Recherche Littéraire
Literary Research

Volume 24 - Summer 2008

ISSN: 0849-0570

AILC | ICLA

Association Internationale de Littérature Comparée
International Comparative Literature Association

Président / President:

Manfred Schmeling (Saarbrücken)

Vice-président(e)s / Vice Presidents:

Chung Chung-Ho (Seoul)
Eduardo F. Coutinho (Rio de Janeiro)
Dorothy Figueira (Athens, Georgia)
Chandra Mohan (Delhi)

Secrétaires / Secretaries:

Marc Maufort (Brussels)
Steven P. Sondrup (Provo)

Trésorier(e)s / Treasurers:

Kano Takayo (Tokyo)
Ross Shideler (Los Angeles)
Micéala Symington (Nice)

Président(e)s honoraires / Honorary Presidents:

Eva Kushner (Toronto)
Douwe Fokkema (Utrecht)
Maria-Alzira Seixo (Lisbon)
Gerald Gillespie (Palo Alto)
Jean Bessière (Paris)
Kawamoto Koji (Tokyo)
Dorothy Figueira (Athens, Georgia)

Bureau / Executive Council:

Hans Bertens (Utrecht)
Vladimir Biti (Zagreb)
Assumpta Camps (Barcelona)
Cho Sung-Won (Seoul)
Lieven D'hulst (Leuven)
Ibra Diene (Dakar)
Mario Domenichelli (Florence)
João Ferreira Duarte (Lisbon)
Manfred Engel (Oxford)
Angela Esterhammer (Zürich)
Inaga Shigemi (Kyoto)
Liu Xiangyu (Beijing)
Stéphane Michaud (Paris)
Jean-Marc Moura (Lille)
Andries Walter Oliphant (Pretoria)
Anders Pettersson (Umeå)
Luz Aurora Pimentel (Mexico City)
Zhao Xiaoyi (Beijing)

© L'Association Internationale de Littérature Comparée (AILC), tous droits réservés.
All rights reserved by The International Comparative Literature Association (ICLA).
Website: http://icla.byu.edu/www/

Recherche Littéraire
Literary Research

Volume 24, Numbers 47-48 (Summer 2008).

ISSN: 0849-0570

Rédacteur / Editor: John Burt Foster, Jr.

Assistants du rédacteur / Editorial Assistants:
Anastasia Clare, Sophia M. Foster-Dimino.

Traductions françaises / French Translations:
Paula R. Gilbert, Jocelyn Van Tuyl.

Publié avec le concours de / Published with the support of:
George Mason University et la/and the AILC/ICLA.

Table des Matières / Table of Contents

Présentation du rédacteur / Editor's Introduction 1

Forum

Are You the Puerto Rican Girl Who Wants to Learn Sanskrit?
Race, Affirmative Action, and the Study of the Other.
Dorothy Figueira 5

États de la profession / States of the Profession

Anne Tomiche and Karl Zieger, eds. *La Recherche en Littérature générale et comparée en France en 2007: Bilan et perspectives.*
Mary Ann Frese Witt 27

Haun Saussy, ed. *Comparative Literature in an Age of Globalization*.
Hans Bertens 30

Volker Wehdeking. *Generationenwechsel: Intermedialität in der deutschen Gegenwartsliteratur*.
Nicole Mahne. *Transmediale Erzähltheorie: Eine Einführung*.
Evi Zemanek 35

Tours d'horizon régionaux et nationaux / Regional and National Overviews

Writing a Collaborative Literary History of East Central Europe.
Marcel Cornis-Pope 41

Three Years of Comparative Studies in Spain, 2003-05.
Arturo Casas. 45

Ouvrages Collectifs / Collective Works

Marcel Cornis-Pope and John Neubauer, eds. *History of the Literary Cultures of East-Central Europe: Junctures and Disjunctures in the 19th and 20th centuries.* Volume III: *The making and remaking of literary institutions.*
Ileana Orlich. 51

Jean-Paul Engélibert and Yen-Maï Tran-Gervat, eds. *La littérature dépliée: Reprise, répétition, réécriture.*
Elizabeth Richmond-Garza 58

Anna Guttman, Michel Hockx, and George Paizis, eds. *The Global Literary Field*.
Nina Berman 62

Assumpta Camps, Jacqueline Hurtley, and Ana Moya, eds. *Traducción, (sub)versión, transcreación*.
Mitizi Gomes 64

Assumpta Camps, Montserrat Gallart, Iván García, and Victoriano Peña, eds. *Traducción y di-ferencia.*
Joana Bosak de Figueiredo 67

Astradur Eysteinsson and Vivian Liska, eds. *Modernism.*
Steven Sondrup 71

Ouvrages individuels / Individual Works

Zhang Longxi. *Unexpected Affinities: Reading across Cultures*.
Eugene Eoyang 79

Müge Galin. *Between East and West: Sufism in the Novels of Doris Lessing.*
Abdullah Al-Dabbagh 82

Lingaraja Gandhi. *Connecting the Postcolonial: Ngugi and Anand.*
Annie Gagiano 85

Mineke Schipper. *Never Marry a Woman with Big Feet: Women in Proverbs from Around the World.*
Elaine Martin 88

Paul Gravett. *Graphic Novels. Everything You Need to Know.* *World Literature Today* 81.2: Special Issue on Graphic Literature.
Stefan Buchenberger 91

Ricardo J. Quinones. *Dualisms: The Agons of the Modern Era.*
Gerald Gillespie 94

Zacharias I. Siaflekis. *La relation comparative: Interférences et transitions de la modernité littéraire.*
Styliani Kokkali. 96

Gian Balsamo. *Joyce's Messianism: Dante, Negative Existence, and the Messianic Self.*
Benjamin Boysen 101

Marina Grishakova. *The Models of Space, Time and Vision in V. Nabokov's Fiction: Narrative Strategies and Cultural Frames*.
Brian McHale 105

Comptes rendus brefs / Book Notes

Line Henriksen. *Ambition and Anxiety*: *Ezra Pound's* Cantos *and Derek Walcott's* Omeros *as Twentieth-Century Epics.*
Gerald Gillespie 109

David Damrosch. *How to Read World Literature.*
Paulo Horta 111

Dolores Romero López, ed. *Naciones literarias.*
Maarten van Delden 113

Darko Dolinar and Marko Juvan, eds. *Writing Literary History: Selected Perspectives from Central Europe.*
Aleš Vaupotič 115

Jean Bessière. *Qu'est-il arrivé aux écrivains français? d'Alain Robbe-Grillet à Jonathan Littell.*
Lisa Van Zwoll 117

Michael Bell, Keith Cushman, Takeo Iida, and Hiro Tateishi, eds. *D. H. Lawrence: Literature, History, Culture.*
John Burt Foster, Jr. 118

Comptes rendus des revues / Reviews of Journals

Comparative Critical Studies 4.1, "Empire and Beyond."
Alok Yadav 120

Primerjalna književnost [Comparative Literature] 29, "On the Dialogue Between Theory and Literature."
Leonora Flis 122

Congrès comparatistes / Comparative Literature Conferences

Memory in Neuroscience and the Arts.
John Burt Foster, Jr. and Suzanne Nalbantian 125

Patrick Colm Hogan and Contemporary Comparative Literature.
Donald R. Wehrs 127

Notices bio-bibliographiques sur les collaborateurs / Bio-Bibliographical Notes on Contributors. 134

Avis aux collaborateurs prospectifs 139

Information for Prospective Contributors 140

Call for Submissions for the Anna Balakian Prize . . . . Inside Back Cover

PRÉSENTATION DU RÉDACTEUR

EDITOR'S INTRODUCTION

This issue of *Recherche Littéraire/Literary Research*, when viewed according to the units marked off in the table of contents, opens with a forum article that addresses a topic of current professional concern, the issues of otherness and cultural diversity. It then turns to the status of our discipline in five national or regional areas, as set forth in reviews of book-length self-evaluations in the case of France and North America, in a review of typical current research with Germany, and in short essays giving overviews of Eastern Europe and Spain. The bulk of the issue consists of traditional book reviews, with collective works placed first—an innovation for this journal that responds to the greater importance of collaborative scholarship as our discipline seeks to become more truly global in scope.

Reviews of individual works come next and fall into two groups, longer reviews with books that merit such treatment, and shorter book notes for works that can be discussed more briefly. Readers seeking models should compare Brian McHale's review (pp. 105-09) with the sample book note I provide (pp. 118-20). Both deal with single-author works, but McHale puts a book on Vladimir Nabokov in the broader context of narratology, while I emphasize only those parts of a D.H. Lawrence collection that will directly interest comparatists. *RL/LR*'s final two sections review special issues of journals from Britain and Slovenia, then cover topics addressed at two conferences in the U.S. Since in future issues both of these sections could easily accommodate a greater number of items, I invite members to propose reviews and reports of each type.

However, the formal organization just outlined fails to communicate the full sweep and variety of the research described in this issue, which reflects, I hope, a wide-ranging and generous conception of comparative literature. In my previous years as a review and journal editor, I came to see our discipline as a fabulous ten-limbed creature, one not yet named in the world's mythologies (though a more down-to-earth colleague has suggested a spider with its two feelers, or—more prosaically still—the fingers of both hands). In my imagination, each of these limbs corresponds to a field of inquiry with major implications for the international, multilingual study of literature, and all ten are represented in this issue. For a more finely calibrated overview of *RL/LR*, let me indicate how this year's thirty-one contributions relate to our many faceted discipline.

Comparative literary history is closely identified with the AILC/ICLA due to our organization's active sponsorship of ambitious collective projects in this area. Accordingly, this issue features detailed reviews of the two most recent volumes in the long-standing History of Literatures in the European Languages, one de-

voted to an innovative and thorough remapping of the literatures of East Central Europe, the other to Modernism as a movement identified not with a single language but broadly international in scope. Marcel Cornis-Pope, a coeditor of the East Central European volume, has also written an essay on the intellectual challenges and rewards that a collective project of this scope and duration entails. In a related book note, Aleš Vaupotič profiles debates about literary history in Slovenia and the surrounding region.

Comparative literature's most consistent interest, of course, has been the interlingual, cross-cultural study of specific writers and literatures. Several varieties of this mode of comparison are examined by our reviewers, ranging from Ricardo Quinones's study of the agonistic impulse in modern Western literature to Zhang Longxi's approach to the formidable topic of East-West intercultural study. Other examples of the inter-Western approach include books on Joyce and Dante; on the dilemmas of contemporary French literature by Jean Bessière, one of our former presidents; and on Ezra Pound and Derek Walcott. The last of these books was also honored with our first Balakian Prize; a call for submissions for this prize, awarded to first books by younger comparatists and named after a distinguished member of the AILC/ICLA, appears on the inside back cover. East-West comparison of a second kind figures in Abdulla Al-Dabbagh's retrospective tribute to a book on recent Nobel laureate Doris Lessing's affinities with the Sufi branch of Islam.

