

Haidu, Peter. *The Subject Medieval/Modern: Text and Governance in the Middle Ages*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 2004. Pp. 464. US \$70.00 cloth, US \$29.95 paper. 141

**Gwendolyn A. Morgan, Montana State University**

Peter Haidu's *The Subject Medieval/Modern* traces the development of the Western state in conjunction with the shifting subject position in the socio-political ideologies and practices of the Middle Ages. His underlying agenda is to prove that the Modernist and Postmodernist perception of the medieval subject as monolithic and relatively static is entirely incorrect and that, rather, the medieval manifestations have much in common with the subject positions recognized by these schools of thought today; indeed, that they are at times indistinguishable. This is, he argues, because contemporary ideologies and perceptions are necessarily a continuation of those of the earlier era. While the book focuses mainly on the development of the state and the changing subject positions defined by it in France, Haidu does include some analysis of the same in England, especially through the reign of Henry VI when continental possessions are lost and the development of a specifically English identity becomes paramount. A smattering of references to other states and cultural groups also appears.

Following the lead of medievalists such as Umberto Eco in locating the origins of the modern nation and its various social relations, along with contemporary economic systems, in the Middle Ages, Haidu traces the evidence for their development and reviews the subject positions available to those in different echelons of the Church, government, and social classes. Indeed, he ventures not so much into new territory as

catalogues and evaluates much established thought, bringing it into a comprehensive framework to create a whole. His approach is primarily Marxist, with a heavy dose of Freudian and Postmodern thought, although he appears to relish demolishing the arguments of some related major schools, such as those of Jungian and Lacanian devotees. Consequently, the book's triple foci are the institutionalization of violence and responses to it, the developing system of economics and distribution of wealth, and—perhaps necessarily for any study of the period in Western Europe—the shifting power equation between the genders, which finds its most elaborate expression in the code of Courtly Love.

142 In support of his perceptions, Haidu offers a balanced examination of historical documents, such as treaties, grants, religious tracts and the Domesday Book, on the one hand, and of the evolving expression of the state (from the tiered feudal system, to centralized kingship, to a true impersonal nation state) and behavioral ideologies in literature on the other. Indeed, he finds in the poetry of the age not only a mirror for the continual growth and change of national identity and the roles it defined for inhabitants of the state but also an important link between the development of vernacular poetry, and later prose, and the movement towards independence from the Church, which, of course, employed Latin for its important philosophical and theological treatises. The break between the state and the Church, with its de facto elimination of cultural and geographic borders in its rule of “Christendom” as a single entity is, indeed, probably the single most important factor in allowing for the emergence of national identities. In natural consequence, with the rise of the nation state came different subject positions for its ruler and various classes of subjects. The ultimate development, as Haidu sees it, is the creation of an autonomous and self-perpetuating bureaucracy independent of the particular individuals in positions of power, which he sees as the major defining attribute of the modern state. Some particularly tantalizing literary analyses include that of the *Romance of the Rose* and its responses, especially those of the marginalized and, among the latter, notably Christine de Pizan's *City of Ladies*, as well as Francois Villon's deliberately proletarian poetry.

While little ambiguity exists regarding what is meant by the state and its various predecessors, the term *subject* is a little more slippery. Perhaps intentionally, but nonetheless with a resulting confusion, Haidu applies the term to the subject of a king within a monarchy or of a lord within a feudal hierarchy; to socially constructed roles based upon gender, vocation, religion, and socio-economic standing; to stock character roles within literature; to the topic of a literary piece in particular or to a genre in general. While such certainly underscores the interrelatedness of all of these, it also allows for a certain sloppiness in allowing conclusions drawn in one case to spill over into another based on little more than linguistic similarity. It is one of the text's more disturbing attributes.

On the positive side, *The Subject Medieval/Modern* is extremely well researched and documented, perhaps more so than any such work to date. It includes careful and thorough consideration of all currently accepted theories on its objects of study,

and Haidu's arguments regarding the strengths and weaknesses of each are in the main convincing. The book is veritably encyclopedic in its consideration of social stratifications and their inter-relationships, of classifications of texts, of competing ideologies, all set in the standard context of the tripartite society. Indeed, it evinces occasional moments of brilliance in a solidly academic text.

Nonetheless, a major drawback to Haidu's study is that the author frequently belabors points, stating the same argument or conclusion several times within the same section, but using different terms. Such would not frustrate the reader nearly as much as it does were it not for the fact that the author insists on employing jargon and unnecessarily complex expression, along with what are frequently convoluted sentence constructions. Thus, it takes some effort to realize one is reading the same thing one has just struggled through only a short time before. Indeed, so awkward is the expression that it occasionally results in grammatical errors, unusual in a monograph prepared for and published by Stanford University Press. Nonetheless, a number of sentence fragments, invalid possessives, and poor punctuation—along with the occasional typographical error—plague the text. In short, the book receives low marks for readability. 143

Despite this significant drawback, *The Subject Medieval/Modern* is probably an essential addition to university libraries as the most comprehensive discussion of the development of Western subjectivity to date, especially as it examines the inter-connections not only between the state and social structure, but also between social ideology and the development of literary practices. Although not a text for the classroom, it will justifiably also make its appearance in the personal libraries of literary and historicist theorists, as well as those studying the phenomenon of medievalism in theory.

HILL, JANET. *Stages and Playgoers: From Guild Plays to Shakespeare*. Montreal & Kingston, ON: McGill-Queen's UP, 2002. Pp. 241 CDN \$80.00 cloth.

**Cindy Chopoidal, University of Alberta**

Drama is a paradoxical art form. On the one hand, it takes place in a separate world from that of the audience, as marked by the boundaries of the playing space; yet on the other, it frequently not only acknowledges the presence of the viewing public but engages in dialogue, actual or implied, with that public, through the use of various techniques of the sort we know by such terms as metatheatricality, breaking the fourth wall, direct address, or open address. It is this last term that Janet Hill prefers in her analysis of these techniques as they are used in English medieval and

Renaissance drama: the term *metatheatricity* suggests the Brechtian defamiliarization effect which self-consciously emphasizes the play's unreality, while *direct address* "suggests a one-way dynamic, stage to audience only" (5); but *open address* emphasizes the audience's participatory role in simultaneously becoming part of the play's world and bringing the events of the play into its world. Hill traces the use of open-address techniques in medieval and Renaissance drama in chronological order from the mystery plays—or "guild plays" (6) as she prefers to call them, emphasizing the working-class nature of these performances—to early Renaissance plays performed in the homes of noblemen to the professional dramas of Shakespeare and his contemporaries, in which "asides, monologues, and soliloquies" (6) are the predominant forms of addresses to the audience. The use of chronological order does not necessarily suggest a linear progression from the mystery plays to Shakespeare, but it is useful in showing how the open-address techniques of the earlier plays influenced, and were used and transformed by, Shakespeare throughout his career, from the first

144 tetralogy to the late romances.

Hill acknowledges the influence of various critics of medieval and Renaissance drama on her study, both for information on the physical layout of the playing spaces in which each type of play was performed and for the ways in which the play texts themselves, at least those which are known to us, acknowledged the audience's presence and invited them to participate in both the establishment of the dramatic world and the merging of that dramatic world with the actual world in which the play is being performed. Two of the most significant influences on her analysis are Anne Righter (Barton)'s *Shakespeare and the Idea of the Play* and Michael Mooney's *Shakespeare's Dramatic Transactions*. However, where Righter generally maintains the separateness of the play's world from the audience's world, Hill argues that the two worlds can and do become intertwined; and where Mooney differentiates "locus (framed playing space) and platea (unframed playing space)" (11) as belonging respectively to the play's world and audience's world, Hill considers both to be part of the greater interaction between the dramatic and the real.

Hill begins her study with an examination of various episodes from the four existing texts of medieval mystery plays, the Wakefield, York, Chester, and N-Town (Norwich) cycles, supplying Barry Fox's Modern English translations alongside the original Middle English quotations as a support for those readers who would have difficulty with the play texts in the original. Her decision to include modern translations also, to me, works as an analogy to the ways in which the dramatic texts under discussion engage their audiences by 'translating' their subject matter into familiar terms: just as a modern translation brings the play text closer to our linguistic experience, so do the mystery plays conflate the Biblical universe and medieval Yorkshire to bring the vast expanses of time and space into "the here and now of the audience" (16).

