

*MARIKE FINLAY. *The Romantic Irony of Semiotics: Friedrich Schlegel and the Crisis of Representation. Approaches to Semiotics* 79 (1988). Pp. 294. DM148.00

Romanticism has long been understood as having enthroned the subject, but innumerable recent studies have challenged the self-appointed authority of the Romantic subject to construct both itself and the world around it. Professor Finlay shows how Friedrich Schlegel's irony is engaged in this process of destabilizing and dispersing the subject and the authority it claims for itself. Although heavily indebted to poststructuralist thought, she does not deconstruct Schlegel's arguments and presuppositions but, rather, uncovers his own autocritical tactics. Ironically, Finlay does not seem to be aware that the dexterity with which Schlegel performs irony bespeaks a masterful subject, one which constitutes itself through the conscious play of self-affirmation and self-effacement.

The phrase "crisis of representation" refers to Foucault's discussion of representation in *Les Mots et les choses*. According to Finlay, Schlegel breaks with the classical episteme that saw irony in logical, syntactical, or rhetorical terms — that defined irony, for instance, as the discrepancy between enunciation and intention. This dyadic *écart* was only possible in the stable order of representation that characterizes the classical episteme. Words gained representational value according to their place in a nominalist, taxonomic system. Tropes and figures were related and classified among themselves within this system, such that little attention was paid to the communicative, often nonverbal aspect of irony. One of the most useful and tightly argued sections of Finlay's book is the first chapter that outlines pre-Schlegelian irony in Aristotle, Cicero, Quintilian, the fourth-century grammarians Donatus and Vossius, and the eighteenth-century rhetoricians Clausier and Fontanier.

With Schlegel, irony becomes engaged in perpetually breaking established codes; it destabilizes the subject who pretends to wield it. Instead of the subject speaking language, the subject is spoken by language, a process that renders "obsolete the traditional use of the term irony as the perception of the intention to be ironic" (46). That Schlegel reflects on the production and

effect of discourse in such texts as *Lucinde* and *Über die Unverständlichkeit* indicates that, unlike his predecessors, he brings into play the communicative, pragmatic aspect of irony. A contradiction arises, however, when Finlay equates art's self-presentation (reflection on its own linguistic production) with the social, communicative dimension of irony. One would expect claims for artistic autonomy to conflict with dialogic exchange along the producer-text-recipient axis. Furthermore, Finlay's observations about the socio-political import of Schlegel's irony need to be substantiated with more than quick reference to his famous "Tendenz-fragment." Does Schlegel's pragmatic approach to irony mean — more than interaction between sender and receiver — that language is in the service of a goal-oriented, perhaps politically subversive praxis? Finlay uses the terms pragmatic, communicative, social, and political interchangeably and hence somewhat imprecisely.

Finlay's analysis of Schlegel's short essay *Über die Unverständlichkeit* is detailed and convincing. She focuses on the perpetual cancellation of one statement by the next and "the presence of self-quotation, intertextual quotation, and floating deictics in this essay." These are "all factors which make it difficult to isolate any fixed subject of enunciation or of reception" (228). In this section, Finlay also illuminatingly points out how, in his definition of the novel, Schlegel advocates the ironic or mutually relativizing mixture of genres.

The discussion of Schlegel's novel *Lucinde*, however, suffers from a lack of sustained textual analysis. To list dichotomies (such as love/hate, life/death) in the novel and then assert that the main character, Julius, displays a torn, unhappy consciousness (who does not?) does not display a particularly close reading, a problem aggravated by Finlay's recourse to semiotic encoding. To be sure, as Finlay points out, Julius is aware of his contradictory character, but this does not necessarily set him apart from earlier German literary figures such as Anton Reiser or Werther, who also cannot unite inner contradictions in the verbal and hence temporal medium. If "the condition *sine qua non* of language is 1) to be nontransparent to the idea or object to be referred to, as well as 2) to have no tense which unites ... the enunciated and the act of enunciation" (116), then why would *Lucinde* be unique in expressing this? On the one hand, Finlay works with a historical model that attributes pivotal significance to Schlegel; on the other hand, her general claims about how language functions turn Schlegel into one example among many.

This contradiction in Finlay's argument seems to come from an eagerness to make Schlegel an appealing contemporary for us. The author all too frequently blurs Schlegel's uniqueness by bypassing his texts and referring the reader instead to a dizzying array of current theorists. On page 142, for

instance, we are offered an exercise in deconstruction: the names Schlegel, Kant, Hegel, Kierkegaard, Benjamin, Lukács, Adorno/Horkheimer, and Szondi are linked by arrows to one another without subsequent explanation. In her next breath, Finlay then drops the names of Louis Marin and Foucault. She risks conflating these thinkers and giving a reductive analysis of Schlegel. Obviously, the intent is not to draw upon such thinkers in order to further our understanding of them. But nor can they substitute for a textually attentive investigation of Schlegel. Other indications of scholarly haste are the frequent typos and the quoting of Szondi and Schelling in French, or Jean Paul in English.

The virtue of this book is that it makes one think through the complexities of irony. Readers also gain insight into Schlegel's contribution to definitions of irony. This has also been accomplished recently by Gary Handwerk in his *Irony and Ethics in Narrative: From Schlegel to Lacan* (Yale UP, 1985). It is too bad that Finlay presumably was unable to respond to "Handwerk" in her own work. In contrast to her view of irony as a relativization of values, Handwerk sees not only negative but also ethical irony operative in Schlegel. Whereas Finlay hardly takes into account the function of Lucinde, Handwerk shows how her relationship with Julius demonstrates the role of love and intersubjectivity in Schlegel's irony.

(ALICE A. KUZNIAR, THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA-CHAPEL HILL)

*BARBARA JOHNSON. *A World of Difference*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press 1988. Pp. 225. Paper US\$10.95

A World of Difference, Barbara Johnson's sequel/response to her volume, *The Critical Difference*, is a collection of essays on wide-ranging literary and theoretical topics from "The Fate of Deconstruction" and "Significant Gaps" in literature and know-ledge, to "Poetic Differences," and "Other Inflections of Difference" in race and gender. Since Johnson is a critic possessed of great sensitivity to poetic expression, perhaps the best-crafted sections of the book are "Significant Gaps" and "Poetic Differences" in which she examines aspects of poetic structure from the function of rhetorical tropes like catachresis to individual works by writers as varied as Wordsworth, Baudelaire, Mallarmé, and Thoreau. Originally published in 1987, the volume is theoretically aligned with deconstruction, a fact underscored by the new preface to the 1988 paperback edition entitled "A Note on the Wartime Writings of Paul de Man."

In her introduction Johnson states that her purpose in forming this collection was: "to transfer the analysis of difference ... out of the realm of linguistic universality or deconstructive allegory and into contexts in which

difference is very much at issue in the 'real world' [sic]" and, by means of the dedication and epigraphs, "to situate this book in complex relation to de Man's death." Careful reading of these essays reveals that Johnson unintentionally succeeds far better in her second objective than in her first for the book is indeed complexly influenced by the work of de Man, a witness to both the 'blindness and insight' of his writings. As for her 'real world' agenda, 'nothing succeeds like failure' (to parody one of her titles) for, while Johnson shies away from the stronger political stances to which writers like Adrienne Rich and Zora Neale Hurston implicitly urge her, she does identify rather precisely some of the stakes of the language game and of black and white, male and female in the 'real world.' Perhaps the most significant contribution to her project is the analysis of the problem of address in "Thresholds of Difference" where she correctly notes the linguistic and political nature of interpersonal and inter-racial interlocution. Another analysis of the politics of interpersonal asymmetry is begun in "Teaching Ignorance: *L'École des femmes*," yet both essays have neutralized, anti-climactic conclusions and neither essay's insights influence such articles as "Is Writerliness Conservative?" or "Deconstruction, Feminism, and Pedagogy."

What is often lacking in these and a great number of deconstructionist readings of 'real world' texts is the recognition that perceptions of undecidability and depersonalization in language do not release the writer or reader from responsibility. For example, in the last two articles mentioned above, Johnson seems not to know that what she terms "the depersonalization of deconstruction" and "the repersonalization of feminism" are not parallel reverse activities. "The depersonalization of deconstruction" avoids personal responsibility while "the repersonalization of feminism" is an actual or potential acceptance and declaration of responsibility. The tendency in feminism to generalization can be seen as an invitation to share personal responsibility while deconstruction's depersonalizations can often be accused of avoiding or denying it.

In a social situation of unequal power, the 'powerless' voice (e.g. female, black, student) avoiding or denying linguistic certainty or responsibility is not equivalent to the 'powerful' voice (e.g. male, white, teacher) engaged in the same activity. The asymmetry of effect (and affect) would perhaps be better perceived if the object of critical inquiry included contextual encodings of texts rather than almost exclusively their decodings (readings). Johnson's book is sprinkled with illustrative deconstructionist *faits divers* not the least interesting of which concern Paul de Man. Statements like "testimonials repeatedly assert that it was precisely his way of denying personal authority that engendered the unique power of his personal

authority" cry out for analysis in a book which purports to "attempt to recontextualize a certain way of reading."