A related branch of our discipline is the field known as literature and the other arts, which has recently acquired the more comprehensive name of intermediality. As the review by Evi Zemanek suggests, this trend has come to dominate comparative study in the German-speaking region, and Arturo Casas's richly informative survey of Spanish comparatism indicates that a similar trend also flourishes there.

Two other fields consistently identified with comparative study are theory and method. Ironically, literary theory may have become more closely entwined with comparatism in the U.S. than in France (as comparing Mary Ann Witt's and Hans Bertens' reviews of books on our discipline in these countries makes clear), even though France propelled the theory boom during the last third of the past century. Elizabeth Richmond-Garza, however, examines how interest in the more intellectually daring aspects of intertextuality (in contrast to traditional influence study) has revived in France. Similarly, Brian McHale's discussion of Marina Grishakova's book on Nabokov shows that Slavic literary theory continues to thrive at the famous University of Tartu, now in the form of "post-classic narratology." A new book by Zacharias I. Siafelekis, president of the Greek Comparative Literature Association, addresses theories of myth and of reception in the course of treating lyric poetry drawn largely from the Mediterranean region.

An allied preoccupation of comparative literature is its readiness to reflect self-critically on aims and methods, a trend amply illustrated in the two units that profile national and regional versions of our discipline. It is also a notable feature of Dorothy Figueira's Forum, which, given the foundational significance of cultural diversity for our discipline, invites us to reexamine some of our deep, perhaps even subconscious assumptions as scholars. Like all Forum articles, this is one that, beyond its careful scholarship, challenges us to think about the nature

and direction of our discipline.

World literature, translation studies, and postcolonial studies are three fields with close ties to comparative literature that in recent decades have attracted increased attention. As we know, the idea of world literature dates back to the origins of comparative literature itself, but today's more fully globalized manifestations are relatively recent. Nina Berman, Paulo Horta, and Elaine Martin, all of them associated with world literature majors or programs in North America, review a variety of books on this subject. They range from an essay collection that addresses facets of the ongoing debates on this topic to a discussion of pedagogy and an analysis of proverbs about women drawn from the entire world. Two collective works on translation studies edited by Assumpta Camps and associates have been reviewed by Mitizi Gomes and Joana Bosak de Figueiredo, both colleagues of our late president Tania Franco Carvalhal. Their contributions, which take the form of memorial tributes, bring out the special role of Haroldo de Campos's anthropophagical theory of translation in the Brazilian context, but also cover many other aspects of this dynamic field, especially in the Spanish-speaking world.

Postcolonial studies come to the fore in Annie Gagiano's review of a book pairing an East African with a South Asian novelist and in Alok Yadav's review of a recent special issue of *Comparative Critical Studies*, the journal of the British Comparative Literature Association. In addition, several themes spotlighted in Donald Wehrs's profile of Patrick Colm Hogan, a younger, impressively prolific comparatist in the U.S. who will be the plenary speaker at a comparative literature conference this fall, are also explicitly postcolonial in emphasis. A profile of this kind, focused on a highly productive scholar who deserves further recognition, is a feature that I hope to continue in later issues. I welcome recommendations and proposals from the readership.

The interdisciplinary study of literature, a ninth field, has inspired much of my own work as a comparatist. I thus take pleasure in publishing Leonora Flis's review of a special issue of the Slovenian journal *Primerjalna književnost* [Comparative Literature], on the hybridization of theory and literature. This topic connects with the wide range of issues involving transactions between poetry and philosophy, or more generally between literature and abstract thought. Literature and the nation, a vast topic tied to history and culture that cuts to the very heart of comparative literature's claims to internationality, is the subject of a reader edited by Dolores Romero López and reviewed by Maarten van Delden. In the conference section, Suzanne Nalbantian and I report on a symposium in the area of literature and science, one that focused on connecting research in neuroscience with the role played by memory in several literary genres and in the arts.

The tenth and final limb of my mythical comparative creature is transnational cultural studies. In this vein Stefan Buchenberger draws attention to a contemporary trend in popular culture by reviewing two studies of so-called "graphic novels," one from a special issue of *World Literature Today*. This new genre, in its interrelation of text and picture, also has strong affinities with intermediality. In addition, though Dorothy Figueira might disagree, I see her forum article on affirmative action in the U.S. and India, which enlarges on her presidential address

at the Rio conference, as a form of transnational cultural studies. It qualifies for this label because it addresses the issues of culture, race, and politics embedded in a set of social practices, namely the reinterpretation of affirmative action laws so that they no longer serve the severely disadvantaged people for whom they were intended. At the same time, the article is clearly comparative in other ways, both in yet another East-West sense from Zhang's and Al-Dabbagh's and in its aims-and-methods polemic with the institutionalization of postcolonial studies.

Readers should realize that *Recherche Littéraire/Literary Research* is not meant to rival or supplant already existing comparative journals. Hence it does not publish literary scholarship but seeks instead to fill the disciplinary vacuum highlighted by the following questions. The subject matter of comparative literature is international, but is the field itself equally so? And do we comparatists possess the means to become better informed about scholarship in our speciality, not just in our own country or region, but worldwide? It is my hope that, within the limits of an annual journal, *RL/LR* can help to fill this gap, both with forum articles that encourage serious reflection and with reviews of books, journals, and conferences from around the world. This mission is all the more important because, in my experience, books in our discipline are often underreviewed.

This issue marks a transition for the journal, which moved last year to George Mason University, the editor's home institution in the Washington D.C. metropolitan area. The historical George Mason, who lived nearby, was an older neighbor of George Washington and became notable for his insistence that his state's and then his nation's constitution include a Bill of Rights. Since one of these rights is freedom of speech, Mason—I like to think—is an appropriate figure to be associated with a journal devoted to literary study. For literature flourishes best when it is able to enjoy the closely related freedom of artistic expression.

The AILC/ICLA has defrayed many of the production costs for *RL/LR*, but some of those costs along with the heavy postage fees for an international journal have been borne by George Mason University. *RL/LR* had previously been sponsored jointly in Paris and Brazil, but Professor Carvalhal's untimely death brought an end to that arrangement. After the journal's move, I learned that several reviews had been submitted for publication before the transfer and through various paths was able to obtain them. They make up a valued portion of this transitional issue, and include the pieces by Mitizi Gomes and Joana Bosak de Figueirado as well as the ones by Arturo Casas, Benjamin Boysen, and Styliani Kokkali.

In closing, I wish to express my gratitude to Jack Censer, Dean of George Mason's College of Humanities and Social Sciences, for his assistance in enabling the journal's move to its new home. Several AILC/ICLA officers and executive council members have also been helpful, especially Hans Bertens, Eugene Eoyang, Dorothy Figueira, and Steven Sondrup, both with advice and with their willingness to contribute reviews, so essential to the success of *RL/LR*. I look forward in the years ahead to more collaboration of this kind, from both the leadership and the members of our uniquely international scholarly organization.

John Burt Foster, Jr., Editor

F O R U M

Are You The Puerto Rican Girl Who Wants To Learn Sanskrit?: Race, Affirmative Action, and the Study of the Other*

When I entered the Ph.D. program at the University of Chicago in 1980, I was able to fund my education with a minority fellowship. The very manner in which I came to receive these funds has always been a source of fascination for me, since my situation highlights US notions of race and ethnicity and, in some respects, their arbitrary nature. In essence, I am a poster girl for both the advantages and the serious shortcomings of affirmative action.

On my mother's side, I am Italian-American. My father was born and raised in what was then called British Guiana; he was a creole, descended from Portuguese forebears who had settled in Brazil and moved northward some time between the 16th and 20th centuries. Growing up in the sixties in upstate New York, I definitely felt exotic among the children of Anglo-Saxon and European Jewish refugee professionals surrounding me. In this setting, we were a lower-middle class extended family of vague ethnicity. In the late sixties, the guidance counselor in the local public high school thought that my future was to be found in the field of cosmetology. Everything about me, it seemed, the number of vowels in my name, my looks, and my economic class pointed to a career as a hairdresser. My mother had different thoughts. Then, somewhere between high school and a state scholarship- and loan-funded BA from a prestigious female college, I became bureaucratically "Othered."

It was the mid-seventies. Although my brothers, who were five and seven years my senior, had never been deemed ethnics, suddenly I found myself an official minority. I had in fact always been treated as one, as had the entire family, with the social slights, oddly offensive comments, and exclusionary treatment endured. But now, because it was 1976 and my father had been born in South America, I alone in the family became a certified victim of racial discrimination. Snatched from a likely career in cosmetology, I suddenly served a cosmetic purpose. So I began my graduate and professional career as a minority female.

True, at Harvard Divinity School, a theologian of German descent trained

* This essay provides a more substantial and complete version of the argument outlined in my Presidential Address (*ICLA Bulletin*).

during the Nazi era, did ask me if I was one of the new "token" students. At Chicago, however, I received full funding as a minority doctoral student, with a Dean asking me at my first reception if I was "the Puerto Rican girl who wanted to learn Sanskrit." Such an instance of class, caste, and racial ambiguity could never occur in India, where these issues take entirely different forms, as I shall discuss later in this essay. It could, however, occur at elite institutions in the US. While I do not subscribe to the academic genre of confessional scholarship nor am I fond of identity as a scholarly topic, as the following essay will attest, I do feel this episode illustrates a larger concern with how race is imbricated in American universities, how institutions relate to diversity, how administrators view diversity mandates and scholarship, and how pedagogical theory collaborates in the management of the Other, whether it be the individual others it encounters as personnel or the Others it consumes as products.

I. Introduction

Multiculturalism arose in an attempt to uncover occluded and submerged identities and to liberate the repressed through the dissemination of peoples' histories. Its project was to redraw boundaries and affirm the authority of internal colonies. This process, however, became fetishized into a cult of ethnicity that seeks to unmask and repudiate inferential racism. The institutionalization of multiculturalism in the US has thus come to serve a bureaucratic structure claiming to foster minority rights. An outgrowth of the movement in the eighties on US campuses to revamp the canon, multiculturalism claims to open the canon up to the Other, whether it be minorities, subalterns, exiles, and any of the various competing others.

Multiculturalism calls for a reinvisioning of the world from a decolonizing and anti-racist perspective. It has triggered reactions on both the Right and the Left. On the Right, multiculturalism is seen as an attack on Euro-American culture. On the Left, it represents not an assault on Euro-Americans, but on Eurocentrism, the discourse that "embeds, takes for granted and normalizes . . . the hierarchical power relations generated by colonialism and imperialism" (Shohat and Stam 7). One of multiculturalism's underlying assumptions is that people can only comprehend people like themselves, rather than translate difference (Gitlin 208-09). Or, as a Stanford University student put it, when asked during that university's debates over canon revision about studying important non-Western trends such as Japanese capitalism or Islamic fundamentalism: "Who gives a damn about those things? I want to study myself" (San Juan, *Hegemony* 230-31). The sad truth is that some multiculturalists, although they view themselves as "border-crossers" (Giroux 23) and cultural workers (Giroux 21), define alterity in very self-referential terms.