Hill's preference of the term "guild plays" over "mystery plays" serves to emphasize the localized and everyday nature of the drama: calling them *guild* plays draws

attention to the fact that these plays were put on by working-class tradesmen, not by professional actors, and the plays often were as much advertisements for the players' everyday trades as they were entertainment and education for their audiences (24-27). The nature of the playing space, the town streets marked off by wagons and temporary wooden structures, both scaled down the vast spatiotemporal setting of the plays into the familiar terms of the town and expanded the town into the greater world of Biblical history. This simultaneous contraction and expansion was accomplished verbally as well as visually: with the addresses of the actor playing God to the audience at the beginning of the play cycles (31-33), the dramatic world, like the actual world according to Christian theology, is spoken into existence. But it is through characterization and dialogue in the body of the play cycles that mystery plays made their greatest impact on their audiences, for among the kings, wealthy men, great historical figures, and divine messengers represented in the plays were also more familiar characters, everyday farmers and tradesmen whose lives were very similar to those of the audiences. The upper-class characters dressed and behaved in ways that would immediately mark them as authority figures, often in a parodic and exaggerated manner, characterized by a need to define and control their audiences (34-41); while the lower-class characters spoke of concerns that seemed more suited to their counterparts in the actual world of medieval Yorkshire than in the dramatic world of the Holy Land, approaching the audience as familiars and confidants (41-54).

145

The familiarizing effects of medieval plays produced in town streets by and for everyday people stand in contrast to the very different playing spaces and dramatic conventions of sixteenth-century plays, which as Hill reminds us (76-78) are most familiar to modern readers from the amateur actors represented in Shakespeare's *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. These plays were usually performed in the homes of noblemen, either by private companies in the pay of a noble family or by travelling companies that often risked running afoul of anti-vagrancy laws; but either way, these performers were professional actors rather than tradesmen who acted on the side. The subject matter also changed: rather than the cosmic sweep of the mystery plays, sixteenth-century plays dealt with shorter, more self-contained stories of specific people, historical or fictional. It is due to the temporary nature of players, playing space, and subject matter that Hill refers to these sixteenth-century plays as "nonce plays", emphasizing their status as entertainment "for a brief time only: for the nonce" (77).

Nonce plays, as Hill points out, do share some characteristics with their medieval ancestors, most notably in the use of prologues and/or epilogues spoken by characters representing abstract entities such as Charity, Fancy, Folly, or Sensual Appetite, to name a few; or the presence of the impresario, a descendant of the medieval Vice figure, who both guides the audience into the dramatic world and mocks both worlds in equal measure (101-07). But the impresario marks a departure from his dramatic forebear by functioning to keep the worlds of actor and spectator separate, even as his addresses to the audience modify the mystery plays' technique of building both

an audience and a dramatic world through actively engaging the spectators' imaginations. However, a major difference between the open-address strategies of medieval and of sixteenth-century plays that Hill also acknowledges is that sixteenth-century plays often dealt with potentially controversial subject matter, as for example the romantic triangle in Henry Medwall's *Fulgens and Lucrece*. In this particular case, the play's heroine defends not only her decision to marry a lower-class man but the presence of such a plotline in a play meant for a noble audience by directly addressing that audience "to explain that her choice. . . need not be taken as a precedent or model for their contemporary world" (91). With potential audience/patron disapproval in mind, it is all the more important for the play to maintain the border between fiction and reality.

146 Hill's final two chapters both focus on Shakespeare's use of open-address techniques, as influenced by the physical environments in which his plays were performed and by the enduring presence of earlier dramatic forms in his works. The third chapter of the book begins with a brief history of professional drama in sixteenth-century London, from the inn-yard performances to the building of permanent theatres just outside the city borders to evade laws regulating public performances (109-15), with the opening of the Red Lion Theatre in 1567 marking the beginning of the era of the professional playing space. Unlike the pageant wagons of medieval drama or the noble houses and inn-yards of nonce plays, the post-1567 theatres were permanent, dedicated playing spaces, defining their audiences as those who paid to see the play, and their space as "its own dramatic world" (116). At the beginning of Shakespeare's career, his earliest plays, such as *Henry VI, Part One* and *Titus Andronicus*, do appear largely self-contained with relatively little address to the audience; however, even these early plays demonstrate his transformation of the open-address techniques inherited from mystery plays and nonce plays for use in a specifically-marked-out dramatic space. For example, in *Henry VI, Part Three* and *Richard III*, Richard combines "the medieval devil and the nonce play impresario" (121) to exert control not only of his immediate society within the play's world but also of the audience itself; and in *Henry IV, Part One*, both Falstaff and Hal modify the impresario tradition, though in different ways, at once to define and dismiss their audiences in both the play world and the actual world. Similarly, both *Henry V* and *Troilus and Cressida* use open address first to build up the image of heroic epic, and then to undermine the audience's expectations by presenting drastically unheroic characters and situations, while simultaneously undercutting the audience's claims to moral superiority over the characters.

Hill characterizes the use of metatheatrical techniques in *Hamlet* and *King Lear* as "open address on a closed stage" (133). The worlds of these plays are oppressively self-contained, as *Hamlet*'s characterization of Denmark as "a prison" (II.ii. 243) and the frequent use of the pronoun "I" (including *Lear*'s use of the royal "we") in the first scenes of *King Lear* illustrate. *Hamlet*'s soliloquies represent his search for an outside world, acknowledging the existence of the audience but unable to interact

directly with them because of the fiction/reality boundary. His instructions to the actors (II.ii. 298-303) serve not only as a guide to good acting but also as a reference to the playing space as the borders of his world. The storm scene in *King Lear* represents the opening up of the play's closed world, as Lear's simpler speech and use of the more inclusive pronouns "you" and "we" show; and Lear's elegy over the body of Cordelia is a tragic equivalent of the mystery plays' inclusion of the audience as part of the play's world.

Hill concludes her book with a look at three of Shakespeare's final plays: *Pericles*, *Cymbeline*, and *The Tempest*. The nature of romance drama creates distinct boundaries between a highly stylized and fantastic fictional world and that of mundane reality; and in its essentially optimistic worldview, Hill compares romances to the heavenward-glancing mystery plays (167). Shakespeare's romances are similar to mystery plays in more than just their hopeful outlook: these plays use the open-address conventions of mystery plays as a way of bridging the gap between the romantic world and the everyday world. The prologue of *Pericles* is delivered by an actor portraying the author of the play's source; the fantastic theatrical effects in *Cymbeline* are counterbalanced by numerous soliloquies and asides; and Prospero in *The Tempest* is characterized very much as a stage manager. The epilogue to *The Tempest* acknowledges that in the dramatic world, power lies not merely in the character, nor in the actor who plays him, but in the audience: "[Prospero's] words, this ending, are acts of community fusing play and audience" (184). It is this sense of inclusion that has helped to keep Shakespeare's plays interesting for generations of audiences after his time.

147

HOECKLEY, CHERI L. LARSEN, ED. *Shakespeare's Heroines: Characteristics of Women, Moral, Poetical and Historical*. Peterborough, ON: Broadview Press, 2005. Pp. 464. CDN and US \$22.95 paper.

**Suzanne Gossett, Loyola University, Chicago**

Shakespeare criticism is both progressive and circular. Progressive in that the plays are constantly reanalyzed as the interests of critics change and the concerns and events of the present highlight previously neglected elements of old texts; circular in that critical approaches—ideological, psychological, moral, theatrical—go in and out of fashion and when they reappear ask familiar questions in a new vocabulary. One place where progress and change has occurred is in feminist and gender criticism, which has introduced new methods, asked new questions, and sometimes shown the inadequacy of old answers. An example of revival is character criticism, for a long time dismissed as essentialist and ahistorical, describing Shakespeare's figures as if

they lived next door and one could infer their psychology from our own and count even their missing children. Yet in 2000 the Shakespeare Association of America included a seminar on “Shakespeare and Character,” and gradually work on character has been repositioned as a form of ethical analysis, avoiding essentialism in an updated approach that “acknowledges that fictional characters can effectively model human actions, but that accounts too for the influential role that historical and cultural forces play in the formation of individual identity.”<sup>1</sup>

The publication of Cheri Hoeckley’s edition of Anna Murphy Jameson’s *Shakespeare’s Heroines* is a welcome result of these changes. Feminist criticism has recovered many women writers where none were assumed to exist, as in the Early Modern period; it has also revived interest in the history of criticism by women. The very structure of Jameson’s book, first published in 1832, reveals its basis in traditional character criticism. After an introduction in which “Alda,” the author’s representative, explains that she has written her book “to illustrate the various modifications of which the female character is susceptible” (49) and to help overcome “the system of education which inundates us with hard, clever, sophisticated girls... with feelings and passions suppressed or contracted, not governed by higher faculties and purer principles” (66) by presenting Shakespeare’s characters who ‘are complete individuals, whose hearts and souls are laid open before us: all may behold, and all judge for themselves’ (55). After the introduction four sections divide Shakespeare’s women into “Characters of Intellect,” “Characters of Passion and Imagination,” “Characters of the Affections,” and “Historical Characters.”

