
E.D. Hirsch published Validity in Interpretation seventeen years ago and immediately became the apologist for historical and biographical literary criticism. In 1976 he published Aims of Interpretation and was hailed as the American response to European relativism which was taken by many to be comparable only to an intellectual epidemic. Although one cannot hold the author responsible for the claims made by his camp followers on his behalf, there is no doubt that Hirsch's writing, because of its combative nature, its clear defense of 'traditional' practice and not least of all because of his penchant for universalization, lent itself to the rallying cry of outrage for a generation of his contemporaries. Thus Hirsch proclaims:

Textual commentary is threatened nowadays by a bigger danger than the innocent accumulation of worthless knowledge. In its decadently skeptical forms, it threatens to degrade knowledge and value at once, simply by attempting to create value as a substitute for knowledge. Some French theorists, Derrida and Foucault, for instance, along with their American disciples, hold to the doctrine that since genuine knowledge of an author's meaning is impossible, all textual commentary is therefore really fiction or poetry. (p. 147)

But, beyond whatever may have been made of The Aims of Interpretation in the academic wars of North America, the book itself, far from being a mere polemical statement is a carefully worked out response to the critics of Validity of Interpretation. Some of the chapters are well known from previous publication; this is especially the case with 'Stylistics and Synonymity' and 'Three Dimensions of Hermeneutics.' The book as a cogent argument, however, stands or falls on the effectiveness of Hirsch's distinction between meaning and significance. He writes in the Introduction:

These dogmatic relativists, whom I call cognitive atheists, insist strongly upon the artificiality of any distinction between meaning and significance ... the distinction
itself is far from artificial; it is natural and universal in our experience. In fact, if we could not distinguish a content of consciousness from its contexts, we could not know any object at all in the world. (p. 3)

In spite of his objections, and not aided by his combativeness, Hirsch is plainly less than adequate on this very point. This inadequacy is due to the fact that his argument does not respond to the philosophical objections made by those who hold that the meaning of a text is indeterminate, but even more damaging to Hirsch's cause is the fact that he fails to provide a sustained argument for his own camp, those who hold that the meaning of a text is determinate.

First, let us consider the counter argument from the standpoint of the indeterminist critics. The term 'meaning' as used by Hirsch refers to the verbal form within the text and its established semantic sense. The term 'significance' refers to the perceived relevance of the text in the commerce of ideas in the community. Thus the crux of the argument is the separability of the descriptive analysis of a text from the normative aspects of interpretation.

In his book Hirsch argues that the meaning of a text is not necessarily the same as the meaning that the author originally intended (the thesis he pursued in the previous book). His earlier position, he now states, was too narrow. Thus, he now affirms that the meaning of the text must be constructed by the critic using the guideline of respect for the construed intention of the author. However, if meaning must be constructed by the critic following certain norms, it follows that the critic must be able to discern between what is and what is not permissible according to the norm, therefore critical choices are a fundamental part of constructing meaning. The distinction between meaning and significance given Hirsch's own definitions can no longer hold up. This is not to say that within the activity of literary criticism it is not fully warranted to demand that differences of interpretation strive for the establishment of a common ground through the description of the text in question. What is untenable is that the belief — for that is what Hirsch's argument comes to be — that the meaning of a text is a unified given available through the application of a norm, is an axiom of interpretation. In other words, Hirsch has failed to convince us that the meaning of a text is not always the product of the critic's work and thus is never free of his value judgements. In conclusion to this counter-argument, Hirsch's thesis is self-contradictory once he accepts that the critic's work is the construction of meaning.

Now let us turn to the counter-argument from the standpoint of the determinist critics. The problem with Hirsch's argument from this standpoint is that it is high in polemics and low in semantic method.
The weaker claim that verbal meaning is to be construed in terms of the author's intention comes forth not as an analytical claim based on a semantic theory, but rather as a pious wish that this is what we ought to be doing if we respect the vision of the author. Therefore as a plea we can accept it or reject it on an ethical basis, but it has no bearing on the nature of interpretation. The determinist critic cannot be satisfied with Hirsch's position, for what he is looking for is analytical proof of meaning and he will not accept a mere claim that the author's intention provides a valid norm with which to determine meaning. Finally, for the determinist critic, Hirsch's distinction between meaning and significance is of no consequence whatsoever for it begs the question. Since Hirsch's basic presupposition is that a stable meaning of a text exists and it is to be determined on the basis of what we can learn about the author's intentions, his argument assumes what in fact has to be proven. The very question at stake becomes: how is it possible to know what the author meant? But Hirsch would have us begin with the belief that he meant something and this intention is recoverable. But, why did the author have to have a unified coherent plan for his text, and even if he did, how is it recoverable with any degree of confidence that it is accurate, complete and authentic? The determinist critic will turn away from Hirsch at this point and look toward analytical theories. If conflicting claims for specific meaning can both pay homage to the author's intention and there is no effective means of resolving the conflicting claims, the norm becomes functionally meaningless. The determinist critic wants textual evidence for the establishment of the meaning of the text and will not accept appeals to ethics in its place.

There is one more dimension to this book to which I have alluded in passing. Hirsch, whatever his intentions may have been, has given literary theory one of its most rewarding debates, first with Hans Georg Gadamer and subsequently with all comers from the indeterminist camp. Hirsch has offered us the possibility of considering and re-considering the crucial theoretical paradox of the inexhaustibility of literary texts in the light of the evidence that each generation of readers rediscovers them and remakes them in its own image while nevertheless maintaining a stability of the text as source and a tradition of commentary which only grows.

(M.J. Valdés, University of Toronto)
This book is, to my knowledge, the first work of literary theory whose main purpose is to put the ideas of Karl Popper and his school into service, in a large-scale way, for the study of literature. Popper is best known for his theories of falsificationism — his criterion for demarcating 'science' from 'nonscience' or 'metaphysics' — and anti-inductivism, which he first propounded in The Logic of Scientific Discovery (1934), as well as for his advocacy of the 'open society' and his denunciation of its 'enemies' (The Open Society and Its Enemies, 1963). Aspects of the influential and highly controversial theories of this celebrated philosopher of science have been received into a variety of disciplines, including the philosophy of mathematics, the philosophy of history, and, with E.H. Gombrich, the history of art. Recently they have also found their way into a few works of German literary theory: Gerhard Pasternack's Theoriebildung in der Literaturwissenschaft (1975), Siegfried J. Schmidt's Literaturwissenschaft als argumentierende Wissenschaft (1975), and now, Karl Eibl's Kritisch-rationale Literaturwissenschaft.

What does Popper have to offer literary theory? Pasternack and Schmidt, as well as Eibl, are attracted first and foremost by critical rationalism as a metascience, by the criteria it offers for distinguishing science from nonscience and for evaluating the claims of competing theories. Such concerns, expressed in these terms, may seem strange to an Anglo-American audience, but they should not be dismissed merely as an attempt to resurrect nineteenth-century positivism. Rather, these critics are evidently motivated by a sense that there is something wrong with the way the discipline of literary criticism has taken shape and is still being practiced today. Pasternack speaks of the 'eclectic assimilation of arguments' from other disciplines that are 'scarcely unifiable' in their theoretical presuppositions; Schmidt complains of the 'individualistic fragmentation of research activity' and the 'Babylonian confusion of languages' among scholars 'primarily striving for originality in expression'; and Eibl too alludes to the diffuseness of approaches to literary study. Their response to this admittedly confusing and anxiety-provoking situation is to demand that Literaturwissenschaft become more of a Wissenschaft — not in the sense of blindly adopting scientific methods, but rather by conceiving of itself as a science and fulfilling the requirements for a science according to metascientific criteria. In short,
literary theories should not immunize themselves from criticism (for example, by hiding behind the currently much questioned distinction between the natural sciences and the humanities in terms of the methods of 'explaining' versus 'understanding'); they should advance testable and thereby falsifiable arguments; and they should make the implicit presuppositions that underlie their explanations explicit.

Of course there is a political dimension to the argument, in the sense that these critics are attempting to free the discipline entirely from politics. One has the dizzying impression that they overlook entirely the question of why literary studies are not more scientific — why they are not practiced more efficiently, and according to a more rigorously controlled methodology. The answer surely has less to do with the intrinsic nature of the discipline and still less with the capricious individualism of our present 'scholars of one candle' than with the fact that, given the institutional structures within which literary studies take place today, it is in no one's interest to apply rigorous rules to it. The academic literary industry may be dominated by standards of market competitiveness, but no one has yet figured out a way to make a significant profit out of its services. Not enough is at stake for intimidation or interest to impose result- or efficiency-oriented methods on it, or for that matter, to provide it with resources that would make such results possible. If literary scholars are not yet working in teams and if world literature is not yet available to us at a touch on our terminals, it is because no one has yet smelled a good investment in the (potentially very exciting) results such innovations would bring. In the meantime, literary criticism has a way of defining and redefining itself that is not confined solely to the criterion of correctness; as it is presently constituted, the discipline has no interest even in such partial closure. Within this larger context even the contributions of these critical rationalist theoreticians have to be evaluated not according to their own standard of correctness, but as simply interesting.

Eibl's stated purpose is to apply critical rationalism to the perennial problems of literary history. He does not only advocate the adoption of Popper's metascientific criterion of falsifiability for literary studies; he also uses Popper's arguments against teleological and deterministic views of history, and he goes so far as to adapt some of Popper's theories, notably, his 'conjectural' evolutionary epistemology and 'world 3' hypothesis, in order to come to positive theoretical hypotheses of his own. Each of the book's four chapters presents one of the main stages in the argument.

In the first chapter, Eibl sets forth Popper's basic premises as an aid to the uninitiated and in order to enlighten readers who, after the
Positivismusstreit of the 1960s, might wrongly identify Popper as a positivist. According to Popper, all theoretical knowledge is purely conjectural. The method of induction does not work; we cannot legitimately move from single observations to true universal statements. Induction is not a priori valid, but could only be justified inductively, which would lead to infinite regress. But while we can never verify our hypotheses empirically, we can falsify them. A false conclusion or single case can be used to falsify the premises. Eibl underscores the difference between this theory and positivism, which placed faith in the principle of induction.

In the second chapter Eibl discusses a fundamental problem of historiography: can one speak of laws in history? He approaches this important question by attacking a traditional way of resolving it, which he calls the 'two-world thesis' — the idea that a world of immutable laws stands behind a world of contingent appearance. Theorists who subscribe to the 'two-world thesis' include Emil Staiger with his 'Grundbegriffe' and Fritz Strich with his characterization of German Classicism and Romanticism as well as Popper's essentialist and historicist arch-enemies Hegel and Marx. The 'two-world thesis' is pernicious, for it permits one to trivialize contingency as 'mere appearance' and immunize one's theory against contradictory facts. Thus Hegel accounts for irrational moments in history as the 'cunning of reason,' and Engels immunizes Marx's theory of economic determinism by proposing that a dialectic interchange takes place between basis and superstructure.

After this critique, which is, to my mind, the most interesting part of the book and which Eibl extends to Gadamer and the notion of the authority of the text, the author introduces the concept of 'assumptions of regularity' that will guide his argument throughout the rest of the book. The idea is borrowed from Popper. Since it is a cornerstone of Eibl's theory, it will be useful to summarize Popper's views, although Eibl himself does not do so. Popper believes that organisms do not perceive reality directly and immediately, but rather according to innate 'dispositions' that are theory-impregnated. As part of his campaign against induction, he asserts that induction is not only logically untenable, but also not an operative psychological concept. The 'formation of belief by repetition' is a 'myth.' Instead, all organisms have an inborn need for regularities and leap to conclusions about regularity, even where such regularities do not exist in the environment (regularity is a psychological a priori, but not a priori valid); they then correct their assumptions on a trial-and-error basis.

Eibl introduces the idea of 'assumptions of regularity' at the close of his metatheoretical critique. He asserts that all human theorizing is based on assumptions of regularity, and that if we can make these assumptions ex-
plicit, they can be tested. In particular, all historical explanations are based on such assumptions, as Popper, Carl G. Hempel, and Hans Albert have shown. Eibl discusses various types of historical explanations — probabilistic and spatio-temporal laws — and the degree to which they can be tested.

The third chapter involves a change in direction. Eibl moves from the critique of theories to the formulation of his own theory. He begins by asserting that we can use the idea of assumptions of regularity to posit the existence of actual regularity in history, inasmuch as it is the history of human behavior. Citing Hans Albert, he proposes that people's habits of action have a great deal to do with their beliefs. Their beliefs are in turn related to their assumptions of regularity. People generally act rationally (rational' is understood in the widest sense), so that there is a direct connection between assumptions of regularity and regularity in behavior. Eibl concludes: The "historicity" of the human world is evidently constituted by changes in the normative-cognitive factors, i.e., in the assumptions of regularity' (p. 54). 'Explaining' and 'understanding' can be redefined so that both methods apply to historical study: 'explaining' means putting together 'facts' according to our assumptions of regularity; 'understanding' means reconstructing someone else's way of putting together facts according to his assumptions of regularity.

In the fourth chapter Eibl applies Popper's theories directly to literary history. He addresses four questions: textual interpretation, genre, the ontology of the literary text, and literary change. Using the new definitions of 'explaining' and 'understanding' in a discussion of the hermeneutic circle, he concludes that there are two different ways to understand texts: to reconstruct the author's intended meaning, and to adapt the text to new criteria as defined by the critic. In the discussion of genre (here termed 'poetic matrix'), he points out the parallel to Thomas Kuhn's 'paradigms,' while he prefers Popper's evolution model to elucidate the question of literary change. Popper's model supposes that human history, the history of human ideas, follows the same principle as biological evolution. Man's activity takes place in response to a 'problem'; a 'tentative theory' is evolved; attempts at 'error elimination' follow; and the result is the emergence of a new problem. Eibl cautions that the search for an absolute law of literary development is illusory, but suggests that literary change nevertheless, in a general way, takes place according to Popper's scheme. A problem situation elicits literary experiments, which result in a matrix of relative stability; the whole process brings a new problem situation into being; a discursive stage of critical discussion follows; an exemplary work causes a reorientation of the matrix; and finally a new problem situation emerges. Eibl discusses
the ontology of literary texts by using Popper's term 'dispositions.' He distinguishes 'hermeneutic dispositions,' or signals in the text that tell us how to read; 'mnemotechnic dispositions,' or rhyme, meter, and other devices that make texts memorable; and 'ostensive dispositions,' or the way a literary text functions as a sign. He proposes that the textual signified/signifier relation consists of 'cryptotheories' and 'exempla,' where 'cryptotheories' are norms, patterns of behavior, ideas, etc. reflected in the work, and 'exempla' are modes of expression, concretizations of the cryptotheories in poetic language.

_Kritisch-rationale Literaturwissenschaft_ is a mixed success. On the positive side, it is no doubt an intelligent, well-informed, closely-argued book, and one that makes interesting reading. It provides the literary scholar with a useful and not overly technical introduction to critical rationalism. Among its advantages are excellent organization, an exemplary economy in presentation, and a clear, readable style. The line of serious argument is enlivened by witty asides, and Eibl takes care to supplement each of his theoretical points with an illustrative example. Every aspect of the book testifies to the author's commitment to clarity; there is even a four-page, point-for-point résumé of the argument at the end.

In terms of content, the first and second chapters, where Eibl introduces the principles and methods of critical rationalism and presents his critique of historicist assumptions, are the best. When Eibl moves to his positive conclusions in chapters three and particularly four, however, his arguments invite criticism. First, Eibl's conversion of 'assumptions of regularity' into actual regularity in history is not entirely satisfactory. Eibl constructs his argument, I believe, with a dual end in view: he wishes both to affirm our hunch that there is regularity in history and to ground the critic's 'understanding' in a psychological a priori. (Other people's behavior conforms to their beliefs; therefore it is accessible to us, for the beliefs rest on assumptions of regularity that are in form if not in content similar to our own.) Still, while no one would deny either that human beings make assumptions of regularity or that human behavior manifests regularities, the connection between the two, forged through beliefs held by the rational mind, is tenuous. Most of us would constate patterns of regularity in human behavior by simple observation. Eibl perhaps does not wish to do so because for a Popperian, such observation would rest on epistemologically shaky ground or — worse — involve a commitment to induction. If one wishes to derive the regularities in human behavior from a cause, however, it is surely necessary to seek their motivation in deeper and more complicated factors than merely beliefs held by the rational mind. Eibl undertakes a weak defense against Marx; he does not mention Freud's work on repeti-
tion. His mode of argumentation brings him rather close to the rejected Hegel.

In the fourth chapter Eibl chooses veteran topics: textual meaning, textual ontology, genre. (Perhaps one of the reasons for this choice is that, as the back cover of the book states, the book was designed with an eye to use in basic courses.) Eibl's treatment of these topics is open to criticism on a number of counts. First, what we find here is largely well-known conclusions and the standard hardware of literary theory, to which the terminology of critical rationalism has been applied. Inasmuch as traditional material is used, very little attempt is made to transcend the 'normal discourse' of critical theory, and the substitution of Popperian and other new terminology ('disposition,' 'cryptotheory,' etc.) for known terms is more of an irritation than a help. By way of example: the section on genre ('matrix') is good, but it tells us nothing that cannot be found in Claudio Guillen's 1962 essay 'Toward a Definition of the Picaresque' (in Literature as System, 1971) and has often been echoed elsewhere (by Hirsch, Todorov, Scholes, etc.), while the problem of conceiving of genre as a 'mental unity' (p. 78) versus a set of texts (p. 98) persists. Second, parts of the discussion are not on a par with the current level of critical discussion, primarily because no attention is paid to recent French criticism (while the book bristles with references to current trends in Germanistik, there is not a single French title in the bibliography). Thus in the section on interpretation it is taken for granted that the text can be viewed as a repository of meaning, that there is such a thing as the meaning the author intended, and that the genesis of the literary work has something to do with the author's desire to communicate. Eibl's 'dispositions' recall Barthes' more useful treatment of the subject as 'codes' in S/Z. Third and most seriously, the argument becomes most problematic precisely where it is most firmly grounded in Popper's theories instead of in previous literary criticism. Eibl bases his adoption of Popper's 'evolutionary epistemology' as a model for 'literary evolution' on the premise that literature can be considered a 'problemsolving activity.' This designation grates: while the solution to problems no doubt enters into the activity of writing literary texts, and while it may be useful for the literary historian to interpret works of literature retrospectively in terms of solutions to a particular type of problem, the notion, implicit in Popper's conception of human activity as a response to a problem, that the production of literature is motivated by the existence of problems, is questionable. Certainly, we try to solve our problems; but one cannot therefore assert that every human activity (such as the creation of works of art) represents the response to a problem, at least not unless one extends the definition of 'problem' to a wide variety
of circumstances. What is a ‘problem’? Would Eibl include problems with one’s father, with money, with literary predecessors, with the government? If so, would the resulting history of literature be useful or avoid the pitfalls of eclecticism? Alternately, if one defines ‘problem’ more strictly, how would one decide between the competing claims to relevance of social and historical, literary and technical, or even psychological problems? Eibl does not answer these questions.