Much has been written on the philosophical theories behind multiculturalism.[1] In practice, however, in its US version it has become institutionalized primarily as the study of hyphenated ethnicity (Chinese-American, Japanese-American, African-American, etc.). It is in this form of "domestic multiculturalism" that the Other is often consumed in the American classroom. In many instances, the Other is taught within the confines of an English department, since area studies and

foreign literature departments have undergone substantial downsizing in recent years. The primary global variant of this domestic form of multiculturalism is postcolonial studies, a relatively new discipline that deals with the study of formerly colonized peoples (in the broadest sense of the term) writing back against their subjugation in the language of their erstwhile oppressors.[2] In the following discussion, I would like to examine the pedagogies of multiculturalism and postcolonialism as practiced in the US. The analysis of postcolonialism will emphasize the Indological vector of the theoretical and disciplinary problems that I will address.[3] Specifically, I will critique multiculturalism and postcolonialism as they have been institutionalized within American academe. I will then examine their role within academic racial politics. In order to analyze the function of these pedagogies of alterity, a history of affirmative action initiatives both in India and in the United States will be provided. It is my intention to show how multiculturalism and postcolonialism reflect and extend institutional mandates for diversity management. Toward this end, a central question needs to be addressed: Who really benefits from the alterity industry promoted by multiculturalism and postcolonialism?

II. Multiculturalism and Postcolonialism

Multiculturalism seeks to include representatives of traditionally neglected groups and to offer an alibi for liberal reform that may not, in fact, exist. In this effort, the educational system has manifestly entered the important promotional work of encouraging tolerance, pluralism, and diversity as rearguard damage control (Cruz 32). Under this format, multiculturalism serves as an institution's strategic response to a perceived deterioration of progressive policies, civil rights gains, and demographic change. Toward the same goal of teaching tolerance, institutional offices of diversity, workshops at teachers' conventions, publisher's marketing sessions, and curricula in primary and secondary schools throughout America now all target "cultural diversity" and multicultural literacy as prime directives. Numerous critics have questioned the value of multiculturalism. Noam Chomsky has dismissed it as a form of fetishized knowledge. Russell Jacoby noted that multiculturalism flourishes as a program to the very extent that it weakens as a reality (124). Wahneema Lubiano condemned it as an empty abstraction used by administrators to take the political heat off their institutions for their failure to diversify in more meaningful ways (68). Under multicultural initiatives, students are still held to Euro-American values for education and life success (Guerrero 61). Studying the Other in multiculturalism's thoroughly appropriated and diluted fashion ensures that the continued domination of Eurocentric knowledge remains unchallenged. Slavoj Žižek has characterized multiculturalism as an experience of the Other deprived of its Otherness. In other words, multiculturalism appears to many as nothing more than a subterfuge for business as usual. One can offer a selection of ethnic or racially specific courses without addressing the ways in which the focus of what we understand as Western culture is itself incomplete and distorted (Lubiano 68).

Minority critics and students have also made their voices heard. At the

University of Texas, Chicano students expressed their uneasiness regarding multiculturalism. They viewed it as a bland, catch-all phrase connected with diversified reading lists or required courses on non-Western cultures. They perceived it as a means of thwarting a head-on confrontation that should take place over the more deeply embedded issue of institutional racism (San Juan, *Hegemony* 224). Their perception had a good deal of validity. As an imposition of some norm of tolerance, multiculturalism is inherently a form of control (Essed 210). Satisfied with bracketing the Other, multiculturalism glosses over pressing problems of a political, legal, and economic nature. Minority critics have viewed multiculturalism as offering only the illusion of victory over racism. Behind multicultural initiatives in diversity they recognize strategies of personal and professional development and claim that the fragmentary and a-contextual representations of ethnic identity taught in the multicultural curriculum are promoted by an intellectual and administrative mainstream out of a deep cynicism regarding the Other as a fossilized object of clinical experimentation. Indeed, multiculturalism has been condemned as a patently deceptive and self-serving upper-class democratization (Fox-Genovese 142), resulting in a situation governed by a seemingly inclusionary logic of pluralism that in fact only preserves the status quo (Okada 198).

From a marketing standpoint, it is not only the fragmentary and irresponsibly incomplete representation of minority populations within syllabi that is necessary; so is the presence of minority faculty. However, their inclusion into the teaching ranks is often less significant than their presence "doing minority things." A black female junior faculty member with a dissertation on Lully is not permitted to teach French Baroque opera, but "encouraged" to teach Scott Joplin. Some minority faculty have been known to get uppity, expecting to teach in fields where they have trained. This, too, has been managed. If an institution can fill its quotas with minority multiculturalists, it need not recruit minorities in underrepresented (i.e., traditional) fields. One need only make the minimal effort to pass muster as an institution valuing diversity. It is of paramount importance that people of color be given jobs in fields that deal with minority issues because the minority hire exists to showcase not only the institution's commitment to hire people of color, but also its commitment to minority programs. Behind the dual role imposed on minority hires (to be a person of color and "do the minority thing"), there is the deep cynicism on the part of institutions regarding the minority instructor's ability to perform in traditional disciplines where they cannot rely on ethnicity-specific intuitive knowledge. Pedagogies of alterity, therefore, serve an important purpose: they allow universities to balkanize minority professionals under the guise of inclusion and to supplant ethnic minorities whose fields of expertise do not reflect and publicize their ethnicity. In some instances, the institutionalization of identity studies under multiculturalism has enabled universities to showcase their commitment to minority studies without even having to promote minority hiring.

If one cannot be a minority in American universities today, one must find a way to identify with a minority situation. This strategy is dictated less by genuine curiosity than by marketing motives on the part of universities. Marketing in this context is twofold. First, there is marketing to and through university administra-

tors and deans who buy into the idea that alterity initiatives are the most advanced and "logical" approach to domestic minorities, the Third World, and the miasma of competing national ethnicities. Such initiatives assuage institutional needs to recruit and restructure with supposedly cutting-edge responses to new socio-economic realities. Administrators can then pad their scorecards with curricular diversity, even if their institutions maintain an abysmal record in real diversity.

The critique leveled against multiculturalism as currently practiced in American universities is persuasive. Given the extent to which this pedagogy has been challenged, it is quite astonishing how much it is still considered a desirable pedagogy on many campuses across the United States. Epifanio San Juan, one of the harshest critics of multiculturalism, has suggested that multiculturalism remains a viable pedagogy for the very reason that it does nothing to address inequities of power within academe. Multiculturalism is still viewed as a viable pedagogy *precisely because* it does not address the issue of who has the power to determine what courses are taught and what requirements are established (San Juan, *Hegemony* 224–25). Multiculturalism may claim to teach tolerance and undermine endemic racism but, contrary to its inflated aspirations,[4] it does not guarantee equality of opportunity or access to resources for the disenfranchised. In fact, as a theory and pedagogy, multiculturalism appears to be more interested in managing the Other within the American continuum than in analyzing minority and non-Western reality. The case can even be made that multiculturalism provides a smokescreen for societal and institutional unwillingness to change the academic situation of those underrepresented within academe, especially minorities. In this effort, it is aided and abetted by its "stepchild," postcolonial studies.[5]

In many American universities the Third World is studied almost exclusively under the umbrella of multiculturalism and under the fairly inclusive rubric of "postcolonial literature."[6] The reasoning behind this packaging of alterity is obvious: like multiculturalism (Talbot), postcolonialism is easy. Neither of them necessitates really learning about another culture or demands mastery of another language. In multiculturalism and postcolonialism, all groups preserve their own heritage as long as they speak English (Prashad 112). Such pedagogies feed American monolingual arrogance and cultural isolationism. Moreover, the celebration of pseudo-diversity found in postcolonialism in no way compromises US tendencies to cultural provincialism, triumphalism, or indifference to the rest of the world. Like those popular ethnic fairs one finds in the States, postcolonialism allows students to taste other cultures without digesting them. Quite often, the resounding "global education" that these pedagogies ultimately offer a literature student can consist of nothing more than snippets from Arundhati Roy, Toni Morrison, or Maxine Hong Kingston. In a multicultural or postcolonial literature classroom, there is the presumption that one can grasp the experience of ethnic minorities and even the world by reading selections from representative women of color writing in the English language (Talbot). Finally, postcolonialism is "more palatable and less foreign sounding to skeptical deans than Third World Studies, more global and less fuddy-duddy than Commonwealth Studies" (McClintock 93).

Postcolonial criticism tends to obscure the continuities and discontinuities of

colonial power (McClintock 87–88), amidst discussions of hybridity and subalternity. It reduces the facts of exploitation to the status of discourse and intertextuality and then minimizes the effects of social subjects shaping their individual lives. The critical focus on past forms of ideological hegemony enables critics to disregard contemporary abuses (Dirlik, "Postcolonial" 356). We do not see in postcolonial criticism any sustained or viable critique of neocolonialism. Postcolonial criticism might even be said to contribute to neocolonialism, since ex-colonies are yet again used to provide "raw materials" for Western academic consumption (Behdad 82). Postcolonial criticism focuses primarily on the overvalued diasporic intellectual (San Juan, *Racism* 278). It makes no reference to internal colonies such as Puerto Rico, to affirmative action, or to undocumented residents. The main problem that postcolonial criticism masks is that of class. Although historical evidence unfailingly discloses the complicity of upper classes in reproducing systems of inequalities and brutalities (Larsen 140), postcolonial criticism cleanses the postcolonial subject both of its historical and class determination. In this regard, postcolonial criticism might be seen as abetting and perpetuating racism.[7]

The political advantages of postcolonialism, however, bear mentioning. There are at least two political agendas at work here—the Indian diasporic and the American institutional ones. Diasporic "cultural" groups maintain strong ties to Indian political parties, especially the major vehicles of the Hindu Right, such as the Vishwa Hindu Parishad (VHP) and the Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP).[8] These parties came to prominence in the 1980s, advocating the end of compensatory positive discrimination to oppressed castes in response to the report of the Mandal Commission upholding affirmative action. The VHP has brilliantly exploited the resources available from non-resident Indians in the West (NRIs). Playing upon immigrant guilt, the Hindu Right has funded numerous educational initiatives through allied cultural associations such as the Vishwa Hindu Parishad of America (VHPA). Through its student wing, the Hindu Students Council (HSC), the VHPA champions *Hindutva* as the neglected culture of Hindu Americans.[9] It has consciously entered "into the multicultural space opened up in the liberal academy" by promoting the "neglected virtues of an ancient civilization" (Prashad 144). Claiming merely to be cultural organizations, the VHPA and the HSC can thus officially distance themselves from the very political groups of which they are offshoots. In terms of American university development needs, postcolonialism also serves concrete political goals. While students may learn little regarding the languages, literatures, histories, or philosophies of foreign cultures, university administrators and faculty can pretend that they all have somehow confronted alterity. If you add texts to the curriculum marked by "otherness," then you have provided a non-threatening element of diversity, without having to engage *real* diversity on an institutional level. In this manner, postcolonial theory provides an excellent test case for Guillory's critique of the institutional leveling out of putatively marginal cultural forms (37–38). Disparate postcolonial texts, collectively studied in English and co-opted for a largely imaginary pedagogic agenda, are deployed as forms of cultural capital in an institutional setting. With postcolonial literature thus grounded, it becomes an ideal oppositional academic discipline as

well as an attractive and non-threatening object of consumption.