The title Cheri Hoeckley has chosen for this first modern republication is of some interest. For most of her life Anna Jameson was a well known female social reformer, author of essays such as the 1843 “Woman’s Mission and Woman’s Position,” on the condition of working women, and the 1856 lecture on “The Communion of Labour,” urging the professionalization of middle-class women’s philanthropy in such venues as hospitals, prisons, and workhouses. According to Judith Johnston, her biographer, Jameson’s decision to call her book *Characteristics of Women, Moral, Poetical and Historical* was a “very deliberate one”; she even consulted her friend the actress Fanny Kemble, the book’s dedicatee, about the title and then rejected Kemble’s advice to name the book *Characters of Shakespeare’s Women*.<sup>2</sup> A variant of the current title, *Heroines of Shakespeare*, first appeared on an unauthorized American edition, and it only became *Shakespeare’s Heroines* in English editions after Jameson’s death. The book’s production history is a clue to Jameson’s intentions: she wrote the introduction last, during the debate over the Reform Bill of 1832, and this “gave the book a political unity it had hitherto lacked. . . . the tension of gender, the expression of particular matters at issue between the men and women of her own time . . . underlies the description of the lamentable condition of women which eventually dominates the discourse . . . . Jameson uses her discussion of Shakespeare to re-establish and relocate ideas about women” (77-78). In her choice of title Hoeckley presumably hopes to attract Shakespeareans to the volume; nevertheless she herself acknowledges that

while the book can be read either as a conduct manual or as a critical work, it “offers its most intriguing reading experience. . . when it is taken as a hybrid genre” (9).

As a critic Jameson can easily be dismissed as bardolatrous and romantic, worshipping at the shrine of “Shakespeare, who understood all truth” (58). Nevertheless, she is an acute reader and takes some positions radical for her time and surprising even now. In each section her primary interest seems to lie with one of the characters discussed. The close analysis of Portia as a character of intellect replies to Hazlitt, who found the young woman guilty of pedantry and affectation. For Jameson, instead, Portia unites in herself “all the noblest and most loveable qualities that ever met together in woman” (77): these include dignity, high mental powers, buoyancy of spirit, the grace that comes with her social position, and yet “warm and generous affection” (84). Juliet, the central character of *Passion and Imagination*, in a lengthy passage more redolent of Jameson’s own complicated marital experience than of conventionally assumed Victorian prudery, is defended against those who object to her passionate invocation of her wedding night, partly by attention to the dramaturgy—“in this speech Juliet is not supposed to be addressing an audience, nor even a confidant,”—partly through Jameson’s implicit acceptance of her “blissful anticipation” (144). Among the characters of the affections figure Hermione, Desdemona, Imogen and Cordelia; Jameson shares the Victorian admiration for Imogen, finding that “of all his women, considered as individuals rather than as heroines, Imogen is the most perfect” (226). Most surprising, however, is her evaluation of Lady Macbeth, who appears a bit oddly among the “Historical Characters.” Here, observing that Macbeth has been “considered one of the most complex in the whole range of Shakespeare’s dramatic creations,” Jameson demurs. Instead of holding Lady Macbeth—though “cruel, treacherous, and daring”—primarily responsible for the murder, Jameson notes that the reasons she seems the “more active agent of the two . . . is less through her pre-eminence in wickedness than through her superiority of intellect” (361-64). Macbeth, fundamentally inadequate, needs womanly encouragement, and she, though as a good wife, supplies it!

149

Jameson was not a modern scholar and Shakespeareans will recognize errors. For example, as an example of the “moral greatness of the poet’s mind, which disdained to sacrifice justice and the truth of nature to any time-serving expediency,” she praises his courage in making Katherine of Aragon the heroine of *Henry VIII* “in the reign and for the court of Elizabeth” (342). She is aware neither of the undoubted date of the play—*Henry VIII* was new in 1613, when fire from one of its cannons caused the destruction of the Globe theatre—nor that some of the passages she cites were almost certainly composed by John Fletcher. Yet her insightful reading of Katherine reflects a current scholarly preoccupation, performance as interpretation. Sarah Siddons had triumphed as Katherine in her brother John Philip Kemble’s production of 1788 and many times thereafter; as Gordon McMullan writes, “the chief legacy” of Kemble’s three productions (1788, 1803, 1811) was “the location of Siddons’s proud Katherine at the emotional centre of the play.”<sup>3</sup> Jameson, who was friendly with Siddons and her

two Kemble nieces, shared with them the view, as Hoeckley puts it, that “successful theatrical performances ... are always critical, textual endeavors” (33).

Hoeckley's edition includes an interesting introduction to Jameson, her biography, her historical and cultural environment, and her views on women and women's position. The volume also includes a chronology of Jameson's life, samples of her writing on “Women, Work, and Acting,” as well as extracts from contemporary reviews of *Characteristics of Women*, conduct books and Shakespearean criticism. The edition is based on the 1858 text, the last published in Jameson's lifetime, and illustrated with her own designs. This is an excellent contribution to studies of the history of feminist criticism, of Victorian women writers, and of Shakespearean reception.

150 CHAOUACHI, SLAHEDDINE. *Les Sensations Orientales et le Merveilleux dans l'œuvre de Théophile Gautier*. Tunis: Centre de Publication Universitaire, 2005. Pp. 842.

### **Lilia Coropceanu, Emory University**

À travers une étude attentive de l'entreprise littéraire de Théophile Gautier, Slaheddine Chaouachi fait ressortir les multiples références à l'Orient, en analysant la place et le rôle de celles-ci dans l'économie complexe de l'œuvre gautiériste. Démarche d'ailleurs pleinement justifiée, car la présence de ces éléments orientaux révèle, chez Gautier, non pas uniquement d'un engouement général qui envahit et occupe pendant longtemps l'imaginaire de ses contemporains, mais qui, au contraire, fait preuve d'un choix délibéré et d'une alternative (1). Or, comme le soutient S. Chaouachi, la rencontre de l'écrivain avec l'Orient marque profondément sa création littéraire et va lui permettre de «renouveler son inspiration, de concevoir et d'exécuter la partie la plus originale de son œuvre» (6).

Dans la première partie, *Les Sensations Orientales*, S. Chaouachi analyse les particularités révélatrices qui caractérisent les débuts littéraires de Gautier, dont l'univers s'avère tout plein de figures sinistres du diable, des spectres et des doubles et qui, en effet, témoigne du grand impact que l'œuvre de Hoffmann produit sur le jeune Gautier. Cependant, comme le suggère S. Chaouachi, on ne saurait pas voir dans cette veine fantasque de début le seul désir de pasticher le maître. Le critique nous invite plutôt d'y discerner les préoccupations de Gautier qui tournent à cette époque-là autour de la question de l'art et de la vie, et d'y voir surtout les efforts du jeune écrivain en vue de «baliser un tracé nouveau qui s'écarte de celui des prédécesseurs» (20). C'est ainsi qu'entre 1831 et 1834, dès la rédaction d'*Albertus* jusqu'à la parution de la *Cafetière et Omphale* Gautier parvient, progressivement, à « apprivoiser définitivement les démons de la nuit» (51). Or, cette séparation de l'univers fantasque annonce, chez Gautier, l'avènement d'une nouvelle écriture, dont le trait quintessenciel sera

un élan évident «vers l'extériorité, vers un monde opposé terme à terme à celui de la France des années trente: l'Orient» (59). Un monde nouveau donc, dont les éléments fascinants archéologiques, culturels et livresques vont jouer le rôle de catalyseurs dans la production littéraire de l'époque. Cependant, l'Orient de Gautier n'est pas uniquement le produit d'une imagination débridée. Dans *Fortunio*, comme dans *Une nuit de Cléopâtre* ou le *Pied de la Momie*, on découvre plus un Orient de mots qu'un Orient véridique, toute une «palette lexicale dans laquelle Gautier puise pour réaliser les plus beaux effets de sens» (122).