The major problem with the book, then, is that between Popper on the one hand and constructive literary theory on the other, there is an abyss. When Eibl abandons Popper’s cautionary methodology and begins to formulate his own theories, he bases his argument on two powerful anthropological formulae, the notion of assumptions of regularity and that of human activity as problem-solving. These Popperian concepts have their potential uses for literary theory, but Eibl’s application of them, while interesting, is too exclusive and above all too simple to yield useful results. If we seem to have arrived safely on firm ground by the end of the book, it is because we suddenly find ourselves on familiar terrain, not because we traversed a flawlessly-constructed bridge. (LORNA MARTENS, YALE UNIVERSITY)


Rezeptionsgeschichte: Grundlegung einer Theorie / 399


In Abschnitt 1.5, der sich mit der Neubestimmung der Begriffe 'Wirkungsgeschichte' und 'Rezeptionsgeschichte' beschäftigt, heißt es im Zusammenhang der Absicht des Wirkungshistorikers, der nach jener Wirkung der Werke fragt, die in der Gegenwart noch wirken und dadurch ihren Wert erwiesen haben:

Hier liegt also ein Schluß von der langfristigen Wirkung auf den Wert des Textes vor, der die Untersuchung erst legitimiert. Im Grunde handelt es sich um einen Zirkelschluß: Wertvoll sind die historischen Texte, weil sie heute noch gelesen werden; gelesen werden die historischen Texte, weil sie wertvoll sind. Würdig einer Untersuchung sind letztlich nur die Texte, die sich durchgesetzt haben. (S. 28)

Durch diesen Modus der Beweisführung jedoch macht der für Grimms Argumentation einsehbar notwendige Abbau des hermeneutischen Ansatzes einer groben Vereinfachung Platz; denn die historischen Texte werden ja keineswegs nur gelesen, weil sie 'wertvoll' sind. Vielmehr interessiert doch die Frage, über welches Potential und welche Art von Stimulanzien diese Texte in ihrer bisweilen langen Geschichte verfügen, die den Leser verschiedener Zeiten immer wieder zu interessieren und anzuregen in der Lage sind. Es geht also um eine in das Form- und Inhaltsgefüge der Texte – vielleicht nur um eine hineinvermutete – literarästhetische Dimension, die über die Wirkung der Texte mitentscheidet.


Abschließend noch eine zusammenfassende Bemerkung: Ich vermute, daß dieser nicht unbedingt leicht zugängliche Band in der weiteren rezeptionsästhetischen Diskussion eine hervorgehobene Stelle einnehmen wird, vor allem auch als Arbeitsbuch. Die Ideen sind nicht nur brisant und herausfordernd, sie werden gründlich und fest entwickelt. Auch die
umfangreiche Bibliographie, das Personen-, Begriffs- und Sachregister entsprechen der Qualität des Bandes. (Holger A. Pausch, The University of Alberta)


Das für Veröffentlichungen von Sitzungsberichten ungewöhnlich hohe Niveau dieses Sammelbandes ist die unmittelbare Folge der Arbeitsweise dieser Forschungsgruppe. Und zwar werden während der Kolloquien keine Referate gehalten, sondern die Arbeitsgrundlage wird durch schriftliche Vorlagen gebildet, die den Teilnehmern vor Beginn der Sitzung zugestellt. Aus den Diskussionen zu den Vorlagen, die sich im Verlauf des Kolloquiums ergaben, haben die Teilnehmer später für diesen Band ihre Beiträge formuliert, ein, wie sich zeigt, sehr effektives, nachahmenswertes Verfahren. Die vierzehn Vorlagen des Bandes, verschieden in Qualität und Zugänglichkeit, behandeln das weite Feld der Negativität. Allerdings, so H. Weinrich, werde es nicht vollständig ausgemessen, sondern es seien nur einige Positionen dieses Feldes markiert, und zwar durch die Sprachwissenschaft, die historische Begriffsforschung, die philosophische Ideengeschichte, die Systemtheorie, die Ästhetik und Poetik. Es handelt sich also um einen Ansatz zur Integration des noch heterogen Zerstreuten. Nun muß natürlich ein Buch wie dieses eine Auswahl treffen; aber es
müßte gesagt werden, was fehlt und warum ausgewählt wurde, was ausgewählt wurde. Da eine eingehende Kritik hier ausgeschlossen ist, beschränke ich mich auf die wichtigsten Perspektiven und Problemansätze der Vorlagen.

Im ersten Bereich, also im sprachwissenschaftlichen, untersucht G. Stickel aus linguistischer Sicht die semantische Kernfrage, was ist sprachliche Negation? G. Stickels Überlegungen wie auch die zentralen Thesen aller anderen Arbeiten werden in dem im zweiten Teil des Bandes abgedruckten Beiträgen, fünfzig an der Zahl, unterschiedlich diskutiert und erweitert. Gleichfalls unter der Ägide der Sprachwissenschaft behandelt H. Weinrich anschließend die Stellung der Negation im semantischen System einer Sprache. Das Negationsmorphem als Paradigma in der deutschen Sprache betrachtend erörtert H. Weinrich die Fragen, wie ist die Abgrenzung von Subsystemen, zu denen er das der Negation zählt, in der Sprache möglich? Was bedeuten die Signale der Affirmation und der Negation im Text? Die Problemstellung in den Bereich der historischen Begriffsforschung erweitert analysiert R. Koselleck die Grundfigur asymmetrischer Gegenbegriffe, also beispielsweise die Begriffe Hellenen und Barbaren, Mensch und Unmensch u.s.w., im Sprachgebrauch der Politik. Er fragt, wie sind die unterschiedlichen Weisen der in diesen Gegenbegriffen enthaltenen Negationen beschaffen?


nung "nichts" zum Substantiv "das Nichts" inszeniert (S. 140). Seine Ausführungen gelten der These, daß das Grundwort, auch um den Preis seiner philosophischen Fragwürdigkeit, bewahrt werden müsse. Der Arbeit G. Bucks, '"Die Freudigkeit jenes Sprungs ... ." Negativität, Diskontinuität und die Stetigkeit des Bios,' folgt eine der interessantesten aufsätze des Bandes, und zwar O. Marquards Gedanken Über positive und negative Philosophien, Analytiken und Dialektiken, Beamte und Ironiker und einige damit zusammenhängende Gegenstände.' Ihn beschäftigen die Motive des 'Kontroversenbedarfs' in der Philosophie. Das Bedürfnis nämlich, positive und negative Philosophie einander entgegenzusetzen, sei offenbar zuerst dort entstanden, wo die Philosophie eintrat ins Zeitalter ihrer Agonie. Denn, so der Verfasser:
Die Gemeinsamkeit, die sie sich seither durch Gegensätzlichkeiten zu verdecken versuchte, war — extrem geredet — ihr Sein zu ihrem Tode: daß die Philosophie unterwegs war zum Ende der Philosophie. Gerade dort — wo die Philosophie eigentlich keine Positionen mehr hat, sondern nur noch Indispositionen — wird der Versuch plausibel, ihr Ende durch ihren Streit zu ersetzen oder wenigstens hinauszuzögern, ihren Exitus durch ihre Differenz. (S. 179)


Damit umfassen die Arbeiten die Positionen der Negativität als simples semantisches Paradigma bis hin zu den ästhetischen Formen der Stilisierung. Der Band ist ein, um dies deutlich zu sagen, brauchbares, nützliches (s. Bibliographie, Sach- und Personenregister) und anregendes Buch, faszinierend in der Thematik, bestechend in der Argumentation, ein Buch, für das der Herausgeber und die Autoren Dank verdienen.

(HOLGER A. PAUSCH, THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA)
No one can afford to overlook the researches of Reinhard Kuhn. In this study he addresses one of the basic elements of the West European mind defined from antiquity down to the present day as: *horror loci, taedium vitae, acedia, tristitia, melancholia, mal du siècle, spleen, ennui, boredom, noontide* and other like synonyms pointing to ambiguous and very differently assessed mental realities. *Ennui* has turned out to be a formidable problem of great complexity: once scorned as a 'disease,' then as a 'sin' by Christendom, that first analyzed it and gave it a systematic definition, subjected more and more persistently to objective-introspective observation, accepted and finally converted into a literary theme and a subject of moralistic-philosophical speculation. That is the reason why Reinhard Kuhn's study inevitably wavers between a thematic and historical treatment of ideas, between moral typology and literary criticism, essay and comparative literature. This polyvalence constitutes the wealth, the utility and, ultimately, the 'weakness' of the book, for none of these aspects is exhaustively dealt with. Thus, the *Demon of Noontide* finds itself simultaneously on several reference planes. Thematologists may find excellent compact pages, but there are certain lacunae (some of which I shall point to). Literary critics will no doubt appreciate certain chapters, especially the very good analysis of chapter seven, 'Children of the Century.' Psychologists will no doubt be interested in the analysis of certain genetic aspects (psycho-pathological, social — e.g., 'exile'), but they will not find a global analysis of living conditions in the West during the twentieth century which generate an obsessive ennui in mass proportions. But it may be unfair to apply a series of rigorous categories to a well nigh 'interdisciplinary' study. It is, however, true that though the study is very reliable in its fragmentary analyses, it falls short of a synthesis, of a gathering of fragments into a harmonious whole. The author's approach to his material is kaleidoscopic. It is an excellent panoramic 'introduction,' each chapter being an invitation to reread, complete and sometimes add details and bibliographical notes. The author's workmanship also deserves attention: the introduction which is a brief terminological analysis, defines the basic terms (*sorrow, monotony, désœuvrement, anomia*, etc.) and in fact prefaces what we might call a veritable 'model' of ennui-noontide. This psychological aspect is considered a fixed permanent 'structure' of the Western psyche, a perspective that we, at any rate, believe to be sound and justified. If that is the case, and no doubt it is, then greater stress should have been laid on the 'constants' of the structure. They should have been brought
out into bolder relief. The author seems to be more concerned with the internal history of the theme (as it seems in a passage on p. 127), than with its morphological, typological and 'phenomenological' structure. This point of view is obvious from the simultaneous reading that the author practises. Reinhard Kuhn continually brings out classical-modern, supratemporal points of similarity of such type as Verlaine-Petrarch (p. 74), du Bellay-Fellini, Corneille-Gide, Chateaubriand-Beckett, Jean Paul-Genêt and many others that at first sight are paradoxical: Seneca-Gide, St. John Chrysostomos-Bernanos, etc. We repeat: we raise no objection; on the contrary, we believe that the method requires more precision and continuity.

At any rate, even if in spite of himself, Reinhard Kuhn's study represents, even if only indirectly and implicitly, a plea for a structural-typological approach to the great literary themes. The study's 'forte' lies undoubtedly in the fragmentary analyses of works and categories of works grouped in neither a very historical-literary nor a very 'philological' manner. But, we repeat, this was not the author's aim, for he was successful in systematizing a large amount of material. The result is an insight into the depths of human psychology which enriches our knowledge of the anthropological image of Western culture. From disapproval to acceptance and gradually to creative transformation, ennui follows us like a shadow. It could also be assessed in terms of (Western) 'decadence' implied by the obsession with a depressive, devitalizing theme lacking in fighting spirit, strength, and moral resistance. From a certain point of view, the book under discussion is the history of a 'failure,' a deficiency, a lack of ideals, élan, fighting spirit, determination, higher goals which could drive ennui away. The problem of a creative transmutation of deficiency and suffering into a moral quality and pleasure and especially into a lyrical-literary theme openly declared as such could in itself be the subject of an essay. This has been ostensively turned to account beginning with the Renaissance when suggestions and methods of 'healing' were first made.

The following addenda might be taken into consideration: melancholy was already defined as a 'disease' in antiquity in a text that the author missed (Aulus Gellius, Noctes Atticae xviii, vii, 4), it was treated even in traditional cultures with the magic pearl (cf. Mircea Eliade, images et Symboles [Paris 1952] p. 192), certain specific 'treatments' are recommended: music (numerous references), story-telling, reading (Boccaccio, introduction to the fourth day in The Decameron), 'Purgation' through drama as in Aristotelian 'Catharsis' (Thomas Heywood, An Apology for Actors, 1612, Book iii), contemplating nature (Clement Marot, cf. Bernard Weinberg, Critical Prefaces of the French Renaissance [Evanston 1950] p. 71).
Documentation in the chapter on the Eighteenth Century is especially subject to addenda; some of which are important, such as: Thomas Warton, *Pleasures of Melancholy* (1747), Loisel de Tréogate, *Les Soirées de mélancolie* (1777), including other 'pre-romantic' references with the psychology of Ossian and his companions as protagonists. 'Le doux sentiment de la mélancolie' and 'an agreeable melancholy' (David Hume, *Delicacy of Taste*) were in circulation at the time when the enthusiasm-melancholy symbiosis (Shaftesbury) and 'une idée grande et mélancolique' acquired a great aesthetic value, as in Diderot (in various texts, it is surprising that the article *Mélancolie* in the *Encyclopédie* is omitted). The ravages of ennui are denounced by Holbach (*Système Social*, iii, ch. vi).

It is not our intention to complete the author's general bibliography but at least two documentary studies deserved to be consulted: A. Bianchini Fales, 'Le Développement du mot “ennui” de la Pléiade à Pascal' (*Cultura neolatina* xi [1952] pp. 225-38) and Norbert Jonard, 'Quelques aspects de la mélancolie en Italie au xviiie siècle' (*Rivista di letterature moderne e comparate* 2 [1971] pp. 86-126). (ADRIAN MARINO, CLUJ-NAPOCA)


In the field of literary criticism, which today is vast beyond ready comprehension, there appears once in a while a study which has a rather levelling effect on many other publications, because of its outstanding analytical and deductive qualities, its clarity behind a difficult approach. Marc Shell's *Economy of Literature* is such a book. The aim is high, since this study 'seeks to understand dialectically the relationship between thought and matter by focusing ... on economic thought and literary and linguistic matters' (p. 2). Nevertheless, its method of interpretation, its economy of thought and discourse is such that a highly complex subject-matter is presented in a most stimulating, interesting way, highly recommendable to students and scholars of literary theory, philosophy, classics, and economics.

Shell defines the concept of the economy of literature as a tool to look 'from the formal similarity between linguistic and economic symbolization and production to the political economy as a whole' (p. 7). The book proceeds as follows: after the study of the 'constitutional' relationship between the origin of money and the origin of philosophy itself in the first chapter, the book deals with the poetics of monetary inscriptions,
followed by economy in literary theory in the third chapter; chapter four: 'Rousseau's theory of verbal, monetary, and political representation'; chapter five: 'John Ruskin and the political economy of literature.' These chapters pose specific questions, according to Shell. For example, why did coinage, tyranny, and philosophy develop in the same time and place? What is the sociology of the distinction between the invisible, private realm and the visible, public one? What is the semiology of coins as material media of exchange and as symbols or works of literature? What are the relationships among verbal, monetary, and political representation? Though other times, places, and problems might have been considered, Shell explains, he understands these central questions as representative enough to outline in general ways the economy of literature. But he most certainly does more that that.

Though I would subscribe to most of what Shell has to say in his theoretical statements, I can perceive at least one difficulty. If I understand him correctly, his central argument is based on the assumption that the productive mechanisms in literature and economy are basically metaphorical, i.e., that their functions are representative. Yet is it not possible to consider economy and literature in terms of material entities enclosing their context (e.g., H. Heißenbüttel), i.e., eliminating their dialectic properties? This would be a totally different viewpoint, but, nevertheless, it is the other side of the coin. (HOLGER A. PAUSCH, THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA)

Lawrence Lipking devotes this excellent volume not to the lives of poets, the facts of biography, but to the life of the poet, the poet's vocation. Through analyses of key works by fifteen authors Lipking explores recurring patterns that mark major stages in the poet's career. As he points out in his Preface, 'interpreting poems is not only the method of this book but one of its central themes' (p. xiii). Lipking is convinced that poets develop through reading and re-reading the works of others and of their own 'younger selves,' that they grow through discovering the 'hidden meanings' in their own works: To repeat this process, finding again what great poets once found and passing it on to others, is the aim and the hope of this book' (p. xiii). The result of Lipking's astute and thoughtful interpretations is a stimulating study that should not only interest academics but could also serve as a handbook for aspiring poets.
Lipking addresses three central questions: how does one become a poet? how does the established poet renew and deepen his poetry? and what legacy does a poet leave? In answering these questions Lipking focuses on three crucial points in the poet's development: 'the moment of initiation or breakthrough; the moment of summing up; and the moment of passage, when the legacy or soul of the poet's work is transmitted to the next generation' (p. ix).

To become a poet one begins like Keats, Lipking says in his introductory chapter: by forging a poetic identity, by inventing an image of oneself as a poet. Then, armed with an 'enormous will to discovery,' one immerses oneself in the critical reading and interpreting of poetry (p. 6). The test of the aspiring poet's success, of course, lies in the poems he writes. Practice and revision are essential, but the moment of breakthrough, according to Keats, comes not as a result purely of technical refinements but as a consequence of submission to something beyond the poet, the Genius of Poetry. 'On First Looking into Chapman's Homer' displays the pattern of a poet's beginning.

There is nothing particularly new or startling in Lipking's portrayal of the poet's beginning as illustrated by Keats. Lipking's work comes into its own, however, in the main body of the book where, in separate chapters, he explores the literary forms that capture the essence of the critical moments in the poet's development: 'Initiation,' 'Harmonium,' and Tombeau.' The first of these chapters examines 'Books of New Life' (p. 16). Dante's La Vita Nuova, Blake's The Marriage of Heaven and Hell, and Yeats's Per Amica Silentia Lunae all 'crackle' with the immediacy and excitement of the poet's new discoveries as he re-interprets his own earlier poems in a 'protean' literary form that Lipking terms the initiation (pp. 18, 16). Despite its shifting narrative focus and its mix of poetry and prose commentary, the initiation is not a miscellany of fragments but an ordered, unified book. It is the poet's testament of his trial by fire and passage 'to a stage of higher knowledge' that brings radical reinterpretation of past experience and a vision of the future (pp. 16, 17). The initiation is the alphabet, the source book from which the poet/priest continues to draw inspiration and in which he attempts to initiate the reader into his meaning. It is his sacred book recording both the poet's beginning and renewal.

If the initiation is the poet's testament of youth and regeneration, the harmonium (Lipking takes the term from Wallace Stevens) is the poet's last testament, his summing up. Eliot in The Four Quartets, Virgil in The Aeneid, Goethe in Faust, Whitman in Leaves of Grass, and Broch in The Death of Virgil attempt, often in opposing ways, to order their poetic lives into a unified whole. The prime focus of the harmonium is the poet's
career, his destiny. Frequently the poet is conscious of a wide disparity between his achievement and 'the ever-receding harmonium toward which he aspires' (p. 72). Then he may desire, like Virgil, to destroy his master work; he may, like Goethe and Whitman, indulge in a continual reconstruction or deconstruction of his work. Or he may, like Broch, denounce art and give up poetry altogether. Recantation is not unusual at the end of the poet's life and is characteristic of the harmonium as the poet dispossesses his work, leaving it and his destiny in the hands of others.

The poet's control over his poetry ceases with his death. The question then becomes, what happens when the poet dies? One thing that typically happens if the poet is of any stature is that a spokesman for the living writes an elegy or *tombeau* assessing the dead poet's legacy. Jonson performed this service for Shakespeare, Collins for Thomson, Auden for Yeats, and Mallarmé for Poe, Baudelaire, and Verlaine. The *tombeau*, Lipking observes, is 'the heart of literary history, at once a memorial of the past and an attempt to improve upon it or put it to use' (p. 138). A collaboration, a dialogue, between two poets, one living, one dead, the *tombeau* is marked by tension (p. 139). Whether the living poet be an admirer or an opponent of the dead, 'respect and animus contend' (p. 140). While the dead poet becomes the property of the living and is often reconstructed into the image of the *tombeau*-writer, the dead poet still exerts a pressure on the living. Reminiscences and echoes of the dead are almost inevitable in the *tombeau*.

