

connections between physical and metaphysical praxis, and Schwenger's insights here have important resonances for theorizing the political dimensions of the discursivity that engendered the capacity to create weapons of mass or total destruction. Furthermore, Schwenger eloquently makes a case for language as *pharmakon*. The pathology of a speech that uncovers its potential for total destruction is but one side of the coin. The flip side notes the salutary effects residing in language's ability "to make the world, to make something even of its unmaking on that August morning" (52).

The reverie of destruction compels the possibility of renewal, an argument that sustains Schwenger's book through to its conclusion, which argues for language's "paradoxical being" (150) as a form of resistance to nuclear nihilism. (But remember: no aporias, not now, especially with regard to the nuclear referent.) The perverse redemption of "hope" — that most suspect but necessary condition of possibility — in the face of the totalitarian reality of the Bomb thus becomes a form of critical resistance against the cynical discourse engendered by the Bomb as either a physical or a linguistic phenomenon.

Inscription, then, physical or psychical, may become transcription; scars of both kinds may be translated into new meanings; and the unconscious that is Hiroshima may emerge into a language that is adequate, if not to its impossible real, at least to us who are struggling to come to some kind of deferred terms with it. (54)

The struggle to create an "adequate" language, at once impossible but real, present but deferred, conscious but unconscious — remember, no aporias, not even now — becomes the struggle to articulate the crisis of a criticism for which no such language exists, except as an impossible, transcriptive deferral of possibility. Schwenger aligns that possibility with creative acts of resistance to the totalitarian discursivity that produced the Bomb. The desire to create "new meanings" remains perhaps the unconscious dream of survival that flies in the face of its nemesis, the unconscious dream of a ritual purification that forever removes the pathological stain of language and its effects.

But to say as much is to remember that no such aporias gather in the shadow of the nuclear referent.

University of Guelph

Works Cited

- Baudrillard, Jean. *L'illusion de la fin ou la grève des événements*. Paris: Galilée, 1992.
 Derrida, Jacques. "No Apocalypse, Not Now (Full Speed Ahead, Seven Missiles, Seven Missives)." *Diacritics* (Summer 1984): 20-32.
 Duras, Marguerite. *Hiroshima Mon Amour*. Trans. Richard Seaver. New York: Grove Press, 1961.
 Foucault, Michel. *The Order of Things*. New York: Vintage, 1973.
 Schwenger, Peter. *Letter Bomb: Nuclear Holocaust and the Exploding Word*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins UP, 1992.

BOOK REVIEWS

*KATALIN KÜRTÖSI and JÓZSEF PÁL, eds. *Celebrating Comparativism*. Szeged: József Attila University, 1994. Pp. 567. No price.

Celebrating Comparativism, subtitled *Papers offered for György M. Vajda and István Fried*, is a collection of papers deriving from a celebratory conference held at Attila József University of Szeged, Hungary, in the spring of 1994. Vajda, whose eightieth birthday was being celebrated, founded the University's Department of Comparative Literature, and Fried, succeeding Vajda as Chair in 1985, continued to lead the Department in new thematic and methodological directions. Both scholars helped establish the Szeged tradition of comparative study of interrelationships among Western and Central European and Slavic literatures, especially of the nineteenth century.

This volume brings together a large number of essays that vary widely in subject, language, length, and quality. The first two of these criteria, at any rate, indicate the other aspect of celebration evident in the collection: it celebrates the wide-ranging potential of Comparative Literature itself. There are a total of forty-three essays — nineteen in English, twelve in German, eleven in French, and one in Italian. (Unfortunately, typos are equally common in all languages.) An introductory essay on the history of Comparative Literature at Szeged is followed by three approximately equal sections, which, under the headings "Definitions and Contacts," "Myths and Arts," and "Moments and Perspectives," more or less succeed in sorting the essays into methodological topics, thematic topics, and generic or literary-historical topics, respectively.

"Definitions and Contacts" is the most interesting grouping. It brings together papers, often quite short, that make a wide range of bold proposals about the methodology, assumptions, and direction of Comparative Literature. Several of these are marked by a humanistic vision, such as Eva Kushner's fine essay calling for a renewed emphasis on the subject or individual in literary and cultural theory — not only for the sake of being faithful to the textual evidence, but also in order to make cultural study a more humanistic, or even humanitarian, enterprise. Kushner's paper is surrounded by other calls for a revised relationship between literary and cultural studies, including Henry H. Remak's challenge to make *the literary* central to the discipline of Comparative Literature, Béla Köpeczi's proposal that a new interdisciplinary collaboration between cultural history and the history of literature can help reveal how even "la grande littérature" depends on the cultural needs of a reading public, and Armando Gnisci's contrary claim that literary criticism, as "discipline ascétique de la vraie réciprocité" (72), can — in contrast to anthropology — respect true alterity and

reciprocity. Other essays go beyond a renewed humanism to strike a rather reactionary note, such as Holger Klein's sweeping celebration of "the role of literature in humanising the world" or Haskell M. Block's revival of the concept of "Families of minds" as an analogy-based method of literary study. Rien T. Segers's essay, in which he develops a hypothesis about progressive improvement in literary theory in order to argue that the empirical study of literature is a more adequate and effective methodology than reception aesthetics, also falls into this category.

The first section contains some longer, methodologically-oriented essays on the study of particular periods or genres. Noteworthy examples are Jacques Voisine's "L'essai littéraire est-il un genre anglais?" on the emergence of the modern literary essay in light of diverging traditions of essay-writing in France, England, and Germany, and especially Jean Weisgerber's "Citations polyglottes et citations non-verbales dans les littératures d'avant-garde." Weisgerber's study, complete with numerous visual examples, is an insightful as well as entertaining survey of the use of polyglossia (including citations from other languages, pseudo-translations, the concept of the "ready-made," hybrids of two languages, and hybrids of word and image) in the culture of the avant-garde (including advertisements, newspapers, and literary works).

Essays in the second section, "Myths and Arts," are related by a kind of Wittgensteinian family resemblance. Successive but interwoven thematic threads connect papers focused on myth (Orpheus; Atlantis; Dante's Earthly Paradise) to papers on symbolism (water in Goethe; the Mediterranean in Hungarian literature; nature in modernist literature) to papers on music (Palestrina in modern German opera; eighteenth-century operas that satirize the operatic world; Weber's *Freischütz*), and back to myth (resonances between Irish literature and far-flung cultures, including the Classical world and Japan). There is a sub-theme in many of these essays, as they examine ways in which the poet, artist, or virtuoso figure has been represented, revived, or satirized over the centuries. Perhaps the most interesting essay on this topic is George Biztray's "Author-Auteur: The Time When Literature and Film (almost) Met," a concise summary of the auteurist movement that concludes with a reflection on the differences between artforms, differences that limited the development of auteurism but that also give Comparative Literature its unique identity as a discipline. Some of the "Myths and Arts" essays also share a potential weakness: it is sometimes unapparent what makes a particular study of imagery or symbolism "comparative." Notable counter-examples of myth- or image-centered essays that do strike out in innovative comparative directions are János Riesz's paper on the use of the Atlantis myth in colonialist propaganda in the early twentieth-century French-language literature of Africa, Éva Martonyi-Stéphane Sarkany's literary-cultural study of the topos of Venice and the Mediterranean in contemporary Hungarian literature, and Peter V. Zima's wide-ranging study of nature as both a threat to

and a liberation of the subject in modernism.

The book's third section, "Moments and Perspectives," is loosely organized in chronological order with essays on specific periods and genres from medievalism to postmodernism. It is also more heavily focused on the relationships between Western and Eastern European, especially Hungarian, literature. Several essays pursue the most conservative of the comparative strategies covered in the earlier methodological essays, by comparing two writers or examining a straightforward case of influence (e.g., the self-fashioning and early reception of the Renaissance poets Philip Sidney and Bálint Balassi; the modernist writers Italo Svevo and Géza Csáthi; the influence of the Arcadian movement in eighteenth-century Italian literature in revitalizing Hungarian literature). More complex approaches to Hungarian fiction in the context of West-European literature are pursued by Livia Käthe Wittmann, who compares femaleness and Jewishness as criteria that determine either subject- or object-positions in modern fiction, and László Illés, whose study of the Hungarian writer Lajos Nagy is thoroughly integrated into the context of a new functionalism or objectivity ("neue Sachlichkeit") in European late modernist literature. Also noteworthy, for its command of several cultural traditions and of interrelationships between "high" and "low" culture, is Werner Röske's long essay "Schälke — Schelme — Narren: Literaturgeschichte des 'Eigensinns' und populäre Kultur in der frühen Neuzeit," which examines the topos of the fool or picaresque in the late mediaeval period in the context of the presumed intellectual privilege of orienting oneself toward reality differently from the norm. The collection ends as boldly as it began with Miklós Szabolcsi's short paper "L'assin c'est le lecteur ou l'artiste comme déviant," which argues that the image of the deviant personality in literature is almost always a self-portrait of the author.

Celebrating Comparativism is a full, rich, and thought-provoking, if uneven, collection. The deplorable condition of the physical volume detracts somewhat from the experience of reading it. It is marred by flaws of all kinds: poorly cut paper, an inadequately glued spine that causes the book to fall apart on one reading, wide variations in print quality and ink colour, inconsistencies in punctuation and capitalization. There are an astounding number of proofreading errors — albeit some of them add comic relief, such as the reference to "the writhing of literary history" (192) or the citation of *Brizan* Joyce as the author of *Ulysses* (347). In terms of content, however, this is a worthwhile collection that celebrates diversity while nevertheless coalescing around recurring questions of the role of the individual or the subject in literature and culture, the role of the artist and how it has been interpreted across the centuries, and the role of Comparative Literature as it continues to evolve in relation to other enterprises. (ANGELA ESTERHAMMER, UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN ONTARIO)

*DONALD BRUCE and ANTHONY PURDY, eds. *Literature and Science*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1994. Pp. 179. US\$ 36.91.

What is the relationship between Comparative Literature and literature and science? The problem is complex, for both are interdisciplinary fields whose domains have been variously defined. As is evident from Bernheimer's 1995 collective volume, *Comparative Literature in the Age of Multiculturalism*, the boundaries of Comparative Literature are currently very much in dispute. And as Bruce and Purdy's *Literature and Science* demonstrates, what the dust jacket describes as "the exciting new field of literature and science" is no less open to multifarious characterizations. Indeed, the issue of interdisciplinarity itself is the subject of the volume's lead essay, Katherine Hayles's "Deciphering the Rules of Unruly Disciplines: A Modest Proposal for Literature and Science." Hayles argues that all thought is shaped by tacit disciplinary assumptions, yet that genuinely interdisciplinary work is possible since disciplines are not monolithic structures but polysemous, contested practices. Disciplinary fissures afford occasions for embedded yet deregulated explorations of the space between disciplines, and as instances of such embedded interdisciplinary inquiry she discusses Donna Haraway's analysis of gender assumptions in primatology research, Gillian Beer's study of Darwinian rhetoric and 19th-century fiction, and the Derrida/Searle exchange about iterability and speech-act theory. Hayles's "modest proposal" is eminently reasonable, but it suggests that the discipline of literature and science is subject to perpetual redefinition and that the differences between philosophers of science, historians of science, and students of literature and science so evident in this essay are bound to remain unresolved.

One of Hayles's points is that literature and science's methodological issues are common to all interdisciplinary research, but as one follows her through widening examples, it is easy to forget that the volume's focus is literature and science. This is even more the case with Anthony Wall's witty and insightful contribution, "A Taste for Metaphors." Opposing theories of metaphor as translation or deviance from a norm, Wall insists on the embodied, performative nature of metaphor, which makes possible a non-propositional mode of knowledge transmission. Wall's strategy is to discuss metaphors in metaphors — in this instance metaphors of taste, tenor and vehicle combining, say, as spices in a ragout. A metaphor is not an abstract coupling of concepts but a performative instance of a savory concoction. "This performativity is further connected to the fact that taste is a purely physical sense that cannot be 'reasoned' in the abstract: in order to taste we must physically come into contact with the other" (60). Clearly, Wall's performative approach to metaphor may serve to challenge unreflective oppositions of figurative, literary language and literal, scientific discourse (a point he does not stress), but his essay demonstrates as well that at times it is difficult to distinguish the discipline of literature and

science from such fields as literary theory and the philosophy of language.