La deuxième partie de l'étude, *Fantastique et Merveilleux*, se focalise sur une certaine redéfinition du merveilleux tel qu'il se révèle dans l'œuvre gautiériste. Le critique y examine la notion de l'ailleurs absolu chez Gautier, qui, selon l'opinion du critique, transgresse la représentation d'un pur exotisme ou bien les conséquences d'un dépaysement radical, tout en devenant, pour l'être de Gautier, un espace à conquérir, un espace où celui-ci connaît «des transformations ontologiques salutaires» (311). Or, comme le démontre S. Chaouachi, le coloris oriental de *La Pipe d'Opium* et du *Pied de Momie* est dû, avant tout, aux personnages qui maintiennent des relations différentes avec l'Orient (313). Dans ce contexte, le cycle de la drogue, par exemple, évoque «l'exploration du rêve et de l'hallucination comme sources d'inspiration» (332), la drogue offrant l'ultime «paradis des sensations» (339). Suite à cette présence de l'Orient, l'univers des récits de Gautier de cette époque se révèle essentiellement différent : c'est un univers merveilleux où personnages, objets et animalier sont dans un rapport étroit. Mais c'est aussi et surtout une autre merveille que les textes de Gautier font découvrir au lecteur—la merveille de l'écriture. C'est ainsi qu'en optant délibérément pour les lumières d'Orient, Gautier parvient, selon l'affirmation du critique, à chasser les démons de la nuit, se débarrasser d'un pessimisme trop envahissant et donc à mettre en œuvre une nouvelle écriture plus attentive à la vie, dont l'exemple par excellence reste *La Mille et Deuxième nuit*, le conte oriental où «la poésie, la danse, la peinture et la musique se fondent dans une seule et profonde unité» (495). Voilà pourquoi dans la plupart des récits de Gautier l'écriture du merveilleux équivaut au merveilleux de l'écriture. L'analyse détaillée du critique met en évidence le fait que le merveilleux, tel qu'il apparaît dans l'œuvre de Gautier, c'est bien un merveilleux spécifique, «dont les ressorts principaux s'appellent poésie et fantaisie» (531).

La troisième partie, *Thématique de Gautier*, est destinée à l'exploration de la thématique gautiériste: amour, bonheur et pouvoir. L'analyse du critique fait voir qu'à chaque thème correspond une modulation et une esthétique à part. Le thème de l'amour, par exemple, est perpétuellement évoqué sous le signe du tragique. Comme le soutient S. Chaouachi, «chez Gautier il n'y a pas d'amour heureux» (553). Les récits d'inspiration orientale n'en font point exception: dans *Avatar*, *Jettatura*, *Roman de la Momie*, *Spirite*, on ne retrouve que des personnages et fins tragiques, où persiste la même conception de l'amour: incapable de s'épanouir dans *cette* vie, il peut trou-

ver, au contraire, son accomplissement uniquement dans *l'au-delà*. On retrouve les mêmes tonalités pessimistes dans le traitement gautiériste du thème du bonheur, qui ne peut être qu'illusoire. Pour Gautier, le bonheur et la vie restent deux choses absolument incompatibles. Cet aspect antithétique est d'autant plus évident quand on l'analyse dans le contexte du *bonheur et pouvoir*, car le pouvoir chez Gautier équivaut à la solitude. C'est ainsi que le seul bonheur possible pour Gautier demeure celui lié à l'art et à la contemplation de la beauté.

152 L'analyse critique effectuée dans la quatrième partie, *L'écriture en miroir*, est basée sur la lecture de *Palimpseste* de Gérard Genette. À travers ce biais le critique examine les multiples facettes de l'intertextualité interne et externe chez Gautier, qui apparaît comme un des principes fondamentaux de l'entreprise littéraire gautiériste, grâce auquel plusieurs éléments—l'influence des peintres orientalistes, les récits de voyage en Orient antérieurs,—se retrouvent, réarticulés, dans ses textes orientaux. Le critique souligne qu'en tant que phénomène observable, l'intertextualité y accomplit un double rôle : d'une part, elle nous renseigne sur la poétique de Gautier et, d'autre part, elle nous permet de mesurer l'originalité de son oeuvre (671). En d'autres mots, c'est exactement l'intertextualité qui, selon l'opinion du critique, permet à Gautier «de se situer par rapport à ses prédécesseurs et en même temps de tracer de nouvelles voies qui seront suivies et explorées par ceux qui viendront après lui» (672). Le critique révèle en outre dans l'oeuvre gautiériste le phénomène de la transposition d'art, grâce auquel se réalise le passage du même objet représenté antérieurement dans une certaine forme artistique à une autre, nouvelle, forme. Par conséquent, on peut retrouver dans un texte littéraire l'évocation d'un ancien motif pictural, ou bien reconnaître dans un poème un passage évoqué auparavant dans un récit de voyage. C'est ainsi que l'écriture devient chez Gautier le miroir de tous les arts.

Le livre de Slaheddine Chaouachi offre une riche et originale lecture de l'écriture orientale de Gautier, en ouvrant des perspectives nouvelles dans les études gautiéristes du dernier temps. Compte tenu de la longueur un peu excessive de l'étude, qui pourrait s'expliquer par un certain souci d'exhaustivité, on appréciera beaucoup la structuration très soignée du matériel facilitant considérablement la lecture. Les grandes lignes de la démarche de l'auteur sont synthétisées dans les conclusions et les notes qui accompagnent chaque chapitre, tout en offrant une transition logique aux idées qui seront exposées dans la partie suivante. La conclusion générale de l'étude rappelle au lecteur que l'écriture de Théophile Gautier est avant tout une écriture de l'enchantement. Or, du charme subi, conclut le critique, il faut passer au charme exercé. Charme exercé par l'univers lumineux d'une oeuvre, qui rêve d'absolu et qui témoigne d'un amour profond de la langue et des mots.

LYU, CLAIRE CHI-AH. *A Sun Within a Sun: The Power and Elegance of Poetry*. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 2006. Pp. 222. US \$30.00 cloth.

**Greg Keeler, Montana State University-Bozeman**

In discussing the work of Baudelaire and Mallarmé, Claire Chi-ah Lyu's *A Sun Within a Sun: The Power and Elegance of Poetry* follows that delicate line between the abstruse and the accessible, the academic and the popular, leaning often toward the former, then regaining its balance with occasional references to the contemporary undergraduate classroom and such authors as Henry Miller, William Burroughs, Mary Oliver, E.A. Poe and Antoine de Saint-Exupéry. Though the book's six chapters and epilogue generally steer clear of judgment and didacticism, a definite anti-Cartesian attitude permeates the whole, encouraging readers to abandon the structured realm of the absolute and open themselves up to the Post-Structural risks of questions and uncertainty.

153

It may, at first, be difficult for readers to find Lyu's own voice among her quotes, particularly those from Walter Benjamin and Gilles Deleuze, but as the chapters progress to the refrain of Baudelaire's comment on poetry, "What can be this drunkenness of love,/already so powerful in its natural state,/when it is enclosed in the other drunkenness,/like a sun within a sun," she focuses her references to her own purpose, encouraging readers and writers to dislodge the anchor of thought from acquired knowledge and carry it as a light and delicate instrument into the emotional heights and depths where beauty resides.

Using the stories of Icarus and Daedalus and Orpheus and Euridice, Lyu's prologue and first chapter lay the groundwork for her advocacy of Baudelaire's poetic principles and the necessity that, in its quest for beauty, poetry confront the unknown. Both Icarus and Orpheus take tragic risks for beauty: Icarus for a closer look at the sun and Orpheus for a forbidden glimpse of his beloved. Like the mythic heroes, Baudelaire risks losing his rational integrity and identity by investigating the heights and depths of experience for beauty in his poetry. Lyu elaborates by citing Baudelaire's "Le Poème du haschisch" and its distinction between banal intoxication and poetic intoxication, that a literal addict will be stripped of thought and lost in an intoxicating haze with only a tawdry illusion of beauty, whereas a true poet will go stone sober to that beautiful and terrifying place where wings, lyres and the rational facilities prove useless—and return damaged yet intact to write of that beauty, that sun within the sun of poetry.

Lyu's second chapter on Mallarmé, "The 'Frivolous' Other and the 'Authentic' Self," seems a rather drastic departure from the passionate tone she sets in chapter one, as if she were perhaps attempting to frame a previously published article to suit the purposes of the book. To accommodate the playfulness and reflexivity of Mallarmé's journalistic take on Paris, fashion, and literature, she leads us on a light but labyrinthine tour of the poet's sometimes tedious concern for the play between people

and names, fashion and true identity, the native and the foreign, the Other and the same, and the nuances of syntactical variations. It may be a bit of a stretch when, at the end of the chapter, she points out the root similarity in French between risk and play and finishes with “At once absolute and circumstantial, Mallarmé’s writing risks opening the certainty and weight of meaning to contingency and lightness.” If that sentence were to reflect literally on the first chapter, we might imagine Orpheus saying “Woopsy daisy!” as Euridice goes spinning off into the void or Icarus emulating Homer Simpson with “Doh!” when his wings melt.