Mallarmé's *tombeaux*, especially distill the essence of the genre. To the question, what happens when the poet dies, Mallarmé gives a threefold answer. Although absent in body, the poet remains present through his work and, simultaneously, is translated 'into his next stage of life' through the 'stelification' carried out by the *tombeau*: in purifying the dead poet of the accidents of individuality the *tombeau* apotheosizes him, transforming him into a 'constellation,' 'an artifice of eternity' (pp. 177, 169). The *tombeau*, then, records both the death of the poet and his 'renewed existence,' his 'life-in-death' (pp. 162, 176).

Lipking suggests, with Eliot, that in the poet's beginning is his end and in his end is his beginning. Thus, in discussing the ending of the life of the poet in his final chapter Lipking returns to where he began, with Keats. Believing that the poet's survival depends on 'responsive acts of attention' by posterity, Keats 'resigns his fate to strangers' (p. 183). Robert Lowell, on the other hand, distrusts posterity. Consequently he 'repudiates his life as a poet,' expresses dissatisfaction with his work and dwells on the sacrifice — the 'death-in-life' — the poet's life demands (pp. 185, 186). Lowell feels that if the life of the poet depends on a fickle posterity it isn't
worth the sacrifice. Unlike Broch, however, Lowell does not abandon poetry but concludes that he must achieve a new artistic integrity, become true to himself and write for his own satisfaction. For Rilke, too, the poet’s life demands sacrifice but, because he sees the poet as intermediary for the beyond and responsible for the transformation of the world, his response to the sacrifice is totally different from Lowell’s. Rilke aspires to a poetic purity that culminates in ‘the ultimate sacrifice’: the disappearance of the poet into anonymity as he becomes simply the body through which the one poetic spirit — Orpheus — manifests itself (p. 190).

From ‘Beginning’ to ‘Ending’ Lipking’s tight little book is a pleasure to read, although its message is not comforting. One of its central themes is ‘the expense of greatness.’ As Lipking points out, ‘The poet who sets out to achieve a great career may doom himself to a life of unsatisfied hungers and broken poems’ (p. xiii). We should be grateful that despite the sacrifices involved poets continue to write and critics like Lipking to read and interpret their work. Let us hope that Lipking continues his excellent work in the projected volume on the ‘anti-careerist’ poetic vocation he alludes to in his preface (p. xiii). (MARY G. HAMILTON, ATHABASCA UNIVERSITY)


The six extended chapters of this complex and compendious work trace the interconnections between poetry and music from primitive man through the twentieth century. Chapter one, ‘The Poet as Singer,’ shows the virtual inseparability of the two arts at the dawn of history and their growing independence by late Greek and Roman times. ‘The Word as the New Song,’ Chapter two, surveys early Christian developments along the four coordinates of the practice and the theory of each art; where rhetorical theory and practice were closely related, those of music were widely separated and practical music largely the servant of the word. Chapter three, ‘Polyphonists and Troubadours,’ shows the growth of abstract structural devices in both arts and the decreasing dependence of each upon the other. Chapter four, ‘The Rhetorical Renaissance,’ delineates the shift of constructive devices in each art toward expressive rather than symbolic purposes, and the efforts of the humanists to subordinate music to textual expression. Chapter five, ‘Imitations,’ the most
complex of all, ranges from the seventeenth into the nineteenth centuries; it focuses on the tendencies of each art to 'imitate' a variety of models, but we are also shown how music was emerging as an autonomous art with its own logical syntax, and how that autonomy met with various forms of resistance and misunderstanding among literary figures still prone to view music as a formless language of the passions. The final chapter, 'The Condition of Music,' covers the last 150 years and shows music to be finally recognized as a fully autonomous art; at the same time the author points out continuing analogies and mutual influences between the two arts, and he counters the anarchic tendencies of the arts in the twentieth century by emphasizing the continuing essentiality of both structure and expression.

No summary such as the foregoing can do justice to the multiplicity of themes and ever-shifting relationships that threaten to overwhelm the reader. After three perusals, an underlining of key sentences, and the preparation finally of an extensive outline summary, I find a clear overview of the work still elusive. Despite Professor Winn's statement that he has 'written neither a history of music nor a history of poetry but a history of the relations between the two ...' (p. x), it is hard to view his work in other terms than as a number of distinct histories woven into one: it does indeed contain a pretty comprehensive history of music and music theory; one could abstract from it a sketch of a history of poetry and rhetorical theory; and even in the matter of interrelations there are still several different histories here — a history of the combining of words and music as song, a history of the two arts' influences and impacts upon each other, a history of analogous structural and expressive devices between one art and the other. The work may affect the reader like those 'Fourth of July' rockets that explode in continuous showers of brilliant sparks, dazzling but amorphous. Is it possible that a non-chronological approach, whereby each separate strand is treated in a separate chapter, might have given a greater sense of coherence to the whole?

For all its compendious nature, the book must perforce be highly selective, as Professor Winn points out in his introduction. In the course of such a toboggan ride through history, there will inevitably be tendencies to delineate a given school from a one-dimensional viewpoint; to accept a particular interpretation of a phenomenon where a contrary interpretation may be more valid — or more current; to force an analogy or an analysis so as to support a unity that may not be there. As illustration of the first tendency, the author's view of the Vienna Classical composers as the quintessence of rational constructivism neglects the strain in their music from the Sturm und Drang experiments of C.P.E. Bach that were
in themselves quintessentially irrational, eccentric, and impassioned. As illustration of the acceptance of a questionable and possibly outmoded interpretation, Winn views the products of the Troubadours as the height of constructive subtleties in poetry coupled with loose, casual, and quasi-improvisatory music: yet in the most recent and authoritative work on medieval music, Richard Hoppin states, 'Troubadour melodies are on a par with the poems in the ingenuity and diversity of their formal structures,' (Medieval Music [New York: Norton 1978] p. 277). As regards the forced analogy, I find the chapter entitled 'Imitations' the most confused and confusing in the book, proposing parallels that seem not parallel. I particularly cannot accept Professor Winn's inclusion of the musical device of 'imitation' in the sense of a fugal or canonic procedure as even 'emblematic' (p. 214) of the other kinds of imitation he names, such as the imitation of established models or the imitation of the emotions; it seems to me that the author is seduced here by a coincidence in terminology. The reader must be forewarned then that Professor Winn's summary of a school or a practice may not be balanced, definitive, or compellingly logical. In all fairness, however, Winn himself admits in his preface to selectivity, controversial interpretations, and 'heterodox positions' (p. xii).

In suggesting these questionable aspects, one must hasten to point out the work's strengths. Professor Winn's range of knowledge of the primary material and secondary literature in his two disciplines is awesome. He is perfectly at home in the technical and aesthetic aspects of both disciplines, and, as a musicologist, I found never a weakness or a false note (no pun intended) in his treatment of music and its terminology. His analyses of both poems and compositions are brilliant and illuminating, and among the most engaging features of the work. And finally he is able to elucidate even the most complex concepts in a prose that is unfailingly a model of clarity, precision, and elegance; one never need labor over a sentence or a paragraph to discover what he is trying to say.

We may legitimately inquire after the audience for whom the work is intended, and the use to which it might be put. Concerning the first query, it must be pointed out that the audience who can read with equal understanding every section of the book must necessarily be limited to those few readers who, like Professor Winn himself, are trained in the critical analysis of both poetry and music (and examples of musical notation occur throughout the volume); this would seem to limit its employment as a textbook. Being a historical survey over eons of time and a multiplicity of topics, it will not easily serve to give the reader the sort of focused viewpoint by which an entire field is illumined, as do certain
works more concentrated in theme such as John Hollander's *The Untuning of the Sky* (Princeton: Princeton University Press 1961). Like most all-encompassing histories, its chief employment may be as a reference work that can assist one's teaching or research on a given topic. Finally, it may serve as a stimulus toward new ways of viewing and analyzing works of either art by increasing the reader's sensitivity to their interconnections. In the words of Professor Winn himself, '... analogies between poetry and music can help those of us who read and listen as well as those of us who create: by recasting poetic problems in musical terms, or musical problems in poetic terms, we may gain fresh perspective' (p. 346). I confess to having gained such fresh perspectives from his every chapter. *(ALMONTÉ HOWELL, UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA)*


die auf begrenzten Raum zu reduzierenden Zusammenfassungen komplizierter dichtungstheoretischer Überlegungen gestellt werden.


Canadian students of early drama will be glad to have the third volume of Glynne Wickham's study of English plays to the close of the London theatres in 1642 not only because it brings this large enterprise nearer completion but also because he was Senior Killam Research Professor at Dalhousie University during the year he largely prepared this volume. Volumes III and IV (forthcoming), in analyzing play-texts, depart from the strict theatre history of the first two volumes: the first (1959; 2nd ed., 1980) explored pageant-wagon and hall staging up to 1576, when the Theatre opened in London; and the second (pts. I-II, 1963-72) dealt with playing houses, church and state controls on them, and stage business, up to 1660. His last two volumes, while not engaged in conventional analysis of play-texts, do develop a unified theory of the nature of this drama by analyzing comparatively its occasions, its emblematic devices, its genres, and its dramaturgy as revealed by both texts and external records of performance.

Briefly, the field theory presented in volume III can be summarized as follows. Wickham proposes that plays before the opening of James Burbage's Theatre in Shoreditch in 1576 regularly grew from a 'sense of occa-
sion,' a special time, place, and audience, in that drama had not yet become available on demand at certain publicly-known locations for the price of admission. The meaning of such occasions derives mainly from the orderly procession of the winter and summer solstices, and the vernal and autumnal equinoxes, onto which the church calendar of fixed and movable feasts were later imposed. Thus the Plough Monday *ludus*, the Twelfth Night mumming, the Shrovetide morality, saints' plays (most of whom were the subject of a fixed feast in the church calendar), the Corpus Christi cycle, and the Christmas interlude each receive a measure of form and content from its season, in contrast to post-Theatre plays like Marlowe's *Edward II* or Shakespeare's *Twelfth Night*, which are, properly, plays for all seasons. Because occasions tend to celebrate events rather than recount histories, the early play-maker generally embodied his subject in static visual or verbal figures, in what Wickham calls emblems and devices. *Tableaux vivants* in royal entries, personification allegory in moral plays, parable in the prodigal son play, and typological prefiguration in scriptural drama are examples of such emblematic, spectacular artifacts: they express in strange images the formal commonplaces of Christian faith or secular *rites de passage*. Using mainly the early Tudor moral interlude, but also drawing extensively on post-1576 plays, Wickham illustrates a variety of such visual images or devices (superimposition and typology, the combat, the tavern, costume and name changes, and plays within plays) and verbal ones, what we might call figures (speaking pictures, narrative, argument, word-games, and song). Despite Wickham's insistence on the year 1576 as a watershed for our drama, the network of recurring devices extends from the early Tudor drama through to the end of Elizabeth's reign and is strong evidence for the unity of medieval and Renaissance dramaturgy. Finally, he argues from two interesting chapters on comedy and tragedy that these literary genres, fracturing man's life into partial images, did not develop fully until after 1576, and that medieval and early Tudor drama mixes images in a tragi-comic way. The same play represented its Adam or Everyman both tragically as characters 'confronted with a dilemma provoking an extreme conflict of emotional responses,' and comically as figures moving towards 'redemption obtainable through repentance' (pp. 178, 252). The volume's helpful and full apparatus includes eighteen plates, four appendixes (mainly of documents), ample book and play lists, and a good index.

This field theory is a stimulating and attractive hypothesis against which to measure the evidence. Because there are already good recent books on British and continental medieval drama (those by Richard Axtom and William Tydeman come to mind), Wickham's narrower focus is
Welcome. Not surprisingly, its strength lies partly in the questions raised by his direct, incisive proposals. For example, how much hard proof is there of the relationship between medieval drama and the occasions of its genesis? Does the play on the life of Christ always relate in practice to the Corpus Christi feast (May 21–June 24)? London’s cycle of Old and New Testament pageants occurred in late August; and the ‘Corpus Christi plays’ at Chester, Exeter, New Romney, and Norwich took place at Pentecost, ten days earlier. Wickham would date the anonymous Digby Conversion of St. Paul as performed on that saint’s feast, January 25 (pp. 258-9), but weather would make that very unlikely, for the play shows every sign of outdoor place-and-scaffold staging (and Wickham himself argues in an earlier paper that the play was meant for a town square). Schools, inns of court, colleges, and the royal court before 1576 all had conventional seasons for playing, but these derived from the same considerations — weather, sessions, end of term, periods not on progress — as held true for these play-sponsors under Elizabeth and James; and their plays are not occasional in a seasonal sense. Playing companies at the London playhouses certainly had a longer season than these sponsors, but Lent and times of plague still defined that season’s boundaries in the same way that Lent and the great winter court household feasts defined the season of travelling playing troupes who visited towns and manors from the mid-fifteenth century onward. Was the arrival of a troupe in Norwich to act in the guildhall or the market-place any more ‘occasional’ than the appearance of a play at the Rose in Southwark a half-century later? The four seasons regiment playing activity to some extent, but to what degree can one demonstrate, in existing texts, that weather and climate are the ‘occasions’ that inform their subjects? If we are to argue well for ‘occasional’ features in the early drama, I believe that we will have to look less at weather than at topical allusions, than at the way early plays attacked contemporary religious and political issues, or hope to discover several texts of genuinely seasonal folk plays other than the Robin Hood pieces we have (which Wickham does not discuss).

Just as challenging a concept is his use of the Renaissance emblem as a key element in medieval drama. Starting from the assumption that the stage, not the text, is the focus of drama, Wickham says that medieval playwrights lacked a ‘dialectical approach’ to drama; to them it was stage imagery with spoken dialogue, not ‘a form of argument’ (pp. xvi, 70, 187). Although this notion helps one understand royal entries and many scriptural pageants, which Lollards in particular attacked as blasphemous images, it is a handicap in reading many allegorical plays or texts like the Wakefield pageants. The Macro moral Mankind has as its theme idleness, but that is revealed gradually as the logical outcome of the in-
teration of a variety of allegorical vices (not one of whom is called Sloth or the like) with Mankind. While Secunda Pastorum shows the Wakefield Master contrasting images of charity in the shepherds' gifts to Mak's 'horned' child and Mary's lamb-child, the play actually prepares for their quite undeserved act of generosity to the first by a process of characterization we are expected to watch unfold. 'Device' is, as Wickham says, a good (and contemporary) critical term for this craftsmanship, but it ought sometimes to suggest a 'machine,' turning and releasing a surprise, rather than an emblem, a motionless artifact.

Without wishing to overemphasize what are quite minor slips in a long, most readable book, I wonder whether Wickham does not show a certain indifference to dialectic in the way he can unintentionally misrepresent a play's action. The monster Tediousness in Redford's Wit and Science is a threat to Wit, not to Lady Science, and the play has no character called Policy (p. 75); Reason and Sensuality in Medwall's Nature are his counsellors, not his father and mother (p. 100); in The Interlude of Youth Charity, not Humanity (not a character at all), is put in the stocks (p. 96); and in Thomas Lupton's All for Money there is no 'hero' (p. 73) and Money fathers Pleasure, not Satan (p. 213).

There are good grounds to welcome Wickham's characterization of this drama as tragi-comic in a genreless way; but if dialectic is stronger than he allows, we may also question whether he does not underestimate the strength of classical influence on this drama. Of the plays and playwrights Wickham does not discuss (one is Laurentius, prior of Durham ca. 1150, our first known playwright), several show an awareness of genre drama: Babio, possibly by Walter Map, at the court of Henry II; John Lydgate (ca. 1420-30); Tito Livio Frulovisi, who wrote two Latin comedies for Humphrey, duke of Gloucester (ca. 1437); Thomas Chaundler (ca. 1460); Nicholas Grimald (ca. 1541); and John Foxe (1544-56). The many productions of Terence, Plautus, and Aristophanes recorded at Oxford and Cambridge from the early sixteenth century show that a native classical drama ran parallel to the great scriptural cycles of the north. Even about 1515, the earl of Northumberland in his Twelfth Night ceremonial for his Yorkshire seats allowed for choice of a comedy and a tragedy as well as an interlude for the evening revels. Are we so far from Renaissance Italy, where Latin imitations of classical comedy began in the first half of the fifteenth century and the first revival of Plautus's Aulularia was at Rome in 1484?

One way of testing this field theory of medieval drama as occasional tragi-comic stage imagery would be to apply it to continental dramatic texts and records. French sotties, moralités and farces seem more accessible than their English counterparts in the light of this theory, and
one would like to know why. For that reason I hope that Wickham’s enterprise finds users outside the main stream of British scholarship to which it is principally directed. (Ian Lancashire, University of Toronto)


First in his east the glorious lamp was seen,
Regent of day, and all th’ horizon round
Invested with bright rays, jocund to run
His longitude through Heav’n’s high road; the gray
Dawn, and the Pleiades, before him danc’d,
Shedding sweet influence: (PL 7.370–5)

These are beautiful images,’ wrote Thomas Newton in his famous edition of 1749,’ and very much resemble the famous picture of the morning by Guido, where the Sun is represented in his chariot, with the Aurora flying before him … . The picture is on a ceiling at Rome; but there are copies of it in England, and an excellent print by Jac. Frey.’

Annotations of that kind — in which an attempt is made to suggest a specific pictorial influence in Milton’s poetry — are very rare indeed. Among the thousands which trace literary sources — from Ovid to Shakespeare — in the early commentaries of the Richardsonses, Newton and Todd, one occasionally finds a reference to Michelangelo, or Raphael, or the ‘marble of Bandinelli’ which Milton ‘might have seen’ and which, therefore, might have ‘stimulated the genius’ of the poet. A reference, here and there, but little more. And, though the literary sources have been explored in all their multiplicity (and even Milton’s influence on such artists as Blake and Doré has received its share of attention), no scholar has been willing to amplify those passing suggestions — to test the validity of Henry John Todd’s brief 1801 assertion, ‘that several of the immortal works of the finest painters and statuaries may be traced in Milton’s poetry.’

The reasons for such an unwillingness are not, of course, difficult to find, though I have no room to more than suggest them here. Certainly among them is the fact that, while literary and musical allusions are

1 The Poetical Works of John Milton (London 1801) Vol. 1, xxvi
abundant and Milton's love of them is supported by autobiographical evidence, nowhere does he manifest any interest in or admiration of the vast European collection of masterpieces which, especially on his trip to Italy in 1638, one supposes he must have seen. It was a commonly accepted belief, therefore, that Milton was one of those Puritans (perceived by some to be typical) with a religious antipathy to pictorial art and, as Christopher Hill observes, 'the legend of the Philistine Puritan, hostile to art and culture, dies hard in popular imagination.'2 Then there is the poetry itself, which many influential critics have considered, though brilliant, sensuously impoverished—a view beginning with Coleridge's assertion that Milton is not a picturesque, but a musical poet' and culminating in T.S. Eliot's declaration that Milton may be said never to have seen anything.3 To tackle those critical assumptions and, at the same time, seek an acquaintance with all the works of visual art which Milton could have seen (before his blindness) is a task monumental enough to make most scholars wary of the challenge.

