature." I shall be among the first to attest that it does. (MASSIMO VERDICCHIO, UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA)

Canadian Review of Comparative Literature Revue Canadienne de Littérature Comparée

The Review is published by the Canadian Comparative Literature Association (CCLA) and supported by grants from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, and the University of Alberta / La Revue est l'organe officielle de l'Association Canadienne de Littérature Comparée (ACLC) et elle est publiée avec le concours du Conseil de recherches en sciences humaines du Canada et de l'Université de l'Alberta.

Founding Editor and Senior Editorial Consultant/Directeur fondateur et conseiller principal: M.V. Dimić (Alberta)
Editor/Directeur: J.L. Hart (Alberta)

Associate Editor/Directeur associé: E.D. Blodgett (Alberta)

Book Review Editor/Rédacteur associé pour les compte-rendus: R.R. Wilson (Alberta)

Editorial Consultant and Contributing Editor/Conseiller et Collaborateur à la rédaction: I. Sywenky (Alberta)

Corresponding Editors / Rédacteurs associés: E.D. Blodgett (Alberta), E. Cobley (Victoria), P.A. Demers (Alberta), S. Gunew (UBC), A. Malak (Grant McEwan), P. McCallum (Calgary), R.J. Merrett (Alberta), K.

Mezei (Simon Fraser), J. Pivato (Athabasca), C. Potvin (Alberta), R.A. Young (Alberta).

Members of the Secretariat / Membres du secrétariat: M. Deeb, M.K. Garstin, N. Mallet, U. Margolin, C. H.

Moore, H. Pausch, N. Rahimieh (Alberta).

Editorial Committee/Comité de rédaction: M. Angenot (McGill), R. Cavell (British Columbia), D. Chamberlain

(Queen's), P. Chavvy (Dalhousie), E. Cobley (Victoria), L. Dolézel (Toronto), M. Dolézelová-Velingerová (Toronto),

M. Goetz-Stankiewicz (British Columbia), L. Hutcheon (Toronto), E.-M. Kröller (British Columbia), W. Krynski

(Montreal), E. Kushner (Toronto), P. Mervale (British Columbia), C. Moisan (Laval), W. Moser (Montréal), E.

Mozesko (Alberta), R. Sutherland (Sherbrooke), D. Suvin (McGill), M.J. Valdés (Toronto), R.R. Wilson (Alberta)

Editorial Assistants/Adjointe à la rédaction: G.S. White, K.J. Kozak, F. Bitney, C. Irwin, K. Clark, S. Wilson,

M. Mannani

Advisory Board / Conseil de patronage: J.E. Benscheikh (Paris/Alger), J. Bessière (Paris), R. Chambers

(Michigan), R.K. DasGupta (Delli/Calcutta), M. Ferguson (U of California at Davis), J. Ferraté (Alberta/

Barcelona), P. Ford (Cambridge), H.G. Gadamer (Heidelberg), C. Guillén (Harvard/Barcelona), G. Hartman

(Yale), A. Pagden (John Hopkins), T. Reiss (New York), A. Viatte (Zürich/Paris), M. Worton (London).

Cover design: Alan Brownoff (University of Alberta Press).

Aims and Scope: The Canadian Review of Comparative Literature/Revue Canadienne de Littérature

Comparée is a journal providing a forum for scholars engaged in the study of literature from both an international and an interdisciplinary point of view. The editors define comparative literature in its broadest sense. The journal publishes articles on the international history of literature, theory of literature, methods of literary scholarship, and the relation of literature with other areas of human expression. In addition, the journal publishes shorter reviews of individual books, particularly those published in Canada or published by scholars working at Canadian universities and, in the section "Notes, Documents and Review Articles," review articles about important publications. Members of the Canadian Comparative Literature Association and our Canadian and foreign colleagues are invited to submit papers, notes and queries, reviews of scholarship, review articles, and suggestions about possible contributions to the editor.

Information to Contributors and Subscribers: Manuscripts should be sent directly to the editor (J.L. Hart, Department of Comparative Literature, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada, T6G 2E6 e-mail: crel@ggpu.ualberta.ca) in three paper copies. Upon acceptance, a diskette with the word-processed text and a print-out is required. When possible the author should include an email address. Texts should follow the MLA format described in the *MLA Handbook for Writers of Research Papers*, Third Edition. New York: The Modern Language Association of America, 1988, section "Documenting Sources - Parenthetical documentation and the list of works cited," pp. 155-79. Manuscripts should not have been published previously (except for an abstract, lecture, personal announcement, thesis), and should not be submitted simultaneously for publication in another journal or medium. It is suggested that English or French be used for the submission; occasionally, and for special reasons only, articles will be accepted in German, Italian, Russian, and Spanish. Preference will be given to manuscripts of 6000 to 7500 words, but the editor will consider a limited number of substantial studies. Manuscripts will not be returned. The Review is published four times each year, in Winter, Spring, Summer, and Fall. Single copies Can\$25.00. Individual subscriptions: Members of the Canadian Comparative Literature Association receive the Review as part of their membership dues, which are: Can\$60.00/US\$57.00 (Can\$70.00/US\$67 after 31 March) for regular members; Can\$30.00/US\$27 (Can\$40.00/US\$37 after 31 March) for students, emeritus or un/deremployed; Can \$75/US\$70 (Can\$80/US\$75 after 31 March) for joint membership; lifetime memberships are Can\$375; TWO YEAR regular membership is Can\$120.00/US\$115; TWO YEAR student/emeritus/un/deremployed membership is Can\$60.00/US\$55, TWO YEAR joint membership is Can\$150.00/US\$140. Institutional subscription is Can\$64.50 /US\$62.00; overseas add US\$5.00 for both individual and institutional subscriptions (CRCL/RCLC, 347 Arts Building, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB, Canada T6G 2E6; crel@ualberta.ca).