Chapter three, “‘Vice of Stone’ and Open Air: *The Weight of Living*’ and *The Search for Lightness*,” returns to Lyu’s more passionate tone and, in retrospect, lends more substance to the “contingency” and “lightness” applied to Mallarmé’s work. Quoting Calvino, she writes, “In lightness is nothing ‘frivolous.’ Indeed, ‘Thoughtful lightness can make frivolity seem dull and heavy.’” She proceeds to illustrate Calvino’s paradox with the myth of Perseus and Medusa where the latter turns men to stone because of their literal heavy-handedness, their desire to confront and clash rather than touch and accept. Because Perseus knows that Medusa is beautiful under her snakes, a victim herself of Minerva’s jealousy, rage and confrontation, he accepts her, and she, in turn, allows him to take the life of her monstrous transformation. When he thoughtfully and delicately wraps her severed head and lays it in seaweed, Medusa’s awful power is in turn gently transferred to the seaweed, which is transformed to coral. This delicate transformation through lightness of touch and thought shows, in Ovid’s classical rendition, the physical transference of beauty through contiguity.

Lyu then shows how Baudelaire employs an equivalent lightness and restraint in his “Spleen” poems, applying poetry’s “weightless lucidity” to the heaviest, most monstrous corners of the human psyche, finding modern correspondence in “catastrophic” encounters where his Greek predecessor found physical contiguity through literal touch.

Just as Baudelaire anticipated his critics and “hypocrite reader,” Lyu seems to have a subtle way of offering tactful arguments and alternatives when she anticipates her own readers’ misgivings. By the middle of the book, those who might be put off by her royal we, her shadowy appearances between her sources and her affinity for Post-Structural layering and repetition might be tempted to stop reading, but then comes chapter four, “Beyond Hell and Paradise: The Poet and the Critic.” Here the reader encounters Baudelaire’s trial and conviction for “outrage to public morality” in his writing. Here those who adhere to Cartesian absolutes reduce Baudelaire to a guy with a dirty mind and a dirty pen and put him in jail to protect the female readership.

In terms of the previous chapter, these judgmental critics confront, clash, and turn to stone, snubbing the delicacy and nuance of language that touches a darkness they refuse to acknowledge in themselves. This may be the most accessible and practical (to use a truly dirty word) chapter in the book, and it places what precedes it in a fresh context.

Lyu uses Flaubert's letters commenting on Baudelaire's "Le Poème du haschisch" to show how criticism can be disagreement that is open and accepting and can foster the correspondence and contiguity necessary for poetry to flourish. Flaubert "holds still at the point of precarious discomfort from diverging forces, neither agreeing nor disagreeing, in the manner of his fluid, free, indirect style of writing." He hesitates, thinks and questions but doesn't judge. He sees the beauty in difference, in disagreement. So, too, may Lyu's readers disagree, hesitate, question, and continue to chapter five, "Quantum Elegance: *Content and Form in Science, Fashion and Poetry*."

Here, through a close reading of Mallarmé's poetry Lyu shows how he puts Poe's theories concerning brevity into practice to create beauty through the mathematical precision required in writing the short poem. This chapter has an abundance of vivid and engaging discourse relating Mallarmé's methods to those of Baudelaire and ultimately to her own theme concerning the light, the heavy and the creation of beauty, (the sun within a sun). Mallarmé, a hero of lightness and lucidity carries the burden of form just as Perseus carries the head of Medusa. Mallarmé "bears that oppressive constriction of form... just as Baudelaire bears that of spleen. As spleen takes form in Baudelaire, the difficulty of form takes form in Mallarmé." 155

Chapter six, "The Eternal Enigma of Beauty" is an elegant pep talk to discourage dualistic thinking and encourage acceptance in the place of understanding, bringing preceding chapters (with the possible exception of two) to a crescendo and closing with an image of the sun, this time from Rimbaud's poem, "L'éternité" and Lyu's refrain: "A poem lives and dies, rises and sets, as a sun within a sun."

In her epilogue, Lyu explains how, like good poets, good readers may find beauty by opening themselves up to the text and risking their hold on known experience.

"If a poem is to reveal itself, to give its self, and to happen, so, too, is the reader to show the self and to happen, for to receive the poem of deep transformative power means receiving, recognizing, and embracing our ephemeral...self, risking our own being to hear and respond to poetry's imperative."

Ultimately, *A Sun Within a Sun* should prove inspirational to writers, readers and teachers willing to lighten up on judgement and take some risks for beauty's sake.

SIMONSEN, KAREN-MARGRETHE, MARIANNE PING HUANG, AND MADS ROSENDAHL THOMSEN, EDs. *Reinventions of the Novel: Histories and Aesthetics of a Protean Genre*. Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi, 2004. Pp. 346. US \$74.00.

**Patrick Parrinder, University of Reading**

The novel is one of the great artistic success stories of the twentieth century. Its demise has been predicted more often than the disappearance of the easel painting or the

death of tragedy. Rival media such as film, radio and television drama, and candid biography and autobiography have arisen to flourish alongside the novel, but not to displace it. Far from occupying a diminished cultural sphere, it has spread around the world and found new readerships in whole continents where novels were previously little known. In the first decade of a new century there is a manifest urge to look back and take stock of this extraordinary phenomenon, as the five volumes edited by Franco Moretti and published in Italy as *Il Romanzo* (and reproduced in an abridged edition by Princeton University Press in 2006) have demonstrated.

As its subtitle indicates, *Reinventions of the Novel*, a collaborative volume produced by members of the Comparative Literature department at Aarhus University, Denmark, is very much part of this stocktaking. In the words of the back-cover blurb, the sixteen articles and linking editorial essays “investigate connections, differences and similarities in the Novel around the world for the past three hundred years ... Close readings combined with historical overviews and theoretical discussions open up new constellations in the history of the novel.” This could equally serve as a prospectus for Moretti’s star-studded, consciously heavyweight project. There are, necessarily, aspects of fiction that the present comparatively modest enterprise does not and could not have attempted to cover. For example, there is no representation of the novel’s global range and its non-European and postcolonial developments, despite the editors’ recognition of a “veritable renaissance” in the genre since the 1960s (9). Nor is there discussion of the commercial and social history of the novel and its readers, or of the nature and variety of its subgenres. The focus is steadily on the formal construction and theoretical implications of “literary fiction” from Rabelais and Richardson to the digital age. That said, the essays assembled in *Reinventions of the Novel* are remarkably probing, wide-ranging, and well integrated. To anyone contemplating, but fighting shy of, a serious assault on the Moretti volumes—which could take as long as *War and Peace* to read in full, and longer to digest—one might say: start here.

The novel, as the editors’ introduction suggests, is a genre like no other. It is a late-coming, “bastard” form, “the genre of emerging modernity” (15). But it also shows an astonishing dynamism, refusing to be bound by rules and constantly undermining its own constitutive traits, so that the right question is not what a novel is, but what may count as one. E. M. Forster, in *Aspects of the Novel*, had recourse to a minimalist definition of the form as “prose fiction of a certain length”; this is a reminder that, however much the novel is reinvented, it must remain separable from the short story. The implications of the novel’s length are teased out by more than one contributor. A novel must have narrative space enough to support its “dialogical and multi-voiced structure” (61); it allows for temporal duration, so that an individual’s complex *Bildung* or identity-formation can be traced in depth; and, as Henry James observed, its length is necessary for wide-angle vision and the comprehensive rendering of life. In the present collection, Rolf Heitmann looks at Nathaniel Hawthorne’s prefaces to his fiction and at James’s responses to Hawthorne, showing how deliberately the ear-

lier writer set about producing fictions that were either too short or too anti-mimetic to qualify as novels. A novel, for Hawthorne, had sufficient amplitude both to fill a book and to provide total absorption for its readers, who were enabled to “steal experiences and live the life of others” (129). It was this power to promote the reader’s vicarious living that Hawthorne, so Heitmann argues, was keen to relinquish.