Knowing the immensity of the task, then, and the critical armoury necessary to its engagement, one can be forgiven for expressing admiration for Roland Frye's daring—even before one has read his Milton's Imagery. But, if one takes up this 'monumental' work with a sense of awe, one puts it down with a great sense of satisfaction: Frye has indeed succeeded in his aims, 'to study the ways in which artists represented the scenes, events, and characters that Milton treats poetically in his epic works' and 'to recover the vocabulary of visual images which Milton and his reader may reasonably be expected to have known.' And in so doing he has, in a book which contains 261 magnificent reproductions to buttress a lucidly-argued case, also enabled us to read Paradise Lost 'with greater awareness and sensitivity.'

Primarily, what makes Frye's case so convincing and acceptable is his extreme commonsense; quite simply, though he is daring, he is not foolish. 'I have no interest,' he states, 'in arguing that I have discovered particular and individual 'sources' for the descriptive passages in Milton. I shall engage in considerable analysis of individual works of art, and of particular details, but such analyses are undertaken to show the traditional ways of seeing things that the arts can reveal to us, and not to identify a particular painting or sculpture as the source for this or that line in Milton' (p. 4). In other words, what he has wisely chosen to do is

---
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to illustrate the iconographic tradition itself, to insist that Milton was at
least 'subconsciously aware of the established iconographies' and, though
one-to-one analogies might be difficult to prove, to show that this visual
tradition influenced Milton's poetic descriptions more strongly than was
ever considered likely.

Directing his attention towards four familiar aspects of Milton's world
— The Demonic, The Heavenly, The Created, and The Human — Frye
in each section then discusses such specific scenes as 'The War in Heaven'
or 'The Creation of Adam and Eve' as depicted by Milton and by a
number of visual artists (whose depictions might or might not have been
similar to Milton's). For example: 'When it came to describing the color
of Eve's hair as golden, Milton had very little, if any, choice, given the
pervasive iconographical traditions. It is interesting to know, as Giamat-
tti has informed us, of parallels in the description of Aphrodite by Homer
and Marino, and of Horace's 'yellow-haired Pyrrha.' Ancient literary at-
titudes towards feminine beauty must surely have had considerable in-
fluence upon the complexion generally ascribed to Eve, but Milton did
not need to think of "golden Aphrodite" in order to imagine his Eve. At
least from the Renaissance on, Eve's hair was always blonde, and I know
of no example in art which could not be described, mutatis mutandis, by
Milton's phrases "golden tresses" or "flowing gold" (iv, 305 and 496), as
we find in paintings by Masolino, Michelangelo, Tintoretto, and virtual-
ly all others. The color reproductions shown here of the Medici tapestry,
the van Linge window, and the Rubens painting are representative' (p.
273). At that point, by means of marginal references, Frye guides his
readers to several reproductions of paintings which illustrate his argu-
ment. It is an exciting methodology — one which, since so many of the
reproductions are intrinsically worth viewing, might lead some readers
to disregard the burden of proof. It is enough, they might suggest, that
Frye's ideas are stimulating, his commentary illuminating (in terms of
both the poetry and the art), and the paintings themselves eminently
worth reproducing in such an excellent manner. It is not, I hasten to add,
a view to which I subscribe (though I understand its motives), but it is
one which prompts me to suggest that Frye has, in his introduction at
least, unnecessarily engaged in critical overkill.

I am not convinced, for example, that Frye's chapter on 'Milton's
Visual Imagination and the Critics' is always or entirely germane to his
thesis. Though he might incidentally calls the cavils of David Hume
and others (against Milton's War in Heaven) objections 'to overly concrete
descriptions,' they are rarely such. The objections were not so much con-
cerned with Milton's pictorial vividness — not, in other words, with his
style — but more with his handling (or distortion) of Biblical events,
scenes and places. Frye himself makes that very point when he suggests that John Clarke 'objected strenuously to angels fighting and suffering in armor,' which is something other than an objection to the 'concreteness' with which Milton pictured those angels. Concrete or not, Clarke would have objected, as would many others. I am not insisting that the entire argument is invalid, but that Frye seems to be trying too hard to convince where little convincing is needed.

Similarly, when Frye turns his attention to 'Milton's Awareness of the Visual Arts' the desire to persuade — almost as if he were doubtful of his argument — sometimes proves bothersome. His basic proposition is acceptable enough: that Milton's cultural awareness — which has 'never ceased to amaze commentators' — was so vast that he could not have failed to absorb the visual images he most surely came in contact with. Lack of autobiographical evidence notwithstanding, that premise is not difficult to accept. If the reader chooses not to agree, he or she is not likely to be persuaded by a statement that when Mylius went to see Milton at Whitehall, he 'reported that he passed through anterooms hung with splendid wallpaper and tapestries' or by Frye's belief that Milton probably kept a 'personal record' of his trip to Italy in 1638-39 and that it was subsequently lost.' No doubt such a diary would have revealed much, but the pointlessness of speculating is obvious (as Frye admits). Again it seems unnecessary to want to make so much of such a flimsy amount of evidence. For all one can conclude is, as Frye states, that 'when Milton's earliest biographer says that in Italy he saw "the rarities of the place" and when his nephew John Phillips writes that "he met with many charming objects," I think the evidence permits us to assume with some confidence that among those "rarities" and "charming objects" he included the masterpieces of art with which the cultivated Englishman was expected to be familiar' (p. 31).

I find, therefore, Frye's long introduction (Part One of Milton's Imagery) to be the least satisfactory part of his work. If he intended to prove that Milton consciously relied on the visual arts or to disprove the view that Milton's poetry is primarily evocative, such a critical defence might have been warranted. He intends neither, but only to describe the iconographic tradition to which Milton had access, to insist (but not to prove) that Milton must have been familiar with that tradition, and to show how it influenced his poetic description in a general rather than specific way. Given that fact, much of the introduction seems irrelevant and self-justifying. Even without it (or, at least, without this kind) Frye's book would still have been a critical masterpiece — a valuable addition (even corrective) to Milton scholarship.

For it is not so much Frye's critical defence of his thesis but his in-
defatigable search for and analysis of a whole realm of visual art, his perceptive reading of Milton's poetry and original insights into the poet's visual perception of the world he created, and his illumination of so much that we consider beautiful in Milton's poetry — all so brilliantly organized and eloquently stated — that makes this book so important. We could quibble about Frye's occasional suggestions of one-to-one correspondence between poetic scenes and specific paintings (something he said he would not do) or about the few times he stoops to trivial pursuits, as when he attempts to associate Adam's 'parted forelock' with those of Cromwell and Milton himself (as evidenced in their portraits). But this would in no way — any more than my misgivings about the introduction — detract from Frye's magnificent achievement. Nor should it surprise or bother us to learn that, even though Frye has convinced us of Milton's hitherto unacknowledged indebtedness to the visual arts, the poetic descriptions themselves are uniquely the poet's own. And on many occasions Frye must say that 'neither in the visual nor in the verbal arts had anything comparable been created before him.' That is how the assessment should read and it does not in the least diminish Frye's contribution. He has indeed written a work which 'will lead to the fuller appreciation of a great poet whose inherent stature and whose value for us increases the more we understand him.' (R.G. MOYLES, THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA)


This international meeting was held to commemorate the tercentenary of the *Art poétique*. It chose as its unifying theme 'criticism and creation' during the century of Malherbe and Boileau but in fact the participants minimized the creative aspect to stress instead the history and the theory of criticism. The volume, divided into five sections, includes the papers of thirty-three contributors, five of whom were from Canada and the United States, three from the British Isles, two from each of Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, and one from Yugoslavia; the others were from France. Boileau and his *Art poétique* were dominant, but preoccupations varied, ranging as to authors from Montaigne, Mlle de Gournay and Sorel to Bouhours, Mairet, d'Aubignac and Racine, with, not surprising-
ly, recurrent attention to Boileau's models and salient stars or targets: Aristotle and Horace, Vergil and Longinus, Ronsard, Malherbe, Molière, Chapelain, Desmarets, Godeau, Rapin. Most subjects tried to function within poetics' field of gravity but a surprising number were drawn towards the allure of rhetoric.

A preface by Jean Mesnard briefly outlines what needed to be examined in order to complete our understanding of Boileau and that was in fact studied or probed through intersection in the papers of the colloquium.

Most papers can only be mentioned with scarcely more than a hint of their content. A few are singled out and briefly analyzed, not because they are necessarily 'the best' or the 'most typical' but rather because they allow this reviewer to try to recapture the tone and sense of this meeting.

The first essays systematically rooted the vision and ideas of Despréaux in Ancient Greece and Rome, then many of the others, striving to cast a new light on old theories, sought perspective in the works of Antiquity or in their offshoots in the Renaissance. Under the first of the five sections, Les Sources, Rhétorique et Poétique humanistes, the late Franco Simone, focussing on two themes, thirst for encyclopedic knowledge and the assumption one lives in a superior age, shows that the apparent break so often stressed between the humanism of the Renaissance and the classicism of the seventeenth century is in fact continuity clad in different garb. The four other papers in this introductory section are by: A.D. Leeman, who discerns in Boileau's Art poétique an inspired transformation of Horace's Ars Poetica; Alain Michel, who deals with the enduring 'problèmes du ciceronisme'; Jean Marmier, who traces the 'conscience du satirique' - aesthetic and ethical - across the centuries, focussing however on Horace and Boileau; Noémi Hepp, whose study of Vergil's place in French criticism gains depth by limiting itself to the years 1668-75.

Section II deals with the 'Problèmes des genres en prose sous Louis xiii.' In an article respectfully titled 'Charles Sorel et les problèmes du roman sous Louis xiii,' Maurice Lever examines two key concepts of that writer's novelistic vision: verisimilitude and moral aims. An advocate of 'truth' in all things, Sorel identifies it with 'vraisemblance' in literary creations. Having linked probability in fiction to moral goodness, he finds novels harmful in general, with the possible exception of L'Astrée and the fictional works of Jean-Pierre Camus. A certain optimism however imbues Sorel's critical writings: he held to the belief that each age was bringing more realism, i.e., 'vraisemblance,' to narrative forms, hence by implication he suggested that novels were becoming progressively better, in more ways than one.

There are four other contributors to this section. René Fromilhague in
Montaigne et la nouvelle rhétorique' points out a propensity to resort to verbal games in the subsequent editions of the Essais. Raymond Lebègue discerns in Malherbe a precursor of Balzac, both indebted to Cicero and Seneca. P.J. Bayley perceives the influence of Borromeo's aesthetics in J.-P. Camus' homilies. Bernard Bray analyzes revealing dialogues in the correspondence between Chapelain and Balzac.

Under section III: 'Problèmes de poétique sous Louis xiii,' Jeanne Goldin, in a paper at once concise and yet replete with facts cogently analyzed, affirms that the 'pointe' is not a 'figure de rhétorique' but rather a certain use of rhetoric, 'un dynamisme mental particulier,' a manner of being. In short, 'la rhétorique pointue ouvre sur un art de la pointe' (capitals in text). This masterful essay situates the 'pointe' in the climate of France's classical age, then, through a telescoped comparative study of related phenomena in Spain (ingenio, agudeza, concepto, sutileza), in Italy (ingegno, argutezza, acutezza, concetto, concettismo), and in England (conceit), determines, if not its precise nature, at least what it was and was not, at one moment in France. For the sake of concision and clarity, Cyrano de Bergerac's discourse and world view are given a privileged position in this study.

The section contains four more essays. Heinrich Lausberg details Marie de Gournay's opposition to the new poetics of Malherbe. Jean Pierre Chauveau reveals disagreements among Malherbe's disciples, specifically Costar's criticism of Chapelain and Godeau. Giovanni Dotoli explains why Mairet was the sole exponent of the new dramaturgy he developed in the preface to Sylvanire. Hugh M. Davidson, in his analysis of d'Aubignac's 'pratique et rhétorique du théâtre,' shows how special were the abbé's ideas and how far removed they were from those of Aristotle.

Five of the eight essays in section IV, 'Boileau et le débat critique sous Louis xiv,' focus in fact on Boileau. Slobodan Vitanović casts doubt on the view that Boileau as a critic is above all an exponent of rational poetics. By comparing the Art poétique to the treatise On the Sublime, he persuasively demonstrates that Boileau's poetic theory — inspired by Longinus — mirrors the great classical works of his age in that both contain beneath a surface of intellection and order a current of energy that flows out of robust genius and at times from a lustiness or furor that however steadily remains under reason's control.

In his essay on 'Boileau et la critique poétique,' Jules Brody offers all students of poetic techniques, undergraduates and graduates, teachers and scholars, illuminating penetrations into the genius and significance of an often misunderstood classical masterpiece. Brody's own curbed ludism functions as a particularly suitable vehicle for an appreciation of
the poetry in what superficially can appear as neat arrangements characteristic of Boileau. The confirmation of an absolute radicalism in the Art poétique that allows no middle ground between success and failure in poetic creation is less important in this essay than the progressive unveiling of Boileau's extreme sensitivity to shades of expression in French.

Six more essays are found under this rubric but not all deal directly with Boileau. Pierre Grimal's does, both in the title and in the substance of his paper ('Boileau et l'Art Poétique d'Horace'), but in his comparison of the two Poetics, Boileau's emerges as the more shallow of the two. Bernard Tocanne helps us fathom the complexities of Boileau's views on the epic genre. Gaston Hall looks into conflicting religious visions, Boileau's and that of Desmarets de Saint-Sorlin, as they relate to 'le merveilleux chrétien.' Ronald W. Tobin claims that Racine owed much to Seneca but was most reluctant to acknowledge it for fear of compromising his reputation as a connoisseur of Greek culture. J.P. Collinet documents Bussy's fecund and judicious role in criticism during the period that extends from the departure of Molière and Corneille, then Racine, from the literary scene to the arrival of La Bruyère, Bayle and Fontenelle. Roger Duchêne shows how the freshness of Mme de Sévigné's letters is in large part due to her unfamiliarity with rhetoric as it was systematically imparted in the colleges to the males of the time.

Some of the papers in section v: 'Problèmes généraux de la critique littéraire au XVIIe siècle,' could perhaps have been accommodated in the first four sections. Henri Coulet shows how the use of architectural metaphors in literary criticism evolved in the course of the century. E.T. Dubois reflects on the nature of poetic creations. A. Kibédi Varga brings imaginative perspective to the concept of 'vraisemblance.' Jean Molino in a long paper examines the notion of style in the seventeenth century. Jacques Thuillier probes the notion of imitation, variously interpreted by critics of the visual and the literary arts. Roger Zuber analyzes the complex idea of atticism and compares it to our vision of classicism. Jean Lafond discusses literature and morality in terms of the desirability of 'le plaisir littéraire,' seen as a diversion in the seventeenth century. Bernard Beugnot explores the poetics of allegory in the classical age and shows that by the questions it raises allegory remains germane to some of our preoccupations today. The volume also offers a select and seminal bibliography by Beugnot on the history and evolution of allegory, from Antiquity to the 1970s. Nicole Ferrier casts light on a neglected genre, the 'génétique,' rhetorical par excellence.

Section v closes with an essay by Marc Fumaroli, the organizer of the colloquium and the editor of this volume. His paper, centered on the
seventeenth century, studies the role of allegory in literary confrontations at critical moments across the centuries.

The quality of the papers given at the colloquium varied greatly, as one would expect, but reading the essays at one sitting reminded this reviewer of how exhilarating even very traditional criticism remains when the matter is treated cogently and insightfully, or imaginatively. (ARMAND A. RENAUD, UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA)


Le travail de Martin Franzbach donne tout d’abord, à partir de trois drames de Calderón, une vue d’ensemble de la ‘métamorphose’ qu’opère la réception littéraire: il suit les traces des adaptations et des remaniements d’adaptations dans les littératures européennes (en France, en Italie, aux Pays-Bas, dans les pays de langue allemande et en Angleterre). En s’appuyant sur la réception littéraire Franzbach croit trouver dans chaque cas ‘de nouvelles idées d’interprétation des pièces’ (‘neue Ansätze zur Interpretation der Stücke’). Il éclaire ensuite le particularisme de la réception de Calderón dans le romantisme allemand et son interprétation qui prolonge en maint endroit des tendances plus anciennes, et il rassemble les résultats de la réception littéraire de Calderón dans les nations européennes avant le romantisme. Un débat très critique et polémique sur la recherche concernant Calderón pratiquée par l’Institut de Recherche ibéro-américain (Ibero-Amerikanisches Forschungsinstitut) de Hambourg dirigé par Hans Flasche, conclut son travail.

L’étude de Franzbach a été terminée en 1969 et publiée en 1974. On ne m’a proposé d’en faire le compte-rendu qu’en 1982, mais elle aurait mérité d’être commentée plus tôt et plus rapidement, car elle contient une foule de documents et de détails intéressants. Naturellement, les années écoulées entre-temps ont amené des changements de perspective, par exemple nous voyons autrement les questions de réception littéraire depuis la discussion provoquée par l’esthétique de la réception défendue par Jauß et Iser.

Il s’agit pour Franzbach de relativiser les conceptions concernant Calderón répandues surtout en Allemagne depuis l’époque romantique. Il veut montrer qu’il ne faut pas voir dans les pièces de Calderón simplement la ‘poésie de la théologie’ (‘Poesie der Theologie,’ Eichendorff), ou bien l’expression d’une conception du monde catholique et espagnole
étroitement liées à un art sévère, mais que d’autres périodes ont mis l’accent sur les buts et les moyens de l’effet dramatique et sur la fécondité des sujets, et qu’on est tout à fait en droit de considérer les créations de Calderón du point de vue des effets. La doctrine souvent ajoutée à ‘El astrólogo fingido’ paraît alors n’avoir que peu ou plus du tout de fondement. À ce propos, il faudrait faire la remarque critique que jamais la réception n’a forçément mis complètement à jour l’essence d’une œuvre littéraire et que la réception peut toujours renfermer une interprétation erronée ou tendancieuse. En règle générale, la façon dont est fait un commentaire renseigne plus sur le commentateur (que ce soit l’adaptateur, le groupe, le public ou l’époque) que sur ce qu’il commente. La réception de Calderón hors d’Espagne a certainement nivelé le particularisme et l’originalité de l’auteur, surtout dans la mesure où elle se préoccupe principalement des sujets et des possibilités dramatiques de l’invention.

Comme jusqu’en 1800 (contrairement aux essais philologiques depuis le romantisme), les pièces de Calderón ne devaient pas être jouées sous la forme et avec l’expression originales et par là même étranges, mais qu’on s’efforçait de donner une adaptation actuelle et proche du public, les travaux des dix-neuvième et vingtième siècles sur Calderón peuvent nous en apprendre plus que les remaniements plus anciens. Certes, il faut aussi interroger la recherche plus récente sur ses exigences et ses motivations; mais la polémique de Fränbach contre Flasche a été influencée par les idées des années soixante-dix et peut être expliquée, de même que la position de Flasche, par l’environnement idéologique.

Les documents présentés par Fränbach dans le texte et en appendice sont d’un grand intérêt. Ils contribuent à faire de cette étude un instrument indispensable à la recherche sur l’impact de Calderón. Sur certains points elle peut aussi être mise en relation avec le livre de Werner Brüggemann Spanisches Theater und deutsche Romantik (Münster 1964) qui traite pour l’Allemagne de la réception littéraire de Calderón à une époque que Fränbach ne fait qu’effleurer. (WOLFRAM KRÖMER, UNIVERSITAT INNSBRUCK)


The editor divides the twenty-six papers presented in this volume into four groups. The first two papers raise problems of ‘method.’ In his presidential address, Phillip Harth argues for the relevance of historical
and interdisciplinary studies in literary investigation. Barbara Stafford, in her Clifford Prize winning essay, 'Toward Romantic Landscape Perception,' shows that 'the taste for discovery, fed by nature's endless succession of specimens, was as important an aesthetic category as the Picturesque; indeed, it was its rival' (p. 64).