In her introduction Johnson directly queries "Why am I reading *this* text? What kind of act was the writing of it? What question about it does it itself not raise? What am I participating in when I read it?" yet the book somehow skirts the question (pun intended) "*how* am I reading this text?" Indeed, "How am I *writing* this text?" is also the question, especially in the context of her article "Gender Theory and the Yale School," a very interesting piece (auto)biographically speaking. Johnson begins the article in the feminist first person, protesting her erasure as a woman from the deconstructionist enterprise. The latter part of the article, however, slides into the "depersonalized" third person as Johnson examines "Johnson's" complicity in the erasure of women from her own book, *The Critical Difference*. She concludes that "It is not enough to be a woman writing in order to resist the naturalness of female effacement in the subtly male pseudogenderlessness of language," all the while abandoning her "I" in favor of the "genderless" third person.

Indeed, the book continually underscores the paradoxical nature of a "Yale daughter" deconstructor and the inherent paradoxes of her enterprise. For example (and in conclusion), Johnson's summative statement that "The impossible but necessary task of the reader is to set herself up to be surprised" does surprise by means of the gender shift (in a book which does not consistently use a generic "she") yet thus also undermines its would-be paradox in that it ironically valorizes traditional "active" female passivity. When she learned of de Man's collaborationist writings, Johnson tells us in the preface, her "first impulse was a desire to rename [her] dogs (Nietzsche and Wagner)." Surely, the necessary and possible task of the critic is to take responsibility for having so named them in the first place. (VIRGINIA M. FICHERA, SUNY-OSWEGO)

*CLAYTON KOELB. *Inventions of Reading: Rhetoric and the Literary Imagination*. Ithaca-London: Cornell University Press 1988. Pp. xiv + 265. US\$29.95

Where do writers of imaginative fiction get their ideas? Clayton Koelb convincingly situates the "beginning" (in Edward Said's sense of the term) of many fictional works in the writer's own rhetorical reading of another text — often a familiar expression, a piece of everyday language — which is subject to divergent, even incompatible, interpretations. The dust jacket of *Inventions of Reading* misleadingly proclaims that Koelb "takes issue with those who regard inspiration or imitation as the chief forces behind literary invention"; in fact, he claims simply that the "rhetorical potential of language

itself is an *equally* fertile source of fictional (and occasionally nonfictional) concepts capable of being developed into complex narratives" (243. My emphasis). Indicative of Koelb's approach, such a claim reveals part of the beauty of the book, whose argument resists the reductive tendencies that an attempt at supercomprehensiveness would likely entail. Koelb's rhetorical analysis, as he himself insists, "cannot explain everything" (112). It does illuminate, however, in a most engaging manner, the fascinating process of "rhetorical construction" in writings by authors as diverse as Kafka, Schiller, Sarraute, Rabelais, Hawthorne, Büchner, Hans Christian Andersen, Kleist, Boccaccio, Hoffmann, Calvino, Goethe, Flannery O'Connor, and Nietzsche.

Acts of rhetorical construction are, in essence, acts of reading. What Koelb therefore calls "inventions of reading" (the texts by Kafka and others which he chooses to analyze) arise from the writer's sensitivity to the rhetoricity of a given piece of discourse; to the fact, for example, that an expression may be read both "literally" and "figuratively" or that an utterance is capable of being understood as performative and constative at the same time. In the inventive practice of rhetorical construction, such tropological or performative uncertainty is exploited to produce a new text, a work of imaginative fiction, which explores the narrative space opened up by the different possible interpretations of the received discourse. Thus, for example, an ordinary phrase such as "asked him the way" gives rise to a philosophically rich and quite intricate story — Kafka's intriguing miniature "Gibs auf" — which functions by staging a confrontation between conflicting readings of the familiar phrase.

In the very first chapter of his book, Koelb addresses the question of the relation between deconstruction and rhetorical construction, two closely interrelated reading practices. Differentiating between deconstructive "pointing out" and constructive "exploiting," Koelb argues that constructions of the verbal imagination go beyond the discovery of an interpretive crux, a moment of undecidability, to exploit the narrative potential of "already-deconstructed" language. "The aporia produced by the availability of two (or more) incompatible readings is the rhetorical moment out of which the fiction is generated, not the moment of insight toward which it moves" (9-10). In his concluding chapter, Koelb raises the issue again, commenting specifically on the difference between his own project and that of Paul de Man. Whereas de Man presents rhetoricity "first and foremost as something to which we are condemned," Koelb focuses on the positive ramifications of rhetoric, on "the privilege of being able to participate in the prolific fertility of unlimited semiosis" (249).

Many factors contribute to the effectiveness of this book. Koelb writes lucidly and engagingly, not only of the inventive process he is describing, but also of his own critical motivations and position. Clever only in the best

sense, his analysis resists the trickiness, the short-circuiting, and the reductive closure characteristic of certain other rhetorical studies I have read. Koelb's theoretical sophistication does not prevent him from telling us, very clearly, what he is doing and why he is doing it. The construction of a theory proceeds here by way of a set of readings, and these readings are generally sound, not at all forced, and genuinely convincing. Far from functioning as discrete examples, the essays on individual works depend on one another as well as on the framework of the book itself for the full development of their critical potential. For example, Koelb's reading of Kleist's *Penthesilea* now emerges as possibly the best interpretation of the play I have encountered, whereas the identical paper did not have the same impact (on me) when it was presented at the 1987 MLA convention, where it lacked precisely the kind of critical context that Koelb's book, as a whole, provides. Occasionally problematical, his interpretations are nevertheless consistently stimulating, and one cannot fail to recognize how productive this mode of reading is. Also impressive is the sheer variety of texts shown to be works of rhetorical construction, even though the study is 'restricted' to readings of texts written in languages that Koelb knows: German, French, English, and Danish. A truly comparative study, *Inventions of Reading* provides an excellent example of "what comparatists actually do," the subject of another book by Clayton Koelb, co-edited with Susan Noakes, *The Comparative Perspective on Literature: Approaches to Theory and Practice* (Cornell UP, 1988).

The book does suffer, however, from a failure to acknowledge other interpretations of the various works being treated. Koelb claims not to have enough space to be able to pay attention to the scholarship on individual authors *and* keep a "reasonable focus" on his topic (xi), but surely critical studies whose concerns and even conclusions overlap with his own warrant some mention. As for the statement that his readings are in any case intended not "as contributions to the scholarship on individual authors," but "only as part of a larger discussion of rhetorical construction" (xi), can the one project not inform the other? Indeed, the critical literature on many — if not all — of these authors could well stand an infusion of the kind of insight that Koelb's approach offers, just as his own rhetorical analysis would benefit from a serious engagement with existing readings. Silence here could imply either tacit endorsement of this criticism or the feeling that such scholarship has been eclipsed. Since Koelb obviously intends neither of these things, it might be helpful if he were to consider the relation of his work to that of other readers, some of whom have reached similar (or, for that matter, very different) conclusions.

Throughout the study, Koelb observes the close link that exists between our reading and our behaviour, and in the last two chapters he examines

various implications of the fact that matters of rhetoric "are intimately bound up with morals, even with matters of life and death" (202). Speech-acts, after all, "are genuine actions in the world" (245); saying is doing, figures and facts can be metamorphosed one into the other. This discussion of the relation of rhetoric to ethical and social concerns makes for the most challenging reading in the entire book. Refusing simply to pay lip service (or, as Koelb himself might argue, doing so in the best sense) to the idea that the study of rhetorical construction is inherently, as we used to say, a political act, Koelb both explicitly and implicitly poses significant questions regarding our activities as readers, questions that probe our responsibilities, failures, evasions, and breakthroughs as construers of language. Following, in a sense, the Nietzschean strategy of "making the familiar problematic" (186), this undefensive and thought-provoking study serves an important critical function. In focusing on the practice of "construction" ("construction" being a concept that unites reading and writing" 12), Koelb's book sheds new light on possibilities for the exploitation of rhetorical discourse, prompting us in turn to reflect upon such activity and all its attendant complexities. (JEAN WILSON, MCMASTER UNIVERSITY)

*SANFORD BUDICK and WOLFGANG ISER, eds. *Languages of the Unsayable: The Play of Negativity in Literature and Literary Theory*. New York: Columbia University Press 1989. Pp. 394. US\$39.50

Wittgenstein concludes the *Tractatus* with "Whereof one cannot speak, thereof one must be silent." But, as the editors of this collection of papers note, poetic, philosophical and historiographic discourse of the last two decades is very marked by the contemplations of the unsayable, in one guise or another — negativity, the ineffable, otherness, trace, supplement, God — and implications for the apparently sayable. Furthermore, as the collection demonstrates, and as it is expressed in the problematics of being, essence, identity, knowledge, meaning and truth, in religious and in secular discourse, this contemplation has not only a very ancient history but a notable resistance to finalities. Silence speaks, the unsayable has many languages and, whether it is perceived as subversive other, transcendent possibility, or enabling condition, its 'place' is negotiable, its status uncertain and its effect always incomplete.

Languages of the Unsayable: The Play of Negativity in Literature and Literary Theory presents fifteen papers arising from ten months of communication at the Institute for Advanced Studies of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem, in 1985-86. Demonstrating the interdisciplinarity of critical theory and practice, as well as providing a variety of models of analysis, they range in focus from classical Greek texts and medieval allegory

to twentieth-century fiction, from linguistics, negative theology and hermeneutics to traditional apostrophes and to American film. They offer considerable difference not only in focus and strategy, but also in perceptions of negativity and its effects in texts, reception and culture. It is appropriate to the general theme of the address that they invite comparison while resisting identification.