This is in some ways a puzzling contention, since the power of absorbing the reader in vicarious experience was precisely what Hawthorne’s successors, such as Robert Louis Stevenson, would claim for the romance rather than the novel. Heitmann, however, clearly refutes James’s view of Hawthorne as a theoretical innocent; rather, his anti-realism appears as a deliberately anti-novelistic strategy. Nevertheless, the term ‘anti-novel’ is unsatisfactory, since anti-novels are, by and large, simply part of the normal process of generic reinvention. On the other hand, a short fiction is not a species of ‘anti-novel’ but simply another genre existing side by side with the novel. The ‘rules’ of the novel are more seriously undermined by works of fiction or fictional series that may be described as too long rather than too short. Mads Rosendahl Thomsen suggests in this volume that, since novels depend on closure, a work that in principle seems “endless” must push the genre to its extremes. His examples consist of Modernist masterworks by Joyce, Musil, and Proust, of which he says that “The monstrosity and ambitiousness of these novels will probably never be exceeded” (291). It would be worth relating this insight to popular culture, which throws up very different (but perhaps no less monstrous) examples of “endless” fictions.

Thomsen firmly categorizes Joyce’s *Finnegans Wake* as a novel (a point to which I will return), and he finds lineal descendants of the Modernist experiments in works by Georges Perec and Nicholson Baker. Although his essay is subtitled “The Novel after its Extremes,” nearly all this volume’s contributors focus on novels which, in their time, represented the genre’s extremes. Thus the “reinventions” considered here include *Tristram Shandy*, a work which (as Kirsten Pedersen writes) “reflects upon its own impotence as a novel” and “demonstrates that the world is possible although it is not real” (39, 47). They include the epistolary fictions—little more than collections of letters arranged in sequence—analysed in Ole Birklund Andersen’s essay on *Pamela*. Surrealist texts such as Breton’s *Nadja*, paradoxically considered by Frits Andersen to be a “Siamese twin” of Zola’s *Nana*, are also reclaimed for the novel. Essays by Frederik Tygstrup and Karen-Margrethe Simonsen look at ways in which the form makes use of pictorial techniques, even though (as Simonsen concludes in her discussion of Nathalie Sarraute’s fiction) “the Novel is based on the longing for a visualization that it must dissolve when it appears” (241). Moreover, as Rasmus Blok argues in the volume’s final essay, the novel easily accommodates works of interactive fiction, the so-called “digital novels.”

Blok takes issue with the “convergence theory” which states that new systems such as hypertext are destined to exemplify and validate the existing body of ideas about post-structuralist textuality. The reverse, he suggests, is often the case. Digital fictions have not dispensed with narrative or narrative closure, and the number of meaning-

ful combinations they offer is distinctly finite. If the reader's "freeplay" is increased in certain respects, it is seriously curtailed in others. According to Blok, the digital reader no longer has the option to skip pages, to reread them, or to obtain an overview of the "dominating hierarchical structure of the text" (319). What he does not ask is whether this simply reflects the current relatively primitive state of the genre and its associated software.

Can it be said, then, that the novel's reinvention reigns triumphant in every aspect of the avant-garde fiction of the last century? Possibly the most indigestible of the great avant-garde works, so far as both the novel and its accustomed readership are concerned, has been Joyce's *Finnegans Wake*. Steen Klitgård Povlsen's essay analysing Freud's study of the joke through the lens of *Finnegans Wake* is learned, intricate, and witty in the familiar mode of *Wake* scholarship, which is to say that it must be hard going for the uninitiated reader. Povlsen and his fellow-contributors class *Finnegans Wake* not just as a novel, but as one which new generations of readers may  
**158** find increasingly accessible. Nevertheless, the *Wake* remains completely *sui generis*, and I would suggest that the question whether anything more is achieved by calling it a reinvention of the novel than by excluding it from the form remains open.

Another aspect of the novel's "reinvention" is the way in which particular, exemplary texts may be reread by new critics or schools of criticism, to the extent that incompatible or incommensurable versions of the same work become current. Several of the essayists in this book enter into the thicket of interpretations surrounding classics such as James's *The Aspern Papers*, Goethe's *Wilhelm Meister*, and Proust's *À la recherche du temps perdu*. In the case of *Wilhelm Meister*, as Birgit Eriksson shows, the conflict of interpretations originated in correspondence between Goethe and Schiller while the work was still unfinished. Jens Peter Lund Nielsen incisively rereads Proust's novel against such powerful critical precursors as Roland Barthes, Paul de Man, and Gérard Genette. The effect of his reinterpretation (I suspect) is to make the work a more extreme text, one more likely to deceive its ordinary and not-so-ordinary readers, and this is perhaps true of *Reinventions of the Novel* in general.

Although the eighteenth and the twentieth centuries are strongly represented in this book, the nineteenth-century novel and the pleasures it offers are much less prominent. Austen, Brontë, George Eliot, Hardy, Tolstoy, and Turgenev are among the names missing from the index, while Dostoevsky is only mentioned once. This means that the coverage of the novel's ability to enable us to "live the life of others" is rather limited. Frederik Tygstrup's essay includes a quotation from Stendhal's *Le rouge et le noir* in which Julien and Madame de Rênal are sitting in the garden at Verdy, and Julien, after much furious cogitation, has just seized his companion's hand. How does Mme de Rênal react? As Stendhal writes, "elle se laissait vivre," "she allowed herself to live." Tygstrup does not comment on this phrase, yet (as Henry James among others suggested) the reason for the novel's continuing dominance may still be that, more than any other modern literary form, it allows its readers to live—or at least to live vicariously.

ZAMORA, LOIS PARKINSON. *Review of The Inordinate Eye: New World Baroque and Latin American Fiction*. U of Chicago P, 2006. Pp. 424. Illustr. US \$49.00 cloth.

**Patricia Nisbet Klingenberg, Miami University, Oxford, Ohio**

This amazing book is destined to be required reading for anyone interested in Latin American fiction. For me it has satisfied the many doubts I have had over the years regarding post-colonial theoretical approaches as they have been uneasily applied to the region. Zamora constructs a new paradigm for understanding contemporary literature which emerges from within the blending of cultures during the original Baroque period. The New World Baroque and the Neobaroque provide a framework for comprehending evolving modes of artistic expression which Zamora presents as part of an overarching aesthetic spirit visible across both time and space. It is a paradigm shift, exciting in its multifaceted exploration of figures we thought we knew and are asked here to review. 159

Zamora defines her unusual title as a metaphor for her cross-disciplinary approach, which addresses both the plastic arts and literature, and for the original world view expressed therein:

In its literal sense, “inordinate” defines spatial relations, the negative particle designating what those relations are not. Inordinate relations are not co-ordinate relations; inordinate points are not deployed in ordered relation, as are coordinate points, but in irregular, decentered, asymmetrical relation. A Spanish dictionary provides the definition of “inordinate” closest to my own intention, and to that of the writers whose work I will discuss: *una energía de signos que no siempre depende de la razón organizadora/coordinadora*—an energy of signs that does not always depend upon organizing/coordinating reason. (original emphasis, xxii)

Starting with ideas most familiar to students of Latin American literature, Zamora provides an argument about the blending of cultures in the first moments of the Spanish colonial empire, which then continues, in her view, as a spirit of originality into the modern and postmodern era. Her use in Chapter 1 of Quetzalcoatl and Guadalupe as both orally transmitted myths and constantly repeated visual images illustrates many of the points she will make later: the indigenous cultures viewed images, not just as resemblance but as embodiments of the spirits represented; the sacredness of the physical world denies a separation of body and spirit; the bodies of spirits undergo constant metamorphosis. These ideas blend, against all efforts to the contrary by the converting clergy, with the energies of the Spanish Baroque in both art and oral traditions.

The subsequent chapter’s discussion particularly of Diego Rivera’s murals and Elena Garro’s novel, *Los recuerdos del porvenir* and her story collection *La semana de colores*, draws the arguments about the syncretism of colonial culture into the twentieth century. As in the entire book, Zamora takes a well-known element of Rivera’s work,

his interest in pre-Columbian history, and elevates it to an entirely new realm. After arguing in the previous chapter that perspective in painting is a Western Renaissance privileging of the individual, she is now able to argue that Rivera's dispensing with the use of perspective in his murals honors the unique world view of the indigenous culture he depicts. The evident consciousness of Diego Rivera as *tlacuilo* (the painter/priests who made the codices) provides what can only be described as an epiphany to Zamora's reader, and adds greatly to our appreciation of Rivera's already moving work. The refusal of standard Western perspective in visual depiction can now be identified in Elena Garro's mystifying "floating" narrator in *Los recuerdos del porvenir*. This voice of the anonymous, powerless masses becomes the tombstone of the heroine, but also speaks for the town itself in gestures which defy Western notions of time and of the individual; Garro's stories in *La semana de colores* are explained by Zamora as a sustained study of Mesoamerican time/space conception.