Postcolonial theory is as much a fetishized commodity (Ahmad 127) as is multiculturalism. The process involves turning the literatures and cultures of the non-West into saleable exotic objects, such as multicultural anthologies and highly publicized first novels by young authors who are *de facto* spokespersons for their place of birth (Brennan 47–48). Here, as opposed to Black or Women's Studies, the spokespersons do not necessarily include the oppressed themselves. Others usually speak for the voiceless subaltern Other—the "native" whose education and life experience bespeaks privilege or liberal self-minoritized whites who have studied under them. The cosmopolitan alterity industry has perfected a rhetoric of fetishized otherness (Huggan 10), where sympathetic identification masks the transformation of power politics into spectacle (Arac and Ritvo 3). These very gestural and performative aspects, in fact, make them suspect. They offer too convenient a structure for career development (Krishnaswamy 128).

Commodifying the Third World serves concrete development needs. Universities have suffered considerable downsizing in recent years. With the loss of public funding, state and private institutions have had to target special interest groups in order to fund new initiatives. Diasporic groups, like the above-mentioned VHPA and HSC, have increasingly figured in such development projects. Indian-Americans, who are the richest immigrant demographic group in the United States, present tremendous economic potential as evidenced by recent Indian-based endowments of chairs in major public and private universities. Institutions have become quite adept at catering (some might say, pandering) to such groups.

If vested interest groups fund a program, one can be sure that an "official," i.e. politically acceptable, representation of that nation, its people, and its cultural products will be promoted. Appeals to cultural nationalism are implicit in institutional development efforts (Grewal). Moreover, since universities are recruiting Indian-American students in ever increasing numbers, it is only logical that they would solicit courses focusing on their communities and concerns. Ideally, these courses would be user-friendly, and would not challenge religious or communalist sympathies. Once again, courses that focus on the victimization of a people under colonial rule do not threaten a diaspora community's idealized view of the homeland. Postcolonial theoretical initiatives can thus dovetail very nicely with marketing concerns. Populating these programs can suit institutional mandates for diversity in hiring. Elites from the ex-colonial world, possessing a deep sense of self-worth and further legitimized by an Ivy League/Oxbridge education stand "at the ready to step in in the name of affirmative hiring" (Bahri 71).

Highly commodified distinguished professors thus rack up points on university administrators' score card of cultural diversity, and "academic gestures of acceptance of visible difference presented by displaced Third World postcolonials" mask "the continued disenfranchisement of second and third generational American minorities" (Bahri 71). In other words, theories of the margin offer the rationale and their practitioners provide the personnel to undermine the initial, more ambitious goals of affirmative action. Colonialisms of the past, in this respect, become less significant than imperialisms of the present (Ahmad 222). In their very

globalism, the cultural requirements of transnational corporations (among whose number we must count universities) can no longer afford the cultural parochialism of an earlier day. They have a need to internationalize themselves. In academic institutions, this process often can take the form not of promoting international scholarship in a conventional sense but of "importing" and "exporting" students and faculty (Dirlik, "Postcolonial" 330, 354–55; cited in Robbins 164).

In the discursive realm of postcolonial discourse, power differentials between racialized minorities in the metropoles and elites in the Third World disappear. Multiculturalism and postcolonialism as practiced in universities and colleges in the United States today feed institutional and individual desires for engagement without actual effective engagement. As a corollary, they foster the pretense that academic criticism functions as a political act and support the myth, common to most poststructuralist theory, that textual culture can replace activist culture. A discourse of freedom, individuality, and tolerance sustains cultural ignorance (Srivastava 16), while the critic aspires to appear relevant on a global level. In this process, the real world and the variety of its literatures are eclipsed by the larger professional project.

While claiming to offer a viable mechanism for adjustments of power within historically white-dominated societies, these pedagogies serve often nothing more than a cosmetic purpose. While some might pretend that they are workable models for civic tolerance in societies struggling to free themselves from the burden of their white supremacist past (Hutcheon and Richmond), others may view them just as willfully aestheticizing discourses that inadvertently serve to disguise persistent racial tensions. While multiculturalism and postcolonialism affect a respect for the other as a reified object of cultural difference, they deflect attention away from social issues such as discrimination, unequal access, and hierarchies of ethnic privilege that are far from being resolved (Huggan 126).

Ultimately, multiculturalism and postcolonialism do nothing to help those for whom they purport to speak. While affirming the virtues of the margins, they leave the centers of power uncontested (Gitlin 236). They may claim to offer the putative end of meta-narratives: all kinds of representations and cultures are deemed as valid as others (Lyotard). However, as Rey Chow has noted, they still only offer a one-way street. Some form of white culture is the one recognizing the non-white culture. In order "to be" or "speak out," the non-white culture must seek the legitimacy and recognition from white culture and use the language of white culture to produce itself (Rizvi 63). In the final analysis, multiculturalism and postcolonialism are really about assimilation with domesticating egalitarian demands attached. They obscure issues of power and privilege.

By promoting a showcase tolerance of diverse ethnic practices, multiculturalism and postcolonialism in fact enable an academic elite to displace, diffuse, and thus intensify class, gender, and racial contradictions. The case can even be made that the culturalist abuse of ethnicity serves to mask hegemonic domination under the pretext of pluralist tolerance (San Juan. *Racial* 15) or valorize differences to guarantee sameness (San Juan, *Hegemony* 237). Under multiculturalism and postcolonialism, class divisions and systemic inequalities remain intact. In

postcolonial studies, ethnic groups rarely enter into discussion, let alone are affected (Dirlik, *Postcolonial* 337). In fact, there is no space at all for Fourth World peoples dominated by Third World nations (Shohat 105).

Several years ago, the librettist for the Broadway show "Bombay Dreams" was quoted as saying, "Brown is the new black." William Safire noted in the *New York Times* that Meera Syal was not in this instance making a fashion statement. She was alluding rather to the popularity of South Asians in the West. The culture of people with brown skin from South Asia is now "hotter" than that of the culture of black-skinned people in the estimation of "with-it" whites (Safire 18). Indeed, postcolonial politics can be seen as being complicit with globalizing capitalism's drive to maintain its ruthless hegemony over the world's multitudes, especially its people of color (Ahmad, cited in San Juan, *Beyond* 6). The success of postcolonial theory should be seen in terms of a Third World strategy to contain "pocs" (people of color) (Shohat 105). To a certain degree, postcolonial theory enables educational institutions to contribute to the hegemonic social process reproducing inequality. In the case of the United States, the dominant issue is not colonialism and postcolonialism (as in England and India), but civil rights and post civil rights (Frankenberg and Mani). However, postcolonial criticism glosses over this fact or, indeed, occludes it. Vijay Prashad puts it succinctly: institutions use Indians as a weapon against black America (7). Prashad has noted that Indians have come a long way since the days when W.E.B. Du Bois claimed they recoiled from being mistaken for Negroes and were forced to share in their disabilities (315; cited in Prashad 157). Prashad evokes Du Bois's question to the blacks: "How does it feel to be a problem?" and asks his fellow Indian Americans, "How does it feel to be a solution?" (6). The Indian high castes and non-minority Americans have responded to affirmative action initiatives by devising the theories and pedagogies of multiculturalism and postcolonialism. In other words, Indians have effectively become part of the solution to the continued disenfranchisement of minorities within American academe.

Both in the US and India, affirmative action has hit everyone hard. Across American culture and certainly across Indian caste groups, there is a deep feeling that ground has been lost by those segments of the population who have been used to garnering the advantages of privileged status within their respective societies. Whites in America and brahmins in India cannot expect doors to open as easily as in the days prior to affirmative action and the Mandal Commission Report on compensating for discrimination. In response, Americans minoritize themselves and upper-caste Indian academic displaced persons adopt the minority status of ersatz African Americans. The diasporic Indians' ability to "play the race card" stems, in part, from the complexity of Indian constructions of race and color[10] and the nature of educated Indian immigration.[11]

In many ways, the immigration of intellectuals is a familiar occurrence. Certain consequences of the present Indian immigration are, however, unprecedented. It should be noted that Indians immigrated under the special skills provisions of the 1965 Immigration Act and that these provisions totally skewed the demographics of South Asian Americans. Unlike other immigrant populations, Indians who im-

migrated from the 1960s onward were exclusively professionals.[12] It was not only the skills of the South Asian intellectual population that were exceptional. They fit seamlessly into the contemporary academic milieu. Not only could administrators employ Asian "people of color" to fulfill minority hiring and diversity quotas, but given their class backgrounds, Indian immigrants tend to share the racial values and attitudes of middle- and upper-middle-class white Americans.[13] Historically, Aryan Indians have always distinguished themselves from their Other in terms of their high spirituality and civilization (Figueira, *Aryans*). They exported this racial ideology to America as early as Vivekananda's tour in 1893. This self-image allows Indian Americans (Desis) to position themselves in such a way that they can believe themselves to be superior to American blacks, an attractive position for a migrant in search of some accommodation in a racist polity (Prashad xi). When this concept of self-worth encounters the unconscious or semi-conscious need of white academics to identify with and support the postcolonial intellectual, we have a highly effective meeting of minds. South Asians seem to satisfy white academic fantasies and longings for "revolution," "freedom," "the primitive," "cutting edge," etc. The fulfillment of such exoticist fantasies may, indeed, provide the structuring force behind the entire enterprise of postcolonial criticism.

It is, of course, ironic that the discourse of decenteredness facilitates the direct transfer of Third World elites to American elite positions and that the discourse of marginality serves to place these theorists in remunerative posts in the metropolitan center. Agency is arrogated to borderland scholastics seeking to negotiate a zone between the bourgeois comprador nationalism of neo-colonized nation-states and the cosmopolitan high culture of the metropole (San Juan, *Racism* 278). Postcolonial criticism's "strategies and sites [are] structurally dispersed" (Slemon 7) for a very good reason. Postcolonial critics, as deconstructionists of hegemony, have constructed the theoretical priority of the margin (its position as the only authentic voice and its supremacy over any competing voices) in order to establish a location of power from which they themselves most directly benefit.[14] In this instance, however, postcolonial subjects in the West were merely adapting a tradition of positive discrimination that had a considerable history in colonial and post-independence India.