Other contributions to the volume conform more closely to disciplinary expectations. Valerie Greenberg's "Vienna and the Brain: Freud's Tangled Explanations" and Geoffrey Winthrop-Young's "Undead Networks: Information Processing and Media Boundary Conflicts in *Dracula*" examine the scientific and technological contexts of *fin-de-siècle* narratives. Greenberg points out that Freud's 1877-1882 studies in neurology and the early psychoanalytic *Studies in Hysteria* (1892) use the same language of core and periphery, suggesting the existence of common models and metaphors in Freud's properly scientific research and his more anecdotal case histories. Core and periphery have mythic resonance in Freud's thought, she observes, but they also characterize the geography of Vienna and the essential elements of Freud's quest for upward mobility. Science, narrative, myth and autobiography interpenetrate in Freud, which leads Greenberg to conclude that the "cultural context" of a text should be conceived of not as background but as "food or air — both inside and outside, separate and incorporated, surrounding and imbibed, welcome and inescapable" (104). Winthrop-Young offers an intriguing look at communications technology as much as *Dracula* needs blood; consequently, *Dracula*'s fortunes depend on the degree to which he is able to restrict unwanted information exchange" (112). Telegraph, phonograph and typewriter, he shows, function as sources of power, but also as modes of control and symptoms of anxiety over "media-related intrusion and change" (108). What *Dracula* dramatizes, finally, is print culture's ambivalence toward electronic media, an ambivalence Winthrop-Young finds throughout the late nineteenth-century novel.

The remaining essays focus on the themes of chaos and chance. Anthony Purdy frames his "Introduction: On Scientific and Social Discourse" in terms of the different conceptions of entropy in thermodynamics and information theory. While adroitly situating the book's essays in this conceptual schema, Purdy astutely observes that context alone can determine whether data function as nonsense or sense, and that in an age of information overload, nineteenth-century worries about energy degradation have necessarily given way to concerns about means of converting mere data-noise into meaningful information. Joseph Conte brings chaos theory to bear on Calvino's *Castle of Crossed Destinies* in "The Uncertain Predictor: Calvino's *Castle of Tarot Cards*." Calvino's ludic novel combines deterministic rules and aleatory variations, the work's generative force arising from the interplay of chance and necessity inherent in the interpretation of the limited set of Tarot signs displayed in a single random distribution. Calvino's narrative, though experimental, is also paradigmatic, Conte argues, for every work of literature "must be an instance of negentropy, an area of self-organization in the vast and anarchic domain of experience" (143). In "Chaotic Phenomena in Word and Deed: Representations of Nature and Culture in the

Paris Commune of 1871," Donald Bruce imports chaos theory into the social sciences, treating the 1871 uprising as an instance of dynamic complexity and the spontaneous formation of new social relations as examples of emergent structures in far-from-equilibrium situations. By differentiating phenomena in which order is latent within chaos from those in which order emerges from chaos, Bruce is able to regard Proudhon's anarchism both as the natural order of sympathetic human relations submerged within competitive, bourgeois chaos and as an emergent structure of social relations produced from the chaotic disruptions of the Commune. Bruce ties his discussion to literature by considering Jules Vallès's *Jacques Vingtras* trilogy as an artistic response to the Paris Commune, Vallès's narrative account of these events disclosing patterns of dynamic complexity and emergent order similar to those articulated in chaos theory. Finally, William Paulson's "Chance, Complexity, and Narrative Explanation" offers an ingenious account of narrative in terms of algorithmic complexity. Defining the random as information that cannot be algorithmically compressed, Paulson argues first that narrative is allied to the contingent, there being no shorthand formula of events capable of standing in for a simple recounting of what happened. But he also recognizes that fictions impose patterns, and hence generate informational redundancy. Narrative explanation pays obeisance to both the random and the expected, and in this Paulson finds literature's affinity with chaos theory, whose appeal "derives in no small measure from this double imperative, whose antagonism seems reconciled in non-linear dynamical systems that are at once deterministic and unpredictable" (89).

As this volume demonstrates, the field of literature and science accommodates a wide range of concerns — philosophy of language, cultural studies, narrative theory, literature and technology, literature and sociology, etc. None of the book's essays conforms to Comparative Literature's traditional disciplinary expectations, but the volume's literary analyses could easily be extended across linguistic bounds, and the theoretical issues it treats are among those that comparatists regularly engage. Scholars who explore the many connections between literature and science have much to contribute to Comparative Literature; comparatists in turn could certainly enrich the discipline of literature and science, especially by extending discussions beyond the major Western literatures and the sciences of the last two centuries to provide global and broadly historical perspectives on the field. Comparatists should find this collection of intelligent and thoughtful essays highly rewarding. (RONALD BOGUE, UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA)

*DAVID BEVAN, ed. *Literature and Sickness*. (Rodopi Perspectives on Modern Literature, 8). Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1993. Pp. 116. £ 15.40 paper.

This is a fascinating and timely collection of articles on the general theme of aspects of neurological, mental, and physiological illness as they occur in certain

European and American works of fiction (and reporting). Susan Sontag is the presiding genius and the editor prefaces the whole volume with a quotation from her courageous and disturbing *Illness as Metaphor* (1987). David Bevan has had the intelligent idea of asking for six essays "some by well-established academics, others by younger researchers." The various affiliations of the contributors — Lynne S. Vieth, Jan B. Gordon, Pamela S. Saur, Elisabetta Nelsen, Kathleen A. Patterson, and Steven G. Kellman, respectively — are not given unfortunately. Their essays appear to have been written for this edition.

Each one is a carefully researched and highly informative addition to our knowledge of the writers under discussion. Lynne S. Vieth opens the volume with an examination of Walter Benjamin and Franz Kafka: "From Melancholic to Parabolic Expression." Although largely on *Der Prozess* (Vieth adopts the spelling of the Fischer Verlag 1990 edition) and its manic-depressive allegories, it ends with appropriate praise for the ingenious parable "Die Wahrheit über Sancho Pansa."

Jan B. Gordon's "The Key to Dedlock's Gait: Gout as Resistance" is an extended essay not merely on gout in literature but also on its medical diagnoses over the centuries. This essay is most valuable for its careful historical medical researches. Its only weakness, from a clinical point of view, is its reliance on the case descriptions given by Freud in *Studies on Hysteria*. Recent research (not available to Gordon) clearly demonstrates the inadequacies of Freud's diagnoses and treatments.¹

The next essay, by Pamela Saur, entitled "The Triumph of Sickness in Modern Austrian Literature," is a triumphant and well-documented treatment of its subject and, furthermore — and much to its credit! — Freud is only mentioned once, quoted from his letter describing Arthur Schnitzler as his "Doppelgänger." Her rapid survey covers Kafka, of course, and Thomas Bernhard, but also includes Joseph Roth, Arthur Schnitzler, Christine Lavant, Ernst Weiss, and Gerhard Roth.

Elisabetta Nelsen's essay analyses, as its subtitle indicates, "The Themes of Neurological Disease and Madness in Elsa Morante's Novels." Noting that few critics have approached Morante's work from a feminist perspective Nelsen offers to take up the challenge. She sensibly distances herself from Sandra Gilbert and Susan Gubar in *The Madwoman in the Attic* and suggests that Elsa Morante's is not a "feminist poetics" but a "female poetics." She includes an

¹ The facts about Freud's early misdiagnoses are most painstakingly revealed in *Why Freud was Wrong: Sin, Science and Psychoanalysis* by Richard Webster (New York: Basic Books, 1995). The early chapters of Webster's book include a detailed investigation of Charcot and Freud and of their assumption that *hysteria* is a disease entity in patients whose illness was neurological (e.g. epilepsy) or a consequence of organic brain damage. The first half of his massive book (over 600 pages) is now essential reading for anyone wishing to incorporate Freudian notions of human behavior into a study of literature.

interesting discussion of epileptic seizure and its possible symbolizations.

Kathleen Patterson's "Negotiating Elevators and Hay Lofts: Disability and Identity in Flannery O'Connor's Short Fiction" is a tough-minded and witty response to O'Connor's own personal knowledge of illness (lupus) and her brilliant sardonic humorous use of it in her fiction.

The final essay with its strange title "Reading Shilts Reading Camus Reading a Plague" is a quite brilliant and intensely moving example of Comparative Literature at its best. Kellman carefully examines the intertextual strategies at work behind the investigative journalist Randy Shilts's construction of his prize-winning *And the Band Played On: Politics, People and the AIDS Epidemic* (1987).

I was so impressed by this splendid little essay that I would not hesitate to recommend this volume on the strength of Kellman's beautifully measured and thoughtful writing. Kellman reminds us in his first sentence of the literary devices knowingly at work in Camus's *The Plague*:

Even before his narrative begins, Albert Camus offers a cue on how to read *The Plague*. He positions a statement by Daniel Defoe as the epigraph to the entire work. Any novelist writing about epidemics bears the legacy of *A Journal of the Plague Year*, the 1722 text in which Defoe recounts the collective story of one city, in his case, London, under the impact of a plague, and uses a narrator so self-effacing that his only concession to personal identity is the placement of his initials, H.F., at the end. (105)

Kellman goes on to demonstrate how the investigative journalist Shilts was himself deeply impressed by Camus's technique in *The Plague* and did his utmost in his *factual* reporting of a *real* (not allegorical) plague — AIDS — to use Defoe's and Camus's aesthetic narrative strategies to sharpen and make more intensely effective his own document on the present AIDS crisis and its origins. Camus's narrator, Bernard Rieux (an agnostic humanist if ever there was), allows himself a sharp critique of humanists who will be the first to disappear "*parce qu'ils n'ont pas pris leurs précautions*." (Camus, *Théâtre, récits, nouvelles, Pléiade*, 1245) — a phrase which nowadays takes on a significance quite unintended by Camus! By the same token, Shilts, himself a homosexual, is scathing in his denunciation of the various duplicities of bath-house managers in San Francisco and of the "mauvaise foi" of many in the gay activist community. Kellman sees in this moral intransigence both a continuation of Camus's moral importance as a writer who was also a witness and an aesthetic *tour-de-force* on Shilts's part that renders contemporary the technical choices of Defoe and Camus before him. Kellman's essay is a supremely compact, dense, and provocative piece of writing, deeply informed and superbly alert to the power of literature in the right hands. He prefaces his account with a remark by the literary correspondent of *Le Monde*, Bertrand Poirot-Delpech, "Was not Camus' only fault, apart from being too widely read, that he was right too soon?" Once one

has read his essay one realizes that Poirot-Delpech's barb is ALSO intended for those readers of *And the Band Played On* who have denounced Shilts's book because of its popularity and its moral and factual accuracy.

All of the essays in this little book are worth reading. David Bevan is to be congratulated on having produced an excellent volume of thoughtful material on many authors and, in fact, on many illnesses! The result is nowhere near as morbidly depressing as one might imagine. Indeed, if anything, this book is a nice example of how we humans manage to go beyond our frailties even when we use them as the objects of our study. (ROBERT WILCOCKS, UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA)

*CHERYLL GLOTFELTY and HAROLD FROMM, eds. *The Ecocriticism Reader: Landmarks in Literary Ecology*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1996. Pp. 415 + xxvii. US\$ 19.95 paper; US\$ 45.00 hardcover.

The Ecocriticism Reader: Landmarks in Literary Ecology is the first of its kind — an anthology of ecocritical essays devoted to organizing an area of study whose efforts have, until now, not been "recognized as belonging to a distinct critical school or movement" (xvi-xvii). Rather, as Cheryll Glotfelty points out in the introduction, many of the twenty-five essays collected in this volume have appeared under headings as varied "as American Studies, regionalism, pastoralism, the frontier, human ecology, science and literature, nature in literature, landscape in literature" (xvii), and so on. Avoiding the apocalyptic rhetoric that sometimes accompanies discussions about environmental issues, Glotfelty's introduction maintains a sense of the urgency and timeliness of the ecocritical project and argues that it is difficult to defend the traditional failure of the literary profession to address "green" issues. Glen Love, paraphrasing Glotfelty's point, puts it best: "race, class, and gender are words which we see and hear everywhere at our professional meetings and in our current publications ... [but] the English profession has failed to respond in any significant way to the issue of the environment" (226). *The Ecocriticism Reader* is a major step toward organizing the field and bringing literary studies into closer contact with what is generally recognized as a contemporary crisis.

The book is divided into three parts, which are intended to reflect the stages through which ecocriticism has progressed. Borrowing from Elaine Showalter's discussion of the three stages of feminist criticism, Glotfelty organizes ecocritical research into those phases that 1) examine images of nature in canonical literature, 2) rediscover or recognize "the tradition of nature writing in both neglected and celebrated writers" (383), and 3) ask theoretical questions about the constructedness of nature, relationships between ecofeminism and deep ecology, postmodernism and the environmental crisis, and so on. The collection begins with the theory, moves to discussions of canonical literature, and finishes with essays both about neglected and celebrated American nature writers.