A second group of papers is classified as 'the career of ideas.' In an essay which the editor qualifies as 'provocative,' but which this reviewer finds 'exciting,' Roger Hahn shows that 'the originators of the Encyclopédie were less concerned with attacking the Establishment — civil or religious — and more with linking the arts to the sciences through a reorganization of knowledge and a manipulation of information through the word and the picture' (p. 78). Thomas E. Kaiser traces the development, during the Revolutionary years, of an 'educational policy that came to embrace forms of elitism and authoritarianism which the Ideologues at the outset of the Revolution had sworn to destroy' (p. 96). Jeremy D. Popkin shows how 'the debates over the press in the revolutionary period succeeded in identifying most of the significant issues raised by the existence of a newspaper press' (pp. 128-9). Peter M. Briggs explores 'Locke's Essay and the Strategies of Eighteenth-Century English Satire' (p. 135), while Jack Fruchtman Jr. explores the political thought of two late Dissenting ministers. Bruce Tucker opens 'Perspectives on the Puritan Enlightenment' in North America. Finally, in this group, John Sitter seeks to illustrate that in mid-eighteenth-century England, 'religious conversion becomes the model, usually secularized, for what ought to happen in a poem' (p. 181).

The next group of ten papers the editor calls 're-readings.' These papers amply justify his statement that 'ultimately the cultural history of an epoch must be built from the shrewd reading and re-reading of its central and influential texts' (p. xii). The authors dealt with are Gay, Blake, Diderot, Goethe, Sterne and Hippel, Phyllis Wheatley, Smollett, Austen, Montesquieu, Boswell and Johnson.

The last seven papers deal with what the editor calls 'new frontiers,' specifically medicine, family and women. In this group, perhaps a prize should go to Barbara Brandon Schorrenberg for the conclusion to her article on 'The Decline of Midwifery in Eighteenth-Century England,' a fine piece of controlled writing:

Women were excluded from the universities, the teaching hospitals (except as patients), from the professional organizations. Medicine, like other professions, was a male preserve, to be guarded jealously against incursion from illogical, unscientific, weak women. If medicine was to be scientific, it must be male. This is an attitude which has not died easily. (p. 402)

(E.J.H. Greene, The University of Alberta)
This volume deals with German classical and romantic literature between 1789 and 1815, with the exception of the last two essays (see below). It appeared half a year after the publication of volume II, which is devoted to European perspectives on romanticism. The editor attempts to justify his exclusive focus on German literature by pointing to its exceptional poetic achievements and leadership position during the nineteenth century; yet whatever argument one can think of to support this approach, it goes against the grain of the present reviewer to read a book on German romanticism under the title of European romanticism. This is a serious drawback and much more noticeable than in the previous volume which dedicates at least five of the fourteen chapters to international relations. However, the individual contributions assembled here will serve as an intellectual inspiration to many students of German romanticism.

While I do not intend to discuss in detail the merits of each chapter, I do want to point out the wealth of perspectives and some of the more salient results in as much as they set new directions for the study of German romanticism. Otto Dann's 'Politische Voraussetzungen und gesellschaftliche Grundlagen der deutschen Literatur zwischen Französischer Revolution und Wiener Kongreß' investigates the sociopolitical conditions for the rise of German letters. Toward the end of the eighteenth century the pocket-size residential courts were still the most influential centres of culture and of enlightened reforms. This situation is the reason why the French Revolution did not come as a shock to the aristocracy nor to the urban class which 'lebte in Deutschland nicht im Gegensatz, sondern in einer engen materiellen und lebensmäßigen Verflechtung mit den Höfen' (p. 33). Only after Napoleon's defeat did this symbiosis ('Einheit der deutschen Bildungsgesellschaft der Spätaufklärung') break apart with the bourgeoisie taking up the cause of reform, now in opposition to the princes' policy of restoration (p. 47). This sociopolitical 'inversion' is of major importance for an adequate grasp of literary developments (see e.g., E.T.A. Hoffmann's parody of the by then outdated courts in Kater Murr, written in 1818 and 1821).

Those interested in the interplay of literature and politics should turn next to Harro Segeberg's essay on 'Politische Schriftsteller in Deutschland' (pp. 205-48). In several sections, it deals with 'literarischer Frühlproblem der Spätaufklärung' (e.g., Knigge), 'literarischer
Jakobinismus' (Rebmann, Forster, not Hölderlin!), 'Bonapartisten in Deutschland' and Prussia (Buchholz, Stein), and 'Metapolitische Neuorientierungen' (Fichte, Arndt). However, Segeberg excludes the discussion of 'patriotic romanticism' proper as well as Goethe's encounter with Napoleon in favor of treating trivial popular writers of the period, an approach which yields some insight into a collective attitude but little into romantic literature.

In contrast to this expedition, E. Behler's contribution on 'Französische Revolution und Antikekult' is a masterpiece in its own right. Behler starts with Winckelmann's 'Antikekult' as a basis and ends with Marx's revolutionary stance, constructing an ideal bi-polarity between the two topics in the process. Perhaps it is the first time that someone like Behler emphasizes the overall critical view of Greece among the so called German 'Graecomaniacs,' such as W. von Humboldt, Schiller, Hölderlin and even Goethe, whose view of Greece seems to have been strongly influenced by romanticism. How Behler, out of this criticism of the ancients, develops the necessity of the period's thinkers for a revolutionary program ('Die Revolution der Denkart,' pp. 106 f.) makes intriguing reading. As the most prominent of the contemporary revolutionary plays he regards Goethe's satirical comedies of 1793 and *Die natürliche Tochter*.

In his contribution on 'Literaturtheorie' (pp. 49-82) Mandelkow makes an excellent case for the joint consideration of classical and romantic theories, through their common orientation toward Greece (e.g., Schiller, F. Schlegel), their emphasis on transcendental philosophy and their reaction to the French Revolution. A split occurred between both groups after 1800 when the romantics gave up the ideal of fusing the ancient and the modern world in favor of historical romanticism (see p. 61). The 'tyranny of Greece over Germany' was finally broken by F. Schlegel's 'Copernican' revolution, namely his programmatic declaration of the possible mixing of all genres (Lyceum No. 60). His treatise on *Epochen der Dichtkunst* becomes the manifesto of the romantic history of literature (p. 71), a turning away from an earlier programmatic theory of literature.

Two more essays treat theoretical aspects of the literary period, Otto Pöggeler's 'Idealismus und neue Mythologie' (pp. 179-205) and P. Sprengel's 'Antiklassische Opposition.' Hegel scholar Pöggeler presents a succinct survey of the quest for a new mythology among Germans from Winckelmann to Schelling with an emphasis on the Tübingen 'Bund der Geister' and the succeeding attempts to recreate mythology either by using Catholic, Indian or philosophical sources or by creating individual mythologies (*Faust* 11, Hölderlin's late hymns). Sprengel discusses the anticlassical opposition to the concept of the genius and to Kant's idealism
as well as the counter-production of a non-autonomous poetry by Herder, Jacobi and Jean Paul (pp. 249-72).

The more descriptive, mostly historically oriented discussions of genres are also highly interesting. In his essay on classical drama (pp. 113-40) D. Lohmeier disarms the much taunted slogan of classical ‘escapism’ by stressing the conscious efforts of Goethe and Schiller to counter the chaotic spirit of their own times by means of aesthetic (p. 131). W. Segebrecht in his ‘Lyrik der Klassik’ (pp. 141-78) contrasts Goethe’s and Schiller’s development toward classical maturity (Römische Elegien; Bürger-Rezension) using Winckelmann as the common denominator, followed by a contrastive analysis of their joint efforts (see ‘Der klassische Bund,’ p. 156) in the field of ballads (‘Balladenjahr,’ p. 161), elegies, and lieder. Goethe’s ‘Gelegenheitsgedichte’ become ‘situationsbezogen und öffentlichkeitszugewandt’ (p. 174).

In keeping with the editor’s combined approach to Klassik und Romantik, (pp. 49 f.) are H. Remak’s essay on the novella and Mandelkow’s own third contribution, this time on the novel. The former proceeds from a comparatist’s view point by discussing how the Romance novella was received and then transformed by German authors (pp. 291-318). After a brief general definition of the genre he juxtaposes classical and romantic novellas and elucidates key features by drawing on characteristic examples. The various elements of ‘eine sich ereignete [unerhöhte] Begegnheit’ are analyzed and applied to mixed forms (Anekdote, moralische Erzählungen, Gespenstergeschichten, Märchen). Mandelkow, in his ‘Der Roman der Klassik und Romantik’ (pp. 393-429), traces the development of the novel from Werther to Kater Murr. Not surprisingly, Wilhelm Meister becomes central as model and counterpoint to the romantic novel. Unfortunately, Mandelkow interprets Franz Sternbald und Heinrich von Ofterdingen, but not Kater Murr which, as the only German romantic novel, has risen into the canonical ranks of world literature (p. 421).

There are three essays which deal exclusively with romantic themes: J. Brummack’s ‘Komödie und Satire,’ J. Krogoll’s ‘Geschichte im Drama und im Roman’ and W. Frühwald’s ‘Romantische Lyrik im Spannungsfeld von Esoterik und Öffentlichkeit.’ Brummack’s contribution (pp. 273-90) is important in that the author treats a rather neglected and undervalued genre. Contrasting romantic comedy with enlightenment plays he manages to isolate two types, Tieck’s Weltkomödie’ and Brentano’s ‘Komödie des isolierten Subjekts’ (→Büchner), both intended as Romane, Arabesken’ and both apparently under the influence of la Commedia dell’arte. These two types correspond to two tendencies in romantic satire, understood as integrated elements of novels (Nachtwachen,
Kater Murr) or plays (Tieck, Kaiser Octavianus), on the one hand to 'Spiel der Phantasie,' on the other to 'welthaltiges, wesentlich satirisches Werk des Witzes' (p. 288). The Philistine is their common target, the arabesque their formal principle.

Frühwald provides an excellent survey of the essentials of romantic lyrics (pp. 355-92) with a discussion of their 'Kontextbindung' and their subsequent 'Kontextlösung' through composers and scholars. He proceeds to 'der poetisch-romantische Bund' which involves the dialectics between the seemingly popular style of romantic lyrics and the author's (Brentano's!) original intention to create poetry for an esoteric circle, for the author and his beloved (p. 359). His section on 'literarische Literatur' (pp. 363-71) will serve as an eyeopener to many an admirer of romantic lyrics who may have mistaken the purposefully artificial 'Kunstton' as 'naiver Volksliedton' (see Adorno's explanation of romantic poetry as 'Transfusion des Kollektiven ins Individuelle,' p. 369). Instead of constant growth and development in their poetic existence, romantic authors strove for 'Esoterisierung, Zitatstil, Selbstwiederholung' and formulaic reductions (pp. 367 f.). The key imagery of 'Schwelle und Grenze' ('Schwellenbildlichkeit') constitutes a striking example of their elitist consciousness (pp. 374-9) mirrored in the cult of the poet who dies young, but also in the cult of the mad writer and reflected in their 'Ungenügend am Sprachmaterial' (pp. 380-1).

One of the best organized contributions stems from Krogoll (pp. 319-54) who interprets the romantic preoccupation with history as an attempt to influence the present ('Geschichte meint Zeitgeschichte,' p. 319). In ascending order he discusses several aspects: 'Geschichte als Kunstgeschichte,' 'Kunst und Geschichte: Transzendente Poesie,' 'Kunst als Geschichte: Transzendente Poesie,' 'Geschichte als Kunst: Nationale Poesie,' 'Geschichte als Geschichte: Restauration und Historizismus,' 'Romantik als Geschichte.' Werner Keller's overview of Goethe's 'Spätwerk' (pp. 429-60) from Die Wahlverwandtschaften (1809) to Faust II concludes the German essays, but not the book, since Sven-Aage Jørgensen devotes the last chapter to 'Klassische Romantik der Dänen' (pp. 461-88).

Although almost all contributions to this volume are excellent individually, the editor deserves some criticism for the disjointed arrangement of the diverse essays. I would have preferred a more sensible grouping of chapters which are obviously thematically related, but which are unfortunately scattered, as in the case of the politically oriented articles, the theoretical essays, the genre contributions. I would suggest the arrangement offered in this review. Danish romanticism should have been reserved for vol. III, with the introductory chap. on reception history
taking its place. Admittedly, the 143 text illustrations are usually pertinent and sometimes striking, but why has a chapter on the comparative connection between literature and art/music been omitted? To me, this is a serious mistake, as is the lack of information on the interrelationship between literature and psychology. As stated above, the interdependence between German and European romanticism has been all but eliminated and relegated to vol. II, whereas that between literature and politics as well as between literature and philosophy has been treated adequately. The general malaise is not improved by the lack of references to primary and scholarly literature nor by the dissociation, in the index, of the authors’ works from the pages on which they are discussed in the text. No attempt at cross-referencing has been made: an index of topics is missing, which makes it almost impossible to find where, for instance, Winckelmann, Kater Murr or F. Schlegel’s Über das Studium der griechischen Poesie are treated. In conclusion, this is a highly intelligent undertaking as regards its individual chapters, but an odd arrangement as a whole and hardly to be recommended as a manual. (GERHART HOFFMEISTER, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT SANTA BARBARA)


This is an excellent reference work on European Romanticism, the best one the present reviewer has come across since he studied the history of research for his own attempt at a comprehensive overview of this period (see Deutsche und europäische Romantik [Stuttgart: Metzler 170, 1978]). Also compared with other volumes in this series of Neue Handbücher, e.g., Renaissance und Barock I-II, this book deserves praise on account of its dove-tailed approach (geographical and systematic), its well placed emphases, and its overall successful integration of vast and diverse materials. Thirteen authors contributed to fourteen chapters. The editor, Klaus Heitmann, wrote the introductory chapter ‘Klassiker und Romantiker, sich heftig bekämpfend’ and chapter 3 on ‘Der Weltschmerz in den europäischen Literaturen’; Peter Boerner contributed ‘Die deutsche Literatur der Goethezeit in ihrer europäischen Ausstrahlung’; Margrit Zobel-Finger did ‘Konterrevolutionäre Literatur in Europa’; Hermann Hofer ‘Die Vor- und Frühromantik in Frankreich’; Hinrich Hudde ‘Natur schilderung bei den Rousseau-Nachfolgern’; Winfried Wehle ‘Französisches Popular drama zur Zeit des Empire und der Restauration’;

In accordance with the general editor's purpose to put into practice the acknowledged principles and insights of Comparative Literature as well as of sociology of literature, the first four sections deal with topics of a European scope from a comparative viewpoint, the ten succeeding chapters with a survey of national literatures or genres in the age of romanticism. I wonder, however, why 'Ossian und seine europäische Wirkung' was not moved from the eighth position into the fifth, where it actually belongs with Ossianic centres in Italy, France and Germany. Equally important as Ossianism would have been a chapter on Byronism which, as a major trend of European Romanticism, deserves far better than a few passing remarks on p. 70, culminating in the faulty statement that it encountered no resonance in its native country. (On Byron's impact in the 1830s and 1840s see W. Ruddick, 'Byron and England,' in P.G. Trueblood, editor, Byron's Political and Cultural Influence in 19th Century Europe: A Symposium [London: Atlantic Highlands N.J.: Humanities Press Inc. 1981] pp. 32f.) Moreover the definition of 'Byronism' cannot be restricted to its author and originator only but it has to include Byron's epigones, too. In this context it should be noted that Byron in his self-ironic Don Juan did not only anticipate Heine and Baudelaire (p. 251) but also Puškin, a fact which is not mentioned when his Eugen Onegin is discussed (p. 79). Beside Ossianism and Byronism, I suppose, a section on the European echo of Goethe's Faust would have enhanced the value of the entire project (see pp. 50-3). The same applies to the 'tragedy of fate' which could have been treated either in the context of the French popular melodrama or could have been included in the discussion of the English Gothic novel. Considering questions of organization I wonder whether it was a good idea to include Portuguese romanticism in this volume but to postpone the Polish one until volume three, although it was of great importance to the development of a liberal Romantic literature in Europe in general. Of course, one cannot expect to find everything in one volume covering a literary period of such vast a scope as European romanticism. Indeed, we are pleased to see the most relevant topics, genres, and surveys treated extremely well by so many qualified authors.
Without wanting to delve into each individual contribution, I intend to raise a few points of general concern: dates of published works should be cross-checked if they appear in various chapters (e.g., Ultimé Lettere di Jacopo Ortis, 1802: this date gives the first authorized edition but not the first (1798) and last edition (1817), see pp. 74, 281); the attribution of anonymous works to specific authors should be done with great caution (e.g., Nachtwachen des Bonaventura by August Klingemann, p. 67; see my essay on this topic in Romane und Erzählungen der deutschen Romantik. Neue Interpretationen, ed. by P.M. Lützel, Reclam 1981, pp. 197f.). More disturbing are attributions of individual authors to specific trends, such as Novalis to 'Krypto-Katholischen' (p. 96), a highly questionable label in the light of, for example, Ludwig Marcuse's essay 'Reaktionäre und progressive Romantik' in Monatshefte 44 (1952) 195-210, according to which Novalis counts among the progressive and enlightened Romanticists. To classify Ann Radcliffe's Gothic tales as poetic Bildungsromane (p. 226) seems also misleading. And how can German romanticism owe its discovery to the enlightened Madame de Staël if she served as an intermediary of the Storm and Stress and the German classical period more than anything else? (p. 124) The shifting perspective between the German view of 'Romantik' and the European view would have to be explained. How can one discuss Karamzin's Poor Liza without referring to Werther at the same time? (p. 332) Sweeping statements such as German Romanticism opposing the Enlightenment (p. 17) are not convincing at all if applied to Early German Romanticism and tend to distort the entire picture of European Romanticism. To complete our list of criticisms, a word about secondary sources is in order: Among the bibliographical references on Weltschmerz, an entry by S. Atkins, The Testament of Werther in Poetry and Drama (Cambridge: Harvard 1949) and by Johannes Hösle, 'Die französische Werther-Rezeption' (Arcadia 11 [1976] 113-25) is missing; on 'Konerrevolutionäre Literatur' see also H.G. Schumann, Burke's Anschauungen vom Gleichgewicht in Staat und Staatssystem. Mit einer Bibliographie (Meisenheim: Anton Hain 1964).

But let us return to our entrance in praise of this team work. The first five chapters (including 'Ossian') are well integrated. Some of the unexpected highlights are Peter Boerner's inclusion of American echoes to the age of Goethe and its reception by academics ('Nachleben in Academia,' pp. 47-50) as well as H. Hofer's discussion of Louis-Sébastien Mercier as a leading French Pre-Romanticist (pp. 109 f.) and finally H. Hudde's treatment of Alexander von Humboldt's nature depiction in the wake of Rousseau (pp. 146 f.). In my view, one of the best contributions stems from Klaus Heitmann, whose 'Der Weltschmerz in den europäischen
Literaturen' discusses this 'disease' from its early stirrings in the Renaissance until the Fin de Siècle with all due consideration of national variations in each of the following countries: France, Germany, Britain, and Southern as well as Eastern Europe.