III. Positive Discrimination in India

In 1932, the British created a special electorate for untouchables in India. This instance of preferential treatment for outcastes posed significant problems for Gandhi and the Congress Party. The fear was that untouchables, given a separate voting voice, would not vote in block with their Hindu coreligionists who denied them basic human rights. Gandhi's fear of losing the untouchable vote prompted him to threaten to fast until death in order to prevent the untouchables from gaining a separate electorate. This threatened fast is usually presented in hagiographic terms: Gandhi risked his life in a fast against untouchability. In actuality, it was a cynical strategic ploy on his part to blackmail untouchables into staying within the Hindu fold and delivering votes in favor of a religion that did not grant them

any dignity, let alone basic needs (Figueira, *Aryans* 150–59). The great untouchable reformer and framer of the Indian constitution, B. R. Ambedkar, who had been trained at Columbia University, had to accede to Gandhi's ploy, lest the "Mahatma" actually die in this stunt and thereby precipitate a whole-scale massacre of untouchables throughout India. The untouchables were thus prevented from splintering the Hindu vote. At this time, however, they did receive some preferential access to government jobs. Moreover, since the Congress Party and Hindu nationalists had effectively shown their cards, provisions were built into the Indian Constitution to limit the continued exploitation of untouchables after Independence. Group preferences for the disadvantaged were stipulated in the fourteenth amendment to the Indian Constitution, mirroring the fourteenth amendment of the United States Constitution. Those provisions that Ambedkar was able, after much maneuvering, to include in the Constitution established reservations that were intended to forestall political opposition and conflict at the time of Independence. They were intended to last for five to ten years and then be cut off. The reservations of 1947, however, are still in place today and are continuously renewed. If they remain on the books, they either have been only partially successful or serve some other purpose. Caste in India, like racial discrimination in the United States, is remarkably resilient.

These provisions were initially intended for untouchables and tribals with severe social disabilities. However, as they were framed, they included an omnibus category of reservations for "other backward classes." Because of this wording, there has occurred in the sixty years since Independence a proliferation of preferred groups in India. The original reservations for untouchables and disadvantaged tribal groups were necessary because these groups were outside the caste system and subject to gross inequities. But the miscellaneous classification has come to be used by many individuals and groups within the caste system. In fact, under this omnibus categorization, many more individuals have received preferred treatment than has ever been provided to untouchables and tribals for whom the preferences were created. These "other" deemed backward individuals and groups outnumber the untouchables and, because of their educational, social, and economic standing, they have been in a better position to take advantage of preferences and quotas for government jobs and university admissions. The untouchables, also known as the scheduled castes and the Dalits, comprise 16 percent of the population. Backward tribals make up 8 percent of the population. The "other backward" groups that have arisen in the last thirty years comprise an unbelievable 52 percent of the population (Sowell 24). The provision for "other" disadvantaged groups and individuals has been brilliantly exploited.

Among the "other" disadvantaged are grouped what we might call the "privileged underprivileged," such as the Chamars of Maharashtra who, although they make up 17 percent of the population, comprise 35 percent of its medical students. Chamars can be middle class, but because of the work they do with leather, are excluded from caste Hinduism. In Haryana, the Chamars received 65 percent of the graduate level scholarships and 80 percent of the undergraduate scholarships earmarked for untouchables, according to the *Report of the Commission for*

Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (India 188). The Chamars in Maharashtra have completely monopolized the Dalit quota. These and other "privileged under-privileged" are able to secure reserved places because they are able to fund out of pocket the incidentals that go along with a free education, such as books and supplies, housing, and boarding. These families are in an economic position to absorb the lost labor on farms or lost income. The result is that, as in the United States and elsewhere, the relatively more prosperous tend to enjoy the lion's share of benefits earmarked for the disadvantaged poor.

Also included within the ranks of the "other disadvantaged" are those who represent local preferences. These individuals can be members of groups whom their state favors as less productive natives competing for jobs against more qualified and industrious outsiders who have moved in from other states and thrived. An example of this phenomenon can be seen among the Andhras and the Telanganans. The Andhras had lived under British rule and were advanced in agriculture, education, and general modernization over the Telanganans who had lived under princely rule in Hyderabad and, after Independence, found themselves consistently bested on their own turf, despite "safeguards" that had been enforced to protect them. Local preferences speak to such intergroup conflicts.

Other instances of local preference can be seen among the Assamese, who are often surpassed as a group in their own region by more qualified Bengalis, and the Marathis of Maharashtra. The Shiv Sena, a grass-roots militaristic group molded on the model of the *Hitlerjugend* and very active in present-day politics of Maharashtra, built its recent strength on polarizing the indigenous Marathis, who barely form a majority, and other ethnic (such as the Gujarati businessmen of Mumbai)[15] and religious groups (such as the Muslims). The Shiv Sena was able to mobilize xenophobic resentment so effectively that it was instrumental in putting the Hindu nationalist BJP Party in charge of the country until its recent upset. Much of the widespread carnage in 1993–94 against the Muslim population instigated by the Shiv Sena and the BJP was explained (and justified) by the deep sense of grievance that Maharashtrians felt on account of perceived discrimination against them and governmental indulgences supposedly showered on the Muslim minority.

The Shiv Sena's activities in Maharashtra point to another significant factor. Whatever minimal benefits a given segment of the population receives are usually balanced by maximum resentment and hostility. In India today, there is tremendous resentment against the scheduled castes for the places reserved for them even though few actually profit from these reservations. It is not a rare occurrence for people to die in riots over places reserved for untouchables (Joshi 680-82). One can draw a direct correlation between frustration on the part of the "haves" who are not competitive when judged on equal terms and the violence against the "have nots." In the early 1980s, 13,000 cases of violent acts against untouchables per year were reported, rising in 1986 to 16,000 cases, and in the 1990s to 20,000 cases (Sowell 26). By the late 1990s, the quota system for the backward caste preferences had eliminated whatever good will the upper castes might have been able to muster for the lower castes. Violence against untouchables is directly proportionate to preferential policies even though only 6 percent of untouchable

families have in any way benefited from these policies (Ghosh 159-60).

In higher education, most untouchables and members of backward tribes are unable to use the quotas set aside for them and the preferences for which they are entitled. Many spots remain unfilled. When filled, they are disproportionately held by more fortunate members of unfortunate groups. Those spots that are filled by backward classes are in less prestigious institutions and in easier and less remunerative fields where students take longer to graduate and there is a big dropout rate (Sowell 30). In 1997, none of the elite universities and engineering institutions had filled their quotas for scheduled castes (Ghosh). The increase in resentment has been accompanied by a proliferation of groups demanding preferential status. In 2001, there were rallies in Rajasthan protesting the inclusion of new groups among the backward classes, asking for separate fixed quotas for the original backward classes so that "new" entrants would not reduce existing benefits. This effort essentially sought to institute quotas within quotas (Sebastian). How "backward" a given group actually is remains open to speculation (Sengupta).

The basic thesis of this essay is that everyone wants and feels they deserve to be a minority and that they seek means to minoritize themselves and partake of the benefits squandered on the less fortunate among us. In India, people who were not born untouchable have worked the system so that they now hold the majority of seats set aside for untouchables in the legislature. One particularly effective strategy has been for non-untouchables to gain untouchable status through adoption. This ploy has been particularly successful in Indian academe. While Americans can self-identify as minorities in order to gain access to minority positions in US universities and colleges, in the Indian scenario, high caste Hindus pay untouchable families for their names, so that they can qualify for positions set aside for the scheduled classes. It is fairly common for high-caste students who cannot place into institutions to temporarily become untouchable for entrance into universities and professional schools such as engineering and medicine. They re-designate themselves to take advantage of group preferences and quotas (Galanter 338). These adoptees have found the loophole in the system, one that exists, I believe, in all affirmative action initiatives—what is important to each system is not the number of disenfranchised who actually benefit from such programs as much as the mere fact that there are people filling the spots allotted to the disadvantaged in these institutions. It is crucial to produce a body count, whether or not it actually reflects the population it pretends to represent. The point is to produce a make-believe equality. This politics finds a parallel in American affirmative action.

IV. Affirmative Action in the United States

Since both the US Constitution and statutes such as the Civil Rights Act of 1964 stipulate equal rights for individuals, the idea of mandated preferences had to be packaged in America as policies in agreement with the law. Affirmative action, therefore, functions either as a correction of historical inequities or as a policy that encourages diversity and, consequently, a common goal of democratic society. In the United States, affirmative action was initially intended to benefit blacks who were deemed disadvantaged due to their earlier enslavement and subsequent his-

tory of maltreatment. As in the case of positive discrimination in India, affirmative action in the US has expanded far beyond its initial target population. Unlike India, where the social structure is minutely delineated and documented, minority status in America is a more subjective concept and, as such, clouds the extent to which blacks have been eclipsed in the process of affirmative action. Quite simply, the overall effectiveness of affirmative action in the US is not as well documented as in India because of our more fluid conception of race and color.

The master narrative of affirmative action's efficacy has influenced how the numbers are tabulated and read. For example, the much-touted 1998 book by William Bowen (former President of Princeton) and Derek Bok (former President of Harvard) affirms the success of affirmative action for blacks admitted to elite institutions with lower qualifications. Their conclusions differ significantly from other similar studies. What is left out of their statistical documentation is the fact that they submerged the blacks admitted under lower standards with the pool of blacks admitted under the same standards as the whites admitted (Sowell 152–54). In this instance, the statistics have been cooked to provide the script needed to tout affirmative action's success.

However, in his comparative analysis of affirmative action initiatives throughout the world, Thomas Sowell has shown that the American statistical data provides a glaringly different picture for those who choose to read it in a historical perspective. Sowell shows how between 1940 and 1970 the education levels of blacks rose to almost parity with their white counterparts. In 1940, black men on an average attained levels of 5.4 years of education as opposed to white men who attained 8.7 years. By 1970, however, black men had almost reached levels of parity with their white counterparts, with 12.1 years of education compared to the 12.7 years average for white men.[16] Education levels of black men had risen proportionately to black economic growth. In 1940, 87 percent of black families in America lived below the poverty level as opposed to the 47 percent of blacks living in poverty in 1960. This economic growth of an astounding 40 percent took place before the enactment of civil rights legislation and paralleled the exodus of some three million blacks from the South and its substandard schools. By 1970, 30 percent of black families lived below the poverty line. During the decade of the enactment of federal affirmative action policies, the poverty of black families dropped by 1 percent to 29 percent (Sowell 118–19). Affirmative action did not improve the economic and educational situation of blacks in America, blacks themselves did—by dint of hard work and perseverance in a discriminatory environment (Thernstrom and Thernstrom 189-94).[17]

As in India, affirmative action was a boon to the fortunate, as any analysis of the minority beneficiaries of government contracts show. Between 1967 and 1992, the top 20 percent of black income earners rose at the same rate as the top 20 percent of white income earners. However, the bottom 20 percent of black income earners saw their income share fall at double the rate of the bottom 20 percent of white income earners (Sowell 120). The reason for this loss of ground among poor blacks can be attributed to the fact that immigrants are eligible for the same affirmative action benefits as blacks, even though they themselves have not

suffered past discrimination in the United States. In terms of affirmative action, the advantage of being Black has declined sharply between 1972-92 in first-tier colleges. In the 1970's, Blacks with a given set of test scores and grades had a 13% greater likelihood of being admitted to these schools. That bonus dropped to 5% greater likelihood in the 1990's (Brewer, cited in Brown et al. 114).