Perhaps the greatest obstacle facing the ecocritic is that the polyphony of critical voices articulate at times seemingly opposed purposes — and, indeed, definitions — of ecocriticism. Glotfelty's working definition is that "ecocriticism is the study of the relationship between literature and the physical environment" (xviii), and one of the implicit goals of the approach is to recoup professional dignity for what Glotfelty calls the "undervalued genre of nature writing" (xxxi). Indeed, many of the essays in the collection do analyze nature writing extensively. A danger here, though, is that in so doing, the collection runs the risk of *equating* ecocriticism with one of its own branches, "nature studies," as if "ecocriticism" is simply a new term for an old approach — an approach, moreover, that tends to assume a universalist stand about what constitutes "the environment." David Mazel confronts universalism directly, arguing for a poststructuralist angle that views "the environment ... not as the prediscursive origin and cause of environmental discourse but rather as the effect of that discourse" (143).

Many of the essays in the collection examine conceptualizations of the natural environment, with approaches ranging from Annette Kolodny's discussion of colonial America's experience of the land-as-woman, to discussions from Dana Phillips, Cynthia Deitering, and Alison Byerly about nature-as-commodity. While there is a general appreciation among the critics about the ways in which the natural environment functions as "other" in Western culture, it is in Byerly's analysis of the American National Park Service that we come closest to an awareness of the contempt and fear (what we might call "ecophobia") that guides productions of the environment in mainstream American culture. The bias of the collection, however, is toward analyses of nature writing (which tend to be affirmative representations of the natural environment). Michael McDowell's comment that it is important to "recover the representation of place in even works of 'essential noninterest in the land'" (378) does not represent the primary goal of this collection.

Joseph Meeker's essay, however, is one that does attempt a serious examination of canonical texts that would technically fall *outside* of the "nature writing" genre. Meeker notes similarities between comedy and biology, arguing that "comedy and ecology are systems designed to accommodate necessity and to encourage acceptance of it, while tragedy is concerned with avoiding or transcending the necessary in order to accomplish the impossible" (163). Tragedy is not a good strategy for survival, in Meeker's view. While his comments about the "comic primacy of sex ... and the maintenance of normal reproduction" (159) are startlingly heterosexist (just as his writing is sexist), his general argument remains compelling: "Comedy illustrates," Meeker suggests, "that survival depends upon man's ability to change himself rather than his environment, and upon his ability to accept limitations rather than to curse fate for limiting him" (168-69).

William Rueckert also draws explicit comparisons between literary and biological activities in his essay that coins the term "ecocriticism." Maintaining that poems are like plants (each storing energy from their respective communities), Rueckert's main problem is in figuring out how to turn the stored energy of literature into effective political action in the real world. Sueellen Campbell's piece is also concerned with effective and direct action, and her investigation of similarities and differences between poststructuralism and deep ecology argues that "both [literary] theorists and ecologists ... are at core revolutionary" (127). It is unfortunate, though, that while Campbell's goal is to bridge the gap between poststructuralism and deep ecology, her essay amounts to little more than a comparison of the two, and she does not actually *do* poststructuralist ecocriticism.

One of the clearest, most forceful theoretical pieces in the collection is the essay by Christopher Manes, which examines why "the status of a speaking subject is jealously guarded as an exclusively human prerogative" (15). Manes shows the arbitrariness of what we might call "anthropophilic discourses" that lovingly depict the human "in lofty language about being the paragon of animals or the torchbearer of evolution" (24). As Manes argues, "to privilege intellect or self-consciousness, as opposed to photosynthesis, poisoned fangs, or sporogenesis, may soothe ancient insecurities about humanity's place in the cosmos, but it has nothing to do with evolutionary theory and does not correspond to observable nature" (24). In his discussion about the absurd arbitrariness of classificatory schemata, Manes explains that while *Mycorrhizal* fungus is one of the lowliest of forms on a humanistic scale of values, it is essential to biospheric functions: human life isn't essential. And if evolution has any preferences, Manes continues, it would have to be for beetles — and before that, trilobites (22). Presenting a Foucauldian analysis of ways that the post-medieval introduction of literacy and Christian exegesis have "created an immense realm of silences, a world of 'not said' called nature" (17), Manes argues that it is time to dismantle the model where "a certain kind of human subject ... only speaks soliloquies in a world of irrational silences" (25).

The question about voice and silence recurs in various forms in this collection. William Howarth, in an essay that briefly outlines a "theory and history of ecocritical principles" (82), argues that "ecology leads us to recognize that life speaks, communing through encoded streams of information that have direction and purpose, if we learn to translate the messages with fidelity" (77). Discussing the postmodern experience of commodified and spectacularized natural environments, Dana Phillips voices a comparable sentiment: "the soil is ... to be read, interpreted, taught, learned from, handed down to the next generation, and kept from becoming mere dirt" (221). Similarly, Alison Byerly argues for the need to "read nature's text as something other than fiction" (64), something other than "a picturesque commodity" (59). Scott Russell Sanders, too,

lamenting the lack of environmental awareness in recent American fiction, insists on the need for "listening for what nature [has] to say" (188). What each of these critics share is commitment to an understanding of the interconnectedness that William Reuckert maintains is common to all ecologists and ecological visions: "This need to see even the smallest, most remote part in relation to a very large whole is the central intellectual action required by ecology and of an ecological vision" (108).

Michael McDowell suggests that one way to recognize ecological interconnectedness while practicing literary criticism is by using Bakhtin's theory of dialogics. McDowell argues that "all entities in the great web of nature deserve recognition and a voice" (372), and a dialogical approach is useful because it "helps first by placing an emphasis on contradictory voices, rather than focusing mainly upon the authoritative monologic voice of the narrator ... A dialogical analysis of landscape literature emphasizes contradictory voices in part by exploring its intertextuality" (374). But while the emphasis on interconnectedness in essays by Neil Evernden, Sueellen Campbell, Leslie Marmon Silko, Vera Norwood, and Michael McDowell often involves discussions about the importance of the relationship between "self" and "place," it is curious that nowhere in the book do we get the term "bioregionalism." It is an important term, which has been used elsewhere to describe attempts "to understand place, the immediate specific place where we live" (Kirkpatrick Sale, *Dwellers in the Land: The Bioregional Vision* [San Francisco: Sierra Club Books, 1985] 42). Bioregionalism is one facet of ecocriticism.

Despite some unevenness among the essays and some organizational biases, among which the almost uniformly Americanist slant ranks highest, *The Ecocriticism Reader* remains a tremendous accomplishment that brings together many important themes and issues of ecocritical research. Gloftely is accurate in claiming that "these are the essays with which anyone wishing to undertake ecocritical scholarship ought to be familiar" (xxvi). (SIMON ESTOK, UNIVERSITY OF REGINA)

*GERARD STEEN. *Understanding Metaphor in Literature*. London: Longman, 1994. Pp. 263 + xiii. £ 12.99 paper.

Is there anything special about understanding metaphor in literature? Recent psychological findings concerning the ubiquity and processing of metaphor undermine the long unquestioned view of metaphor as closely related to literature and the arts. The view forwarded by, for example, Lakoff and his colleagues makes the claim that we live by metaphors. If the mind is poetic (e.g., Gibbs 1994), and determines the way we make sense of our daily experiences, the occurrence of metaphors in literature is neither unique nor special. Contrary to contemporary trends in linguistics and cognitive research, *Understanding Metaphor in Literature* by Gerard Steen reevaluates and empirically reestablishes

the relation between metaphor and literature. Steen's research shows that metaphors in literature have a different (cognitive) function than in nonliterary discourse.

Steen begins by questioning a number of current hypotheses concerning metaphor processing. He presents as particularly problematic the conceptual view of metaphor by George Lakoff and his colleagues. On this view, conceptual metaphors, i.e., metaphorical structures stored in long-term memory, partake in the on-line processing of linguistic metaphors during discourse comprehension. Given Lakoff's (1986b) view of metaphor as involving mapping from one domain to another, there is no guarantee that this applies to processing all forms of metaphor. For instance, though the utterances which follow may all be instantiations of the conceptual metaphor "death is a journey," it is questionable whether any mechanism of indirect processing that activates two conceptual domains is involved:

- a. She is gone.
- b. She is still with us.
- c. She's left us.
- d. She's passed away.

Steen argues that even if Lakoff's claim might hold for "an idealized native speaker" (1986a, 223), it may not necessarily be true of individual comprehenders. Alongside with Langacker (1988), he contends that in the case of highly conventional metaphors, people may process the nonliteral meaning directly from the lexicon, because for them there is no metaphorical mapping during their own language processing. Empirical evidence indeed attests that though conceptual metaphors are available for comprehenders, they are, nevertheless not always accessible during on-line processing (Glucksberg, Keysar, and McGlone 1992). Steen, therefore, suggests that metaphors be viewed as potentially (rather than automatically) involving understanding one thing in terms of another.

The observation that individual (as opposed to idealized) readers may not necessarily materialize the potential metaphorical interpretation of figurative language suggests that the study in question has shifted (the traditional) focus from text to reading — from critical interpretation to ordinary reception. Under what conditions, then, would readers pay attention to metaphors?

Following Meutsch (1987), Vipond and Hunt (1989), and Zwaan (1993), Steen proposes that it is the type of discourse that triggers a specific reading strategy (for a similar view see Giora and Shen 1994). Regarding metaphor processing, it is literature more than any other type of discourse that would trigger metaphor understanding as a nonliteral analogical mapping. Steen defines literature in terms of subjectivity, polyvalence, fictionality, and orientation to form, and argues that metaphors are best equipped to allow readers the

opportunity to experience all these while reading literature. He hypothesized that in a literary reading condition, metaphors should enhance and induce the feeling of literariness.

To establish the relation between metaphor and literariness, Steen first examined the extent to which metaphoricality directs attention to metaphors as typically literary. He asked more and less skilled readers of literature to underline ten stretches of maximally five words each which seemed to them "typically literary," and to explain why they had underlined them. The readers were presented with an unidentified text fragment by Norman Mailer, containing 19 metaphors of high (linguistically deviant) and low metaphoricality. Results support the claim that metaphors in literature afford readers an opportunity to experience literature as "literary": A great deal of the underlined metaphors were also explicitly identified as such. This suggests that readers consciously experience metaphors as literary.

The felt relation between metaphor and literariness was independent of literary socialization. Though the advanced readers underlined more metaphors as typically literary than the less literarily socialized group, these results cannot be generalized towards other materials. Furthermore, the effect of degree of metaphoricality did not attain statistical significance. However, with respect to metaphor identification (the explanation task), metaphoricality did yield a significant main effect. Highly metaphorical (deviant) metaphors were explicitly identified more often than less metaphorical ones.

To gain a full perspective on the function of metaphor in literature, nonliterary discourse has to be examined too. Steen hypothesized that context (the presentation of a text as either literary or journalistic) should have effect on both directing attention to metaphors (the underlining task) and identification of metaphors (the explanation task). Fragments of a literary and a journalistic text were used. They contained a similar number of metaphors. They were offered in authentic and perverse contexts respectively: the literary text was presented as a piece of journalism and as a fragment of a new novel, and vice versa. Subjects were free to underline any stretch of text they found relevant.

Results showed that literary reading triggered twice as many metaphor underlinings as journalistic reading. Readers who were not literary critics paid special attention to metaphors in texts they believed to be literature as opposed to texts they believed to be journalistic. They also motivated their underlinings by explicit metaphor identification. The hypothesis that it is the type of text that triggers a specific reading strategy gained support.

Is the type of text functional in triggering different reading strategies for metaphors? Are metaphors in literature and journalism processed differently? To be able to examine metaphorical processes in relation to text type, Steen identified ten processes which are involved in metaphor understanding:

- 2) Metaphor identification ("it seems a metaphor to me").
- 3) Labelling ("a is b").
- 4) Focus processing (understanding the entire metaphor in terms of the domain of the topic. Thus *riding* in "mermaids riding seawards on the waves" will receive the reading of *floating*, as suggested by Reinhart 1976).
- 5) Vehicle construction (activation of the domain associated with the vehicle, as in assigning the reading of *horse* to *waves* in the above example, as suggested by Reinhart).
- 6) Metaphor construction (understanding the metaphor in both metaphor terms).
- 7) Metaphor functionalization (understanding metaphor as related to the other parts of the text).
- 8) Metaphor context construction (understanding the metaphor in terms of authorial intention).
- 9) Metaphor refunctionalization (returning to metaphors interpreted before the current sentence).
- 10) Metaphor appreciation (expressing appreciation of the metaphor and its effect).

Having established that metaphors are accorded more attention in literature (or, rather, in a literary reading condition) than in journalism (or, rather, in a journalistic reading condition), it remained to be examined which kinds of processes (1-10 above) occur under the two conditions. The method that was selected to expose the types of processing involved in understanding various types of texts was thinking out loud: Readers were instructed to verbalize everything that crossed their mind while reading a text. Two groups — experts versus controls — were selected for the task of eliciting literary versus journalistic texts.