The French Revolution as background, as an antagonistic event or as an incitement for change provides a focus of considerable importance for understanding the literature of European romanticism. Although Zobel-Finger's essay 'Konterrevolutionäre Literatur in Europa' is the only one dealing with the French Revolution as a direct source of inspiration and reaction, other authors also choose a similar socio-political approach (see Horst Meller's subtitle: 'Die Geburt einer Romantik aus dem Geist der Revolution'; Hermann Fischer's initial subdivisions on 'Die politische und soziokulturelle Situation' and on the 'Reaktion der jüngeren Romantiker auf die Zeitsituation' (pp. 241 f.); similarly Kohut starts with the 'Zeit der Gegensätze (p. 291) and H. Hofer includes a section on 'Revolution, Bonaparte und die Frühsromantik' in France (pp. 111 f.).

In sum, this volume is very well written, organized, and illustrated. If volume I dealing with the age of Goethe in Germany and volume III with further surveys of national Romantic literatures turn out as satisfactorily as volume II, this handbook will certainly be used as a stimulating and highly reliable aid to students, teachers, and scholars of European Romanticism. (GERHART HOFFMEISTER, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT SANTA BARBARA)


The author of this book, who is increasingly becoming known as a scholar in German Romanticism, attempts to bridge the gap between the occult applications of mesmerism and the psychoanalytic use of hypnosis and to show how the writings of some German, French and American Romantics, as well as Romantic Realists (in Donald Fanger's sense of the latter term), were as much informed by contemporary psychological sources, and especially by Mesmer and his animal magnetism, as twentieth-century literateurs are indebted to the problems, the vocabulary and methods of Freudianism. The two introductory chapters describe Mesmer and mesmerism and place them within the context of contemporary scientific thought, psychological theory, and philosophical speculation; they also relate mesmerism to the later practices and theories of hypnotism and psychoanalysis. The four chapters which trace
the impact of mesmerist ideas on literature concentrate on Heinrich von Kleist, E.T.A. Hoffmann, Honoré de Balzac and Nathaniel Hawthorne. In her analyses Tatar stresses the writers’ dilemma about the moral implications of mesmerism and analogous phenomena; she also demonstrates with impressive erudition and perception their use of mesmeric terms and electrical imagery. A final chapter depicts some of the twentieth-century echoes of the mesmerist tradition. This beautifully printed book has eight pages of illustrations, which include several eighteenth-century caricatures, a very useful index of names and subjects, but all bibliographical information is tucked away in the footnotes.

Tatar is aware that her inquiry could have covered a broader and even more complex area of the history of ideas and that her literary examples are only some of the more important ones. She does discuss in passing other writers, for instance Novalis, the Shelleys, Gérard de Nerval, Gautier, Schopenhauer, Poe, Melville, Henry James, and even D.H. Lawrence and Thomas Mann. Other obvious choices for more detailed analyses are only mentioned, for instance Jean Paul Richter, Achim von Arnim (there are quite a few topical texts besides Gräfin Dolores), Dickens (see Fred Kaplan’s Dickens and Mesmerism: The Hidden Springs of Fiction, Princeton: Princeton University Press 1975), and Flaubert (Madame Bovary and particularly the eighth chapter of Bouvard et Pécuchet). There is no mention of Charles Nodier and Adalbert Stifter (see Johann Lachinger, ‘Mesmerismus und Magnetismus in Stifters Werk,’ Stifter-Symposium 1978. Linz: Linzer Verlaggesellschaft 1979, pp. 16-23) or of phenomena in other languages, of which the example of Russian nineteenth-century literature is of special interest. The very nature of the study condemns the author both to selectivity (in the E.T.A. Hoffmann chapter I miss Die Elixiere des Teufels and more attention to Kater Murr), and to surveys of known facts in most passages of literary discussion. There are also occasional slips in documentation and interpretation. Leaving aside the lack of many critical sources about individual writers, I should like to note only the absence of W. Pagel’s prehistory of Mesmerism and the historical study by H. Grassl about the origins of German Romanticism (Aufbruch zur Romantik: Bayerns Beitrag zur deutschen Geistesgeschichte 1765-1785. München: Beck 1968). The alternative folkloric, or archaic, roots of certain important features in Kleist’s works are left out in favour of the mesmeric lore; this happens also to Neoplatonic ideas in E.T.A. Hoffmann and to Lavater’s physiognomy where literary portraits with ‘piercing eyes’ are mentioned. The ending of Der Prinz von Homburg is probably misunderstood by her, the interpretation of Schopenhauer’s notions about animal magnetism by way of hypnotism seems misguided, and it is curious to see Mario und
der Zauberer (1930) explained by references to Hitler's personality when Thomas Mann had in mind Mussolini and Italian Fascism. It is regrettable that some of the quotations, especially in the chapter on Balzac, are printed only in English, without the original, the opposite is occasionally true as for example in the ten lines from Heine on p. 121. More importantly, Tatar neglects some of the aesthetic implications of animal magnetism which opened new possibilities for the treatment of the supernatural (Cailliois's and Todorov's 'fantastique') in nineteenth-century literature. She also at times emphasizes a Freudian and modern perspective to the point of neglecting the historical position of the events and texts under investigation.

This said — and similar imperfections are almost inevitable in any comparative and multidisciplinary approach to broad questions of history — Tatar's book must be praised for its general soundness, narrative skill and success in presenting a fascinating picture of an important cultural and literary phenomenon. Even today, when this review is being printed five years after the publication of her study, it remains a genuine and, for its topic, unsurpassed contribution to scholarship. (Milan V. Dimić, The University of Alberta)


Ina Schabert's study is eminently designed to introduce the serious student to the genre of historical fiction as it developed and exists within the English and American cultural areas. The work is aimed, it should be emphasized, at the student and not for any particular national audience. Despite the fact that Schabert teaches at the University of Munich, there are only two solitary references to German writers, thus making the international focus of the work apparent. In one instance, she cites Alfred Döblin (p. 3) as an advocate of the documentary panorama; in another context, while remarking Peter Demetz's view that historical fiction is a stage on the road to mature realism, Theodor Fontane is also mentioned as an example of a proto-realist.

Schabert's erudition inspires confidence, and her organization also makes the work handy as a reference. In the clear arrangement of the table of contents, the reader can recognize a concision that makes the information readily accessible. The text is divided into three sections dealing first with the philosophical foundations of the genre. Schabert grapples,
for instance, with the ambivalent relationship between those critics and writers, on the one hand, who consider the romance of fiction and, on the other, those who see the historical facts as being of primary significance in the tradition of the historical novel. The dialectical movement between these two poles is explored within a historical context.

Subcategories of the larger tradition, such as the fictional biography, are also examined, as well as topological questions of plot, and Schabert poses interesting problems well worth further investigation. There is, for example, a discussion of the uses of ideology in biography developed and expanded in the third section in which an ideological approach is postulated as one of four critical perspectives important to the genre. Here the author's use of overlap and repetition proves a useful device, for a tantalizing question is suggested: just why is it that the Anglo-American critic rejects the ideological-normative perspective as inadequate?

In another context, while summarizing current research, Schabert shows how historical fiction began to develop in England in response to reader demand to know how it 'felt' to live in another age. It was in England, she remarks, that the notion first took hold in the eighteenth century that each epoch possesses its own unique character. In order to know such a phenomenon a reader needed to experience vicariously the texture of life as an early Saxon or Celt or knight-at-arms, yet this could not be provided through reading objective history. It is only through fiction or, in some cases, biography, that a reader comes close to satisfying curiosity about the quality of subjective experience in another age. It was, of course, Scott who proved craftsman enough to put the tools together which he needed to respond as writer to such an audience.

Historical fiction certainly has shared, in its concern for presenting subjective experience within a historical context of varying verisimilitude, an interest in the quality of individuality that characterized an entire European movement. Though Schabert does not say so, it is surely true that ideological criticism with its collectivist prejudices and universalizing abstractions is an alien incursion upon the territory where the focal point is the unique and even the individual. Can it thus be said that the notion of inviolable epochal specificity still determines the angle of an Anglo-American perception of history?

At the same time, Schabert is true in her way to a postwar German emphasis on literature being relevant to history. Rather than arguing ideologically, however, she provides a framework for viewing historical fiction as the raw material for a history of consciousness, or Bewußtseinsgeschichte. Through a careful study of the historical novels dealing with a single theme, one can extract information that would enable the
historian to reconstruct changing moral attitudes. Reading historical fiction is, in other words, like watching an ethical seismograph. Her dialectical interpretation is life into art, art into life. In support of her argument Schabert also presents an enlightening analysis of fiction devoted over a hundred year period to the theme of the American Civil War.

Taking a position that historical fiction is a documentary barometer for changing social and moral attitudes removes Schabert from allegiance to either of the two great traditions of criticism she classifies in relation to the genre. She surely does not share the prejudices of the critic whose attitude is governed by his retrospective approach. These critics, so the author notes, set up certain prototypes and then define a long, descending line to ever lower levels of achievement — except for isolated exceptions generally agreed upon, such as Thackery's *Henry Esmond*. The literary history written by such critics leads always from a serious confrontation with history to mere escapism.

Neither does she agree with the prospective school of criticism which insists on seeing the history of the genre in terms of an ascending line to more important achievements, more complex and subtle treatments, more sophisticated genres. There is never, for instance, the slightest hint that Schabert indulges in condescension so typical of the prospective critic when regarding the work of an earlier writer. While insisting that historical fiction does have relevance to the study of history, she manages also to regard each work on its own merits and in the context of its own particular reality. Her work is measured by such consistent balance and bears consideration outside Central Europe. (T.H. Pickett, University of Alabama)


The fusion of word and tone and the symbiosis of poet and composer championed by E.T.A. Hoffmann are more often than not illusory, and the music usually wins out in the end. The music of an opera can make one pardon the sins of the librettist, but I cannot think of an opera that has survived on the strength of the libretto alone, though some have clearly survived in spite of them. It is, therefore, for historical rather than aesthetic reasons that operas with a common theme or source deserve special attention. Of the forty-odd operas based on novels by Walter Scott that Jerome Mitchell has managed with the care and cunning of a good scholar to ferret out and record in his book, only two or
three remain in the repertory of the modern opera house. Most of them, composed by such luminaries as Rieschi, Mazzucato, Fétis, Grisar, and Maclean, were last performed in the mid-nineteenth century, and revivals of operas like Sir Arthur Sullivan’s Ivanhoe or of the (better-known) work of Auber, La Muette de Portici — which is only indirectly based on Peveril of the Peak — are rare. Opera fans will continue to remember Walter Scott’s Italianate form in Lucia di Lammermoor and I Puritani, but they will probably live on in ignorance of the staggering influence Scott exerted on nineteenth-century opera.

It is not the quality of these operas that is noteworthy but the proof they offer of Walter Scott’s effect on nineteenth-century artists and audiences in England, France, Italy, and Germany. It is no wonder that Balzac published his first novel, L’Héritière de Birague (1822), under the pseudonym of Lord Rhoone, an anagram that was supposed to sound Scottish, no doubt, but was typically and charmingly Frenchified, or that one of Heine’s two early plays, William Ratcliff (also 1822), is full of Scottish lords and Scottish castles and Scottish ghosts. The subject of Walter Scott operas is fascinating as a manifestation of popular taste and artistic reception, and the book would be twice as long if Mitchell had not wisely excluded, with a few exceptions, the hybrid form of the musical drama. In the form Mitchell has chosen, however, the subject becomes ungrateful in the writing, for the retelling of plots and the comparisons of libretto and novel do not make for good reading. The synopses of libretti of the same derivation (and with only minor variations) serve mainly as a reminder that opera is much more than words and that to tolerate a libretto, even in its musical setting, one must generally suspend disbelief. Wagner was very proud of the poetry he composed for his Gesamtkunstwerke, but that pride reflects the magnitude of his ego rather than the excellence of his product. Few libretti possess the quality of Berlioz’s for his Vergilian masterpiece, Les Troyens, and few writers of Hofmannsthal’s calibre wrote libretti.

Mitchell’s work, his knowledge of opera, and his familiarity with Scott’s novels are nothing short of astounding, and his careful study could be a good basis for a more interpretive one, such as Joseph Kerman’s of Otello and Othello or David Cairns’s of Les Troyens and The Aeneid. Now that Mitchell has minutely recorded the differences between the libretti and the novels on which they are based and the differences between one libretto and another based on the same novel, it would be of interest to speculate as to why, not just where, the libretti diverge from their model and each other. Mitchell speculates very little; when he does — in discussing the appropriateness of Old Mortality as the subject of an opera, for instance (p. 61) — the change is welcome.
Equally welcome is the kind of summarizing paragraph that comes at the end of Chapter fifteen about Flotow's opera, *Alice*, based on *Woodstock* (p. 333). The conclusion of the book presents the findings in a larger frame and provides the hint of theories and observations that can be expanded, such as the emergence of patterns librettists follow when they rework the novels (the historical subjects of these historical novels are most often reduced to the background for a love-story) and the translation from one artistic medium to another. The conclusion should have been the introduction, I believe; the reader would then have been in a better position to make sense of the mass of material gathered in the book and would have been not only more enlightened, but also more patient.

The style of the book is undistinguished (a character is 'terribly depressed,' [p. 122] or a young woman 'expresses regret' when her father forces her to abandon her lover [p. 13] and another character's heart is 'sore oppressed' [p. 236]). The un-ironic use of words like 'whence' or 'hence' or 'botch up' or 'what makes him tick' is irritating; and in the same sentence we find the words 'espousal' and 'in the nick of time' in an unselfconscious mixture of diction. Since the book — a handsomely printed one with many musical examples and some fine reproductions — will be of most value as a reference work, I wonder whether it would not have been better to reduce some of the descriptive prose; it would have been possible, for example, to give information about first performances and characters in lists rather than sentences at the beginning of each section about a new opera, the way William Ashbrooks does in the appendix of his book *Donizetti and his Operas*.

The book is unwieldy, perhaps because Scott's novels are often unwieldy. It is admittedly difficult to excite enthusiasm about works wrenched from context, indeed twice removed from it, as the descriptions of reworkings of an original must be, and Scott's novels have a charm that is lacking in the retelling of their transfiguration by librettists. Mitchell's patient work is deserving of admiration; many of the operas he has found are unpublished and most are naturally unrecorded, so he spent long hours at the British Museum and the Bibliothèque Nationale finding and examining them. It is therefore regrettable that this study, which provides essential sources for other investigations — of Scott's vogue or of the transformation of a literary text into an opera — is not better presented. Perhaps Mitchell is himself the victim of another vogue, the present-day (and misguided) contempt for archival research. It is his attempt to disguise these archival findings through repetitive and sometimes infelicitous prose that detracts from his otherwise important and revealing discoveries. (JOCELYNE KOLB, DARTMOUTH COLLEGE)
Ever since Soma-Deva's *Katha-Sarita-Sagar* or 'Ocean of Stories,' the *Pancha-Tantra*, *Hitopadesh*, *Vaital-Pachisi* and *Aesop's Fables*, very few books have cast such a magnetic spell upon the reading public as Scheherazade's *Alf Layla Wa Layla* or 'One Thousand and One Nights.' These Arabian tales still continue to exert their fascination and provide a fertile field of study in the ancient technique of narrative art and storytelling. Martha Pike Conant in her book on the *Oriental Tale in England in the Eighteenth Century* had pointed out their romantic machinery, episodic plots and adventurous spirit. Beckford's *Vathek* and Johnson's *Rasselas* had already satiated the English reader's phantasmagoric fancies. And eventually translations of *The Arabian Nights* were attempted by scholars of the eastern and western lore like Galland, Lane, Torrens and Payne. But it was not until the Library Edition of Sir Richard Burton's translation of *The Arabian Nights* appeared, that Leonard C. Smithers commented on October 10, 1894 that 'this great monument of Eastern literature — an acknowledged masterpiece of translation — will now take its proper place on the library shelf alongside Cervantes and Shakespeare.'

Burton, soon after his return from the Mecca pilgrimage, had begun his monumental labour on 'this extraordinary monument of Oriental literature' in 1852, at Aden, with some help from his friend Dr. Steinhäuser, of the Bombay army. The first volume was issued on September 12, 1885 'robbed in black and gold, the colours of the Abbaside Caliphs, with its brick-red night-cap after the fashion of ecclesiastical bantlings.'

*Alf Layla Wa Layla* or 'One Thousand and One Nights' marks a distinct stage in the history of Oriental literature. The world has had numerous versions of these stories. These volumes consist of romances, love stories, tales of roguery and adventure, accounts of historical significance tinged with moralistic and philosophical note. These are fantastic flights of fancy accounting wildest improbabilities, but made to appear utterly natural as common occurrences. They beautify the normal prospects of earth and reflect the magical splendours of the weird shadows under tropical skies.

During the passage of centuries these tales have continued to delight the old and the young alike until Scheherazade and Dunyazade, the Fisherman and the Jinn, and the adventures narrated by the Tailor, the Kalender, the Nazarene broker, and the Hunchback — the character
figures of Aladin, Ali Baba, Sindbad the Sailor, and Camralzaman and Badoura — have turned into our intimate friends. This great Eastern saga-book is a repertoire of Arabian manners and customs, laws and religion, beliefs and practices, a wondrous treasury of Muslim folk-lore.

Mushin Ali attempts to illuminate the otherwise obscure genealogy of the Arabian Nights. He tries to coherently unravel the contangled web of its origins in the ninth century, and its evolutionary changes, omissions and interpolations in Baghdad, Syria, and Cairo during the last thousand years. He tells us how they originated and evolved during the period of Abbaside monarchs, and how the story-tellers of Baghdad improvised additional entertaining tales to cater to the increasing thirst of the listeners under star-studded-skies. However, he considers that the bulk of these tales remains genuinely Arabian, and thus continued to multiply until the sixteenth century. By slow degrees these individual tales travelled to Medieval Europe, but it was not until the dawn of the eighteenth century that the Nights were finally translated into French and English.

Dr. Ali builds his argument on the premise that, since Galland's translation, no comprehensive assessment of the critical and popular reception of the Nights has been attempted in England. He, therefore, undertakes to explore the tremendous vogue and impact of the Arabian Nights, to chart its literary reputation, and to attempt to trace and evaluate the salient characteristic popularity of these tales and their impact upon the reading public. Such a survey of relevant responses to historical continuity and basic patterns of reaction opens up further critical insights. It is a full-dressed scholarly study of the generic characteristics, the origins and influence of the Nights.

In this comprehensive assessment and laborious undertaking, Dr. Ali charts the tremendous influence of the Nights on the English drama and romantic fiction, and evaluates the nature and scope of critical responses as reflected in prefaces to its various translations and adaptations. He burrows deep into the reviews, periodical articles, memoirs, recollections, and other valuable miscellanies, and thus provides a veritable index of the socio-cultural taste. He shows the relevance of the Nights in its social, critical and literary concerns, and assesses the causes of its enduring popularity.

This book continues to confirm that the English literary heritage is a rich motley of colours which has absorbed influences not only from the Greek and Latin sources, but also from the literature of distant alien cultures. It provides sufficient evidence to demonstrate the deep influence of the Arabian Nights within the substratum of English literature and culture. Further, the composite nature and aesthetic richness of the
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Nights distinctly provokes pulsating responses within major literary and cultural trends and provides fresh insight into the life and manners of the Orient. Particularly for scholars of medieval Islamic studies, such a focus upon social culture awakens fresh questions, clarifies obscure points, and stimulates new and challenging scholarship.