The influence upon literary theory and critical practice of Jacques Derrida's writings is well-documented. As Frank Kermode suggests in this volume, the publication of Derrida's three books in 1967 set in process developments that marked an epochal change; the perspectives and strategies developed in Derridean deconstruction have constituted such a major field of debate during the last two decades that few areas of attention to language, meaning and the processes of cultural studies remain untouched by the exchange. But, as observers such as Rodolphe Gasché (*The Train of the Mirror*) emphasize, Derrida's writings need to be situated within philosophical traditions largely ignored by many participants in the debate. Derrida addresses the question of possible relationships between "trace" and "negative theology" and discusses Being, essence, and negativity within the context of Platonic and Christian/Neoplatonic thought, and the modernity of Heidegger. Situated first, Derrida's "How to Avoid Speaking: Denials" presents contemplations and procedures that remain central in the collection. His provisional hypothesis is the view that negative theology "consists of considering that every predicative language is inadequate to the essence, in truth to the hyperessentiality (the being beyond Being) of God; consequently, only negative ('apophatic') attribution can claim to approach God" (4). Derrida then considers conceptual difficulties, standard objections to negative theology and implications for truth claims and the use of language, while asserting that, for his own part, he does not write "negative theology." He does concede, however, that in thinking of *différance* and the writing of writing (his project), onto-theological reappropriation remains as a possibility, as a question about presence that always invites reconsiderations. Defending deconstruction against allegations of secrecy, mystery and pseudo-religious leanings, as if "a bastardized resurgence of negative theology" (19), he reiterates the contradictory double-plays of a threshold position and asserts that, in lack of whole truth and with awareness of uncertainty, there is no avoidance of speaking:

Thus, at the moment when the question 'How to avoid speaking?' arises, it is already too late. There was no longer any question of not speaking. Language has started without us, in us and before us. This is what theology calls God, and it is necessary, it will have been necessary, to speak. This 'it is necessary' (*il faut*) is both the trace of undeniable necessity — which is another way of saying that one cannot avoid denying it, one can only deny it — and of a past injunction. (29)

Emphasizing the quest for meaning and knowledge which are always incomplete, not present or absent, Derrida finds in Plato's *Timaeus* a spatial figure for the unfigurable, the "khora" which is neither sensible nor intelligible, neither active nor passive, and so on, but about which one may speak as if it participated in the *both* beyond neither/nor. Examining apophatic movements in Christian and Neoplatonic theology, and Heidegger's paradoxical discourse on theology with and without God, Derrida presents again the rigorous reading that characterizes his writing while returning insistently to the problematics of interplay and uncertainty, being and not-being, God and not God in a discourse addressed to processes of "negativity" as an enabling condition of speaking, and of writing.

As Frank Kermode points out in "Endings, Continued," a paper that begins in tribute to Derrida's writings, there are many connections to be made between "How to Avoid Speaking: Denials" and such earlier texts as *Of Grammatology*, *Speech and Phenomena* and *Writing and Difference*. It is largely with respect to this work that Kermode looks back to his *The Sense of an Ending* (1967), to its assumptions and strategies, to criticisms made by Hillis Miller and to others that would be made from a Derridean perspective, and to changes that would up-date the study. The paper is lucid, offering an interesting commentary on Derrida's Jerusalem lecture, reconsideration of the concept of limit and well-informed reflections on textuality and meaning. It 'ends' in compromise:

The presence of a stable 'crafted text' protected by constructive readings is hard to deny and is allowed even by Derrida; and in any case it may be time to stop apologizing for 'humanism,' even though it connotes a desire for a realm, and a proneness to the kind of error without which a certain species of human being could not live — one of those illusions which, like the 'metaphysics of presence' are so deeply ingrained that they can be thought of as among those Nietzschean lies that turn into truth for the benefit of a hapless non-superhuman humanity. This is a view to which I still incline. It entails an acceptance of realm, place, and limit in books as not necessarily repressive — in many fictions, which we after all described as fictions in *The Sense of Ending*. (86)

Acknowledging changes he would make if rewriting *The Sense of an Ending*, Kermode alleges that he still thinks of interpretation "as subject to constraint," a position elaborated through the distinction between "protective" and "deconstructive" readings — a distinction at best problematic, despite Kermode's definition of the one as dependent on a discourse of hyperessentiality and the other on the discourse of *différance*. The lecture is courteous and astutely defensive. It reveals not only Kermode's "conservative" preferences (as it should) but also limitations of this perspective on philosophy, linguistics and writing: "So much by way of

speaking up for my old book, written before anybody knew there were radically other ways of writing about writing, in the hope that it is still a place, or in place" (93). Even so, the compromise presents a humanistic and pragmatic response to the philosophical knot: "so there are no ends, no unconstructible concords, no such thing as being in the midst. We could allow this to be the case, yet live within our necessary limitations and persist in our necessary illusions, our ways of making sense of the ways in which sense is made of the world" (93).

Two papers address Heidegger's writings. In "Heidegger Transcendent Nothing," Gabriel Motzkin argues that Heidegger's concept of Nothingness needs to be considered in terms of his concept of transcendence, an argument developed with reference to Derrida and to Kant. Gerald L. Bruns, in "Disappeared: Heidegger and the Emancipation of Language," concentrates on the later writings where the idea of language as a "web of relations" and language use as playful, many-sided and uncertain are developed. Examined Heidegger's concentration of rift ("der Riß"), and his sense in texts of "disclosure and refusal, unconcealment and dissembling" (120). Bruns discusses the negativity of slippage in terms of multiplicity and play within language, a perspective developed with appropriate reference to Gadamer's *Truth and Method* and in ways that invite attention to Derrida's concentrations on trace and *différance*. Heidegger and the differences in interpretation of his writings by Adorno and Derrida are part of Hendrik Birus' focus in "Adorno's 'Negative Aesthetics?'," a paper which questions the view that Adorno's *Aesthetic Theory* presents a German version of negative aesthetics, suggesting rather that Adorno, in this last study, remains "bogged down in the oppositions of traditional metaphysics and the repeated invocation of 'negativity,' in spite of his attempt at their critical dissolution" (151). Considering a range of Adorno's works and emphasizing the valuable insights together with the problematic conceptual shifts in *Aesthetic Theory*, Birus presents a persuasive argument that is notable for its close comparative processes.

A number of papers focus on forms of "negativity" in literary texts, presenting close readings that demonstrate quite different approaches to this subject, not all of which can be situated comfortably under the title of the "unsayable." Shira Wolosky ("Samuel Beckett's Figural Evasions") considers the reductive strategies and patterns of negation in Beckett's late prose texts, arguing that they lead not to silence but to imaginative utterance in continuing reflections on selfhood, language and uncertainty: "this movement toward the suppression of figures and silencing of language ultimately takes place in Beckett as a double impossibility: the impossibility of accomplishing it, and the emptiness of attempting to do so" (181). Beckett's "denials," like Derrida's, produce affirmative texts in contemplation of negativity as

incertitude. Reading Baudelaire, Jonathan Culler provides a similar emphasis upon recuperation through processes of negation. Taking Baudelaire as the figure often regarded as exemplary of modernist negative aesthetics, Culler examines negative categories in the poems together with their reception by various critics, but particularly Hugo Friedrich who maintains that Baudelaire transforms negativity into fascination. The general perception may be common, but Culler's representation of it is focused sharply on examples discussed within a strong comparative framework of aesthetics and criticism. In "Patterns of Negativity in Paul Celan's 'The Trumpet Place,'" Stéphane Moses makes the short poem into a vast metonymic reference and enactment of the biblical text of *Revelation* at Sinai, and, therefore, an example not only of negativity as a form of secularization but also of poetic revelation made possible by the same process. Negativity invites redemption. Geoffrey Hartman provides a similarly expansive reading in his concentration on Blake's early sonnet "To the Evening Star." Exploring its figures and resonances, he situates the poem with respect not only to Blake's visionary writings but also to questions of genre, tradition and influence to suggest that "speak silence" is a propitiatory and emblematic gesture against the void, a movement central to Blake's work: "the silence or darkness that has bred Urizen, or mystery-religion, is contradicted by a virtue implicit in poetic naming" (231). Shlomith Rimmon-Kenan looks at figures of loss in *The Sound and the Fury*; Jon Whitman analyses problems of allegory in the *Romance of the Rose*; Neil Hertz, with reference to Blanchot on aspects of the neutral, notes the proliferation of "n"-words — nullify, neutralize, numb — in *Daniel Deronda*; Sanford Budick points to tropes of negation in a series of Greek, Latin and English apostrophes, a reading that makes connections against the rhetoric of fall, failure and division. These contributions share a common focus on language and the play of figurality (against ideas of complete totality and meaning) but their particularities vary considerably. Negativity is located in rhetoric, theme and form, as other, as that which refuses assurance, as trace, as the item that confuses communication and prevents complete understanding. But if it associates with fall or loss or mystery, it is also perceived affirmatively as an enabling condition of the continuing processes of expression against ending.