The majority of government contracts for "minority-owned" businesses from 1986–90 went to European businessmen from Portugal. Minority businesses rent out their minority status. While they are ostensibly owned by blacks, they serve as fronts for and benefit whites. Asian entrepreneurs immigrating to the US receive a large portion of the preferential access to government contracts (Sowell 121). These figures suggest that, in the last two decades, the reality of affirmative action benefits is at radical odds with its rationale. What was intended to benefit blacks benefits four times as many businesses owned by Hispanics and Asian Americans and thirteen times as many businesses owned by women (Sowell 121). As in India, affirmative action has been extended in the US to include groups that were not initially considered in the Civil Rights Act of 1964. This extension was possible due to the definition of the term "discrimination" by that Act to mean intentional actions by an employer against individuals as distinguished from disparate consequences of particular tests or other criteria on different groups.

The single most significant reason that American blacks do not benefit more from affirmative action is that "being disenfranchised" has been extended to new groups that have not suffered anything close to the social disadvantages that blacks have suffered in America. This process consists of opportunity hoarding by one group to the detriment of another (Brown et al. 191). The largest group to benefit from affirmative action in America has been women and most of these women are white. For white women, the argument in favor of preference cannot be the legacy of slavery. In fact, no specific harm or discrimination is demanded for the beneficiaries of gender preferences, since the statistics would hardly prove such discrimination. Women have benefited from the re-conceptualization of affirmative action. In addition to correcting historical inequity, affirmative action now also promotes diversity.

In 1920, women earned 34 percent of the bachelor degrees and 15 percent of the doctorates awarded in the United States as opposed to 24 percent and 10 percent respectively in 1950. For those same years, female degrees in mathematics declined from 15 to 5 percent and degrees in engineering from 10 to 2 percent. As opposed to the situation of blacks, in the latter half of the twentieth century, the education level (degrees awarded) and job rate declined for women. Throughout the 1950s and 1960s, there was not one year when there were as many masters and doctorates for women as there were in the 1930s. Over this time period, either the male power structure was becoming more discriminatory against women or a favorable economic climate increased the birth rate that, in turn, decreased the number of women gaining advanced degrees. The statistics do show that female education is directly tied to birth rates. Between 1940 and 1950, the baby boom years, they decreased by 9 percent. The year of 1902 showed education/job rates double that of 1958 (Johnson 51). As the birth rate declined in the 1960s, female

representation in jobs and education rose proportionately (Sowell 13–35).

Just as with women, the new groups who benefit from the expanded pool of preferences, such as immigrants from Latin America, Europe, and Asia, cannot appeal to the "legacy of slavery" argument to justify why they should get preferences instead of blacks (Sowell 136). As with blacks, the "lingering effects" of oppression do not really hold for women, since they feasibly are able to share in the social benefits that their fathers, grandfathers, and male ancestors have accrued. In 1970, blacks comprised two-thirds of the individuals who were entitled to affirmative action; by the year 2000, they made up 49 percent of those who enjoyed its preferences (Sowell 137). Whatever benefits black men have acquired relative to those enjoyed regularly by white men are more than outweighed by the disadvantages they experience in relation to those received by white women.

The history of affirmative action in the US showcases the supposed benefits it has bestowed upon blacks, while essentially serving the needs of and "positively discriminating" in favor of Latin Americans, Europeans, Asians, and white women. The case can even be made suggesting that affirmative action has contributed to increased failure rate of blacks due to the effect of race norming[18] and pervasive shifting, the mismatching of minority students with institutions that serve the institutional demographics more than the students in question.[19] The overwhelming demand for increased minority "body counts" in all educational institutions has set up a double standard of achievement in which administrators and faculty collude. Minority students who can succeed in any number of settings are turned into failures by mismatching them by preference in admissions, not holding them to competitive standards, and balkanizing them into courses of study that are less competitive, where they can even partake of affirmative grading policies.[20]

Balkanizing minorities into less rigorous ethnic studies departments, grade inflation for such programs, and reducing the failure rate to validate the programs' continued existence all contribute to the ongoing marginalization of minorities. What becomes quickly apparent is that the need for numbers of people of color is all that matters. It does not correspond to the number of those credentialed through shifting and their subsequent failure to thrive in an educational environment, where they are nothing more than a number on some administrator's spreadsheet of success in diversity. The success rates of minorities are less important than their cosmetic benefit to the institutions in question. The system as it is presently constructed and the way in which it functions makes it attractive to non-minorities to be minoritized and labeled disadvantaged.

V. Conclusion

Theories and pedagogies of the margin such as multiculturalism and postcolonialism are constructed precisely to aid in this process of auto-minoritization. They are constructed to redefine what it is to be disadvantaged, and these re-definitions are subsequently incorporated into university policies of diversity. The process shows a clear disregard for the relativity of suffering. The system has been constructed in such a way that it can be easily exploited by individuals who are not particularly disadvantaged—privileged white females, well-to-do Latin

Americans, whites with an infinitesimal percentage of American-Indian blood in their veins, and elites from the Third World. This process works particularly well for "postcolonial" subjects who come from cultures already presented as disadvantaged because of colonialism. They slide easily into American society where a premium is placed on setting aside disadvantage. Quite simply, it is easy to make room for people who can be defined as disadvantaged but are actually as educated, entitled, and elitist as those holding the reins of power. In the case of Indian postcolonials, with decades of experience manipulating a preferential system and caste privilege, the transition is seamless.

We have seen how, on an intellectual level, the theories and pedagogies of alterity have been criticized and their value called into question. On a practical level, however, they are brilliantly conceived and deeply meaningful in light of American affirmative action policy. What we witness in these various theories of alterity is not just bad taste or a rarefied intellectual game devoid of reality. In light of affirmative action, they become the intellectual capital to reinforce a position that individuals and institutions want to maintain. These pedagogies of alterity present a culturally acceptable and sophisticated form of racism, since they leave the institutional benefits of being "othered" invisible and untouched. Why would an upper-class Indian professor at an elite institution stand in front of a room full of white people and claim that his experience is the same as that of ghetto blacks? Such gestures are not just misinformed or perverse. In terms of how preferences work in both India and the US, such a claim makes sense as a tried and true means of positioning the self, appropriating an identity and receiving advantages in a labor market that substantially disadvantages blacks and Hispanics. Without the "smoking gun" of intentionality, one cannot be deemed discriminatory in terms of race (Brown et al. 58).

As Rey Chow has noted, the multiculturalist and postcolonial subject may one day have to face up to their fateful relation to those objects of study behind which they hide as voyeurs, as fellow victims, and as self-appointed custodians (118–19; cited in Clark 24). Ultimately, the issue of accountability (Sunder Rajan 606) may call for some reckoning, but that time has not yet come. In the sly politics of othering, the question of who is speaking for whom (San Juan, *Racism* 183) has not yet been answered, although a need for reassessment looms large before multicultural and postcolonial critics as it becomes increasingly apparent that the periphery does not appear on its own terms. Postcolonialism and multiculturalism are, indeed, strategies of containment and co-optation where Euro-American privilege remains intact. The manner in which the Other is taught in these pedagogies supports belief in as well as the presumed superiority of Western civilization.

Dorothy Figueira, *University of Georgia* (US).

ENDNOTES

1 See Davis, Fish, Gates, Giroux, Gordon and Avery, Habermas, Jacoby, Lubiano, Rockefeller, San Juan, *Racial* and *Hegemony*, and Taylor.

2 While the language of postcolonialism is most often English, francophone and lusophone postcolonial studies have reinvigorated Romance language and literature departments.
3 It is not my intention to impose a parochial cast upon the relevant phenomena exposed in this investigation. It is just that the Indian conceptions of postcolonialism happen to predominate for the historical, economic, and social reasons that I will outline. There are, certainly, plenty of other Third-World avatars, mimics, and pretenders whose concepts of identity, of multiculturalism, and of their scholarly roles approximate the Indian postcolonial paradigm. However, Indian theorists have made their stream of the *Tendenz* so apparent that it makes them conspicuous. Other nativist shamans from Latin America, the Caribbean, and Africa are simply eclipsed.
4 In this respect, see Palumbo-Liu and Giroux.
5 In this essay, I identify multiculturalism and postcolonialism as subgroups of cultural studies, as instances of identity studies that have often come to be seen as studies in victimhood. In this group, one can also place (in varying degrees) other forms of identity studies such as Black Studies and Women's Studies as the initial configurations, and later formations such as Queer Studies, Male Studies, Whiteness Studies, Fat Studies, etc.
6 For a discussion of the definition of postcolonialism, see Figueira, "Profits" 246-47.
7 Timothy Brennan views it as a form of "liberal racism" that reproduces social exclusion rather than enhances diversity (115).
8 These parties push a *Hindutva* (Syndicated Brahmanical Hinduism) platform with two major issues: destroying the sixteenth-century mosque built on what was thought to be the site of the Hindu god Rama's birthplace and symbolically ending the habit of "coddling" Muslim sensibilities.
9 The HSC has moved away from the sectarian violence promulgated in India by the BJP, VHP, their ideological precursor, the Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (RSS), and gang Hindu activists of the Bajrang Pal.
10 For a study of Indian racial ideology and its scriptural justification, see Figueira, *Aryans*.
11 In 1975, the Association of Indians in America (AIA) successfully lobbied to add Indians to the US Census Bureau's non-white category (Nomura 35). They undertook a major campaign for Federal government acknowledgment of minority status and the establishment of a separate category listing in the 1980 US Census. Between 1950 and 1975, Indians (along with Pakistanis, Malayans, Thais, and Sri Lankans) were categorized as "other white" and not separately counted in the Census. With this ruling, they were now able to gain minority status as non-white Caucasians (Mazumdar 35).
12 Between 1966 and 1977, 83 percent of the Indian immigrants were categorized as professional or technical workers, with 20,000 scientists with PhDs, 40,000 engineers, and 25,000 medical doctors (Prashad 75). It is only recently that this demographic is being reconfigured, corrected so to speak, as non-professional cousins from the diaspora (notably Uganda and Kenya) migrate to join families settled in the States (Prashad 78).
13 Upper-caste Hindus have long sought to use notions of "purity of blood" and "Caucasian features" to exercise power over the majority of the population who have been dubbed the non-Aryan untouchables (Mazumdar 31). The "Aryan myth" in India is much more than a desire on the part of the colonized to be the equal of the colonizer. It is also a myth justifying class hegemony (Mazumdar 32). As Harold Isaacs put it rather bluntly in the 1970s, Indians who see themselves as descendants of the Aryans think of themselves as more white than "whites."