Since not all metaphor processing categories were accorded inter rater agreement, only five were investigated: focus processing, context construction, explicit identification, refunctionalization, and appreciation. Findings show a significant main effect of the reading condition: all five metaphor processing categories figured more prominently in the literary reading condition than in the journalistic reading condition. Thus, readers were shown to activate specifically literary reading strategies when reading literature. These strategies, however, are not acquired as a result of expertise: The data show that literary socialization does not affect the incidence of the various kinds of metaphor processing.

Are metaphors occurring in literary discourse different from those occurring in nonliterary discourse, and are these differences related to the type of discourse? Unlike Lakoff and his colleagues who are concerned with the general principles of cognition underlying metaphors in literature, Steen is interested in what is special about metaphors featuring in literature. He is concerned with what makes up their literary appeal, despite their roots in our cultural knowledge and their common, unconscious, automatic, metaphorical basis (Lakoff and Turner 1989, 15).

It should be noted that Steen does not intend to identify a distinct "aesthetic"

1) Problem identification ("what does this sentence mean?").

or "literary" property of metaphors, since upon his view, the characteristics of "aesthetic" or "literary" are social rather than cognitive composites. Though literary metaphors may be different from nonliterary metaphors in that they may be, for example, more emphatically fictional, more subjective and polyvalent, these differences need not rely on any special aesthetic dimension.

Steen investigated the relation between metaphor properties and literary versus journalistic readings. The question was whether metaphor properties exhibited a special relation with the kind of readings examined. Two aspects were chosen for investigation: the conceptual property of relative clarity, and the emotive property of positive/negative value. Findings (in both the underlining and the thinking aloud studies mentioned before) showed that there was a relation between positive and unclear metaphors and literary reading. Unclear and positive metaphors were underlined more often as typically literary than negative and clear metaphors, and they were processed more often in terms of the five processing categories mentioned earlier.

Results with respect to metaphor properties and nonliterary readings were less clear cut. In the journalistic reading condition, clear metaphors were not underlined more often than less clear ones. And positive metaphors were underlined more often than negative ones as typically journalistic. In terms of kinds of processes, clear and less clear metaphors were accorded equal attention. However, less positive metaphors activated all five kinds of metaphor processing. This is precisely the opposite of the literary reading condition, in which these processes were triggered by positive value metaphors. These findings, then, establish the relation between metaphor properties and type of discourse involved.

Understanding Metaphor in Literature by Gerard Steen, then, is an important pioneering and thorough study of the special relation between metaphor and literature. Contrary to current psychological (e.g., Lakoff 1986a, Lakoff and Turner 1989) and linguistic (e.g., Sperber and Wilson 1986) research, it provides ample empirical evidence to support the claim that readers treat metaphors in literature and outside literature differently. Though the methods cannot be revealing as to the comprehension phase of metaphor understanding (Gibbs 1990, 1992), they establish that metaphor interpretation is sensitive to the type of discourse processed. Metaphors are accorded more attention and evoke different processes when read as a piece of literature than when read as a piece of nonliterary discourse. (RACHEL GIORA, TEL AVIV UNIVERSITY)

Works Cited

- Gibbs, Raymond Jr. "The Process of Understanding Literary Metaphor." *Journal of Literary Semantics* 19 (1990): 65-79.
 Gibbs, Raymond Jr. "When is Metaphor? The Idea of Understanding in Theories of Metaphor." *Poetics Today* 13.4 (1992): 575-606.

Gibbs, Raymond Jr. *The Poetics of the Mind*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1994.
 Giora, Rachel and Yeshayahu Shen. "Degrees of Narrativity and Strategies of Semantic Reduction." *Poetics* 22 (1994): 447-58.

Glucksberg, Sam, Boaz Keysar and M.S. McGlone. "Metaphor Understanding and Accessing Conceptual Schema: Reply to Gibbs (1992)." *Psychological Review* 99 (1992): 578-81.

Lakoff, George. "A Figure of Thought." *Metaphor and Symbolic Activity* 1 (1986a): 291-96.

Lakoff, George. "The Meanings of Literal." *Metaphor and Symbolic Activity* 1 (1986b): 215-25.

Lakoff, George and Mark Turner. *More Than Cool Reason: A Field Guide to Poetic Metaphor*. Chicago: Chicago UP, 1989.

Langacker, R.W. "A Usage-based Model." *Topics in Cognitive Linguistics*. Ed. B. Rudzka-Ostyn. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1988. 127-61.

Meutsch, D. *Literatur verstehen. Eine empirische Studie*. Braunschweig: Vieweg, 1987.

Reinhart, Tanya. "On Understanding Poetic Metaphor." *Poetics* 5 (1976): 383-402.
 Vipond, D. and R.A. Hunt. "Literary Processing and Response as Transaction: Evidence for the Contribution of Readers, Texts, and Situations." *Comprehension of Literary Discourse: Results and Problems of Interdisciplinary Approaches*. Ed. R. Viehoff and D. Meutsch. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1989. 155-74.

Zwaan, R.A. *Aspects of Literary Comprehension: A Cognitive Approach*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1993.

*LYNN ENTERLINE. *The Tears of Narcissus; Melancholia and Masculinity in Early Modern Writing*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1995. Pp. 429. US\$ 49.50 cloth.

This study examines the affective disorder of melancholia, what the early moderns themselves called black choler, as a literary as well as a psychological problem. By concentrating on the relationship between subjectivity, eros, and literary forms (specifically Tasso's epic, Marvell's lyric, Shakespeare's dramatic comedy, and Webster's dramatic tragedy), Lynn Enterline strives to illuminate each text's representation of the masculine subject. Her topic, therefore, is not gender, but rather, the comprehension and apprehension of the self and the blindness around which this project is constituted. Since melancholia's symptoms include the destabilizing and undermining of identity and diminution of self-regard, her task is complicated indeed. Certainly not designed for browsing or casual attention, the book is dense, making genuine demands of the reader — both in its material and its approach.

Despite Enterline's disclaimers about the insights to be gleaned from a feminist analysis of melancholia's self-representation, she does privilege "patriarchally inflected subjectivity" (309). Although Enterline questions the ease and frequency with which sons blame their lack or loss on their mothers or their simultaneous attraction to and repulsion at female sexual difference, she is

nevertheless preoccupied with images of the wounded male body, dismembered or castrated, with the male's collapse into oceanic feeling and with the male's sense of dislocation in chaotic woods. Disregarding Renaissance understanding of melancholia along with humoral theory, Enterline chooses to reread these texts in light of contemporary psychoanalytic theory. And so, there is none of Burton's encyclopaedic digressions on "irascible and concupiscible ... perturbations and passions" (Part 1, Section 2, Member 3) and the eccentric erudition of his suggested cures that minds "be quietly pacified, vain conceits diverted, if it be possible, with terrors, cares, fixed studies, cogitations and whatsoever it is that shall any way molest or trouble the soul, because that otherwise there is no good to be done" (Part 2, Section 2, Member 6). Instead, Enterline supplies large, at times determining, chunks of Lacan's mirror stage, Kristeva's theorizing about the semiotic and symbolic functioning of the melancholic affect, and Freud and Laplanche's sense of loss, death, need, and sexuality. The balance between early modern literary text and postmodern theory is not always even or productive. The chapters are discrete, as opposed to interconnected or cumulative, entities. The reader hardly anticipates a grand field theory of Renaissance melancholia. Yet anchoring the study and apprehension of at least some aspect of Renaissance melancholia in early modern explanations themselves plus an effort to connect the four chosen Renaissance authors to larger or more pervasive early modern anxieties might have resulted in a less exclusive and less disjointed book.

The Tears of Narcissus succeeds in linking specific melancholic reactions to formal, rhetorical and poetic concerns. Through examining *Gerusalemme liberata*, the allegoria del poema which prefaced the 1581 edition of the epic, the *Discorsi del poema eroico* (1594) and all Tasso's letters from prison, Enterline demonstrates how the unresolved signifying of allegory can in fact contribute to melancholia. As she argues, Tasso's obsession with rewriting and critical reassessment both evidence and promote an "involved linguistic self-reflexivity" (56). Although she draws some parallels with Astrophel and Stella, it seems a missed opportunity not to connect the *fantasma orrendo* of *Gerusalemme liberata* to the fearful inexperience of Redcrosse Knight and Guyon and the monitory example of the Man of Despair. Similarly, her treatment of the "tradition of Circean unmaning" (100) in Ariosto's *Alcina*, Trissino's *Acratia* and Tasso's *Armida* might have been extended, quite naturally, to include Spenser's *Error* and *Acrasia*. Enterline's charting of Tasso's appearance as a writing subject, as struggling son and poet in search of a lost mother and errant father, is nicely nuanced; her attentive, enlightening comments on Tasso's incorporation of "yew trees" (*i tassi*), which are associated with death and mowed down in the epic, are an ideal, climactic example of patronymic placement commemorating disaster. With Marvell, Enterline strives to articulate his lyric interiority and his pleasurable, theatrical sense of pain and loss. For the mown mower, the originating verbal potency entails a sexual sacrifice; the eunuch's wound is the originating image for melancholia. Enterline spends no time on the slyness of Marvellian

humour (unfortunately melancholia douses any hint of playfulness and irony), nor does she consider a comparative view of Crashawian tears. Her analysis of *The Comedy of Errors*, as a search for self and the other, is the most protracted and Lacanian of the book. The argument that the problems of shifting identity are reminiscent of the imbalance of melancholia is not entirely convincing; moreover, with her preoccupation with the wounding moments and overburdened referential capacities, Enterline appears to forget the fact that the play is, after all, a comedy and not an existential hall of Lacanian mirrors. The *Merchant of Venice* gets short shrift. Baudrillard's social discourse of objects displaces any sustained notion of Shylock's role as scapegoat; hence, the money lender's hunt for his lost stones betrays a castration anxiety, but there is no mention of such specific objects as his spat-upon gabardine and Leah's turquoise ring. Enterline does not discuss the more obvious, admitted Shakespearean melancholics, Jacques and Hamlet. Her analysis of Ferdinand's melancholy, in Webster's *The Duchess of Malfi*, is the most engaging. In discussing Ferdinand's twin sister, whose desire and maternal body mirror and distance his own obsession, Enterline reminds the reader of one possible connotation of "twin" as a verb: "to disjoin, to put asunder, to set free" (256). However, her argument about Ferdinand's transformative melancholia is definitely overstretched; the contention that this incestuous lycanthrope's description of the inversion of his bodily envelope, "hairy on the In-side" (V.ii.18-19), "imagin[es] his own invagination" (266) is no more persuasive than her likening of his "dazell[ed]" eyes at the sight of himself in his twin sister's glass to the threat of a castrated body. Enterline's view of Ferdinand and the play is so absorbed in the trajectory "from phallic enforcement to an invaginated evacuation of conscious agency" (295) that many factors of her argument must be skewed to fit. Ferdinand's digging up of mandrake no longer symptomizes his lycanthropy, but represents his attempt to "appropriate" from his twin "the act of giving birth" (292). Despite the latent eschatology in Ferdinand's observation, "Like Diamonds, we are cut with our own dust" (V.v.92), Enterline maintains that Webster's theatre is not only amoral but virulent, a centre for communicable diseases, "a means to spread infection: as the difference between spectator and spectacle collapses, imitation becomes a way of communicating 'Death and diseases'" (271).

This learned study is packed with helpful etymologies and condensed historical excursions. Enterline informs, in a way that reminds, the reader of the contrast, extending from Plato to Tasso, between paternal forms and the dark woods and chaos of maternal materiality. She rehearses the meanings of error (wandering, straying, being mistaken) to highlight the predicament of the Antipholuses and the Dromios. To underscore the sense of visual resemblance and verbal counterfeiting she explicates the connection between Ferdinand's epithet for his sister, "excellent Hyenna," and Pliny's description of the hermaphroditic hyena which was also compared to a wolf and a dog. Borrowing from Pausanias and Comes, she makes effective use of the story of Narcissus's

grief over the death of his twin sister to illuminate Ferdinand's dilemma.

Yet *The Tears of Narcissus* is neither gripping nor readily accessible. While the reader cannot expect ludic zestiness in a study of melancholia, the density of the writing, often resulting in opaque or laboured explanations, contributes to the book's unremitting bleakness. Enterline's uncritical condensation of Freud's theory of melancholia, as the man's "having already taken that 'woman' inside as his own, thus producing a 'male' self whose consolidation is ruptured, deprived of coherence and sense, by the very negotiation of loss through which it takes shape" (33), is remarkable both for its patriarchal reductionism and its syntax. Her attempted poststructuralist understanding of Renaissance allegory, in which "self-reflexive critical procedure ... though consistently linked ... to a nostalgic project of recuperating occulted origins, produces, nonetheless, some strange textual effects by straining against the drive for origins" (44), fares no better. What she suggests is the "crucial ... resolution of error" in Shakespeare's comedy, that "a properly referential identity is assumed in place of the previously errant pronominal exchanges that condition discourse" (217), can lead to complete puzzlement. Too often the reader echoes the vilified mother of another Shakespearean melancholic, in wishing for "more matter, with less art." (PATRICIA DEMERS, UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA)

*BRIAN VICKERS. *Appropriating Shakespeare: Contemporary Critical Quarrels*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993. Pp. 528. US\$ 20.00 paper.