160 But it is not just Mexican writers who are influenced by indigenous cultures. By relating these interests to authors like Uruguayan Eduardo Galeano Zamora illustrates the extent of the umbrella she is creating. One of the undercurrents of the book is its implication about the overwhelming influence of Mexican intellectuals throughout the vast regions to the south. Chapter 3 begins the expansion of syncretic epistemologies beyond Mexico in her detailed analysis of what she calls Alejo Carpentier's "Mexican initiation." Carpentier names Rivera, Orozco and (Mexican intellectual) Alfonso Reyes as key elements in his development of a transcultural theory of the New World Baroque whose spirit connects Latin American cultural expression across regional boundaries and across history. Weaving this Baroque spirit through art, architecture, music and narrative Zamora traces old-world European and new-world American cultural elements in Carpentier's conception of an "unlimited space-universe" of the Baroque, a universe that Carpentier—and Zamora—make America's own (Zamora 165).

Chapters 4 and 5 continue the journey beyond Mexico, first comparing Frida Kahlo with García Márquez and then incorporating Jorge Luis Borges into this vast polemic. It is particularly thrilling to read original ideas about these most canonical figures. Zamora's subtle distinction is particularly gratifying in the case of Borges where she distinguishes between the pastiche of the postmodern and Neobaroque parody, between cultural fragments devoid of context and those in which "meanings are multiple and elusive, but not impossible" (295). Zamora's confident mastery of European high cultural theory makes her concluding section on the Neobaroque as an alternative type of modernity fully convincing:

This does not mean that the effort [of recuperation and revision] is conservative or closed; on the contrary it is subversive in ways we have seen. . . Hence "neo" rather than "post"; the Neobaroque is countermodern, not postmodern, in its critical reception and reinterpretation of Western modernity. It violates aesthetic and ideological norms in ways that revitalize them; this is the meaning of "counterconquest"—revitalization by means of revision. (295)

This beautifully produced book, winner of an honorable mention for the MLA's Katherine Singer Kovaks prize, provides lush illustrations of the works of art and architecture referred to in the text. The integration of visual and verbal expression, the goal of Zamora's argument, is fully realized in this lovely volume.

EDWARDS, BRIAN T. *Morocco Bound: Disorienting America's Maghreb, From Casablanca to the Marrakech Express*. Durham: Duke UP, 2005. Pp. 376. Illustr. US \$84.95 cloth, US \$23.95 paper.

**Clement M. Henry, the University of Texas at Austin**

In early 1941, before Pearl Harbor, Henry Luce, the press mogul of Time Life Inc., proclaimed "The American Century" to support President Roosevelt's effort to involve the United States in World War II. The American campaign joining the British in North Africa to defeat Rommel marked one of the first US successes in the war, making America's Maghreb a key to the emerging hegemon's global identity. *Morocco Bound*, very rich in its literary and geopolitical implications, is not so much about Morocco as about American images of North Africa reflected in films, novels, songs, and even cookbooks from 1942 to 1973. 161

The title of this book is a pun taken from the theme song of *Road to Morocco*, a 1942 film featuring Bob Hope and Bing Crosby singing "Like Webster's dictionary, we're Morocco bound." The location of the movie, filmed in Imperial Valley, California, could just as well have been Timbuktu, except that the word morocco also connotes a fine leather used for bookbinding, and Brian Edwards extends the pun to convey the packaged representations of the country, American variations on Edward Said's Orientalist themes. Following Edward Said, Edwards not only aspires to do the textual analyses of a literary critic but also to relate them to "the institutional arrangements—that corporate aspect of Orientalism—that have framed America's Maghreb" (25). Some of the literary observations are brilliant but others may be too clever by half.

*Morocco Bound* covers three "snapshots" of American representations of the Maghreb (the Western part of the Arab world defined narrowly here as the former French possessions of Algeria, Morocco, and Tunisia), those of World War II, of the early postwar years 1948-55, and of the 1968-73 generation of hippies and anthropologists. Edwards had originally intended to bring his story up to date at least through the Clinton Administration, but the events of September 11, 2001, drove him to "reorganize that plan and indeed to write a different book than I had conceived" so as to stress "moments of textual rupture and possibility" (23). It is not quite clear how 911 may have altered his analyses, however, as the possibilities opened up by his creative rereadings continue to veil the contemporary reality of an Arab world angered by

American and Israeli occupations that are so reminiscent of the earlier colonial practices in North Africa. Edwards stays on the safe edge of progressive literary criticism, and until recently, indeed, with the postcolonial reemergence of Islamic activism, the Maghreb was relatively sheltered from events in the Mashreq (the Eastern parts of the Arab world). Deviating from Edward Said, our author makes no mention of American complicity in the Israeli occupation of Palestine under the Clinton and other administrations, perhaps for fear of falling off the edge. The only critical mention of Israel is by characters in *The Drifters* (1971) where the author conjures up the dangers of any alliance between black and Islam or Arab nationalism (278-79). Stopping in 1973, the author could critically analyze American images of a Maghreb relatively uncontaminated by the Arab Israeli conflict.

162 In each of the three snapshots Edwards critiques the mainstream reviews and criticisms of various works relating to North Africa, especially Morocco, by uncovering or imagining new connections to American geopolitics. The classic Casablanca, mentioned in the book's title, was released fortuitously within days of Operation Torch, the US military invasion of North Africa in November 1942. Just as in real life General George S. Patton scotches plan for the Vichy French to surrender to the Americans because they are "the only thing holding the Arabs in check" (30), so the film, too, puts the natives in the background. Here is one "paradigmatical example of 'American Orientalism'" (71), the American southwest without "Ayrabs" (56). It also reflects conservative racial politics. Rick's (Humphrey Bogart) sidekick Sam is the Afro-American piano player whose theme song, "As Time Goes By," keeps him in a Casablanca time warp outside Henry Luce's "American Century," the real time within which white heroes march on. Rick's doorman Abdul also lives in Sam's time register, and Edwards imagines the possibility, already intimated in the wartime Negro press but not expressed in the film, of an alliance between the Afro-Americans and Moroccan nationalists. There are different time lags for different peoples and they are also used as an excuse by the US government for cooperating with the colonial power to stall off "premature" independence.

In the author's view the film is a liberal masquerade that hides the wartime alliance between the Americans and the French colonial power, an alliance that betrays the anti-fascist struggle as well as America's anti-colonial image. At the end of the film Humphrey Bogart and Claude Rains, who plays the French collaborator, walk off past the sunset into "the beginning of a beautiful friendship." They shake off the Maghreb much like those hippies three decades later who, Edwards observed, are too self-centered to connect with Moroccan students protesting against a repressive monarchy.

The author may be on shakier ground conflating the hippies on their *Marrakech Express* (1968) with the anthropologists grouped around Clifford Geertz studying Sefrou. Geertz is perceived as culminating the national episteme of looking at Morocco from the outside, prior to the era of globalization that dates here from about 1973, associated with various international financial innovations and also, not men-

tioned here, with the rise of political Islam as a post-colonial form of anti-colonialism. Like the hippies, the anthropologists “turn away” from the ugly realities of Moroccan politics and so stay in harmony with an American Cold War politics that values political stability over human rights and recognize the Other in sites like “rural” Sefrou chosen for their foreignness. But surely the anthropologists were as aware of Hassan II’s political repression as John Waterbury, whose authoritative *Commander of the Faithful* (1970) is recognized here, and Sefrou lies only 30 km. south of Fez, the historic hotbed of Moroccan nationalism. It was after all a British anthropologist, the late Ernest Gellner, not mentioned here but whom every serious social scientist had to read, who was already connecting tribal uprising with national politics in the late 1950s.

The post 1973 episteme of globalization offers fresh perspectives on the Tangier literary circle associated with Paul and Jane Bowles and William Burroughs in the early postwar period. Although Edwards admits that Paul Bowles was hardly a political crusader, he teases out of Bowles’ *Sheltering Sky* allegories of protest against Luce’s “American Century” and premonitions of its demise. He also rereads an intense concern with Moroccan politics in Burroughs’ *Naked Lunch* and an attempt to escape “the awkward identification of Americans with colonialism” (169). And Alfred Hitchcock’s rerun of the film, *The Man Who Knew Too Much* (1956), located this time in Marrakech rather than a Swiss ski resort, also gets transformed into a challenge to the Cold War thinking of the times. In this film a seven year old boy’s accidental unveiling of a Moroccan woman on a bus gets interpreted as “a desire for the American to occupy the place of the French” (188-91), with references to Frantz Fanon’s critique of a French general’s wife encouraging Algerian women to unveil in 1956. Edwards sometimes chases after too many connections, and he also misses the sharp contrasts between the Algerian and Moroccan colonial experiences. Still it is fun to reflect that *The Man Who Knew Too Much* may be subtly undercutting Casablanca. Unlike Claude Rains, Daniel Gellin, who plays a French undercover agent, gets bumped off.