> This endows them with a sort of Mayflower status in relation to "whiteness" or "Aryanism" which they deny to many of their own darker-skinned countrymen. This India, peculiarly outraged, is not challenging the white man's racism as such. He is crying: "How dare you assume your air of Aryan superiority over me when I am just as Aryan as you, even more so." (290)

Isaacs claims that this Indian response to American racism—claiming to be white—has existed from the very beginnings of their immigration to these shores. It was first repudiated in the Supreme Court ruling against Bhagat Singh Thind in 1923. Prior to this ruling, dozens of Indian immigrants had gained US citizenship on the basis of their claim to be Caucasian. The Supreme Court ruled that "Caucasian" was not synonymous with "white." The Indians who had thus earned citizenship did not qualify as white people and, as a consequence, lost their citizenship. Indians' belief in their intrinsic "whiteness" as Aryans has never disappeared. It resurfaced during the main surge in immigration to the States in the late 1960s and early 1970s, reflecting their greater understanding of American racism. However, over time Indian immigrants gradually came to recognize the benefits to be accrued through minority status and sought to position themselves for gain of the resources available to historically oppressed minorities.

14 Lest we think that these issues that I have been discussing pertain only to the situation in the United States, we must realize that it is only a matter of time until we witness their appropriation and wholesale applicability to any number of foreign contexts. With the leveling out of difference, one can equally take a nineteenth-century Marxist interpretation of colonialism as it applies to Bengal and transfer it without reservation to 16th- or 20th-century Korea. It is a sad matter of fact that although literary theorists agonize over the hegemonic proliferations, any crazy theory coming out of the metropolitan centers and, notably, campuses in the United States, is quickly taken up and bandied across the globe. Deconstructionists of hegemony have no problems making their careers on the facile importation and dissemination of what is "hot" in Ivy-League centers of learning. So then, one could find American notions of multiculturalism forming the basis for discussion in a nativist regional languages think tank in Mysore and a conference devoted to Buddhism and postcolonialism taking place in Seoul.

15 Under instigation of the Shiv Sena and the BJP, the name of Bombay needed to be changed to reflect an India before the "usurpation" of the Muslims.

16 In their study documenting the endemic racism suffered by blacks on all levels of economic development, Brown et al. (73) refute the claim that educational gains produced the growth of the African American middle class in the sixties rather than governmental policies.

17 Thernstrom and Thernstrom argued that blacks made their greatest strides prior to affirmative action policies and government programs through the reduction in education deficits, increased job skills, and job experience. Brown et al. (189-94) refute this claim that it was not the individual triumphs in "slogging unassisted up the ladder of success" that improved the economic lives of blacks but the fact that the "ceiling" was "cracked open" by Title VII of the Civil Rights Act.

18 Very early on in the process of affirmative action, race norming became a common practice. Race norming consists of separate percentile rankings according to racial group. It allowed individuals to be ranked within their own groups, rather than in a common pool. Race norming was banned by the Civil Rights Act of 1991 as discriminatory. To bypass race norming, institutions sought representation by setting off searches for non-objective criteria, as in Indian attempts to circumvent court limitations on group preferences. In essence, race norming reappeared under other names.

19 The notion of race shifting was argued by Thernstrom and Thernstrom (407). In 1995, to great hue and cry, the legislature of California banned racial preferences and quotas in institutions of higher education in their state. In 1996, Texas followed suit. As predicted, black enrollment in the flagship schools of the system, Berkeley and Austin, declined. The general enrollment throughout the system, however, rose. Once preferences were banned, students were no longer encouraged to shift to institutions for the sake of the institution's demographics rather than the students' tested skill level. In essence, blacks redistributed themselves. The ensuing clamor centered on how minority enrollments in the flagship campuses were down rather than on how many more students, in

the wake of the banning of preferences, graduated.

20 A recent study cited in the *New York Times* discusses the negative effects of shifting in law schools and the manner in which it impacts on blacks becoming lawyers (Liptak).

WORKS CITED

Afzal-Khan, Fawzia, and Kalpana Seshadri-Crooks, eds. *The Pre-Occupation of Postcolonial Studies*. Durham: Duke UP, 2000.

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

Arac, Jonathan, and Harriet Ritvo, eds. *Macropolitics of Nineteenth-Century Literature: Nationalism, Exoticism, Imperialism*. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 1991.

Bahri, Deepika. "Once More with Feeling: What Is Postcolonialism?" *Ariel* 26.1 (1995): 51-82.

Behdad, Ali. "Une Pratique Sauvage: Postcolonial Belatedness and Cultural Politics." Afzal-Khan and Seshadri-Crooks. 71–85.

Bowen, William, and Derek Bok. *The Shape of the River*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1998.

Brennan, Timothy. *At Home in the World: Cosmopolitanism Now*. Cambridge: Harvard U P, 1997.

Brewer, Dominic J., Eric R. Eide, Dan D. Goldhaber. *An Examination of the Role of Student Race and Ethnicity in Higher Education Since 1972*. Washington, DC: Rand, 1999.

Brown, Michael K., Martin Carnoy, Elliot Currie, Troy Dusher, David. B. Oppenheimer, Marjorie M. Schultz, David Wellman. *Whitewashing Race: The Myth of a Color-Blind Society*. Berkeley: U of California P, 2003.

Chomsky, Noam. *Towards a New Cold War: Essays on the Current Crisis and How We Got There*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1982.

Chow, Rey. "Theory, Area Studies, Cultural Studies: Issues of Pedagogy in Multiculturalism." Miyoshi and Harootunian 103-18.

Clark, John. "On Two Books by Edward W. Said." *Bicitri Sena* 2 [Universiti Sains Malaysia] (Jun 1996): 20-47.

Cruz, Jon. "From Farce to Tragedy: Reflections on the Reification of Race at Century's End." Gordon and Newfield. 19-39.

Davis, Angela Y. "Gender, Class, Multiculturalism: Rethinking 'Race' Politics." Gordon and Newfield. 40-48.

Dirlik, Arif. "The Postcolonial Aura: Third World Criticism in the Age of Global Capitalism." *Critical Inquiry* 20.2 (Winter 1994): 328–56.

———. *The Postcolonial Aura: Third World Criticism in the Age of Global Capitalism*. Boulder: Westview P, 1997.

Du Bois, W.E.B. *Against Racism: Unpublished Essays, Papers, Addresses, 1887–1961*. Ed. Herbert Aptheker. Amherst: U Massachusetts P, 1985.

Essed, Philomena. *Understanding Everyday Racism: An Interdisciplinary Theory*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications, 1991.

Figueira, Dorothy. "The Profits of Postcolonialism." *Comparative Literature* 52.3 (2000): 246-54.

———. *Aryans, Jews, Brahmans: Theorizing Authority Through Myths of Identity*. Albany: State U of New York P, 2002.

Fish, Stanley. "Boutique Multiculturalism or Why Liberals Are Incapable of Thinking about Hate Speech." *Critical Inquiry* 23 (Winter 1997): 378-95.

Fox-Genovese, Elizabeth. "The Claims of a Common Culture: Gender, Race, Class, and the Canon." *Salmagundi* 72 (Fall 1986): 131-43.

Frankenberg, Ruth, and Lata Mani. "Crosscurrents, Crosstalk: Race, 'Postcoloniality' and the Politics of Location." *Cultural Studies* 7.2 (1993): 292–310.

Galanter, Marc. *Competing Equalities: Law and the Backward Classes in India*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1984.

Gates, Henry Louis. "Pluralism and Its Discontents." *Contention: Debates in Society, Culture, and Science*. 2.1 (Fall 1992): 69-79.

Ghosh, Partha S. "Language Policy and National Integration." *Ethnic Studies Report* 24.1 (1996): 49-72.

Giroux, Henry A. "Post-Colonial Ruptures and Democratic Possibilities: Multiculturalism as Anti-Racist Pedagogy." *Cultural Critique* (Spring 1992): 5-39.

Gitlin, Todd. *The Twilight of Common Dreams: Why America is Wracked by Culture Wars*. New York: Metropolitan Books, 1995.

Gordon, Avery F., and Christopher Newfield. *Mapping Multiculturalism*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1996.

Grewal, Inderpal. "The Postcolonial, Ethnic Studies, and the Diaspora: The Contexts of Ethnic Integration/Migrant Cultural Studies in the US." *Socialist Review* 24.4 (1994): 45-74.

Guerrero, M. Annette Jaimes. "American Indian Studies and Multiculturalism." Gordon and Newfield. 49-63.

Guillory, John. *Cultural Capital: The Problem of Literary Canon Formation*. Chicago: U Chicago P, 1993.

Habermas, Juergen. "Struggles for Recognition in the Democratic Constitutional State." Taylor. 107-48.

Huggan, Graham. *The Postcolonial Exotic: Marketing the Margins*. London: Routledge, 2001.

Hutcheon, Linda, and Marion Richmond. *Other Solitudes: Canadian Multicultural Fictions*. Toronto: Oxford U P, 1990.

ICLA Bulletin. XVI.1 (2008): 9-21 (URL www.byu.edu/icla accessed on 4 Jun 2008.)

India. Commission for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes. *Report of the Commission for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes*. First Report Jul 1978-Mar 1979. New Delhi: Controller of Publication, 1980.

Isaacs, Harold. *Images of Asia: American Views of China and India*. New York: Harper and Row, 1972.

Jacoby, Russell. "The Myth of Multiculturalism." *New Left Review* 208 (Nov-Dec 1994): 121-26.

Johnson, Beverly L. "Marital and Family Characteristics of the Labor Force, March 1979." *Monthly Labor Review* 103.4 (Apr 1980): 48-52.

Joshi, Barbara R. "Whose Law, Whose Order: 'Untouchables,' Social Violence, and the State of India." *Asian Survey* 22.7 (Jul 1982): 676-87.

Krishnaswamy, Revathi. "Mythologies of Migrancy: Postcolonialism, Postmodernism and the Politics of (Dis)location." *Ariel* 26.1 (Jan. 1995): 125-46.

Larsen, Neil. "DetermiNation: Postcolonialism, Poststructuralism, and the Problem of Ideology." Afzal-Khan and Seshadri-Crooks. 140-56.

Liptak, Adam. "For Blacks in Law School, Can Less be More?" *New York Times*, 13 Feb 2005.

Lubiano, Wahneema. "Like Being Mugged by a Metaphor: Multiculturalism and State Narratives." Gordon and Newfield. 64-75.

Lyotard, Jean François. *La condition postmoderne: rapport sur le savoir*. Paris: Minuit, 1979.

McClintock, Anne. "The Angel of Progress: Pitfalls of the Term 'Post-Colonialism.'" *Social Text* 31–32 (1992): 84–98.

Mazumdar, Sucheta. "Race and Racism: South Asians in the United States." Nomura, et al. 25-38.

Miyoshi, Masao, and H.D. Harootunian, eds. *Learning Places: The Afterlives of Area Studies*. Durham: Duke UP, 2002.

Nomura, Gail M., Russell Endo, Stephen H. Sumida, Russell C. Leong, eds. *Frontiers of Asian American Studies: Writing, Research, and Commentary*. Pullman WA: Washington State UP, 1989.