In English literature, Shakespeare's work is the ultimate testing ground for any new theory. It is Vickers's aim to analyze in what way contemporary literary theories have been applied in this respect. If the question is how well these theories have done in their confrontation with the bard's plays, then after reading Vickers's study the answer can only be: not very well.

The book consists of two parts, the first of which traces the historic development of the different derivations from Saussure's linguistic theory in the study of literature. The various poststructuralist readings of Saussure are shown to rest on a misrepresentation, and consequently of a misapplication of his ideas. Poststructuralism is not itself fundamentally undermined, of course, by its misunderstanding of Saussure. As Vickers's inquiry shows, however, it is *fatally* flawed by its systematic refusal to engage itself with its critics, and by its contempt for empiricism (20-21). This is shown in a painstaking analysis of the writings of Barthes, Derrida, Foucault, Lacan, and Irigaray. Derrida's work, especially, comes off scathed: "I insist, albeit very briefly, on these gross inaccuracies [in representing Saussure's work], among many others, in order to show, once and for all, that the reputation enjoyed by Derrida for careful reading of texts — and extended to deconstruction, the practical criticism modelled on him — is an illusion" (41).

The chapter goes on to show how such poststructuralist theories typically omit

recent developments in linguistics and the philosophy of language (especially Chomsky, Halliday, Hampshire, Lyons, Strawson, Grice, Sperber & Wilson), and defends some of "the key attributes of natural languages — reference, meaning, intention" (xiv) as central to the study of literary texts. It is precisely the wholesale rejection of these notions in poststructuralist theory that makes it wholly unfit to be applied to Shakespeare's works, as is demonstrated in the last part of this chapter. Once you bar reference and intention from language, there is not much to interpret in a dramatic text, since such texts are based on the premise that you see and read the protagonists' actions as meaningful and intentional. Thus the various poststructuralist approaches to *Othello* cannot explain the characters' emotions, emerging (as they evidently do) from Iago's intentional plotting.

Chapter two argues that much "of the inheritance of the 1960's avant-garde [in literary theory] is now exhausted, still (or perhaps, all the more) vociferous, but not having developed or transcended the limitations that have become so glaringly evident over the years" (xv). Against the prevailing notions of "textuality" and "discourse" Vickers lays out a rich variety of more coherent approaches to Shakespeare that, although present in our academic landscape, have not attracted the attention they should have (Manfred Frank, E.D. Hirsch, John Reichert, Wendell Harris, Stein Haugom Olsen, Nelson Goodman, Richard Wollheim, Robert Alter, Thomas Pavel, E.H. Gombrich, Kendall Walton). Especially the work of the latter on representation and make-believe is invoked to show that Elizabethan drama demands the active (i.e., intentional) and imaginative participation of the spectator. Such participation is denied by poststructuralist theories, which therefore are anachronistic with respect to Shakespeare's work. They also deny readers' own freedom and responsibility in dealing with such work. The chapter closes with a close comparison of Shakespeare's *Othello* with the sources used, especially Giraldino Cinthio's *Hecatommithi* of 1566. As Vickers shows, Shakespeare reshaped his source material to achieve a heightened tragic coherence that transcends the diffuse elements in the source, something that current literary theory is wholly unable to describe, let alone explain.

Part II scrutinizes five currently fashionable models in literary theory, devoting a chapter to each: deconstruction, new historicism, psychocriticism, feminism, neo-marxism. The groundwork of each model is laid out and its applications to Shakespearean drama are then reviewed. All models are shown to distort the text to such a degree that one may well wonder whether those critics are still dealing with Shakespeare's work. The meticulous analyses that Vickers provides show convincingly that what happens in these cases is that critics are dealing with their own projections rather than with a literary text. There is no room here to do justice to the well-documented review of recent approaches to Shakespeare presented in these 250 dense pages. Nor can I

adequately render the fine-grained description and the often witty debunking of the claims and pseudo-evidence presented by current literary theorists and critics. Its net effect, however, is so devastating that the reader inevitably runs up against the question of what state the discipline must be in if whole schools of current criticism get things so utterly muddled up. One example must suffice to illustrate the point, i.e., Stephen Greenblatt's treatment of Thomas Harriot's 1588 *Briefe and True Report of the New Found Land of Virginia*, which he chooses to relate to Shakespeare's *Henry V*. According to Greenblatt, Harriot's text is an example of the "Machiavellian" forces of western colonists to undermine the Indians' confidence in their own cultural and religious understanding of the universe. As Vickers shows, however, a detailed and honest reading of Harriot's text does not warrant any such conclusion, so that one is reminded of Elizabeth Fox-Genovese's appreciation that New Historicism is not particularly historical in its methods and procedures. One wonders how Greenblatt could have produced such an ill-informed picture of Harriot when so many excellent sources on him are readily available (for instance, Shirley 1951, Ruckeyser 1970) and when even work without historical pretensions, such as Turner (1985, 132-40), contains a far more congenial and much more interesting interpretation of Harriot's contribution to Renaissance culture. Again one cannot help wondering: what kind of discipline is this if it allows its most fashionable practitioners such gross distortions, such false and tendentious accounts that go virtually unchallenged?

In the *Epilogue: Masters and Demons*, Brian Vickers faces precisely this question. One common element in current literary theories he points out is their tendency to demonize their opponents and a concomitant belief in a "Modern Master" (417), usually leading to an impossibility to reflect critically on the models adopted. That, however, entails the end of critical debate, the end of scholarship and research, and a return to authoritarian practices in academic disputes.

Fifteen years ago Richard Levin called our attention to the speculative strand in Shakespeare interpretations. He coined the term "Fluellenism" to characterize the wild and unconstrained parallels and the unveiled meanings that some critics had been advancing. The term derives from that marvellous figure of a Welsh captain in *Henry V*, who attempts to demonstrate that kind Henry V is another Alexander the Great:

If you look in the maps of the 'orld, I warrant you sall find, in the comparisons between Macedon and Monmouth, that the situations, look you, is both alike. There is a river in Macedon, and there is also moreover a river at Monmouth. It's called Wye at Monmouth; but it is out of my prains what is the name of the other river. But 'tis all one; 'tis alike as my fingers is to my fingers, and there is salmons in both. (IV.vii.22-28)

Although dealing with "thematic" approaches, and not, as Vickers does, with radical "theories" of a poststructuralist signature, I think Levin's characterization

of much literary theory in terms of "Fluellenism" still stands, and Levin's exposure of it has not been able to turn the tide. Will Vickers's attempt, for all its thoroughness and good sense, fare better? It is to be hoped by anyone who cares for the rational study of literature.

However, the theologians of Shakespearean interpretation may forbid it. They may require that we give up our rational enterprise and blindly believe in their superior wisdom and justice. That will mean that anyone preferring to remain outside the herd will face the rituals of exorcism and exclusion that modern theoreticians brutally enforce upon those who insist on self-criticism. It is not a flattering picture of literary studies that we get from Vickers's book. But its results certainly point to a fundamental issue in scholarship and society. Now again, adherence to truth and rational methods demands courage:

If there are no criteria for evaluating methodology, the use of evidence, procedures of argument, the truth or falsity of the conclusions, then intellectual pursuits become impossible, and unnecessary. Truth will simply be handed down from those in power, while the rest of us acquiesce in its dissemination. Who would want to live in such a world? (438)

(WILLIE VAN PEER, UTRECHT UNIVERSITY)

Works Cited

- Levin, Richard. *New Readings vs. Old Plays. Recent Trends in the Reinterpretation of English Renaissance Drama*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1979.
- Ruckeyser, Muriel. *The Traces of Thomas Harriot*. New York: Random House, 1970.
- Shirley, John, ed. *Thomas Harriot, Renaissance Scientist: A brief and true report of the New Found Land of Virginia*. New York: History Book Club, 1951.
- Turner, Frederick. *Natural Classicism. Essays on Literature and Science*. Charlottesville: UP of Virginia, 1992.
- *MORTEN KYNDRUP. *Framing and Fiction: Studies in the Rhetoric of Novel, Interpretation, and History. A Composition*. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 1992. Pp. 512. US\$ 21.00 paper.

In a well-known anecdote, James Joyce is reported to have decided, out of frustration with translations, to learn Norwegian so that he could read the "real" Ibsen. While I do not wish to compare myself to Joyce, or Morten Kyndrup to Ibsen, my feeling upon finishing this book was perhaps a little like Joyce's. Kyndrup is obviously a skilful scholar who produces lively and provocative work; however, in order to get a full appreciation of his abilities, one should likely learn Danish and read one of his several monographs in that language. Although *Framing and Fiction* is an interesting scholarly adventure in narratology, it is likely to be read less widely than it might be, at least in part because of problems with the language. Kyndrup misunderstands the conventions of English mood, I think, and more generally has some difficulties with English

syntax. That qualification aside — that native English speakers will likely have some trouble reading *Framing and Fiction* on a word-by-word and sentence-by-sentence level — I would recommend this book to anyone who is interested in current theories of narratology.

Framing and Fiction takes as its "point of departure" a determination "to study literature in order to lay bare what *literature* actually is, does, and is able to do," rather than "to state something substantial about the *world*" (12). The ambition to say things about the world (at the expense of saying things about literature itself) is, according to Kyndrup, the basis (and perhaps the failing) of many literary studies: "In practice what happens is most often that the piece of literature in question is immediately acknowledged as an *expression*, which consequently refers to a certain 'content': it is then the purpose of the analysis to find and present the content" (32). Instead of this more common approach, Kyndrup proposes to examine the "interplay between [the] material and [the] point of observation" (17), using, primarily, "semiotics" (21): that is, "*textual analysis, interpretation. And history*" (12).

Kyndrup is interested specifically in the novel as it has developed in Western Europe and the United States from the late eighteenth to the late twentieth centuries. This leads to an analysis of eleven widely different novels and a film, ranging from Diderot's *Jacques le fataliste* and Goethe's *Die Leiden des jungen Werthers* to Calvino's *Se una notte d'inverno un viaggiatore* and Paul Auster's *The Locked Room*. The film is Bertolucci's *La tragedia di un uomo ridicolo*.

In structure the book follows a musical model. It begins with an introduction, which is followed by an "exposition," then two "development" sections (each of which takes a different tack on very similar materials, although in reversed order: the eighteenth to the twentieth century in the first; the twentieth back to the eighteenth in the second); finally, Kyndrup includes a "stretta" — a summing up — and then a "coda" to finish. The musical analogy is carried through with Kyndrup acknowledging that much of what he claims has been claimed before, in various forms and in various places (there are, after all, no new notes in music, although that does not preclude new music).

If Kyndrup has no illusions about the originality of what he calls "semiotic fields" — the ways in which a particular work is "framed" — he does, nonetheless, argue strongly for the fundamental importance of the notion of a frame or field: "One may just recall Peirce's 'habit,' Saussure's 'milieu,' Nelson Goodman's 'system of representation standard,' Jauss's 'Erwartungshorizont,' Bürger's 'Institution Kunst,' Fish's 'interpretative community,' Weber's 'instituted/instituting,' Paulson's 'artificial autonomous system,' or Bennett's 'reading formation'" (425-26). In short, Kyndrup follows many others in noting that "the meaning of singular signs/singular works is necessarily always regulated by codes or conventions, and that these conventions are *specific* ... but at the same time changeable" (426). Fields are neither static nor entirely set in advance:

"the meaning of the work is very closely related with the code or the field; but the meaning of the work is in no way *reducible* to this code or this field. You might say that the single work ... will influence the field and in principle change it irreversibly" (94). The individual text thus influences the whole body of knowledge from which it comes, and of which it is a part: each work comes from a field or frame, and then becomes part of the field or frame in its turn.

The relationship between field and work is thus interactive, and constantly in transition; the relationship constantly influences reading, while making reading possible. In addition, reading is not only concerned with the interaction between work and field, text and context, but (obviously) necessarily involves a reader as well. Any reader who approaches a piece of literature approaches it precisely expecting to read literature; those expectations themselves also directly influence the reading of that text and thus the text itself. This means that the reader and the text are together constituted and framed by the field "literature." Kyndrup notes as a marker of this close relationship that "it is possible to read non-literary texts 'as literature': the fact that texts change their meaning according to the framing within which they are positioned, is not just a trivial experience of everyday language; it can also be proved ... by deliberately passing texts off as something different from what they are" (85).