The last two pieces, fourteen and fifteen in the collection, are Wolfgang Iser's "The Play of the Text" and Stanley Cavell's "Naughty Orators: Negation of Voice in *Gaslight*." It is some time since Iser's *The Act of Reading: A Theory of Aesthetic Response* (1978) and Stanley Fish's characterization of Iser as a phenomenon who is influential without being controversial, one who did not appear on anyone's 'list,' neither amongst those said to be subverting standards, values and common sense, nor with those fighting the good fight against deconstructive nihilism ("Why No One's

Afraid of Wolfgang Iser, "Diacritics (Spring 1981). Compromise marks "The Play of the Text" too, a paper that is interesting and quotable but conceptually woolly and politically conservative. The play is finally "only play" and involved with "make-believe" (338). It is Iser's contention that readers produce something that did not previously exist which he labels the "supplement" (meaning produced in reading). But there are problems in the argument because he writes about the "world" in the text undergoing change while also claiming its independence from supplements; and he does not address the significance or authority of this supplement, seeming to value the activity of play while devaluing its product because it has no ontological or culturally universal status. Iser's "supplement" is less powerful than Derrida's prior notion of the play of supplementarity. His description of the play of the text as transformation of "positions" reduces the idea of play presented, for example, in Derrida's sense of decentering, *différance* and freeplay. Iser adopts Roger Caillois' categories of textual games/play (from *Man, Play and Games* 1961); his framework would benefit from consideration of subsequent studies of play, games, critical theory and literary texts by Bernard Suits (*The Grasshopper: Games, Life and Utopia* 1978); James Hans (*The Play of the World* 1981); Mihai Spatiu (*Literature, Mimesis and Play: Essays in Literary Theory* 1982); Robert Rawdon Wilson (*In Palamedes' Shadow: Exploration in Play, Game and Narrative Theory* 1990); and of course, Derrida. As for negativity, this is associated with the play of the supplement, its subversion of the text and of itself in the process:

This operation is driven by negativity, which is basically an enabling structure. Negativity is therefore far from negative in its effects, for it lures absence into presence, but by continually subverting that otherwise not know anything. Through these constant shifts, the play of the text uses negativity in a manner that epitomizes the interrelation between absence and presence. (336)

The model is a repeat from *The Act of Reading*, with negativity defined as enabling structure. While expressing the activity and exuberance of "play" as reading, Iser seems yet to hearken for legitimization of that play.

Declaring his interest in philosophy and film, Stanley Cavell defines two genres in American classic films of the 1930s and 1940s, "comedy of remarriage" and "melodrama of the unknown woman," the second a negation of the first. *Gaslight* fits the second. Drawing upon the American philosophy of self-reliance expressed by Emerson and Thoreau, and with reference to Foucault and Derrida on the cogito, he looks to film language as an expression of self in culture for what it may reveal about questions of identity and social practices. Invoking Freud's Dora case, he analyses the Cukor film in terms of gender politics, questions of ideology and issues of deprivation, denial and madness. The analysis presents a case for the study

of American film based upon its special place in the culture. Cavell suggests that in *Gaslight* "self-reliance" competes with conformity and repression. As the husband attempts to decreate the woman, she is also paradoxically freed by irony and madness: "In *Gaslight*, we are given the perfect contradiction of the education and creation sought in remarriage comedy: in this melodrama the woman is meant to be decreated, tortured out of a mind altogether" (347-48). Some irony, of course, must also characterize the reading of film as cultural expression, as Cavell demonstrates.

It is not difficult to recommend *Languages of the Unsayable*, for its variety and for the challenges and frustrations as well as for the insights it presents. Within an avowedly shared interest in negativity, the collection probably offers a little of something for most readers likely to be attracted by the forbidding fascination of its title, and project. Contemporary critical theory is a lively arena and part of the reason for this situation is the interdisciplinary character of exchanges in the field. In this instance, philosophy and the intersections of philosophy, language theory and literature constitute the play. (BRIAN EDWARDS, DEAKIN UNIVERSITY)

*MAE J. SMETHURST. *The Artistry of Aeschylus and Zeami: A Comparative Study of Greek Tragedy and No*. Princeton: Princeton University Press 1989. Pp. 507. US\$47.50

For many years, the similarities between No drama and Greek tragedy have been noted. Both began as forms of theater connected with religious ritual. Both are highly stylized forms of poetic drama making use of masks, dance and a chorus. Both maintain an elevated content and tone throughout a single play, yet were presented in a day's program that combined serious and comic plays. Despite this apparently fruitful ground for comparison, up to this point, as Dr. Smethurst notes in her introduction, "no book devoted exclusively to a comparison of No and Greek tragedy has ever been published" (4). Therefore, one can only welcome someone finally taking on the task.

Dr. Smethurst begins by stressing the differences rather than the similarities between the two theatrical forms. Anyone choosing at random and reading the texts of a Japanese No play and an ancient Greek tragedy cannot help being struck by the differences between them: the former will most likely be a play short in length, lyric in tone, and lacking in dramatic conflict; the latter will probably be long and involve dramatic action of a confrontation between characters (3). She further notes that the similarities that have attracted notice are largely related to performance. Since the information about Greek tragedy performance style is necessarily fragmentary and second hand, comparison in that arena is difficult. Nonetheless

her own point of departure is that there must be some relationship between text performance style. She approaches her comparison by narrowing the field of inquiry to two playwrights Zeami (1363-1443) and Aeschylus. On the Japanese side, the choice of Zeami is the only natural one for he crystallized the form of No and left treatises behind that give an enormous amount of information about the relationship of text to performance. Aeschylus is elected because he is distinguished among the Greek tragedians for being more lyrical, appealing less to the intellect and having a "spiritual force" pervade his work (20-21). In short, he is the Greek playwright that has more in common with Zeami than the others. Smethurst asserts that a comparison of the works of these two authors reveals similarities "which when analyzed carefully in the light of each other can provide a fresh perspective on both" (4).

The phrase, "in the light of" appears often through the work and while in the instance quoted above it is "in the light of each other," more often, Greek tragedy is being examined in the "light" of No. What is this "light"? Smethurst bases her perception on both theoretical and practical treatises by Zeami who was a performer as well as a playwright, and on a continuous tradition of performance. While it is acknowledged that the present style of No performance is not exactly the same as in Zeami's time, 500 years having slowed down the pace if nothing else, nonetheless it is an unbroken tradition. There is not an insignificant number of cases where some part of an actual performance of a play today will match with what is described in Zeami's treatises. One of the things that makes Smethurst's work of comparison a tour de force in its field is that the author has expanded the scope of her research to include study of contemporary performance style through observation of plays and discussions with actors and musicians. This has given her considerable insight into how music and chanting styles complement the text. She uses this knowledge to project ideas of how texts of Greek tragedy might have been written to take advantage of possibilities in performance.

The core of the book is textual analysis. She concentrates on essentially two plays, *Sanemori*, by Zeami and, *The Persians* by Aeschylus. The book is divided into four chapters framed with an "Introduction" and a "Coda": Chapter One: "Structure in No"; Chapter Two: "Structure in Aeschylean Tragedy"; Chapter Three: "The Style of No"; and Chapter Four: "The Style of Aeschylean Tragedy." While such a layout of chapters might lead one to think that Smethurst deals with the Greek theater and No quite separately, that is not the case. Comparative reference is made throughout the work: there are liberal quotes of the No in the chapters on Greek tragedy and vice versa. Appendixes provide extra information about No and the original Greek and Japanese (in romanization) for all passages cited. There are

glossaries for both Japanese and Greek terms and an index locum is provided by all citations from the Greek. The bibliography is a rich mine for anyone who might like to follow up her line of inquiry. In other words, the publication is lavish in its apparatus.

This work is an impressive feat of scholarship. If there has not been a full length comparison of Greek tragedy and No before, we need not seek far for the reason. It is extremely difficult to find someone with the requisite knowledge to be able to do one, to wit a thorough command of both classical Greek and Japanese. Moreover, Dr. Smethurst has augmented this with a knowledge of No performance, a rare combination of skills indeed. It also makes it a difficult work to review because most reviewers, (the present reviewer being no exception) will normally have command of only one half of the scope of the book. With that pronounced as a caveat, I can say that her handling of the subject matter is thorough and painstaking as well as original in approach. Her translations of the No excerpts are not only accurate but graceful. They read like poetry.

The prose does not exhibit the same gracefulness. This is not an easy book to read. In places the exposition is confusing and the sentences too long to allow smooth comprehension. For my taste, she overuses footnotes; particularly those that are on the borderline of material that might have been included in the body of the text or simply cut, for example, footnotes 42 and 43 on pp. 162 and 163. She is at her best in the passages of close reading of texts, which after all is the solid substance of the work. Even not knowing Greek, I found her analyses of the subtleties in the Greek texts very comprehensible. It is therefore safe to assume that the Japanese text analyses would read with the same clarity to someone not knowing Japanese.

A dominant theme in her analysis of style is the role of association in both writers' poetic use of language. As she says, "both occasionally connect one 'scene' to another, one passage to another, one line to another, or one word to another verbally, that is, with attention to words *qua* words, rather than to the explicit thought that is a combination of the words syntactically grouped together expresses. The resulting progression often involves words used at least as much for their various associations of meaning and their etymological or phonic potential within the environment of other words as for their syntactic and logical relationship to these words (150). Words are not capsules of fixed meaning but rather fields of possible meaning connecting licentiously with one another outside the strictures of logic and the poet is one who makes skillful use of this riot in the field of signification. This conception of language has been implicit in Japanese poetics from earliest times. Dr. Smethurst demonstrates how this conception can account for some of the richness and beauty in Aeschylus's poetry that has eluded other modes of explanation.