The range of this well-documented study is extraordinarily wide, demonstrates its extensive bibliography. Dr. Ali has devoted himself to finding what seems to be everything in print, and gleaned rich materials from the social, cultural, and intellectual warehouse of the nineteenth century. His clear interpretations, his extensive knowledge of Arabic works and Victorian panorama, make this book a welcome contribution to social history and English literature. (DEVENDRA P. VARMA, DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY)


If one could generate a computer index of the secondary literature on Nietzsche, the most frequently appearing word in that hypothetical list would be 'and.' Nietzsche, because of his consciously protean approach to philosophy he is the Kafka of the philosophical text, has primarily been understood in relationship to fixed points on the philosophical horizon. Therefore, if one does not know what to write about 'eternal recurrence' (because it is a truly slippery and contradictory concept) one turns to an area in which certain parallels might be found, an area where it seems that these parallels are clearly delineated, and one easily finds an instant explication of 'eternal recurrence.' It is useless to note that most (if not all) of such parallels are intellectual crossword puzzles, showing parallels where the only true parallel is to be found in the mind of the critic making the comparison. Indeed, when one examines the Nietzsche literature over the past ninety years, a study of the comparisons with Nietzsche's writings forms a mini-history of Nietzsche's reception, from Nietzsche and the Cult of the Ego to Nietzsche and the cult of rhetoric.

Having prefaces my remarks about Freney Mistry's study of Nietzsche and Buddhism with the above comments, I should now be absolutely ruthless. But Mistry's book is not an entirely 'and' study, regardless of its 'and' -ish title. For unlike the earlier studies of Nietzsche's relationship to the East (such as Ladner, Nietzsche und der Buddhismus 1933), Mistry's
study begins as a study in the intellectual context of the European understanding of Buddhism in which Nietzsche wrote. Mistry stresses the role which Nietzsche’s friend, the orientalist and philosopher Paul Deussen, translator of the Buddhist scriptures, played in shaping Nietzsche’s view of Buddhism as an alterative system to Christianity. This opening chapter does not, however, go quite far enough. For, while Mistry stresses Deussen’s role as the interpreter of the East in the tradition of Schopenhauer, there is little discussion of the problem and implication of such ‘orientalism’ during the 1880s. There is quantum leap in the implications of Eastern systems of thought between the early nineteenth century (Schelling, Schopenhauer) and the late nineteenth century. While there is clearly a continuum, with the later interpreters relying on the earlier approaches, at least as ‘orrible examples, the role of Eastern thought in the Empire was quite different from that in the period preceding it. The beginning of interest in presenting Eastern artifacts, with their religious context, within the newly founded Berlin museums, the publication of numerous translations from the original Buddhist texts (rather than relying on paraphrases by Jesuit missionaries), the presence of Buddhist priests (at the turn of the century) in Germany, all reflected the conviction of the late nineteenth-century mind that Buddhism was of value in terms of its daily use, and not as a strawman against which to play off the evils of Christianity. Nietzsche’s reading of Buddhism is clearly transitional.

Thus when Mistry turns to problems and contradictions within Nietzsche’s thought, such as suffering, truth, repetition, there seems to be a desire to understand and resolve these concepts, not in the light of the emerging ‘orientalism’ of the late nineteenth century, but in the light of some abstract twentieth-century concept of Buddhism (which smacks a bit of European neo-Romanticism of the post-war era). The break between the opening, historical chapter and the later chapters is clear. I am quite sorry that it is so marked, for an understanding of the reception of these concepts within the West during the late nineteenth century would have enabled one to understand Nietzsche’s reworking of them. Where is the journal literature on Buddhism that Nietzsche might have read, where are the more detailed explications of those books, beside Deussen which Nietzsche had definitely read, and where are his notes? Mistry lists these works in the appended, skeletal bibliography, but there is little real use of them in the study.

The end result is a flawed book, a book which begins well, and then decays into ‘and’ -ism. That Nietzsche’s reading of the East is of importance can not be doubted by any one who has read Heinrich Zimmer, and that it is not systematic nor primary can also not be doubted. If we
take the subtitle of Mistry's monograph seriously, maybe there will yet be a major study of this question forthcoming. Based on the work in this volume, it could be quite exciting. (Sander L. Gilman, Cornell University)


One might think that Nietzsche's critical reception outside Germany has been adequately investigated already. However, the interpretation of his writings is ongoing; and Geneviève Bianquis' major study, Nietzsche en France, like Guy de Pourtalès's Nietzsche en Italie, is now over fifty years old. It is time, then, for review and re-assessment of earlier criticism. To cut through the bewildering array of early French reactions to Nietzsche's thought, Eric H. Deudon goes right to a major nerve centre: the theme of antichristianism and French critics' sensibility to it. That fundamental theme, affirming God's death and a general transmutation of values, relates closely to other major themes throughout Nietzsche's work; moreover, it elicited the most deeply felt and revealing responses from critics of all kinds during the first twenty-five years of Nietzsche's fortune in France.

After Michel Guérin's rather laborious preface, the author states the case for his subject and approach. Before tracing the development of early Nietzsche criticism in its two main phases — from 1891 to 1900 and from 1900 to 1915 — he provides a [p]anorama intellectuel, politique et religieux de la France à la "Belle Époque" (1885-1905),' in twenty-five pages. On first reading, the results of such condensation may be disappointing if one does not keep firmly in mind that this background is intended to accommodate specifically the effects of Nietzsche's antichristianism on various aspects of French thought. For example, the first part of this panorama, 'un tableau bref, mais fidele, du climat intellectuel français des années 1900' (p. xvi), explores the influence of Gobineau's philosophy through to Maurras and Bourget, and links this mentality with late nineteenth-century social, political, and literary anarchy. Before the reader pauses to question the overwhelming presence of Gobineau's thought in the intellectual climate (two pages out of five) or the almost exclusive emphasis on pessimism and violence in literature during this period, he has likely objected to himself that idealism had not really died out in poetry, that humanitarianism was still very much alive
in prose writings from Zola to Lucien Jean and Romain Rolland; and that the young generation of French intellectuals, born shortly before or not long after 1870, included many who believed in social justice at home, without violence, and in a Franco-German rapprochement. To the comparatist reader, depiction of the intellectual climate would also seem incomplete without some mention of other German (and Scandinavian) writers whose works gained prominence in the latter part of the century and some comparison of Nietzsche's reception with theirs, for a number of the critical attitudes encountered by Nietzsche in France were by no means unique in his case. However, the author's purpose here is to set the stage for a study of Nietzsche's antichristianism; and he reminds us that violence and its glorification made up 'malheureusement un des éléments qui a contribué à la propagation de l'œuvre de Nietzsche en France au tournant du siècle' (p. 21). Especially valuable for students of literature is the analysis of the religious evolution, an aspect of late nineteenth-century thought not commonly treated so incisively and succinctly. Still, one regrets that Jammes, Maritain, Claudel, Pégy, and Huysmans must come and go in a few lines, and that such short shrift must be made of the upsurge of social Christian thought.

The author categorizes reactions to Nietzsche's thought during the initial period of contacts (1891-1900) thus: those who, shocked, try to discredit him; those who, attracted by his ideas, go to the opposite extreme; and those, from both camps, who attempt to put his thought in a more accurate perspective. In examining the most significant of these views, both positive and negative, he summarizes and evaluates other studies that have dealt completely or partly with Nietzsche's influence in France. He disagrees, for example, with Bianquis's appraisal of Henri Lichtenberger's open-mindedness, considers the cosmopolitan Teodor de Wyzewa's analysis of Nietzsche to be paternalistic, simplistic, and fragmentary, and blames Henri Albert, the future editor and translator of Nietzsche's complete work in French, for the myth of 'the blond beast' in France — the interpretation of the superman as some kind of real solution to the social problems of a decadent Europe. As for Albert's quality as translator, he cites Bianquis's reservations, along with the favorable opinion of a contemporary critic. One would have wished for more information about this important promoter of German letters (he helped, for example, to introduce Hauptmann to the French in the Mercure de France and interpreted their reactions in the Neue Deutsche Rundschau), as well as the author's own estimation of his translations, especially in as much as we are told that, as a critic of Nietzsche, Albert 'ne se soucie pas toujours de l'exactitude de ses sources, ni du bien-fondé de ses citations' (p. 40). One cannot help but wonder to what extent, if any, French
translations constituted an obstacle to understanding the real sense of Nietzsche's antichristianism.

Other critics and writers of special interest include Édouard Schuré, one of Nietzsche's pro-Wagnerian opponents; Daniel Halévy, creator of the 'fusion' myth, carried on by Bianquis and Karl Jaspers among others, according to which Nietzsche was 'saved' in the end by embracing Christ as well as Dionysius; and Paul Valéry, whose view at this time the author neatly describes: 'Nietzsche s'embarquait pour un voyage sans but déterminé, semblable à un capitaine qui créerait en cours de chemin ses propres tempêtes au milieu de récifs imaginaires. Valéry n'était pas prêt à voyager sans compas' (p. 57). At that time, he was unable to see the transvaluation of all values shaping up in Nietzsche's writings. On the other hand, reactions to Nietzsche in French ecclesiastical reviews appear biased to the point of dishonesty. By 1900, when his work has been largely translated, Nietzsche is seen mainly as a dangerous or insane philosopher. His thought is synonymous with the glorification of the ego, the destruction of traditional values, perversity, and blasphemy.

Chapter III examines criticism from the beginning of the century to World War I. As the implications of Nietzsche's transvaluation of values become clearer, attitudes, both pro and con, tend to stiffen. Several of the author's reappraisals merit special note. For example, unlike Bianquis, he praises the 'excellente tenue générale' of Alfred Fouillée's studies and, in particular, his analysis of 'the will to power.' Similarly, he views Émile Faguet's study as a genuine attempt to understand Nietzsche's antichristianism: 'Il a le mérite, en 1904, de donner au grand public une exposition claire et pertinente de la pensée de Nietzsche ... C'est en artiste et poète, plus qu'en critique littéraire, qu'il propose une nouvelle interprétation de la "mort de Dieu," et des conséquences que l'on peut en tirer' (p. 114). However, such impartial interest is countered by deformation and misrepresentation of Nietzsche's thought in the criticism of Church representatives: as Church and State relations deteriorate and, finally, break, Nietzsche's thought is identified with the latter's anticlerical position; adversaries portray him as an antichrist or a mad blasphemer. The author observes that, whereas criticism of Nietzsche's antichristianism from an artistic or poetic point of view (as in the case of Faguet) results in personal interpretations, philosophical criticism leads to dogmatism. One is either against or for Nietzsche, 'ce qui, pour beaucoup, signifie qu'on est catholique ou athée, patriote ou anarchiste, conservateur nostalgique du passé ou radical-socialiste' (p. 117). Accordingly, Georges Batault's fanatical veneration of Nietzsche contrasts with Ernest Seillière's denigration of Nietzsche's supporters: 'Une pauvre petite école ... nous offre de la plus haute et de la plus fortifiante pensée des adapta-
tions pour gorilles' (p. 123). As war approaches, sympathetic, perceptive critics, such as Élie Faure, must fall silent or be taxed with antipatriotic sentiments. Even those who deform Nietzsche's thought, the better to exploit it, such as Maurras and the 'Action Française,' must hide their support.

The author concludes that the extreme reactions to Nietzsche's thought in France, when seen in their intellectual, political, and religious contexts, cannot be fully explained in terms of Christian and anti-Christian beliefs in conflict; Nietzsche's thought was perceived as a threat to more basic elements of belief; his attack on the God-founding instinct itself ('l'instinct théologien') was felt by critics, at least instinctively. Putting the major reactions of these early periods in the perspective of Nietzsche criticism to the present day and in the light of the continuing debate on the nature of his antichristianism, Deudon judges as the most original those exigeses that have developed around the myth of 'une fusion ultime entre Dionysos et le crucifié,' a myth that also postulates 'un parallélisme Nietzsche-Mephistophélès qui donnerait à l'auteur de Zarathoustra le rôle du tentateur ... d'inspiration divine' (p. 143), and to which are related French critical efforts to rehabilitate Nietzsche. In bringing us up to date on recent French studies, the author points out Jules Chaix-Ruy's Poe (William Wilson)-Nietzsche parallel.

Despite the shortcomings mentioned, a number of which may be excused by the need to keep a very close focus, Eric Deudon's study is an excellent handbook that students can profitably read before going back to Bianquis's work. Just as skilfully as he situates French reactions in their appropriate contexts and weaves these threads of criticism into a coherent picture of Nietzsche's reception, the author uses Nietzsche's own words to guide the reader's understanding of his antichristianism and, at the same time, to set off the deficiencies or the merits of his French critics.

The work concludes with an adequate bibliography. Misprints in the text, notes, and bibliography, although not a major hindrance, are too frequently a source of annoyance. (C.H. Moore, The University of Alberta)


The Poets and Time belongs to that category of comparativist studies in which analysis begins with an analogy — a line of connection, an area of similarity or a range of interchangeable functions — and then explores
the implications of the analogy with undeviating singlemindedness. All
the issues not governed by the initial analogy (the questions that atten-
tive readers might ask) are thrust to one side and the analogy itself is
essentially reified. Although this method possesses an undeniable appeal,
it proclaims its narrowness. Even when the analogy can be based upon
significant evidence, it will still delimit the scope of possible discussion.
Smoot's study of Synge and Lorca is disagreeably reductive and self-
important but does, at least, provide some basis for its dominating
analogy.

The possibilities of comparison between Synge and Lorca are based
upon three considerations, of unequal weight and dissimilar import.
First, Smoot establishes that several play-goers and critics familiar with
the works of both writers have noticed similarities. This body of
evidence (for what it is worth) can be traced from the observations of a
Spanish-speaking Irishman, Patrick O. Dudgeon (an 'Irish exile in
Buenos Aires,' p. 1), who first noted, in 1939, that Bodas de sangre ap-
peared to have much in common with Synge's plays. Second, there is cir-
cumstantial evidence that Lorca had actually read Synge, or at least Juan
Ramón Jiménez's translation of Riders to the Sea. Third, Smoot is able
to point out a number of shared preoccupations, both thematic and
technical: tragedy, folklore, imagery, poetic language, characterization
and so forth. However, it is apparent that parallelisms of such a highly
generalized order do not establish affinity, much less a causal relation-
ship. A large number of modern writers, in every mode, could be said to
share the concerns that Smoot believes link Synge and Lorca.

Having developed the analogy that serves as the basis for his study,
Smoot devotes one chapter to the 'aesthetics' of Synge and Lorca, three
chapters to comparative analyses of paired plays, and one, final, chapter
to the discussion of the concept of time. All of this, while occasionally
interesting, moves on a level of unpromising abstraction. The plays are
considered on the level of rather general themes (chapter iv is entitled,
'Society the Antagonist: The Playboy of the Western World and La casa
de Bernarda Alba') which, to repeat one of the strongest objections to
Smoot's study as a whole, does little to demonstrate either specific affinity
or causal interconnection. It is a method that does, of course, suggest
the modernity of both writers.

The chapter on 'aesthetics' summarizes what is known about Synge's
and Lorca's reading, their friends and circles, the literary movements that
touched them: all the influences that, conceivably, may have contributed
to the development of their art. Much of this is fairly commonplace
material, some, plainly tedious (Lorca was known among Spanish
students of the drama for the care he exercised in every detail of play pro-
duction,' p. 55), and very little justifies the intimidating term, 'aesthetics.' The chapter on 'time' is rather more concerned with the writers' attitudes towards death than with the concept of time. One could scarcely call it a conceptually significant discussion or a discussion that reflects an awareness of the intricacies of the concept of time, on whatever level, as it has appeared, both as subject and as motif, in literature.

Smoot's book is pedestrian and unsophisticated. It does provide a summary of information, largely biographical, about both writers and it infrequently rewards its reader with a genuine insight. It is ponderously written, often embarrassingly so. One can only wonder at sentences such as the following: 'Ironically, both men passed away after they had lived approximately thirty-eight years,' (p. 183). This does not seem the most forceful way (nor even an appropriate way) to describe Lorca's brutal murder. There is a selected, but not up-to-date, bibliography. (ROBERT RAWDON WILSON, THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA)


The history of exile is as old as the cabbalistic account of mankind's severance from its original wholeness or the Fall of Man and Exodus as narrated in the Old Testament. Indeed, examples of expulsion and emigration are so numerous and so widespread that they are nearly coextensive with recorded history. From the Reformation on they grow in scale and horror and eventually culminate in the twin terrors of the Holocaust and the Gulag Archipelago. As would be expected, there is no dearth of material on particular instances of uprootedness, nor of general works such as Paul Tabori's seminal study, The Anatomy of Exile (1972). Nor have the effects of exile on individual writers — from Dante to Joyce — or loosely defined groups of writers — the victims of colonialism — escaped analysis. The Republican exodus from Spain in 1939 is one of the many twentieth-century emigrations which have been examined in considerable detail by a wide variety of critics and commentators. This new study, by Paul Ilie, differs from the previous works on the subject in that it is written from an unusual and original perspective.

Professor Ilie's choice of title, with its emphasis on inner exile, sets him apart from the literary historian, the social scientist or the analyst of the political and economic repercussions of territorial displacement. In his view, these quantifiable phenomena have already received adequate
treatment, especially in the post-Franco years. As he emphasises in the introductory chapter, 'The Semantics of Exile,' he intends to explore the exilic sensibility as a bilateral relationship, and herein lies much of the interest and value of his study. Exile is not a unilateral severance, as it is usually understood, but a reciprocal relationship simultaneously uniting as well as disuniting both émigré and resident population. The exilic paradigm he proposes overlooks conventional (though complex) distinctions between desterrados, exiliados, emigrantes, emigrados and other lexical variants. These are used more or less interchangeably as his fundamental distinction is psychological rather than geographical. There is territorial exile, when a population fragment is relocated to another country; but, there is also residential exile, the non-territorial exile experienced by those segments of the resident population which cannot subscribe to the ethical and political values embodied in the dominant culture. Furthermore, the relationship between outer and inner exile is duplicated within inner exile, which consists of any permanent separation within a culture. The example of authoritarian Spain provides a basis for a conceptual approach to exile that seeks to formulate an analytic mode without being encapsulated into a formal theory. As the author states: 'I shall strive rather to identify the axiological and psychological components of a mental structure common to many societies, authoritarian and otherwise (p. 5).'

This dialectic between the general and the particular sets the Spanish experience against a wider background and renders the book as useful to those who are versed in the details of Francoist authoritarianism as it undoubtedly will be to Hispanists and historians. His analysis of the desensitising process of deculturation (Ch. 2) and its effects on both émigrés and residents is highly pertinent to other political contexts. Avoiding the danger of oversimplifying through universalising, Ilie chooses the 'Judaic Exile as a Model for Spain' (Ch. 3) in his analysis of the two main alternatives — assimilation or self-insulation — that confront the émigré. But the rootlessness of Jewish history, prior to the creation of the state of Israel in 1948, has no significant counterpart in Spain. The latter's pre-existence as a political unity means that her exilic model is monistic, or less dualistic than the Jewish distinction between Judaism and Zionism. (In his discussion of the Judaic model, Professor Ilie observes that, despite the abundance of material on the diaspora, the crucial area of inner exile has been largely overlooked.) Assimilation undermines cultural preservation and renders political reintegration impossible even if the historical conjuncture improves; self-insulation is an internal disorder which can operate with or without geographical disruption. Those who decided to remain in Spain after the defeat of 1939,
when the orthodoxy of Francoist culture replaced the heterodoxy of Republican culture, were condemned to live in inner exile. In other words, they were forced to undergo a ‘permanent separation within the culture, whether human values are separated or political ones’ (p. 30). A partial aesthetic solution to this situation, and one adopted even by non-religious poets such as Leon Felipe, was to employ archetypal perceptions that transcend the particular exile of a particular moment.