This interactive relationship may seem complex already, but in addition, the frames in question are not single or simple: there are, according to Kyndrup, always at least three frames at work in the text alone:

A literary text is not only first of all framed by the semiotic field of "literature", in which it is always already included, and it is not only, secondly, in this dimension subject to transformations which the historical changes of the field are always already about to perform. But moreover, the text is thirdly subject to *its own framing* in the sense that it is placed in a certain position of tension between what it is "telling" on the one hand, and its "toldness" on the other. (107)

In other words, there is always some degree of self-referentiality about literature: "the novel, when saying something always simultaneously implies its own 'saying,' ... in the novel one never just sees a world, one always sees somebody seeing a world" (453). Kyndrup claims that this self-referentiality, although it is "historically produced," is "an intrinsic ability of the genre" (451), and not a thematic invention or an aberration of the twentieth century. In one of the more provocative and interesting analyses here, Kyndrup points out various slippages and self-referentialities in Jane Austen's *Pride and Prejudice*.

The treatment of self-referentiality is one of several important considerations in this book. In claiming that the self-referentiality which has attracted so much attention in modernist and postmodernist novels is intrinsic to the form of the novel, Kyndrup makes a convincing case that one does not need to resort to interpretation, to constructing or discovering "meaning" or "contents" outside of

the narratological world of the novels that he has chosen, in order to identify certain characteristics of novels (for instance, self-referentiality). Kyndrup wants to read and analyze the novels in question without resorting to interpretation, which is in his view a process that already implies several steps; it is always a mapping of something from one context onto another context:

It is no coincidence that we have consistently utilized the term "analysis" about our approach to literary texts in this book. With this somehow technically and clinically resounding term we have attempted to establish a distance from the (more or less etymologically well-founded) elements of *translation*, which are inherent to the more common designations of the dealing with texts. Above all *interpretation*, but also *exegesis*, *Auslegung* and similar terms. (488)

Framing and Fiction is not about what makes literature literature; or about ways we define what literature is; or about what it says about the world that there is literature; or about what literature in turn says about the world. Those discussions are all important, but for the purposes of this book, they are beside the point. While Kyndrup singles out literature from the world in an entirely artificial way — he does, after all, understand that literature is a part of the world and that it is a social construct, not just a rhetorical one — he does so deliberately, and without claiming that his method is the only useful way in which to read literature. *Framing and Fiction* is an exercise in narratology; it is a rhetorical and semiotic analysis of narrative, not an attempt to interpret anything. Readers who are interested only in interpretation will need to go elsewhere.

I think that *Framing and Fiction* is an interesting book and that Kyndrup's ideas about narrative are stimulating. That the writing is difficult and disappointing should do one of two things: spur one on to learn Danish, or encourage one to overlook some palpable flaws in a book otherwise worth reading. (STEVEN SCOTT, UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA)

*ANNA BALAKIAN. *The Fiction of the Poet: From Mallarmé to the Post-Symbolist Mode*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992. Pp. 201. US\$ 32.50.

Balakian locates the important and enduring aspect of symbolism in a definition and practice of fiction initiated by Mallarmé:

The true fiction is that of the poet, as Mallarmé so intelligently perceived. As no one before him, he opened up the processes of creating that fiction, which, with the words of the world of realities and with the mechanics of their communication, achieves that level of artifice implied by his famous statement about the flower "absent from all bouquets" as the epitome of pure poetic creation. (16)

Despite the emphasis on artifice here, Balakian is intent on showing that Mallarmé represents a milestone in the apprehension of realities: human alienation from nature, the absence of a humanly satisfying meaning in existence that pre-exists to be found, the fact that our consciousness necessitates creativity, necessitates the struggle to control our means of knowing and expressing experience in order to "make it cohere" sufficiently. It is only through artifice, through fiction as Mallarmé defined it, that such realities can be known.

Naming, said Mallarmé in *Variations sur un sujet*, does not evoke a return of any particular contour of which we have empirical knowledge and that is specifically recognizable to us in its natural environment; instead, the act of naming, which is synonymous with creating, is the composite or the *virtual* image made possible by an art dedicated to *fictionalization*: "le dire retrouve chez le Poète, par nécessité constitutive d'un art consacré aux fictions, sa virtualité" (16-17).

This finely brings out his emphasis on "virtualité", which as in English signifies "being such in effect but not in fact", from the Latin for strength and virtue (*virtus*) and ultimately from *vir*: man, in the sense of a man distinguished by high birth, character, and public role — noble exemplar of a nation. The poet exercises a proper, necessary, and most distinguished social function in restoring to the word its freedom from limited notions of what is real, putting it back in its proper sphere, that of human feeling, concept and creativity.

Such discussion of Mallarmé and symbolism immediately suggests the question of the status of reality. Balakian's interpretation of the poets' notion is clear and firm. Reality for humans is not "external reality" but the human situation of which external reality is, for us, a part. (Great variations are possible in this view, however, as Balakian shows especially in her chapters on Wallace Stevens and Jorge Guillén.) She sees Mallarmé as involved in the essential human question of "what is retrievable in our performance in life and what vanishes forever, like Eurydice" (189). The poetic attempt at retrieval necessitates the realization that words are not bound to things and meanings, and must be used according to our self-reliance.

She examines the interrelationship of Mallarmé and five later poets — Valéry, Rilke, Yeats, Stevens, and Guillén — on the basis of their transformations of this idea of fiction conceived as the poet's free attempt to create his world and essential experience in his work, and thus as a poetic rescue of something of ourselves from "Time, Fate, Occasion, Chance and Change." Balakian terms her method "a serial approach"

from which continuity is no longer considered merely a product of chronology but as consensual elaborations and transformations, demonstrating the fact — which I proposed many years ago ("Influence and Literary Fortune," *Yearbook of Comparative Literature*, no. 11, 1962) — that the connotation of the word influence has gone awry, confused with the word "imitation" True influence is transformation, in my view. It is not subjected

to some kind of psychological repression, but is contingent on the inevitable exhaustion of the original model, or on the evolution of forms, both organic and semantic. These changes or atavisms of models are not necessarily assumed to be improvements over the originals.... (13)

The book has three basic elements: precise definition of the Mallarmean problem and response, delineation of the five later poets' transformations, and differentiation by Balakian of her definition of symbolism and post-symbolism as poetry-based from what she finds to be a traditional Anglo-American critical misconception of it. She illustrates this error by citing, in her chapter on Stevens, an essay by Allen Tate: "the symbolic imagination [wrote Tate] conducts an action by analogy, of the human and the divine, of the natural to the supernatural, of the low to the high, of time to eternity. My generation was deeply impressed by Baudelaire's sonnet, 'Correspondences,' which restated the doctrines of medieval symbolism by way of historical perspective leading back to the original source" (138). This allows Balakian to explain,

Where Baudelaire had used Swedenborg's dictum the better to reject it subtly, the faulty translation of certain expressions such as "expansion des choses infinies" and "les transports de l'esprit and des sens" brought him right back in line with Swedenborg's conception of the teleological duality of the universe. The fact that Baudelaire and after him Mallarmé had thought of language as something other than "dressing" did not penetrate the translations. (138)

Balakian sees that "Mallarmé was trying to replace the theological dichotomy by a new one between nature and the artist's fiction," an innovation which Tate (and of course others) turned into "a revival of medieval symbolism," leading to "several decades of warmed over, stereotyped poetry, elegant in its perfection of models derived from mistranslations from the French" (138). Contrasting Wallace Stevens to this poetry, Balakian comments that "Stevens, like Mallarmé, reshuffled the world's dichotomies so that the separation is not between heaven and earth but between uncontrollable powers of the material world and the sphere of the poet's control" (139).

A fourth element of the book, more minor but rewarding, is her address to the importation of semiotic notions, such as the "surplus of meaning," into literary criticism:

"The margin of surplus," as Derrida calls what he perceives as a series of valences to the main track of meaning, assumes in reality a basic minimum requirement for poetic writing, and the fundamental contribution of Mallarmé and his followers to poetics was to assert and demonstrate that the communication of a message in direct discourse no longer constituted poetry. The so-called surplus was no longer to be considered an excess but rather the essential ingredient for poetic viability. The mechanism at work, which gives the innocent reader a sense of "surplus," is at the heart of the Symbolist technique

and continues in great measure to be at the core of surrealist poetry as well.... (14-15)

The value of this and related comments *passim* is to correct the false notion that recent theorists are the discoverers of language as a *matière* as intractable and foreign as material reality. In fact, this aspect of language is already fully realized by the poets (the date of this realization could easily be pushed back into Romanticism, too). Mallarmé understood how problematic was the idea of "the sphere of the poet's control"; Balakian comments that "the pathos that interferes with an obstinate choice to create one's own sphere of existence is in the premonition that 'the young parqua' is indeed a new form of fate of man's own doing that could be more treacherous than the wrath of the gods" (191). But the poets' creative need and sceptical intelligence have kept them from regarding materiality as *the* aspect of language, its true and known nature.

Mallarmé's "mots, par le heurt de leur inégalité mobilisés" and Breton's "mots sans rides" are examples of not only the realization of language's materiality, equivalent to the otherness of things, but also of the development of a means actually of taking rest, refreshment, and renewal from it: an aspect of the fecundity of the poets' approach. The poets recognized in the independence of language a source of freedom from received definitions, and of meaning-production outside the delimited self-consciousness of the individual writer. One could of course cite many other ways of using language's materiality from the symbolist/post-symbolist ambit: for instance, Celan's "Psalm" and "Tübingen, Jänner," or Trakl's "De Profundis" ("Gottes Schweigen/Trank ich aus dem Brunnen des Hains.... Es ist ein Licht, das in meinem Mund erlöschte"), poems whose tropes make the recalcitrance of language and impermeability of nature a grateful refuge, a possible place of healing, from the inadequacy of what civilization has heretofore offered as expression of pain, injustice, and loss. Balakian points to many related developments, such as Guillén's "conciliation with the world" and his constant exploratory complexification of the "ambiguous word *reality*" (183).

Balakian's suggestive comments linking the six poets to crucial issues make one wish she would produce a similar book specifically discussing surrealist and other poetries in the same way. Similarly, it would be welcome if Balakian would more directly develop her pregnant ideas on recent literature in the context of overall cultural developments. For instance, she locates a powerful, necessary discovery in these poets yet finds them now isolated by "the reaction that has become prevalent at the end of the twentieth century to the effete, evanescent, elegiac attitude of the white male figure of poetic lyricism of what appears to many readers to be an archaic past" (187). Is the late twentieth century right, or is this merely a cultural-psychological avoidance measure against what these poets had the strength to face: "the vastest of all themes ... that of fatality versus the human will to choose" (191)? (ALBERT F. MORITZ, UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO)

*ADAM GILLON. *Joseph Conrad: Comparative Essays*. Ed. Raymond Brebach. Lubbock: Texas Tech University Press, 1994. Pp. 290 + xiii. US\$ 35.00 hardcover.

Adam Gillon, a well-known figure to all Conradians, is president of the Joseph Conrad Society of America and author of numerous publications on Conrad including three books: *The Eternal Solitary: A Study of Joseph Conrad* (1960 and 1964), *Conrad and Shakespeare and Other Essays* (1976), and *Joseph Conrad* (1982). He is also the author of several screenplays, stage and radio plays as well as books of fiction and poetry. Gillon's multifaceted personality coupled with his cosmopolitan cultural and educational background result, undoubtedly, in his personal and scholarly treatment of Joseph Conrad. Gillon's essays, the majority of them previously published in *Conradiana* and now carefully edited by Raymond Brebach, are written with "scholarly passion" and an obvious love for the subject.

This book contains an anthology of comparative essays on Conrad whose work is discussed in the context of other writers (like Henry James and Vladimir Nabokov), other media (chapters on film adaptations), and other perspectives (the Polish context). This, along with essays about the representation of Jews in Conrad's fiction, hand imagery in selected works by Conrad, and Gillon's personal experiences, gives the reader, who may not be a devoted Conradianist, an attractive book which is both scholarly and intimate, meticulous and replete with private recollections.

The first and last chapters are personal: Gillon writes of his initiation into Conrad's world, his own Polish background, and his later international experiences. The engaging opening essay, "My Secret Choice: By Way of a Familiar Preface," describes Gillon's encounters with the works of Conrad (his "life-long companion") and his own "discovery" of Conrad as a major writer. For Gillon, Conrad is "truly a Colossus who bestrode [his] narrow world" (1). In an intimate manner he looks for similarities and differences between his life and Conrad's: the Polish background, biographical facts, literary inspirations. He points out that before the war Joseph Conrad, better known in Poland by his original name Józef Konrad Korzeniowski, was regarded there as "an oddity" — a Polish writer who, under a pseudonym, produced works in expert English; somebody who, to the dismay of patriotically minded writers and critics, ignored "very Polish" themes. (If I can recall my own high school experiences in Poland at the beginning of the 1970s, the situation had not changed.) The afterward offers glimpses of Gillon's recent visit to Poland after an absence of 52 years.