To conclude, this is a superb piece of scholarship that breaks new ground. It will be a substantial morsel for specialists to chew on for many years to come. (SONJA ARNTZEN, UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA)

*JOAQUIN MARTINEZ PIZARRO. *A Rhetoric of the Scene: Dramatic Narrative in the Early Middle Ages*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press 1989. Pp. viii + 279. Cloth Cdn\$40.00

Le sujet traité dans ce livre l'a rarement été par les médiévistes: tout au plus Auerbach (dont J.M.P. se réclame) en a-t-il signalé l'intérêt. Côté latinistes, Norden y touchait, voilà un siècle, à quelques reprises. Il s'agit de l'art narratif original qui se forme et perdure, du cinquième au dixième siècles, dans les anciens terroirs de l'Empire latin ainsi qu'à Byzance. Le corpus sur lequel se fonde l'étude embrasse une quinzaine d'auteurs grecs et deux douzaines d'auteurs latins, la part la plus belle étant faite à Procope, puis Grégoire de Tours, Grégoire le Grand, Agnellus de Ravenne, Paul Diacre, Notker le Bègue, Wāukind.... Large échantillonnage! Vingt pages de bibliographie, dix d'index sur deux colonnes, permettent de (re)situer les chapitres successifs où l'auteur, plutôt que de tenir un discours continu, de vocation théorique, reste à ras de texte et procède par "lectures," attentives et comparées.

Ce beau volume est illustré (170-72) de trois reproductions de plaques d'ivoire, des cinquième, sixième et dixième siècles, témoignant d'une étonnante parenté entre la technique narrative littéraire et celle des sculpteurs. La perspective même dans laquelle l'auteur saisit sa matière contribue à orienter dans ce sens l'attention de son lecteur. Plutôt en effet que de dissertar sur la narratologie ou d'examiner comme tels de grands ensemble, il se concentre sur l'unité de récit qu'il désigne à dessein d'un terme emprunté à la dramaturgie: la "scène." Une véritable scénographie narrative s'applique aux textes, étroitement fondée sur les procédés de "monstration," la visibilité des traits, combinés en ensembles doués de signification globale, dont on peut présumer du reste souvent le caractère conventionnel. Le rapport en effet qu'elle implique du regard avec l'objet, sa vivacité, sa subtilité de perception, s'accompagnent d'un formalisme caractéristique de cette haute époque.

Cette technique scénique apparaît cohérente, assurée en tradition et solidement basée sur un modèle mis au point dans la basse Antiquité. L'influence de pratiques vocales a pu influencer sur sa formation et son maintien, non moins que la narration évangélique. Les pages 20-32, opposant d'emblée un passage de Tite-Live à une page de Grégoire de Tours, jettent un jour cru sur le chemin parcouru. Une véritable révolution narrative a transmué, aux quatrième-cinquième siècles, quelque chose de

l'héritage antique: symétriquement, aux dixième-onzième siècles, une autre révolution marquera la haute époque romane: révolution dont sortira, à plus ou moins long terme, notre littérature. Sur ce dernier point, l'auteur est bref: une 'conclusion' (212-21) lui suffit, mais n'épuise pas le sujet. On souhaiterait qu'à partir de là d'autres études le reconsidèrent. (PAUL ZUMTHOR, UNIVERSITÉ DE MONTRÉAL)

*MICHEL STANESCO. *Jeux d'errance du chevalier médiéval: aspects ludiques de la fonction guerrière dans la littérature du Moyen Age flamboyant*. Leiden-New York: E.J Brill 1988. Pp. 248. US\$50.00

On peut déplorer que ce petit livre, alerte, provoquant et riche d'idées, ait apparemment attendu de longues années la publication, — si j'en juge à la bibliographie (près de 300 titres) qui s'arrête en 1979-80 (quatre titres de 1981 ont été, semble-t-il, ajoutés après coup). De tels retards déflorant toujours plus ou moins un ouvrage. En 1986 a paru chez Droz l'important livre de Jean Flori, éminent spécialiste de ces problèmes, *L'Essor de la chevalerie*: quoique Flori se limite aux onzième-douzième siècles, il me semble impossible de ne pas en tenir largement compte, même lorsque, comme Stanesco, on considère la chevalerie des quatorzième et quinzième siècles.

À cette époque tardive, la pensée et la pratique chevaleresques ont quelque chose de mythique, sinon mythifiant, et fortement rituel. Stanesco préfère employer la qualification de *ludique*. Mais il récupère, dans la notion qu'il se forme du "jeu," de nombreux traits par ailleurs définitoires du mythe et du rite. Son objet est en effet moins la chevalerie en tant que telle et comme ensemble institutionnel, que la façon dont elle est vécue par les chevaliers. C'est un terrain où il rencontre le grand ancêtre J. Huizinga, dont *L'Automne du Moyen Age* semblait, il y a un demi-siècle, avoir épuisé le sujet. Stanesco adopte un point de vue différent, qui tient en quelque mesure à l'esthétique de la réception allemande. Il rejette d'emblée l'idée que le jeu chevaleresque du quinzième siècle soit un anachronisme; il en recherche au contraire, dans le comportement des usagers, les traits réellement fonctionnels. Les deux chapitres sur les tournois (112-36), complétés par de nombreuses remarques dispersées (d'une certaine manière, le tournoi peut être vu comme le sujet du livre), explicitent cette intention et en polarisent l'argumentation. Stanesco s'attache à retrouver sous les formes ludiques, festives, d'une chevalerie négatrice, au quinzième siècle, de l'histoire, "la dignité originale de certains aspects d'un mode d'être" (231), le jeu comme acte existentiel. Par et dans le jeu s'épanouit la *monstration*, le déploiement ostentatoire de l'être, caractéristique de la civilisation aristocratique de cette fin du Moyen Age, mais dépourvue du tragique qu'y

décelait Huizinga. Stanesco envisage plutôt la chevalerie finissante dans le contexte du gothique flamboyant au moment où il se transmue en baroque, dans l'exubérance de ses formes et de son appel à la vue.

Au cours de ses dix-sept brefs chapitres, le livre ne cesse de faire l'aller et retour de la littérature (les "romans de chevalerie" dont se nourrit la fantaisie) à la vie, avec l'indispensable détour par l'image mythique qu'entretiennent les rituels du jeu. Par l'effet de celui-ci, une action en retour finit par se produire, et la vie engendre, au second degré, une oeuvre littéraire, tel *Le petit Jehan de Saintré* (on ajouterait *l'Arioste* et *Don Quichote*), textes où le jeu se prend lui-même pour objet, et se désigne par figure d'ironie. (PAUL ZUMTHOR, UNIVERSITÉ DE MONTRÉAL)

*JAMES M. VEST. *The French Face of Ophelia from Belleforest to Baudelaire*. Lanham-New York-London: University Press of America 1989. Pp. 223. US\$32.50

Dans une brève introduction, l'auteur délimite sans ambiguïté l'axe sur lequel s'ordonne l'étude que nous entreprenons de recenser: "We shall here seek to discover how the Gallic interpretation of Ophelia evolved as she crossed and re-crossed the Channel and repeatedly captivated the French imagination" (3). James M. Vest ne cherche donc pas à nous imposer une contribution de plus sur la fortune de Shakespeare en France; à l'aube du troisième millénaire, un tel ouvrage risquerait de sentir le réchauffé. Nous avons affaire ici à un travail solide, nourri et renouvelé dans sa démarche puisque le critique nous entraîne sur les traces d'un personnage généralement considéré comme secondaire à qui il redonne toute sa force archétypale en en suivant les métamorphoses de Belleforest à Baudelaire. C'est cette orientation et cette focalisation qui font l'originalité de l'enquête, la justifient, la mettent à l'abri de toute accusation de redondance intempestive.

Cette chronique du destin franco-anglais de la "Rose de mai" est logiquement, et poétiquement, divisée en deux grandes parties: 1 "Naming the Rose: Ophelia's Continental Heritage" (5-49); 2 "Tending the Unweeded Garden: The Ophelian Legacy in France" (59-178). La deuxième partie, plus volumineuse, constitue le corps de l'enquête, Vest envisageant successivement les Ophélie du Siècle des Lumières et de l'époque romantique jusqu'aux symbolistes; la première partie, plus compacte mais essentielle, édifie les bases érudites de l'analyse en consolidant ses fondements méthodologiques. L'intérêt de la première partie, en effet, tient surtout au minutieux pèlerinage aux sources (Chapitre I "Belleforest's Obliging Maid" 7-23) qu'entreprend Vest par-delà les *Histoires tragiques* de Belleforest, source généralement reconnue de l'*Hamlet* de Shakespeare, par-

delà même le récit de Saxo Grammaticus, pour dégager les liens de l'histoire du prince danois avec toute une tradition d'anciennes légendes islandaises et de textes de l'antiquité gréco-latine, allant jusqu'à relever la parenté d'Ophélie avec la soeur du Kullevero du *Kalevala*. La leçon à tirer de ce travail archéologique est celle d'une continuité sans fracture de l'imaginaire collectif du monde occidental, syncrétisée en quelque sorte à travers les avatars d'une figure mythique. C'est ainsi que l'analyse des livres III et IV de *l'Historia Danica* de Saxo (XIII^e siècle) fait ressortir le rôle crucial déjà accordé à la jeune fille: "The attention given to the temptress on Amlethus's shield points to the centrality of her role in the story" (14). François de Belleforest qui avait en main le texte latin de Saxo, publié à Paris en 1514, a développé et raffiné l'ébauche: "Her beguiling beauty is emphasized as is her motivation for aiding Amleth.... What was simple lust in Saxo becomes somewhat more subtle in Belleforest" (21). Cet inventaire des sources lointaines fait surgir des profondeurs un intertexte qui permet à Vest de nuancer avec érudition la synthèse qu'il fait au Chapitre II ("Shakespeare's Rose of May" 25-57) du caractère de l'héroïne shakespearienne, surtout dans ses relations complexes avec Hamlet, dans le rôle qu'on lui fait jouer et dans sa fonction poétique et emblématique. Ophélie est une figure qui "like the prince ... is an amalgam of contrarities" (49), complexité d'intention qui culmine dans l'interprétation de sa folie et de sa mort:

Ophelia's mad scenes are a natural outgrowth of tradition and invention. In them, she continues to display the three essential traits inherited from Belleforest's lusty maiden: apparent licentiousness, attachment to him she loves, and public discussion of private affairs. (41)

Chaque élément est analysé dans les transformations qu'il subit une fois dans le creuset de l'imagination du dramaturge élisabéthain et c'est là un aspect de l'ouvrage qui intéressera à coup sûr ceux des critiques qui tentent de percer le mystère de l'écriture shakespearienne. Au lecteur pressé ou profane, cette section d'une trentaine de pages fournira une somme vigoureuse des grands axes de la critique shakespearienne, prenant appui sur l'interprétation de l'héroïne et menée avec une érudition de bon aloi et une honnêteté scrupuleuse qui sera peut-être perçue par certains comme exaspérante: chaque page de développement est en effet nantie d'un appareil de notes et de renvois qui deviennent lassants et, par rebond, font apparaître chacune de ces pages comme un véritable 'patchwork' de sources secondaires et de références habilement cousues; la bibliographie, fouillée et fort à jour, constitue un bon outil de travail pour l'étudiant en littérature comparée s'intéressant aux relations littéraires franco-anglaises. Elle atteste l'extension et le sérieux apporté aux recherches, encore qu'elle renferme bon nombre de titres d'ouvrages, en particulier ayant trait à la recherche féministe — j'en

ai compté douze — qui, à l'exception de la belle étude d'Elaine Showalter, n'ont pas vraiment été mis à profit dans l'élaboration du texte critique et semblent avoir été ajoutés dans une ultime mise à jour a posteriori.

Pour ce qui est de la deuxième partie, il serait hors de propos de reprendre dans le détail tout le panorama chronologique qui va du début du XVIII^e siècle aux *Fleurs du mal*. Notons seulement quelques point forts de cet ample survol: d'abord, en suivant l'Ophélie néo-classique des Prévost, Riccoboni, Leblanc, Voltaire, LaPlace, Vest ne perd jamais de vue le fil conducteur de sa démarche; en rappelant à juste titre l'importance de Ducis, il montre comment "with an occasional nod toward Shakespeare's text as named by LaPlace, his *Hamlet* develops the situation given in Belleforest in the context of a neo-baroque conflict between love and honor" (94). C'est avec Ducis que la triste Ophélie qui sera chère au cœur de Rimbaud était pleinement "rapatriée" (96). Ensuite il fait bien ressortir au XIX^e siècle l'insistance croissante sur la folie et la mort qui deviennent un topos favori des poètes et des dramaturges. Pour qui s'intéresse à l'histoire de la traduction — et l'on sait la vitalité actuelle de la traductologie —, il y aura beaucoup à glaner dans les pages consacrées à Guizot (115-21), aux diverses traductions et adaptations de l'époque romantique (147-50), ainsi qu'aux oeuvres d'Alexandre Dumas (162-67). Les deux rubriques qui m'ont parues les plus neuves, les plus stimulantes, se rapportent d'une part, à l'évocation circonstanciée et à l'influence déterminante de certaines actrices, telle Harriet Smithson, la future madame Berlioz, dont l'impact et la vogue ont 'radicalisé' la vision française d'Ophélie. D'autre part, l'analyse des versions picturales du destin de la jeune fille, dues en particulier au grand Delacroix inspire à Vest des commentaires intéressants et pertinents (151-56). Il met ici en oeuvre une ligne de recherche interdisciplinaire qui mène à des observations éclairantes et plaira aux comparatistes oeuvrant sur les rapports entre la littérature et les arts visuels. Le livre est écrit dans un style agréable, fluide, précis et, à l'instar de la roseaie dans laquelle il nous convie et nous entraîne, le parcours est sans aridité. La présentation générale est claire et attrayante, l'index bienvenu. La graphie est soignée. Par souci de perfectionnisme, signalons les quelques rares coquilles (108 note 154), il faut lire "hemistich" et non "hemistitsch" et dans la bibliographie, "Arthur" et non "Artur" Rimbaud (210). L'érudition, sûre dans l'ensemble, n'est pas dénuée, cependant, de quelques approximations. J'en donnerai brièvement deux exemples: Vest fonde son argumentation relative à la damoiselle de Belleforest sur la présence ou l'omission, suivant les éditions, d'une virgule, qui selon lui change radicalement la lecture du rôle attribué à Ophélie. Nous ne mettrons en doute ni la finesse ni l'enthousiasme avec lesquels ce critique mène sa quête et tire ses conclusions; c'est faire peu de cas toutefois des pratiques de ponctuation du XVI^e siècle qui dépendaient autant de

l'arbitraire d'un imprimeur que de la sémantique et qu'il eût été prudent de rappeler. Le second cas est d'ordre lexical: Vest n'hésite pas à affirmer que l'Ophélie française du XVIII^e siècle partage avec son prince une intimité sexuelle puisqu'on parle d'elle comme de sa "maîtresse." Il y revient à plusieurs reprises depuis la page 62 où il sonde le fameux article de *L'Année littéraire* de 1717 sur la poésie anglaise jusqu'à la fin du chapitre où il affirme sans ambages: "What remains leaves little doubt that he and she are from beginning to end 'amants.'" Certes oui, mais à l'époque classique, il est bien connu que "amant," "amoureux" et "maîtresse" ne sont pas investis de la connotation sexuelle que nous leur donnons à l'époque moderne. *Le Dictionnaire de la langue française* (Robert) signale même que cette acception persiste jusqu'au XIX^e siècle. Comme il est dit dans *Le Paysan Parvenu* de Marivaux: "Je mot de maîtresse ... communément veut dire une femme qui a donné son coeur et qui veut le vôtre" (cité par Robert). Dans la querelle de la critique shakespearienne à propos de la chasteté d'Ophélie, il ne faut donc pas épiloguer plus que de raison sur les commentaires français du temps de Voltaire. Il est regrettable que M. Vest n'ait pas tenu compte avec plus de rigueur des résonances historiques de son glossaire. Ceci mis à part, disons nettement, au risque de nous répéter, que, plutôt que le détail des analyses qui doivent parfois être lues avec quelque circonspection, c'est la synthèse vigoureuse de toutes les sources consultées et des oeuvres dépouillées qui est la vertu majeure de ce travail, en fait une contribution respectable à l'histoire des littératures et des mentalités et une mine de ressources bibliographiques. Donc un volume qui s'avérera un ouvrage de référence commode et assez complet sur la question et c'est à ce titre que nous le recommandons. L'auteur annonce un deuxième volume consacré au visage français contemporain d'Ophélie. On attend avec impatience la suite de cet édifice critique, car depuis les travaux de Bachelard sur le "complexe d'Ophélie" jusqu'aux toutes récentes pages de René Girard sur le théâtre de Shakespeare (*Les Affaires du désir* 1990), sans compter la sortie, à l'heure même où se rédige ce compte rendu, de la version cinématographique de Zéfirelli, la provende risque d'être riche et bigarrée. (NICOLE MALLET, UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA)

*MICHAEL G. PAULSON. *The Queens' Encounter: The Mary Stuart Anachronism in Dramas by Diamante, Boursault, Schiller and Donizetti*. New York-Bern: Peter Lang 1987. Pp. viii + 237.

Professor Paulson's study combines two kinds of investigation. First, in some thirty pages, it offers a reasoned historical account of the life of Mary, Queen of Scots, her role in the demanding political world of her age, and the way different segments of that world viewed her execution. Some seventy

further pages are productively devoted to sifting through Mary's correspondence in general and that between her and Elizabeth Tudor to explain her motives and conduct in the relevant contexts over time. Second, the study moves through a series of literary interpretations of Mary's story and looks both at the likely background materials and the specific artistic aims and merits of each and at the cumulative establishment of a traditional subject-matter which ultimately takes on a life of its own. This independent life becomes unmistakable when generic logic impels dramatists to "improve on" history by inventing the queens's encounter. Although Paulson proceeds in an implicitly neopositivistic fashion, he contributes to "new history" by treating the textual evidence of letters, sermons, partisan propaganda, and official documents in terms of various operative discourses and of real historical pressures. But gradually, in the literary works, we pass from the earlier relevance of Mary in national and international politics, inseparably interwoven with religious conflicts, and consider her relevance to the successor era. At this point (again, without any pretentious ideological claims), Paulson links "new history" and modern "myth analysis" by demonstrating how the modified story carries new values in the post-Romantic world and spreads them through new popularizing media such as opera and film.