Jane Bowles elicits an arsenal of Edwards’ postmodern images to situate her “on the edge between something like the postnational and the extranational” (201) writing in “queer Tangier” where she feels she cannot address any national community, just her “five hundred goony friends” (208), and so fails to fulfill her considerable literary talent. Tangier is also of considerable interest to a number of writers because its special international status from 1926 to 1958 offered them considerable latitude outside national jurisdictions. Edwards is quick to observe how the mainstream press trashed Tangier as being queer financially and politically, as well as sexually (151), thereby again masking official US collaboration with France and Spain in revising the city’s international convention in 1952 in the colonial powers’ interests. The opportunity to consolidate a space beyond narrow state interests got lost in Cold War politics.

In short, this book stresses the anti-colonial undercurrent of the Tangier writers that mainstream American Orientalism suppressed in the interests of Cold War geopolitics and the racial status quo at home. Edwards is also well informed about Moroccan literary politics and presents two recent Moroccan responses to *Casablanca*. One is the Cablanca Hyatt Regency's "Bar Casablanca," which breaks with racial time in its cosmopolitan repetitions of "As Time Goes By." The other is the bar's inclusion in 'Abd al-Qader Laqt'a's film, *Love in Casablanca* (1999). The original film had Ingrid Bergman in the end leaving Humphrey Bogart to return to her husband, but in the Moroccan version the young liberated lady leaves her old man to go with the young lover. The lover explained to her in the film that the original *Casablanca* had "to preserve traditions in order to avoid problems with the censor" (75). Thus the film presents Morocco "as young, vibrant, and modern and modern and the United States as antiquated and outmoded" (76).

164 Despite its strategic silences, *Morocco Bound* offers promising beginnings for more liberated encounters between reoriented Americans and vibrant Maghrebis. Edwards deserves to be encouraged to continue his work in progress, with the Maghreb dialogue hopefully spilling over to better mutual Arab and American understandings of their respective places in the new post American century. And why not include Israel, for that matter, where Moroccans also reside with the right of return to their homeland?

KLAVER, ELIZABETH. *Sites of Autopsy in Contemporary Culture*. Albany: State U of New York P, 2005. Pp. 180. US \$73.50 hard cover, US \$22.95 paper.

**Amanda K. Booher, Clemson University**

JonBenét Ramsey, JFK, Beckett's *Play*, Foucault's *Birth of the Clinic*, *CSI*: these are just a few of the varied "sites" through which Elizabeth Klaver interrogates autopsy in her book *Sites of Autopsy in Contemporary Culture*. Though explicitly a study of autopsy, this text is as much an exploration of the meanings and representations of life, death, and most notably the body throughout Western culture. Klaver embarks on a truly interdisciplinary study, situating autopsy historically as a potential linkage between science, art and humanities, a means of deconstructing staunch disciplinary boundaries that persist even in the face of postmodernism. She accomplishes this by tracing the historical "materialization" of autopsy across disciplines, from works such as Andreas Vesalius' *Fabrica* and Rembrandt's *The Anatomy Lecture*, to the surfeit of texts produced from the assassination of President Kennedy, through fictional works like the novel and movie *Silence of the Lambs*. However, Klaver also argues for autopsy as a philosophical, theoretical, scientific, and humanist "concept" that provides insight into medical, forensic, literary, and cultural "venues" of autopsy

(7). Working histo-etymologically, she identifies the modern Western performance of autopsy as “surgical mutilation, penetration to the interior’s most private parts by cleaving phallic instruments, combining *ana-tome* (to cut up) and *auto-opsis* (to see with one’s own eyes) to produce a ‘piercing gaze’ in the service of medical science or the courts” (19). Klaver brings this “piercing gaze” to autopsy itself, providing chapters on the history and practice of autopsy; the claim of autopsy as performance (through the application of speech act theory); the “problematic” of the subject (particularly in the “talking cadaver” metaphor); the autopsy of JFK as a reflection of the “social” and political landscape; and autopsy in popular culture, such as through *The X-Files*.

The subject/object of autopsy (a distinction she explores in chapter three) is the body; Klaver’s text thus positions her amidst a corpus of work on body criticism. She posits the current debate of body criticism as a conflict between those who see the body as culturally constructed (represented by the work of Judith Butler) and those who embrace “intrinsic” views, which “[do] not deny the intrinsic materiality or physicality of the body” (28). Klaver is clearly disenchanted with the constructivist position; though she claims to have previously followed the “Butlerian mode”, this study of autopsy has forced her reconsideration of the “degree of ‘realness’” of the body (30). She aligns herself with Michel De Certeau, and defines her theoretical position as “constructivist Realist,” which combines “the philosophical theory of Realism, which admits to a real world (however one may end up defining it), with a theory of cultural models (social constructs)” (30). This is an interesting though not unproblematic approach. Klaver’s critical reading of Butler (in chapters one and two) at times glosses over subtleties, leaving Butler as a pure constructivist who sees the body “with no structural or ontological origins” (55). However, Butler does not fully deny the physical body. Butler writes: “To claim that discourse is formative is not to claim that it originates causes, or exhaustively composes that which it concedes; rather, it is to claim that there is no reference to a pure body which is not at the same time a further formation of that body” (*Bodies That Matter: On the Discursive Limits of “Sex,”* New York: Routledge, 1993, 10). Butler argues that there is no “pure” body outside of our cultural understandings of the body. One might suggest that Klaver leans in the same direction with her previous definition of “a real world (however one may end up defining it)” (30).

This points to a larger challenge throughout the text. Klaver weaves theory throughout her analyses with varying degrees of success. She argues intriguingly for autopsy as performative, pulling from speech act theory (J.L. Austin, John R. Searle), concluding that “the performance of autopsy is a way of trying to understand this waywardness, or insubordination, of the body” (56). She claims, again using “*auto-opsis*,” that the act of looking in the autopsy is constitutive, bringing “an event, or an observer-relative fact, into social constitution” (58). However, her continued return to the “real” seems problematic as she claims, a few sentences later, that “[t]he dead body [...] is not constructed by anything other than itself” (59). She engages De

Certeau extensively, often employing him productively in relation to other theorists and through analysis of different texts. However, this discussion could be enhanced by a broader theoretical scope, including the work of Nietzsche and Benjamin, for example (relevant in notions of bodily inscription and anxieties of mechanical reproduction). Additionally, Merleau-Ponty's phenomenological perspective of the body in relation with the world could offer a more productive and cohesive means of integrating constructivist and Realist views.

166 Klaver is at her strongest and most interesting in her cultural analyses. She emotionally recounts her examples through deep description, such as when conveying her experience of observing an actual autopsy: "It was hard enough to see the dead body upon first stumbling into the room; it was harder still to watch it lose coherence, even positioned as I was to take full advantage of 'glancing'" (26). Her analysis is apt when discussing "Katie's Story" from John Douglas's book *Obsession*; when Katie's daughter is brutally murdered, Katie insists on extensively examining the body for herself. Klaver describes Katie's viewing, weaving ancient and modern notions of autopsy again through etymology by claiming that "Katie is performing an autopsy on her dead child, and, oddly enough, a loving autopsy at that" (58). She employs a delightful variety of texts, from the "high art" of painting and theater to "low-brow" TV (such as *Alien Autopsy*), from the texts of Renaissance doctors (Vesalius, Ambroise Paré) to those of modern conspiracy theories (JFK, aliens).

Moments such as these reap the greatest rewards of Klaver's interdisciplinarity, revealing the power and intrigue of autopsy as a cultural/medical/social event and insightful "*concept*." Klaver concludes that "we look to the image of the dissected body because it offers some sense of Western power, however misapprehended, over whatever is outside culture" (153). In the end, she seems a bit apprehensive of what she claims autopsy offers—a sense of cohesion for bodies which resist. This seems an appropriate response to the complex perspective of autopsy Klaver has advanced in this compelling interdisciplinary work.

## ENDNOTES

1 Jessica Slights, "Rape and the Romanticization of Shakespeare's Miranda," *Studies in English Literature* 41 (2001), 358-59. See also Slights's earlier article, "Historical Shakespeare: Anna Jameson and Womanliness," *English Studies in Canada* 19 (1993): 387-400.

2 Judith Johnston, *Anna Jameson: Victorian, Feminist, Woman of Letters* (Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1997), 74.

3 Gordon McMullan, ed., *King Henry VIII* (London, 2000), 28.