In two meticulously researched and executed chapters Gillon traces the connections between Conrad, James, and Nabokov. Both James and Conrad were "more concerned with symbolic vision than with seeing. They painted life not by faithful reproduction of observed historical or factual models" (14). While rightly

emphasizing some differences between Nabokov and Conrad, Gillon's chapter focuses on the affinities between their works by scrupulous analysis and comparison of *Victory* and *Lolita*. Gillon concentrates on similarities between these two novels: stylistic (poetic use of prose, preference for literary allusion, etc.), thematic (these works are peopled with unique, displaced characters), and philosophical (their authors' dislike of Freud, a vision of the world which is ironic and cosmopolitan).

The next two chapters deal with the question of the representation of the Jews in Conrad's fiction and the comparison between two Conradian characters: Prince Roman and Peter Ivanovitch from *Under Western Eyes*. As Gillon asserts, the "Jewish question," though there are only two minor Jewish characters in Conrad's works, is an important one because this is a prominent motif in Western literature. Gillon explains the marginal status of Jewish characters in Conrad's work by an insightful look at the history of Polish literature and Conrad himself. Conrad's exclusion of Polish themes consequently led him to abandon Jewish themes. His stereotyped picture of the Jews, claims Gillon, is a product of the lack of any intimate contact with the Jews, and echoes the representation of the Jewish people from Polish literature, most notably the portrayal of Jankiel in Adam Mickiewicz's classic *Pan Tadeusz*. By providing a panorama of the historical and literary context and combining it with Conrad's biographical details, Gillon presents an argument which refutes Conrad's alleged anti-Jewish prejudice. The view of Conrad as an anti-Semite was also corrected by another respected Conradianist — Zdzisław Najder in his Polish book *Życie Konrada-Korzeniowskiego*.

Gillon's Polish background and his mastery of Polish literature enable him to discuss "the fictional Polish Conrad." Gillon brings forth the "Polish perspective," which is often missing in Conradian studies in the West. He rightly emphasizes Conrad's ambiguous position in Polish literature. The critical voices range from those of apologetic acclaim (Conrad as a Polish cosmopolitan humanist) to charges of betrayal (writes in English and on non-Polish themes; there are only two Polish characters in Conrad's literary output). Gillon accurately points out that "the Polish lovers of Conrad often march to a drummer whose beat the rest of the world cannot follow because they tend to view their subject through the prism of patriotic zeal" (69). To a certain extent, the same may be said of other great Polish expatriates like, for instance, Jerzy Kosinski in literature and Roman Polanski in film.

In addition to analysing the Polish Conradian context, Gillon discusses two Polish novels, *The Radiant Line* by Leszek Prorok, and *The Affair in Marseilles* by Waclaw Biliński, and, in separate chapters, provides translations of their excerpts. Both novels fictionalize fragments of Conrad's biography, making use of characters and places he created.

Gillon goes beyond a standard comparative endeavour and searches for

affinities between Conrad's art and painting ("Conrad as Painter") and film ("Adapting Conrad to Film: A Scholar's Odyssey to Screenwriting"). The visual, painterly aspect of Conrad's prose has attracted a number of film adaptations. Gillon points out that fifteen of Conrad's novels and stories have been made into feature films in the United States, England, France, Italy and Poland. Although they vary in degree of faithfulness to the novels, none match the quality of Conrad's work. Gillon discusses this question in terms of the broader perspective of translating one medium to another.

Focusing on the dangers of adapting rich "artistic" novels to film, Gillon recalls his own experiences as a script writer. He provides a detailed personal description of his struggles to write a producible script based on *Under Western Eyes*: this was his attempt to create a faithful yet filmic version of Conrad. This engaging essay, a must-read for all ambitious scriptwriters, explains a "Catch-22 situation," to use Gillon's words, in which he could not get funds from nonprofit foundations because of the project's alleged commercial profile, and was unable to secure financing from mainstream producers because the project was not commercial enough. Two separate chapters contain excerpts from his scripts for *Under Western Eyes* and *Dark Country*, the latter inspired by *Heart of Darkness*.

This diverse, engaging collection of essays is a virtual summary of the many professional activities undertaken by Gillon. Personal memories and experiences co-exist with purely academic essays showing Gillon's expertise in the field. One may get the impression that this book is a *Festschrift* written solely by the author himself. (MAREK HALTOF, UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN ONTARIO)

*MARTIN MEYER. *Nachkriegsdeutschland im Spiegel amerikanischer Romane der Besatzungszeit*. Tübingen: Narr (Buchreihe zu den Arbeiten aus Anglistik und Amerikanistik, Bd. 9). 1994. 341 S. DM 86.

In seiner Studie widmet sich Martin Meyer einem bislang weitgehend vernachlässigten Bereich nordamerikanischer Literaturgeschichte, der zugleich einen bedeutenden Moment deutsch-amerikanischer kultureller wie politischer Interaktion markiert. Die Arbeit — ursprünglich eine Dissertation an der Universität Kassel — versucht einen Überblick zu geben über die literarische Gestaltung des Themas "Deutschland nach dem Zweiten Weltkrieg" in der amerikanischen Romanliteratur. "Die Aufmerksamkeit dieser Untersuchung richtet sich auf amerikanische Romane, die in der Zeit zwischen 1945 und 1955 im Nachkriegsdeutschland spielen; somit wird die erzählte Zeit zum Selektionskriterium. Das Spektrum reicht von literarisch ambitionierten Werken über Unterhaltungsliteratur bis hin zu Spionageromanen; gemeinsam ist ihnen Handlungsort und -zeit. Die so versammelten 'Zeiträume' sind Vertreter einer historischen Prosa, die zeitgeschichtliche Ereignisse zum Vorbild für ihre fiktionale Ausgestaltung nimmt, ohne sich an eine von der Geschichtswissenschaft als authentisch anerkannte Sicht zu halten" (14).

Insgesamt 21 Romane zieht Meyer zu seinem Unterfangen heran, "das für den Zeitroman Typische herausarbeiten, um durch ihn ein Zeitgeschichtsbild von Nachkriegsdeutschland zu gewinnen, das durch die Augen der fremden Beobachter eine besonders wertvolle Perspektive gewinnt" (32). Um diesen Plan verwirklichen zu können, muß Meyer die Texte als realistische Darstellungen betrachten. So postuliert er: "Bei den meisten Autoren [ist] von einer naiven Realismus-Auffassung auszugehen; ihnen liegt daran, Alltag im fiktionalen Zusammenhang zu dramatisieren, um die in Deutschland virulenten gesellschaftlichen, politischen und historischen Probleme zu thematisieren" (42). Die Romane decken nicht nur einen weiten Bereich an Handlungssträngen ab, ihre Rezeption verdeutlicht auch, daß die literarische Behandlung dieser Thematik lediglich marginal Eingang in den Kanon gefunden hat. Von den untersuchten Texten zählen allenfalls *Generation Without Farewell* von Kay Boyle und *The Cannibal* von John Hawkes zu kritisch etablierten Texten; *Armageddon: A Novel of Berlin* von Leon Uris und *The Dark Arena* von Mario Puzo sind durch den Erfolg, den ihre Verfasser mit anderen Veröffentlichungen haben, nicht völlig unbekannt. Daneben stellt Meyer aber auch Texte wie *Fräulein* von James McGovern und *Small Victory* von Zelda Popkin, deren Existenz heute kaum mehr bekannt ist.

Da die Studie, wie Meyer betont, "dem soziologischen Ansatz verpflichtet" (53) ist, beginnt sie mit einer historischen Darstellung deutsch-amerikanischer Beziehungen seit 1871, wobei besonderes Gewicht auf politische Konzeptionen für das zu besetzende Deutschland gelegt wird. Dieser Teil beeindruckt durch seine detaillierte Darstellung, wirft jedoch die Frage auf, ob das populäre Deutschlandbild während des Zweiten Weltkriegs nicht einen wichtigeren Bezugsrahmen für die Rezeption der Romane darstellt als die politisch-administrative Perzeption des Kriegsgegners. Die in den Gallup-Umfragen festgestellten Ansichten über Deutschland dürften mehr Aussagekraft besitzen und dadurch relevanter sein, zumal Meyer betont, "diese Stimmungen und Haltungen gegenüber Deutschland finden sich auch in den Romanen" (82).

Als Einstieg in die Romanuntersuchung und gleichzeitige Darstellung der "öffentlichen Meinung" beginnt die Studie mit der veröffentlichten Reaktion auf die zu untersuchenden Texte. Zu jedem der Romane — die er zu diesem Zweck in die Kategorien "Literarische Zeiträume", "Journalismus-Fiktionen" und "Unterhaltungs- und Spionageromane" einteilt — hat Meyer die Rezensionen gesammelt und analysiert. Zusammen mit dem Anhang, in dem auf 60 Seiten akribisch Autorenbiografien und Romanzusammenfassungen geliefert werden, macht es dieser Abschnitt möglich, einen Eindruck dieser zumeist unbekannten, zum Teil sogar obskuren Romane zu bekommen und so eine Grundlage für das Verständnis der folgenden Romananalysen zu schaffen.

Die eigentliche Untersuchung des literarischen Korpus hat Meyer in zwei Kapitel untergliedert. Nach der individuellen Analyse von sechs Romanen (*Crazy*

in *Berlin* von Thomas Berger, *Generation Without Farewell* von Kay Boyle, *The Sun's Attendant: A Diptych* von Charles Haldeman, *The Cannibal* von John Hawkes, *The Last of the Conquerors* von William Gardner Smith und *Armageddon: A Novel of Berlin* von Leon Uris) betrachtet Meyer den gesamten Korpus unter dem Aspekt, durch die Konzentration auf Motive, Themen und Urteile eine Verallgemeinerung des literarischen Deutschlandbildes zu ermöglichen. Die exemplarischen Einzeluntersuchungen bilden in sich geschlossene Abschnitte von zum Teil sehr unterschiedlicher Ausrichtung. Trotz vieler Divergenzen lassen sich drei grundsätzliche Tendenzen in der Betrachtung Deutschlands ausmachen. Die offensichtlichste und durch den Titel der Studie naheliegendste ist das Porträt Deutschlands und seiner Bewohner kurz nach Kriegsende. Meyers Zusammenfassung der Perspektive des Protagonisten von *The Sun's Attendant* steht hier stellvertretend für die Aussagen zahlreicher Romane: "Was Kallergis in Deutschland begegnet, ist eine kollektive Amnesie, die ihren Ursprung im instinktiven Überlebenswillen der Nachgeborenen hat; Vergangenheitbewältigung findet in dieser Atmosphäre nicht statt" (158-59).

Daneben identifiziert Meyer Romane, die die Erzählhandlung dazu benutzen, über Vergleich und Kontrast Aussagen über die U.S.A. zu machen. William Gardner Smiths Roman *The Last of the Conquerors* thematisiert eigentlich den Rassismus der amerikanischen Gesellschaft, wodurch der Schauplatz Deutschland lediglich zur "funktionalen Kulisse" (189) wird. Überraschenderweise zieht Meyer hier keinen Vergleich zu amerikanischen Romanen über den Ersten Weltkrieg, wie etwa John Dos Passos' *Three Soldiers*, in dessen Tradition Smith schreibt. Eine gänzlich anders gestaltete Auseinandersetzung mit dem Thema Nachkriegsdeutschland findet sich in dem mit zwei Jahrzehnten Abstand geschriebenen *Armageddon*. Meyers Kommentar, "trotz offensichtlicher Unausgewogenheit und trotz eines offenkundigen Kulturchauvinismus erreicht der Autor, daß der Leser die tatsächliche Politik des Westens nachvollziehen kann" (196), verdeutlicht, wie schnell Nachkriegsdeutschland in der politischen Perzeption der U.S.A. zum Verbündeten gegen den neuen Feind Sowjetunion umdefiniert wurde und wie diese Umdefinition ein literarisches Echo fand.

Bei seiner Untersuchung der vorherrschenden Motive und Klischees konstatiert Meyer, daß die meisten Texte lediglich tradierte Vorurteile und Klischees benutzen, was den realistischen Charakter der Texte durchaus infrage stellt. Meyer identifiziert zahlreiche Gemeinsamkeiten in der Darstellung — so zum Beispiel das in mehreren Texten verwendete Symbol des zerstörten Daches —, kommt jedoch bei dieser Untersuchung schon relativ schnell ans Ende. Offensichtlich sind die untersuchten Romane — mit der Ausnahme von *The Cannibal* — so stark an politischen oder journalistischen Fragestellungen interessiert, daß die künstlerische Gestaltung der Texte nur relativ wenig Aufmerksamkeit erfuhr.