Chapter 4, ‘Two Exiles: A Comparative Morphology,’ develops the idea that territorial and inner exile both exhibit parallels that may be assembled into a common psychological and conceptual structure. The next two chapters ‘Alienation and Exilic Homology’ and ‘A Literary Approach to Exile’ offer evidence that imaginative literature best documents the elusive exilic sensibility. Alienation is not viewed here in Marxist-sociological or Existentialist-metaphysical terms but as an immediate psychological reality interposing unfamiliar language, customs and values between the individual and social structures elaborated by other individuals. Alienation expresses itself through subcultures drawn from migrants within national boundaries, workers who once emigrated to foreign countries and representatives of repressed ethical and cultural minorities. On the other hand, the novelist Juan Goiti Sio differs from the paradigm by attempting to liberate himself from exile. He seeks to accomplish this by demystifying everything associated with the homeland and thereby resisting the abstractions by which the writer in exile alienates himself from his readers. Examples of literary spatialisation and temporalisation and the imagination’s efforts to soar above sterility substantiate Professor Illie’s thesis that creativity can be stifled by rootlessness no less than by totalitarianism.

Though it is generally acknowledged that Francoist Spain, as a result of the spiritual impoverishment caused by the exodus of leading poets and intellectuals, was a cultural ruin, Illie cautions that this judgment may eventually require nuancing, particularly for the fifties and sixties. By the same token, there is a distinct possibility that future generations, untainted by Francoism, will discover evidence of a significant subliterature for the 1940s, the decade when authoritarianism was most oppressive. The 1952 debate between Julian Marías (a liberal resident) and Robert Mead (an American professor) on the relationship between culture and politics was largely unresolved, but it pierced a breach in the exilic wall that allowed an incipient dialogue between the two sides. In the chapter called ‘A Culture in Exile from Itself’ Illie concentrates on émigré perceptions of cultural freedom and defines exile as a ‘negative symbiosis’ uniting expatriates and residents in the same psychomorphic reality.
The next three chapters, approximately one third of the study, examine literary evidence for the exilic condition. In 'Clandestinity and Marginality' (Ch. 8) the focal point is Juan Marsé's 1973 novel Si te dicen que cai (The Fallen), which treats inner exile's most extreme form, the underground resistance. This work illustrates how the sense of fragmentation that helped defeat the Republicans from 1937 on has its post war equivalent not only in the apparently insoluble geographical segmentation but also in internecine disputes among and between anarchists and communists. It reveals how the nightmarish world of torture and terrorism infiltrates the consciousness of children, who internalise, normalise, and perpetuate the legacy of violence, be it politically motivated or not. This continuing phenomenon allows the conclusion that after thirty years of dictatorship Spain has not recovered from its civil war wounds and that political opposites could converge into a single national exile.

The following chapter is devoted to Juan Goytisolo whose exilic journey is traced through Señas de identidad (1966), Reivindicación del conde don Julián (1970) and Juan sin tierra (1975). Goytisolo's evolution from alienation through self-banishment to final repudiation of Spain's culture provides Ilie with a basis for examining the manifestations of exile in a single author. Señas de identidad (Marks of Identity) satirizes the conventional belief that emigration is more advantageous than residence. In that the émigré loses his self-identity and gradually accustoms himself to the bondage of exile, he can provide no solution to his own destiny or that of his forsaken homeland. In Reivindicación del conde don Julián (Count Julian) the definition of exile assumes a more philosophical perspective. History is rejected, along with everything it subsumes, antipatriotism is exalted and the only true patria for the concerned intellectual has to be Truth. Juan sin tierra (John the Landless) follows the process of subversion to its conclusion and beyond limits usually encountered in fiction: the novel ends by demolishing the Spanish language to the extent of replacing phonemes by Arabic script, thereby re-establishing links with what Ilie calls 'the Semitic experience of Iberia.'

By way of contrast, The Prisoner Sensibility (Ch. 10) draws upon the entire literary production of the Francoist era. Imprisonment is viewed here as a psychomorphic structure of residential exile and the prison itself serves as a microcosm for a repressive society. Examples taken from a wide variety of texts stress the pervasiveness of the prisoner mentality and what Ilie has aptly termed the schizoid consciousness of authoritarian Spain.

In insisting upon the necessary relationship between expatriate and resident citizens, Professor Ilie has delineated a way of apprehending the
phenomenon of exile that is both stimulating and original. Given the prevalence of the exilic condition in the present century — each year brings new evidence of displaced populations — there is a definite need for further investigation of its manifestations in imaginative literature, among other written sources. Professor Ilie's analysis of the Francoist period, which in turn illuminates the tension between the two Spain (la España peregrina, la España solariega) proposes a paradigm and a set of conclusions that are likely to be proven valid for other contexts of social estrangement. Furthermore he has skilfully elaborated a vocabulary that should facilitate the research of other scholars who might wish to examine the structure of exile. His readiness to relate the Spanish experience to universal archetypes of exile together with his sensitive reading of literary texts combine to make this comprehensive and richly suggestive study a major contribution to the history of ideas.* (ROBERT S. THORNBERRY, THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA)


* It is curious to note that when Picasso's Guernica was delivered to Spain in September, 1981, forty-four years after it had been commissioned by the Republican government, the Spanish minister of culture should describe the event as the return of the last exile.


Zunächst ist auffallend, daß die durch die einleitenden Worte des Herausgebers vermutete Auseinandersetzung mit Gadamer im Zusammenhang der anvisierten Fragen äußert spärlich stattfindet. Obgleich es kaum denkbar ist, daß alle Teilnehmer sich auf eine methodologische Perspektive hätten einigen können, so bewirkt doch das Abhandensein eines integrierenden Faktors, daß die Beiträge sich nicht in die Richtung eines ästhetischen Gesamtkonzeptes des Allegorischen aufaddieren. Das


The papers in this volume represent the bulk of the contributions by Canadian Slavists at the International Congress of Slavists in Zagreb-Ljubljana in 1978. As it appears from the editorial preface, for technical and financial reasons not all the Canadian papers could be published in this volume. Of the twelve papers, only three are of some interest to the comparatist.

R.W.F. Pope's 'On the Comparative Literary Analysis of the Patericon Story (Translated and Original) in the Pre-Mongol Period,' deals with two literary documents, the Old Church Slavonic translation of a patericon story of the virtuous monk and his temptation by a harlot, and, presumably an original Old Rus' story, the tale of Moses the Hungarian, one of the legends in the Kievian Caves Patericon (thirteenth century), which both in theme and narrative structure is reminiscent of the translated monk-harlot anecdote. The author, discussing these stories against the background of their modern adaptations by Leskov and Leo Tolstoj, arrives at the conclusion that both medieval stories, but especial-
ly the much more elaborate Tale of Moses, should be seen as among the first samples of imaginative literature of Old Rus’ rather than, as frequently before, merely another piece of didactic and homiletic writing. The author is convincing, although the paper is somewhat marred by its heavy-handed style and a not always clear expository writing.

Constantine Bida’s ‘Vestiges of Antiquity in Ukrainian Baroque Literature,’ is quite informative, especially to the non-specialist. Bida shows that the literature of the Graeco-Roman tradition entered Ukrainian Baroque literature not, as one would assume, from Byzantium but rather from the West, primarily Poland, and, yet, Bida claims it was the pronounced Byzantine character of the contemporary Ukrainian literature which made it receptive to the influx of antiquity. Unfortunately, much of what Bida says is not substantiated by either references to other scholarly studies or by illustration. His claim that ‘the constant reference … to the classical world, … was … not entirely inorganic or unnatural to the literature still rooted in the medieval Byzantine tradition’ (p. 33), would require further elaboration supported by more than the author’s assertion. The reader of Ukrainian Baroque writers often has the impression that such references are less than organic and often merely decorative.

V. Grebenščikov’s ‘Stilevoj analizis i tolkovanie literaturnogo teksta (Transformatsionnyj podxod k proze Bunina i Šoloxova),’ is a good example of what linguistic analysis can do for the study of style. One cannot help but note how cumbersome such analyses can be. The conclusions offer valid and well founded insights though one misses the lightness and elegance of Leo Spitzer’s similar analyses.

Other essays in the volume only very marginally touch on problems of comparative literature though they are of interest to the student of Slavic literatures and sociolinguistics. In sum, the contributions of the Canadian Slavists show the span of interests exhibited by the Slavists’ ‘guild,’ frequently transcending the confines of their ‘professional’ interests. (ROMAN S. STRUC, THE UNIVERSITY OF CALGARY)


Sheila Watson provides the epigraph to Figures in a Ground:

...what I was concerned with was figures in a ground, from which they could not be separated.
But this collection of some twenty articles on modern writing, cunningly edited by Bessai and Jackel, seems immediately to pose the question: upon what grounds does one bring together a discussion of Eliot and Wyndham Lewis, of Márquez and Daphne Marlatt, of writing on film and a largely non-verbal, graphic essay on the Canadian hero?

Again, Sheila Watson, as the occasion for this Festschrift, provides the first apparent ground through her own personal, academic or novelistic associations. And this may imply that however much literature may be an institution it is through individual encounters that it is energized. And an analogous point is made by the unexpected initial article, Philip Stratford’s ‘Translation as Creation.’

This may hint at a division. Classically and in much modern theory, it is the linguistic code, the Great Code, the tradition which determines meaning. The ‘Modern’ writers are assumed to have reinforced this view against the Romantics. Certain Romantic voices persist, however, and among the ‘Post-modern’ writers one finds a new emphasis on the individual and the contingent — on the writer as creative transformer, the trickster, traitor or translator.

Certainly, as the ‘extraterritorial’ becomes normal one may ask what language, what Great Code, defines the ground. How, in McLuhan’s phrase, are we to find salvation in pattern recognition? A debate on that question is the real ground of this collection.

The volume is divided into three sections, subtitled ‘Discoveries,’ ‘Explorations,’ and ‘Identities,’ a sequence that sounds reassuring. Yet it might also be retitled as ‘Fusions,’ ‘Confusions,’ and ‘Forms of Madness.’

Most of the articles in ‘Discoveries’ show how major Moderns were able to order contemporary chaos by linking it to the traditional past. McLuhan demonstrates how Eliot used medieval rhetorical categories to structure the Four Quartets. F.T. Flahiff explores the way Scott Fitzgerald shaped The Great Gatsby in ironic relation to Chaucer’s Troilus and Criseyde. Ann Blott on Wyndham Lewis and John Lent on Lewis and Lowry emphasize the way these novelists integrate modernist strategies with more traditional narrative devices.

As later articles reveal, it is just such strategies that certain Postmodernists reject as arbitrary impositions of order on the immediate and contingent, removing lived experience into some traditional, archetypal, or timeless order. In his dialogue with Bessai, Robert Kroetsch will say, ‘The ultimate fall of man is the fall out of time’ (p. 215).

Whether one regards Nabokov and Márquez as Modern or Postmodern, both according to Patricia Buckman and Michael Ondaatje, work to effect a suspension of time. Through the non-linear patterns generated by the ‘Index’ to Speak Memory, Nabokov’s characters lose
their biological and historical definition and take on essentially non-
temporal ‘family’ identities. And the extraordinary nature of the events in
One Hundred Years of Solitude works to dissolve our sense of narrative
progression and of linear time. ‘Time,’ says Ondaatje, ‘has been shat-
tered by Melquiades’s experiments to overcome death’ (p. 30). To antici-
pate Eli Mandel, the characters in these novels persist as active ghosts.

This section concludes with E.D. Blodgett’s study of the metonymical
development of the figure of the house in Anne Hébert compared to its
metaphorical development in Alice Munro, the one carrying the theme
of entrapment in a timeless world, the other of liberation into a world of
action or process.

The articles in ‘Explorations’ are largely concerned to clarify confu-
sions. Fred Cogswell testifies to his personal shock upon discovering,
when he joined the army, that his values were not universal. He sees the
role of the little magazine, which developed in Canada in the twenties, as
being to digest such shock and mediate change.

Pat Gallivan’s ‘Xenophilometropolitania’: The Reluctant Modernism
of the Imagists’ illustrates the contradictions of a transitional period with
the Imagists’ will to the modern and urban and their nostalgia for the
traditional and pastoral, their fascination with an evocative symbolism
and their insistence on the sharply defined and accurate image, which
helps to account for the failure of Hulme, Flint and others to define a
commanding modern poetic.

Paul Tiessen and Morton Ross point to confusion in critical
vocabulary and judgement. Tiessen warns against the ambiguity of film
terminology when applied to literature, underlining what Wyndham
Lewis called the film’s visual violence. How, asks Ross, can we respect
the judgement of critics who in the course of a generation have practical-
ly reversed their readings of Sinclair Ross’s As For Me and My House,
have transformed the narrator, Mrs. Bentley, from the heroine to the
villain, have transformed the Rev. Mr. Bentley from being merely a
pathetic case to being a modern hero, a ‘thoroughly post-modern or ex-
istentialist artist enacting ‘cosmic meaninglessness’ (p. 204)? Such
readings, he suggests, approach comic absurdity.

Douglas Barbour’s ‘The Phenomenological I: Daphne Marlatt’s
Stepleston’ presses the argument that the Post-modern writer is concerned
to render a sense of process, of the particular and contingent. Barbour
would first clarify our perception of a welter of contemporary poets, from
Charles Olson to bp Nichol to Michael Ondaatje, by explaining that they
are all phenomenologists. They cultivate what the American critic,
Charles Altieri, terms (as if to scandalize Derrida) the immediacy of the
poem as event, as the issue of authentic being, or more properly “doing,”
in the world,' so that poetry becomes 'the emergence of place into the energy of language' (p. 179). Marlatt's Steveston demonstrates how this may happen. The result is a densely detailed text, a rather clogged, suddenly veering or suspended syntax (parentheses within parentheses), describing and evoking a place, a way of life. It is also shaped by the repetition of certain words, phrases, images, giving particular emphasis, as Barbour notes, to Chance — but also to the mechanical cycle of the canning factory, the tides, the migrations of fish, the ups and downs of the market and of fishermen's luck. In effect, the ancient and somewhat sinister myth of Fortuna, of the Wheel of Fortune, comes creeping in to structure and largely define the world of the text.

'It darkles,' wrote Joyce, '(tink, tint) all the funanimal world.' Everything, observed the 'distinguished phenomenologist,' Leopold Bloom, everything falls, at 32' sec/sec. (Surely there is no more striking example of the emergence of place into the energies of language than in the work of this old 'Modern'.)

'Explorations' concludes, appropriately, with the dialogue between Kroetsch and Bessai, 'Death is a Happy Ending.' It could also be called 'Murder Makes a Good Beginning,' since the killing of old Mrs. Potter at the start of Watson's The Double Hook serves as a paradigm for the act of violence against static authority, the set code, necessary to release the creative energies of author or community. (Harold Bloom's conception of the anxiety of influence comprehends parricide, but matricide ... ?)

Kroetsch and Bessai are engaged in an exercise of deconstruction, to make way for new construction, but both are more aware than some of the ironic implications of such an enterprise. Kroetsch himself uses myth to make fun of realism and irony to make fun of myth. He works to articulate an authentic prairie culture, but he is also aware that in the case of human culture there are no virgin sites. Our origins, like our language and literature, all suffer a mise en abîme. And he notes that in our present confusion and absence of faith the 'connection between world and word is gone.' Again anticipating Mandel's suggestion that all stories of identity, even the presumably non-fictional, are ghost stories, he notes that 'Fiction becomes fiction' (p. 210). Perhaps it is inevitable, then, that one must rediscover the validity of the artifices of language and literature — such far-out notions as grammar, punctuation, even plot! Even, perhaps, the archetypal myth?

Much of the resistance to the Modern is aimed at Joyce, Eliot, Frye, the critic of the Great Tradition, the Great Code, but as the dialogue rounds in the above fashion Bessai is led to exclaim, 'So much for the critic as theologian, you have replaced him with the creator as theologian' (p. 215).
Though called 'Identities,' the final section begins dismayingly enough with Rudy Wiebe's 'The Death and Life of Albert Johnson: Collected Notes on a Possible Legend,' which concerns a man with no known identity. Jonathan Peters's article on Senghor, Soyinka, and Achebe reminds us that Canadians have no priority on the problems of national identity. And Eli Mandel's 'The Ethnic Voice in Canadian Writings' argues that to raise the question of ethnicity is to raise the question of identity and, at the same time, to recognize that it cannot be answered. Dick Harrison's 'Cultural Insanity and Prairie Fiction' dramatizes a point made by Kroetsch, that the cultural identity assumed by the prairie West is a form of delusion.

Like the white knight, Robin Mathews arrives to save the day with his 'Wacousta Factor,' mapping the Canadian identity in political, social, and literary terms, so that we can fill in the frequent blank spaces of Norman Yates's drawings of 'The Portable Canadian Hero,' which conclude the book. But can we?

If Mandel has a point, must we not conclude that 'The Wacousta Factor' is a ghost story, a largely nineteenth-century ghost story? Do we not need new ones that, like Steveston, will include the Japanese Canadians — and how many other old and new factors that have refigured and, indeed, changed the ground of Canadian life and culture in the twentieth century, in the last generation, even?

Figures in a Ground itself registers such changes in the Canadian academic and literary world. It no longer assumes, for example, that 'modern literature' is defined by the work of a handful of American, British, and European writers; Canadians, along with Africans and South Americans, are producing it. It no longer wholly assumes that the academic critic is a scholarly curator of a classic canon — a divine judge, hors du combat, pondering texts sub species aeternitatis. Scholar, critic, writer may be different faces of the same person. Each struggles, retrospectively and prospectively, to define, connect, or distinguish figure and ground. As the reader moves through this collection, he senses the movement from the historical, scholarly, objective to the more polemical, heuristic, gestural — from commentary on art to art itself. And it is the tension between the two, the sense that a large, international or intercontinental argument is being engaged here and now, locally, that lends to it a certain excitement.

The collection does touch on a large, and perhaps perennial, argument between literature and life, Modernist and Post-modernist, formalist and phenomenologist. And it seems in a measure to reflect a division between Europe and America, which is registered in the recent remarks of Harvard philosopher Stanley Cavell. Where a Derrida feels Western
philosophy and culture have been hagridden by a metaphysics of presence, 'the promotion of something called voice over something called writing,' Cavell finds it hagridden by mere language, 'by a repressive philosophical systematizing - sometimes called metaphysics, sometimes called logical analysis,' which depends upon 'the suppression of the human voice.'

However much Douglas Barbour and many other North American writers may be concerned with voice, with the issue of 'authentic being' into language, one suspects that the relation between life and literature, or language, must remain forever ironic, that inevitably, 'Fiction is fiction.' If there is a real opposition or alternative to this view, it is radical, and it comes, not from the phenomenologists, but from the Christian, Rudy Wiebe, the author of a book called Where Is the Voice Coming From? a writer fascinated by silence, by a man who refused to name himself - by the refusal of language. This would seem a desperate position for a writer. Yet it is possible that one cannot have both, both meaning and being.

The Taoist, it would seem, is content with the idea that meaning is relative and being or 'reality' is ineffable. The man of the West, it seems, is not. It leaves us uncomfortable. But it generates books. (D.G. JONES, UNIVERSITÉ DE SHERBROOKE)
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