In short, the book fluctuates successfully between (in today's stock phrase) "demystification" of the Marian heritage and acknowledgment of it as a still fascinating strand in an intertextual web. Paulson proposes to overturn such empty habits as deeming one or the other queen to be "hypocritical," and instead to scrutinize the political forces, events, institutions, and capacities that were at play and impinged on the individuals who had to represent and mediate at the highest level. Mary's execution in 1587 for her probable plotting and the Armada crisis in 1588 might no longer seem significantly related to readers after Schiller, but these were heartbeats of the emerging British cultural identity to which a politically astute Elizabeth was closely attuned. As Paulson notes soberly: by sixteenth-century standards, Mary's actual failure was the failure to retain power. Paulson, who aims to upgrade critical appreciation of Juan Bautista Diamante, accepts as a given the cultural bias of his *La reina María Estuarda* (1660) which mines mainly such Catholic sources as Lope's epic poem *La corona trágica* (1627) in order to recreate Mary as a devout martyr. Paulson is more interested in the story elements which emerge when Diamante cuts out of whole cloth the encounters between Mary, the legitimate, too tolerant, thus fallen sovereign of both Scotland and England, and her illegitimate, jealous, powerful, and evil Protestant rival — the important generic shift that, in formalistic terms, prepares for the Schillerian moment. With a similar hope of critical upgrading, Paulson next examines the elaboration of romance elements and

greater plot complexity in Edme Boursault's *Marie Stuart* (1683) — for example, the contrast between Mary, embodiment of feminine charm (which the historical record reflects), and her wicked half-brother, the Earl of Murray, and her vile son, later James I of England. The significant innovation that anticipates Schiller is that Mary is aware of her faults, courageous as well as radiant, forgiving out of natural religious feeling, whereas Elizabeth is vain, vindictive, and treacherous, winning a hollow victory because friendless and guilt-ridden at the end (contrary to the historical record of her fame). Paulson stresses the need to situate each interpretation of Mary and Elizabeth in its immediate cultural climate, as well as in the total *œuvre* of the writer; for instance, Boursault's in France after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes.

That is a sound principle, and more promising than the self-admitted faint gesture of suspecting a 'possible' Schillerian awareness of Boursault. Paulson would better serve his own purpose if instead he dealt with the steady flow of interest in the natural high drama of the Renaissance and Baroque period in the Germanic territories, in leading his readers up to his most important playwright, Schiller. To name just a few salient examples by way of illustration: Paulson could contrast Joost van den Vondel's influential martyr drama *Maria Stuart of gemartelde Majesteit* (1646), which *deliberately avoids* bringing Elizabeth on stage, because the great Dutch tragedian, a Catholic convert, well understood how popular the English queen was for her aid to the Netherlands. Or he could compare August Adolf von Haugwitz' *Schuldige Unschuld oder Maria Stuarta* (1669) which presented both queens as fully competent opponents, divided the plot action evenly between them, and closed with a scene of Elizabeth receiving the news of Mary's death — that is, strikingly anticipated the structure of Schiller's drama. Haugwitz was deeply influenced by the great German tragedian and fellow Lutheran, Andreas Gryphius (himself an admirer of Vondel). Most notable is his appreciation of Gryphius' brilliant drama of political revolution, cultural struggle, and regal martyrdom, *Er mordete Majestät oder Carolus Stuartus König von Groß Briannien* (1650). Guiltless of her husband's murder or complicity in others' plans to harm Elizabeth, Haugwitz' Maria (already much like Schiller's, because like Gryphius' Carolus, except more active and vivacious), holds steadfast to her inner identity through a series of spiritual and psychological trials. The main title ("guiltless guilt") implies a richer awareness of the historical complexities. Himself a Protestant, Haugwitz understands the nuances in the thinking of Mary's enemies, but that does not dampen his admiration for a Catholic martyr who plays her fated role. There is no probable case for believing Schiller took his cue from Haugwitz, but less of a case for believing in Boursault's claim. The point is that important new designs in the Germanic swatches of Marian intertextuality

by the mid-seventeenth century are virtually predictive of a work like Schiller's by the end of the eighteenth in *his own cultural stream*.

Essentially, Paulson comes upon the Schillerian connection 'backwards' because of his enormous importance for literary art in France, Italy, and Iberia in the Romantic period. Even if links to Boursault are dubious, it makes perfectly good sense to look for possible Romance roots to explain this later affinity for Schiller's works, especially in light of the fact that a number of stories from Romance and Catholic Europe are 'recycled' through him (e.g., when he glamorizes the bungling Iberian playboy Don Carlos as a hero of freedom of conscience!), and that he was strongly attracted to the French classical genius Racine at the Romantic juncture in Germany around 1800. Paulson's admiring and meticulous analysis of Schiller's Marian play as a drama of moral and psychological transformation and a mirroring of human types and possibilities (Mary as against Elizabeth) lends weight to Goethe's view, when first asked for his opinion by Schiller, that it was Romantic in its tendency. Donizetti's opera is one of many that served as a channel to inundate the public with Romanticism for many decades after the subsidence of its first great literary energies. Since a rebirth of interest in Elizabethan and Golden Age playwrights was a central feature of the Romantic revolution in drama, Schiller is an appropriate terminus ad quem. Paulson's book is thus valuable for two sets of scholars whose interests can converge at this juncture, mainly on a thematological level: experts in the Baroque, and experts in Romanticism. (GERALD GILLESPIE, STANFORD UNIVERSITY)

* ALFONSO de TORO. *Texto-Mensaje-Recipiente: Análisis semiótico-estructural de textos narrativos, dramáticos y líricos de la literatura española e hispanoamericana de los siglos XVI, XVII y XX (con un excursus sobre La maison de rendez-vous de A. Robbe-Grillet)*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr 1988. Pp. 220 + xiv. DM68.00

L'ouvrage d'Alfonso de Toro est composé en trois parties équilibrées, où sont regroupés des articles publiés dans diverses revues et actes de congrès de 1979 à 1985, ainsi que deux "contributions originales" dont la publication avait elle aussi été prévue initialement sous forme d'articles. En dépit de ce fait, et du travail sur des textes renvoyant à des genres, des époques et des aires culturelles très éloignées, une impression d'unité se dégage de la lecture du volume: l'analyse, en effet, porte — du moins pour ce que est du domaine hispanique — sur des écrits reconnus par et travaillés dans l'institution universitaire, et est effectuée dans une perspective "sémiotico-structurale," dont les concepts, hérités des formalismes russe et tchèque, du structuralisme français, des théories de la réception allemandes, sont

introduits progressivement et mis au service d'une visée surtout typologique de contribution à l'historiographie littéraire.

La première partie du livre, consacrée aux textes narratifs, comporte trois études dont la première, "Arte como procedimiento: *El Lazarillo de Tormes*," part de l'hypothèse que "el autor ... trata de resolver problemas artístico-literarios y de creación y no solamente de producir una sátira contra la España des siglo XVI" (3). La parodie de la vaste tradition à laquelle il se livre a pour effet d'introduire un nouveau système littéraire, déplaçant un autre déjà automatisé. La nouveauté que suppose l'introduction du moi narratif est, de plus, un élément décisif dans le développement du genre romanesque. Au chapitre suivant, A. de Toro examine un autre grand moment de cette évolution et, à propos de trois romans contemporains, *Cien años de Soledad* (G. García-Márquez), *La Casa verde* (M. Vargas Llosa) et *La maison de rendez-vous* (A. Robbe-Grillet), il expose un modèle d'analyse qui ouvre la voie à une typologie des structures temporelles et permet d'apprécier les différences de techniques narratives et de conception artistique au sein de la "nueva novela" hispano-américaine (production du "Boom"), ainsi que par rapport au "nouveau roman" français. Nous trouvons, à la base de ce modèle, la distinction fondamentale, déjà opératoire dans l'analyse du *Lazarillo*, entre une pragmatique externe (auteur/lecteur, auteur implicite/lecteur implicite) et une pragmatique interne (narrateur/lecteur fictif). Cette distinction donne lieu à deux fonctions: "una de texto-interno, que se dirige al lector implícito" y otra de texto-interno que contribuye a la formación del mensaje con lo cual la estructura del tiempo es elevada a un *status de signo*" (21). Réelaborant ensuite les analyses bien connues de G. Genette des relations entre temps de l'histoire et temps du récit, A. de Toro se concentre sur l'"arrangement" [*sic*]), une des trois perspectives de travail avec la durée et la fréquence (qu'il ne considère pas), et étudie systématiquement les segmentations au niveau de l'histoire puis les relations entre "discurso I ... discurso profundo del texto que correspondería en la retórica a la *dispositio*" et "discurso II, el cual puede ser considerado como el texto de la historia y que correspondería en la retórica a la *elocutio* en el sentido de narrar" (22). Ce modèle d'analyse utilisé ensuite à propos de *Pedro Páramo* de Juan Rulfo (troisième chapitre) permet à l'auteur de démontrer l'importance du cadre narratif du roman — dialogue à caractère analeptique entre deux morts — qui "conduce a PP del 'realismo mimético' a un 'realismo mítico' que eleva la novela a un plano puramente artístico" (75), et combien les techniques et perspectives que l'on retrouve chez un Fuentes ou un Vargas Llosa font du roman mexicain une des manifestations les plus authentiques de la "nueva novela," avant la lettre.

La seconde partie du livre, composée elle aussi de trois études, est consacrée exclusivement au "drama de honor" des XVI^e et XVII^e siècles, mais

dans une perspective plus générale, nous dit l'auteur, de contribution à l'analyse sémiotique du théâtre. Dans "Sistema semiótico-estructural del drama de honor en Lope de Vega y Calderón de la Barca," la définition suivante du genre nous est soumise: "Como *drama de honor* se puede calificar todo texto dramático en el cual siendo el conflicto des honor la acción central, se comete una agresión que reclama satisfacción (restitución del honor) por medio de venganza, secreta, pública o juicio" (91). Il propose aussi un premier niveau de typologie basé sur la distinction entre "código épico-dramático del honor" et "código dramático del honor," la majorité des drames étudiés relevant du second code, puis un deuxième niveau à partir d'un modèle de base de logique de l'action. L'étude des formes dans lesquelles a lieu l'échange entre destinataire implicite et destinataire implicite, dans *El médico de su honra* et *El alcalde de Zalamea* de Calderón, et l'oeuvre du même nom et *El mejor alcalde, el Rey* de Lope de Vega, permet d'apprécier la dimension de critique du code de l'honneur dans ces pièces, et la rénovation de la conception traditionnelle. Dans le chapitre suivant, à partir de l'examen de quelques concepts fondamentaux élaborés par Aristote dans sa *Poétique* ("Hamartía, Anagnorisis, Peripeteia, Eleos, Phobos, Katharsis, etc.) et des conceptions neoaristotéliennes de la tragédie, de la comoedia, de la tragicommedia en Italie, et de la tragicommedia en Espagne, A. de Toro propose de considérer le "drama de honor" comme "tragicommedia" et énonce une série de critères, principaux et secondaires, valides au moins pour les XVII^e siècles européens, qui lui permettent d'établir son modèle tragi-comique. Ces considérations sont illustrées ensuite, dans le dernier chapitre de la seconde partie, où à propos des drames de Lope, maintenant qualifiés de "tragicomedias de honor," les cinq principaux et les huit critères secondaires autorisent l'établissement d'une typologie.