Abschließend faßt Meyer die Romane als "verdichtete Lebenserfahrung" (253)

zusammen und charakterisiert die Autoren als "Advokaten für die vermeintlich Schwächeren, ohne freilich durch die eigene Fürsprache die Verantwortung für zuvor begangenes Unrecht zu relativieren" (256). Somit stehen diese Werke in der Tradition der *littérature engagée*, was wiederum Zweifel an der Objektivität aufwirft, die ihnen zugeschrieben wird, wenn sie "als Berichte über die tatsächliche Situation im Nachkriegsdeutschland gelesen worden" (249) sind. Leider thematisiert Meyer diese Fragestellung nicht weiter. Er regt abschließend die ausführlichere interdisziplinäre Auseinandersetzung mit der Perzeption Nachkriegsdeutschlands an, trägt jedoch selbst in erster Linie eine — dringend benötigte — Inventarisierung des vorhandenen Romanbestandes bei. Es ist zu hoffen, daß weitere Untersuchungen sich dieses für Literaturwissenschaftler, Historiker, Kulturwissenschaftler und Soziologen relevanten Themas annehmen. Meyers Buch liefert hierzu einen hervorragenden Ausgangspunkt. (AXEL KNÖNAGEL, UNIVERSITÄT HAMBURG)

*HALINA JANASZEK-IVANIČKOVÁ and DOUWE FOKKEMA, eds. *Postmodernism in Literature and Culture of Central and Eastern Europe*. Katowice: Śląsk, 1996. Paperback. No price.

Les Transformations du système de communications écrite dans les pays de l'Europe centrale depuis 1985. Comp. Robert Estivals. Prague: Institut français de Prague, 1995. Paperback. No price.

Ever since the radical changes which took place in the former Communist block in 1989, East Central Europe has become a favourite topos for contemporary literary scholarship. On the North American scene, the focus has been predominantly directed towards the former Soviet Union and the new developments in Russia after the fall of the Communist empire. A very strong area of attention has become gender issues and body politics in the new socio-economic reality. While some traditionally represented cultural *milieus* such as Poland and Ukraine continue to interest Slavists on this continent, the remaining parts of East Central Europe are grossly under-represented in North American Slavic scholarship. Even a superficial survey of recent publications in Canadian and American Slavic journals shows that 80% of the subject matter is devoted solely to Russian issues. At the same time, there is an emergent tendency towards interdisciplinarity manifested in the substitution of conventional close readings of texts with a broader cultural approach in which other disciplines such as history, sociology, and politics are being used.

One of the productive ways to study the recent developments in the former Eastern block countries is through the framework of post-colonialism and their unique position of *inbetween peripherality* (as defined by Tötösy 1997; see also, for a similar concept, Longinović). Placed between the hammer and the anvil of two centres of political and cultural power — the former Soviet Union and its adherent cultural, religious, economic, etc. history and presence and the West —

the countries of East Central Europe are presently faced with serious issues of self-identity and the need for a radical re-writing as well as re-shaping of their social and cultural history. This fundamental goal underlies the problematic of *Postmodernism in Literature and Culture of Central and Eastern Europe*. The volume consists of the papers presented at an international conference organized by the University of Silesia in November 1993. The various contributions fall into four main sections preceded by a general introduction by Halina Janaszek-Ivaničková. In her preface, Janaszek-Ivaničková defines post-modernism from an East Central European point of view in terms of seven distinct features: 1) "the victory of ... 'weak thought'" following Jean-François Lyotard and Gianni Vattimo, and "the toppling of the principle of the 'one and only correct reason,' one party, one world outlook and one nation"; 2) "a new comprehension of the ontological order of the world ... as an incessant performance which constantly requires new legitimization"; 3) "a final rejection of determinism"; 4) "a new comprehension of truth ... as a sense-creating human activity in the process of interpersonal communication (Richard Rorty)"; 5) "pluralism ... [as a consequence of] undermining the principle of the 'one and only correct reason,' making it possible for the reasons of others to develop"; 6) "an emancipation from the terror of Marxism and ... reductionism" in literary studies; 7) "a rejection of both the doctrine of socialist realism ... as well as of the already barren historical avantgarde which also reduces the world to a single principle in the most extreme variant ... [and] the legitimization of literature of the multiplicity of styles and artistic statements" (10-11).

Part one of the volume deals with some general problems of post-modernism and presents various perspectives on the topic not only by scholars from East Central Europe, but also from Western Europe (Douwe Fokkema, Utrecht), the East (Abhai Maurya, New Delhi), and America (Maria Elena de Valdés, Toronto). Part two is devoted to "Regional and National Representation" of post-modernist writing in East Central Europe. The articles included in this section offer a broad and diversified overview of the processes taking place in Polish, Russian, Slovak, Czech, Bulgarian, Serbian, Croatian, Slovene, and Macedonian literatures. Part three presents individual case studies of post-modernist texts in the Slavic literatures. In Part four the concept of post-modernism is applied to other artistic media such as cinema and painting and an attempt is made to identify its context on a historical and semiotic level.

There is no doubt that *Postmodernism in Literature and Culture of Central and Eastern Europe* is not only a timely publication, but it is one of the few instances in which the "periphery" is given the opportunity to speak in its own voice. Most of the contributors are scholars who work *inside* the cultural *milieu* of East Central Europe, rather than being detached observers from the outside. The result is a uniquely accurate account of processes and tendencies which are in the making and which more than anything else determine the re-emergence of

national identities much too often clumped together under the pseudo-homogeneous heading "Slavic." The East Central European perspective is restricted, however, not only by the absence of some other representative Slavic cultures of the area (e.g., Ukrainian, Byelorussian, Slovakian), but even more so by the complete disregard for the non-Slavic element defining the region's physiognomy — the Hungarian, the Romanian, and possibly the Albanian presence. The post-modernist aesthetics itself calls for fragmentation and multiplicity which, while recognized in theory, often fails to be implemented in practice.

Unfortunately, the volume suffers considerably from slack editing. It abounds in typographical, spelling, and grammatical errors. There are too many inconsistencies with regard to translation and transliteration. The latter is particularly confusing since the predominant form in which names and titles appear seems to follow the rules of the Polish sound system and disregards the internationally accepted systems of Slavic sound transliteration. This may be a minor technicality for scholars of the region and those working in the area of Slavic studies, yet such inaccuracies could prove quite frustrating to non-Slavists. While the choice of English as a *lingua franca* certainly ensures a wider readership, an effort to overcome the specificities and idiosyncrasies of the East Central European discourse and the tendency towards literal translation of phraseological units from the respective mother tongues would have been beneficial for the overall effectiveness of the volume.

The second publication dealing with changes in the cultural semiosphere of East Central Europe focusses on the transformations in the system of written communication in these countries. The articles follow the theoretical framework of the *école de bibliologie* whose foremost representative is Robert Estivals (see Estivals 1993; see also Tötösy 1996). The texts collected by Robert Estivals at the Université de Bordeaux 3 were presented at the Premier Colloque internationale de recherche de l'Association Internationale de Bibliologie held in Prague in May 1994. The volume consists of three parts: an introductory section with remarks by the organizers of the colloquium, Jarmila Burgetova and Robert Estivals; a section devoted to issues pertinent to the East Central European countries in the period of transition from communism to a free market economy and special case studies of the publishing institutions and communication systems in Bulgaria, Hungary, and the Czech Republic; and a section on the development of bibliological research in France. The contributions of the representatives of East Central Europe address issues specific to the region such as "l'écritain 'au service des masses,'" "les bibliothèques et les centres d'information scientifique ... durant la période de transition à l'économie de marché," "les changements du marché du livre," "les activités des nouvelles maisons d'éditions." One article is devoted to the more universal problem of the ever-growing influence of electronic media in the system of communication. The

articles of the French contributors concentrate on broader transnational questions: "structures éditoriales dans les pays occidentaux," "bibliothèques, informations professionnelles et nouvelles technologies," and "multimédia et interactivité."

The discipline or school of *bibliologie*, while on the periphery of North American literary scholarship, has a long and well-established tradition both in France and in the countries of East Central Europe. Estivals defines its essence as "science de la communication écrite" (9; see Estivals 1993). Written communication is viewed within a systemic framework and necessarily incorporates such aspects as production, publishing, editing, distribution, cataloguing, media interaction, etc. In this schema the place of the library as an ideological filter possesses a primary position. The problems that researchers of the communication system in the socio-political area of the former Soviet hemisphere are faced with at the present moment are manifold and diverse. On the one hand, there is the crucial political and economic reshuffling taking place in the countries of East Central Europe. In addition, there is an ever-increasing proliferation of publications in all areas of human endeavour. Last but not least, present day written communication cannot be investigated without taking into consideration the radical influence of electronic media and information systems.

Estivals's methodology for bibliological research is firmly rooted in a comparative approach to the issues involved. His ideas are discussed in the theoretical section of Nikolai Mateev's article. Operating within a systemic and empirical framework, "la recherche comparative bibliologique des [science de la] c[ommunication] é[crite] se distingue des recherches comparatives sociales traditionnelles" (54) and possesses certain features which must be highlighted in the new socio-political circumstances. First, "le nouveau schéma exige que les liens et les rapports entre les processus, les événements, les structures, etc. soient observés de manières plus large et que les mécanismes de fonctionnement soit expliqués plus profondément. Cela exige le changement des modèles traditionnels de recherche sur le livre, l'édition, la bibliothèque, les technologies informationnelles et télécommunicationnelles, les modes d'organisation, les formes d'enseignement professionnel, etc." (54-55). The second peculiarity is a direct consequence of the systemic interdisciplinary approach which requires "convergence de la pluralité des modèles" (55). Finally, the comparative aspect in communication research requires the implementing of a "coalition" of models "concernant les divers éléments du s.c.é. — régionaux, sociaux, culturels, politiques, etc. Cela permettra de considérer la formation du relief global des s.c.é. comme infrastructure du système sociale" (55).

While developing as a discipline in its own right, one cannot fail to see a kinship between the discipline of *bibliologie* as defined by Robert Estivals, by Pierre Bourdieu's *champ littéraire*, or by Itamar Even-Zohar's polysystem theory, but especially with the systemic and empirical approach to literature and culture developed by the German scholar Siegfried J. Schmidt and his colleagues

worldwide (see Schmidt; Tötösy 1994). The specific emphasis on aspects such as production, publishing, distribution, history of the book, reception, media, etc., as well as the anchoring of these elements in the social system suggest a similarity of trends in French and German scholarship which counteracts the argument of intellectual confrontation so often associated with these traditional European cultural rivals.

The two publications discussed briefly present an interesting and original subject matter which still retains a marginal position in present scholarship. At the same time, it is worth pointing out that both volumes make a strong case for the vitality and potential of comparative studies (see, among others, Holquist's eloquent argument). Their editors and compilers unequivocally defend the need for a comparative approach at a time when "integration" and "globalization" bear a significance far greater than that of mere buzz-words. (ROUMIANA DELT-CHEVA, UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA)

Works Cited

- Estivals, Robert, Jean Meyriat, and François Richaudeau. *Les Sciences de l'écrit. Encyclopédie internationale de bibliologie*. Paris: Retz, 1993.
- Holquist, Michael. "A New Tower of Babel: Recent Trends Linking Comparative Literature Departments, Foreign Language Departments, and Area Studies Programs." *Profession* (1996): 103-14.
- Longinović, Tomislav Z. *Borderline Culture: The Politics of Identity in Four Twentieth-Century Slavic Novels*. Fayetteville: U of Arkansas P, 1993.
- Schmidt, Siegfried J. *Kognitive Autonomie und soziale Orientierung. Konstruktivistische Bemerkungen zum Zusammenhang von Kognition, Kommunikation, Medien und Kultur*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1994.
- Tötösy de Zepetnek, Steven. "Comparative Literature and Systemic/Institutional Approaches to Literature: New Developments." *Systems Research: The Official Journal of the International Federation for Systems Research* 11.2 (1994): 43-57.
- Tötösy de Zepetnek, Steven. "Jia Feng zhong de Bian yuan xin he bian hua de xü shi: hou zhi min te xin" ["Inbetween Peripherality and Narratives of Change: Postcolonial Specificities"]. Trans. Ma Ruiqi. *Waiguo wenxue [Foreign Literature]* (1997): Forthcoming.
- Tötösy de Zepetnek, Steven, ed. *History of the Book and the Study of Literature*. Thematic Cluster of Canadian Review of Comparative Literature/Revue Canadienne de Littérature Comparée 23.1 (1996): 207-58.