Dans la troisième partie de son ouvrage, A. de Toro, désireux de pallier à la déficience qu'il constate dans l'état actuel d'une approche "scientifique" des textes lyriques, et au retard de l'Hispanisme dans l'assimilation des théories sémiotico-structuralistes, consacre donc un long chapitre à l'élaboration d'un modèle d'analyse inspiré des travaux de Lotman, Greimas, Tizmann (pour la dimension sémantique) et surtout de *Zur Typologie der poetischen Sprechweisen bei Baudelaire* (München 1975) de K. Dirscherl, pour la dimension pragmatique. C'est ainsi que distinguant entre un "gesto proposicional" (qui structure l'énonciation) et un "gesto pragmático" (qui la situe), le dernier chapitre du livre examine les deux modalités du discours lyrique dans *El Rayo que no cesa*: le "discurso hablado" et le "discurso descriptivo." Il est dommage qu'ayant à sa disposition une quantité et une variété remarquable d'instruments, l'analyse débouche sur une lecture mécanique et peu éclairante du beau texte de M. Hernández d'où, décision

discutable, l'auteur exclut dès le départ l'Élégie à Ramon Sijé, alléguant l'incorporation tardive du poème au recueil. Au delà des réserves que peuvent susciter ce que d'aucuns qualifieraient de néopositivisme enthousiaste, ou une sensibilité peu notable à la dimension idéologique du discours, l'ouvrage du professeur de Toro, par sa cohérence, sa lisibilité, la variété de ses références, l'introduction qu'il facilite aux interrogations et aux concepts fondamentaux de la théorie de la littérature, n'en constitue pas moins un outil très précieux, d'autant plus qu'il contribue effectivement à mettre à la portée des lecteurs hispaniques et hispanistes les travaux fondamentaux des théoriciens allemands. (CATHERINE POUPENEY HART, UNIVERSITÉ DE MONTRÉAL)

*SUSANNE ZANTROP, ed. *Paintings on the Move: Heinrich Heine and the Visual Arts*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press 1989. US\$29.95

In one sense, this collection has been bound in reverse order. The reproductions are at the end, preceded first by a useful bibliography, next by a smooth and satisfying translation of *Französische Maler* by David Ward, and, finally, by five essays, most of which were presented at a colloquium held at Dartmouth College in 1985. The prospective reader would be well advised to violate the editor's game-plan and follow instead the actual chronology of creative events by studying the paintings before taking up Heine, only afterwards approaching the essays. Doing so, he or she will probably be struck by how tenuous a relation holds between the works exposed at the Paris Salon of 1831 and Heine's newspaper reports for the *Morgenblatt für gebildete Stände*. Not that Heine's fifteen articles (slightly altered by German censors and fused into an essay which has long been out of the ken of English readers) are wrong-headed or off the track; just that Heine poured so much of himself into his articles that the paintings were primarily pre-text, catalysts for his thought.

At points one feels the same about the critical essays in *Paintings on the Move*, that they have much to do with their own intellectual and critical perspectives, and only secondarily with Heine's *Französische Maler*. Such a remark is not intended to impugn any of the authors, since this collection is uniformly stimulating, scholarly, and topical. By virtue of its apparatus, its turn toward inter-semiotic studies (the relationship between literature and other arts), and the cosmopolitan persona of Heine himself, *Paintings on the Move* deserves a wide readership of contemporary comparatists. It is, moreover, in the spirit of Heine that relative freedom from the literal and from slavish "re-presentation" bear intellectual fruit.

Heine's own distrust of the literal is evident in the two essays on his attitudes toward photography. In the first, Siegfert S. Praver quotes Heine's

somewhat polemic definition of the daguerrotype and correlates it with passages throughout his oeuvre: "Daguerrotype: proof against the erroneous view that art is an imitation of nature — nature itself has provided the proof, how little it understands about art and how lamentable things turn out when it dabbles in art" (76). In the second, Sander L. Gilman conflates four appreciations of photography by Heine, tracing his early dislike for photographic reproduction to a larger sentiment that he was "trapped ... in a world in which technology was replacing aesthetics," not the only passage in this book in which Heine's pessimism is brought to the fore (109).

Yet, the drift of most essays in *Paintings on the Move* is rather that Heine was ahead of his time, a prophetic figure who leap-frogged romanticism and pointed forward to and even beyond the early twentieth century avant-garde with his techniques of 'montage' and radical juxtaposition.

The first three essays are therefore devoted in one way or another to deflecting a criticism which dates back to Heine's initial readers, one not unrelated to the disparity between the paintings in the appendix and *Französische Maler* itself. Gustav Kolb and the publisher von Cotta were both taken with the brilliance of Heine's prose, but others "found fault with his irreverent asides, with his flippant political allusions, with his shifts and jumps, with [his] unsystematic nature" (1). Susanne Zantrop attributes this critique of Heine to a clash between the prevailing Classicism and Heine's new esthetic, which the three authors treating *Französische Maler* consider to be crypto-modernist (Zantrop 44; Sándor 55; and, though mitigated, Hohendahl 28).

A second defense of Heine compliments the first and is expressed by both Hohendahl (10-11) and Sándor (51). Heine's extrinsic approach to art criticism was neither a careless transgression of the intrinsic study of art forms espoused by Goethe, nor the result of Heine's ignorance of visual arts, rather the inevitable result of the kind of speech act he was engaged in (feuilleton journalism). The apparent confusion which marked his columns was inevitable, since Heine was accurately mirroring the chaotic intellectual and artistic conditions following the turbulent year 1830, and also attempting to do so across cultures, in particular the barrier symbolized by the Rhein. With his *Liberté guidant le peuple*, Delacroix was the hands-down artistic winner of the Salon of 1831, and his victory was closely related to Hugo's with *Hernani* the preceding year. Doubtless sensitive to these currents, Heine nonetheless chose to emphasize the more "popular" artists in his dispatches back to Germany — Léopold Robert, Paul Delaroche, Ary Scheffer — "possibly because they were most indicative of the trends, idiosyncrasies, and limitations that Heine sought to uncover in the culture at large" (5), and then, it should be added, tried to telegraph in such way that the German censors would miss his purport, but not his readers. It follows that Heine's

notion of art history is essentially thematic and, at first look, rather traditional, turning as it does around the conflict between "history painting" (which takes its subject matter from myths, legends, the Bible and from history), and "genre painting" (which reproduces scenes from everyday life). According to Zantrop, however, the concealed kernel of Heine's thought can be grasped in his manipulation of the terms which attach to "Historienmalerei" and "Genremalerei," respectively "poetic creation" and "unpoetic exact copying" or, again, "nonmimetic" and "mimetic" (35-36). Heine resuscitated this dichotomy only to subvert it and to open up a discursive realm in which his own interpretations could flourish, a "Kommunikationsspielraum" into which further confrontations could be adduced, Greek terms and quotes from Schiller and Goethe wedged beside crass argot, the high alongside the low (39). To make a long story short, Heine, in the mind of editor Zantrop at least, was far ahead of his time, having intentionally "re-presented representation" (44).

It would be unfair to criticize Susanne Zantrop and her collaborators alone for such anachronism (finding adumbrations of deconstruction in a past which could not have conceived of them), especially since there is much in Heinrich Heine which is modern. Because of the melodic appeal of his lyrics and the stylistic brilliance of prose alluded to above, Heine has never really been out of fashion, except of course when he was suppressed by the Nazis. Yet he may be due for renewed attention. As Central Europe looks for intellectual roots to replace Marxism, Heine's skeptical humanist, materialist but non-dogmatic and above all trans-national voice may well have increasing appeal, at least to some. (GEORGE LANG, UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA)

*LÓRÁNT CZIGÁNY. *The Oxford History of Hungarian Literature: From the Earliest Times to the Present*. Oxford: Oxford University Press 1984. Pp. viii + 582. Can\$109.95

*JOHN MISKA, comp. *Canadian Studies on Hungarians 1886-1986: An Annotated Bibliography of Primary and Secondary Sources*. Regina: University of Regina, Canadian Plains Research Centre 1987. Pp. xiii + 245. Can\$35.00

It may seem unusual to review the literary history of a not widely known country and a bibliography of its Canadian off-shoots in a journal of comparative literature. Yet, the building blocks of this discipline are, in the last analysis, national literatures. Another matter is that 'official' or 'mainstream' comparatism has never been too generous to the many literatures not written in the classical languages, in English, French, German, Italian, Spanish, or Russian. There is no regulation for excluding the 'smaller literatures' from teaching and scholarship: it is entirely a matter