Okada, Richard. H. "Areas, Disciplines and Ethnicity." Miyoshi and Harootunian 190-205.
Palumbo-Liu, David. "Multiculturalism Now: Civilization, National Identity, and Difference Before and After September 11th." *Boundary 2* 29.2 (2002): 109-27.
Prashad, Vijay. *The Karma of Brown Folk*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 2000.
Rizvi, Fazal. "The Arts, Education and the Politics of Multiculturalism." *Culture, Difference and the Arts*. Eds. Sneja Gunew and Fazal Rizvi. St. Leonards, Australia: Allen & Unwin, 1994. 54-68.
Robbins, Bruce. "Secularism, Elitism, Progress, and Other Transgressions: On Edward Said's 'Voyage In.'" Afzal-Khan and Seshadri-Crooks. 157–70.
Rockefeller, Steven, C. "Comment." Taylor. 87-98.
Safire, William. "On Language: The New Black." *New York Times*, 30 May 2004: Magazine Desk.
San Juan, Jr., Epifanio. *Beyond Postcolonial Theory*. New York: St. Martin's P, 1998.
_____. *Hegemony and Strategies of Transgression: Essays in Cultural Studies and Comparative Literature*. Albany: State U New York P, 1995.
_____. *Racial Formations/Critical Transformation: Articulations of Power in Ethnic and Racial Studies in the United States*. Atlantic Highlands: Humanities P, 1992.
_____. *Racism and Cultural Studies: Critiques of Multiculturalist Ideology and the Politics of Difference*. Durham: Duke UP, 2002.
Sebastian, Sunny. "Rajasthan's 'Original Backwards' Rally for Justice." *The Hindu* 28 May 2001. <http://hinduonnet.com/thehindu/2001/0528/stories/142822b.htm>.
Sengupta, Somini. "Indian Officials to Rule How 'Backward' a Group Is." *The New York Times*, 5 Jun 2007.
Shohat, Ella. "Notes on the Post-Colonial." *Social Text* 31–32 (1992): 99–113.
——— and Robert Stam. *Multiculturalism, Postcoloniality, and Transnational Media*. New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 2003.
Slemon, Stephen. "Introductory Notes: Postcolonialism and Its Discontents." *Ariel* 26.1 (Jan 1995): 7–11.
Sowell, Thomas. *Affirmative Action around the World: An Empirical Study*. New Haven: Yale U P, 2004.
Sunder Rajan, Rajeswari. "The Third World Academic in Other Places; or, The Postcolonial Intellectual Revisited." *Critical Inquiry* 23.3 (Spring 1997): 596-616.
Srivastava, Aruna. "Postcolonialism and Its Discontents." *Ariel* 26.1 (Jan 1995): 12-17.
Talbot, Margaret. "Other Woes." *New York Times*, 18 Nov 2001: Magazine Desk.
Taylor, Charles. *Multiculturalism: Examining the Politics of Recognition*. Ed. Amy Gutmann. Princeton: Princeton U P, 1994.
Thernstrom, Stephen, and Abigail Thernstrom. *America in Black and White*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1997.
Žižek, Slavoj. *Welcome to the Desert of the Real!: Five Essays on September 11 and Related Dates*. London/New York: Verso, 2002.

ÉTATS DE LA PROFESSION / STATES OF THE PROFESSION:

France, Amérique du Nord/North America, Allemagne/Germany.

Anne Tomiche and Karl Zieger, eds. *La recherche en Littérature générale et comparée en France en 2007*: *Bilan et perspectives.* Le Mont-Houy: Presses Universitaires de Valenciennes, 2007. 366 pp. 978-2905725967.

This collection of essays on a wide variety of aspects of the state of comparative literature in France is in a sense the French equivalent of the ten-year reports of the American Comparative Literature Association. [See pp. 30-35 of this issue for a review of the most recent of these reports by Hans Bertens, ed.] In the case of the Société Française de Littérature Générale et Comparée, however, the only previous "livre blanc," as it is called, appeared in 1983, twenty-seven years after the founding meeting of the Société Française de Littérature Comparée ("Générale" was added in 1973). The present volume stems from the fiftieth anniversary meeting of the society at the Ecole Normale Supérieure in November of 2006. The objective of the volume, according to editor Anne Tomiche, is "de dresser un état des lieux des domaines comparatistes, à la fois pour mesurer l'évolution, en France, de la discipline dans les vingt dernières années et en même temps pour permettre une mise en perspective des activités et pratiques comparatistes en France au regard de celles menées à l'étranger" (9).

After a brief history of the Society and its fifty years of conferences, the volume groups the individual essays in five parts: "Transmissions et réceptions," "Littérature et arts," "Littérature et idées," "Théories littéraires et comparatisme," "Aires culturelles/linguistiques et globalisation." The essays, all written by different individuals, vary a great deal in style and content. Some tend to be primarily bibliographical compilations of books published and theses completed or in course; others tend toward the abstract and theoretical; most unite in various ways the transmission of bibliographical information with reflection on the discipline. If there is any comparison of French research with its counterpart in other countries, it is almost entirely limited to "le monde anglo-saxon."

The sometimes overwhelming compilations of recent comparative studies from a wide variety of perspectives give the impression that the discipline is alive and flourishing in France. Traditional divisions such as the Bible and literature, myths and literature, and the Greco-Roman heritage appear to have been given new life by developments in hermeneutics, gender theory, and reception theory, among other approaches. "Imagologie," defined as "étude des représentations lit-

téraires de l'étranger" (81), constitutes a long-standing domain that has been revitalized by postcolonial studies, so that it comprises not only the French view of the exotic or the other, but also the other's view of the colonial situation. Translation studies, long relegated to a minor place in French comparative literature, have be come, under the name of *traductologie*, more theoretical and more controversial. French comparatists have recently produced works on the poetics of translation as well as on translation's role in the works of specific writers. A collective work on the history of translations in the French language is in process.

The second category of essays includes discussions of literature and illustration as well as literature and music, dance, architecture, and cinema. Missing are painting, sculpture, and the arts of the stage, as well as the arts of digital media. The essay on illustration does discuss work done on the question of ekphrasis in the modern novel. In the discussion of relations between literature and music, the notion of ekphrasis is extended to include the verbal representation of music. We also learn that "librettology" is emerging as a field of study in the definition of relationships between text and music. New studies of the impact of Wagner on the theory and practice of the total work of art in Europe have appeared. Representations of dance in poetry and studies of the poetics of dance seem frequent in work on the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries; sparse for other periods. The representation of social dance in the novel is integrated into a "sociopoétique." The study of relations between literature and architecture has moved beyond the phenomenological approach in Bachelard's *Poétique de l'espace* (1957) to ask questions such as how rhetoric is incorporated into architecture. Somewhat surprisingly, relations between literature and cinema, neglected in the 1983 volume, make their debut in comparative literature here. Studies of writers who were also film makers seem to dominate the field.

The third section contains six essays whose titles all begin with "Littérature et . . ." and end with, respectively, "philosophie," "psychanalyse," "histoire," "catastrophes historiques," "critique," and "esthétique." Missing, curiously, is "littérature et politique"—a topic of interest in France for quite some time. In the first essay, Camille Dumoulié argues that comparative literature holds "la position stratégique d'un entre-deux," and that comparatists are thus uniquely positioned to offer fresh approaches to the relations between literature and philosophy. The advantages of this positioning seem also to be borne out in the production of work concerning the other dyads. The essays on history celebrate a reaction against structuralism's desertion of the historical dimension in literature and note that French holocaust studies are at last catching up to their American counterparts. In the essay on criticism, William Marx speculates on why "anglo-saxon" research has been so far ahead of its French and other European counterparts in the domains of the history and theory of literary criticism. He finds the answer partially in the insularity of British and American universities, with their tendency to reflect on their own productions. Recent French theses and books, however, attest to growing interest in this domain. Work on literature and esthetics, long dominated by Germans, is also growing in France, notably in the work of Pierre Brunel.

The fourth section, purportedly on literary theory, contains a rather hetero-

geneous group of essays, including not only discussion of work on reception theory, cultural studies, gender studies, and theories of narratology and autobiography, but also studies of children's literature and popular literature ("littérature de grande diffusion"). One consistent theme seems to be that the "anglo-saxons," inspired by "French theory," have been dominant in many of these fields (particularly cultural and gender studies) but that the French are now making their own contributions. Didier Souiller laments the too "politically correct" tendencies of some of the Anglo-American studies and outlines specifically French research in the domain of "histoire des mentalités" and "anthropologie culturelle." Françoise Lavocat makes the observation that for many years, due primarily to structuralist influence in the sixties, French theorists were hostile to comparative literature, which they accused of being theoretically deficient. She credits Thomas Pavel with inspiring a new generation of specifically comparatist theorists of fiction in France. Studies in previously neglected fields such as children's literature and science fiction also seem to have drawn the interest of comparatists in France.

The last section includes essays on the notion of world literature ("littérature mondiale") and that of European literature, postcolonial and "exoticism" studies, "géocritique," and, finally, three essays on comparative work in African literature, "Littératures d'extrême-orient," and Indian literatures. The relegation of non-Western literatures to the end of the book is symptomatic of a tendency of the whole: the reader is left with the definite impression that comparative literature in France is still anchored in the study of European literatures. Tiphaine Samoyault's discussion of world literature is based primarily on the work of U.S. scholars (Said, Spivak, Damrosch), although she notes the earlier contributions of Etiemble. Pascal Dethurens argues that the moment for writing histories of national literatures is over and that it is time to view European literature as an organic whole. Yet his discussion is symptomatic of another general characteristic of the book: it is heavily weighted toward the novel in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Indeed, poetry and drama are, on the whole, noticeably absent from the entire volume, as are discussions of comparative work on periods prior to the nineteenth century and on the literatures of eastern Europe.

Both Jean-Marc Moura, writing on postcolonialism and exoticism studies, and Xavier Garnier, writing on African literatures, lament the paucity of French research in the area of postcolonial studies, but see some promising tendencies for the future. Bertrand Westphal's essay on "géocritique"—defined as a methodology that permits "l'étude des représentations esthétiques des espaces humains," grounded in the work of Deleuze and Guattari and first defined at the University of Limoges in 1999—includes the work of French-speaking African scholars. Garnier's essay, as well as Claudine Le Blanc's on Indian literatures, discuss the necessity of going beyond the study of Francophone and Anglophone literatures toward a plurilinguistic approach necessary for understanding the wide variety of literatures in Africa and India. This can best be accomplished by working in teams, an observation that highlights another general characteristic of the book. The American reader cannot help but be impressed by the mention of numerous research centers and teams where collaborative comparative work is done and la-

ment the relative absence of such possibilities in the U.S.

In her essay on the literatures of the far East, Muriel Détrie reminds us that Etiemble, in 1975, was one of the first to deplore the "européocentrisme" of Western comparatists. Since then, she claims, things have changed, notably in the number of translations of Asian works available in French. While she cites an impressive number of works on literary exchanges between France and China, Japan, and Korea, among others, she laments the fact that since 1971-72, no work of far-Eastern literature has appeared on the program of the Agrégation in general and comparative literature. The virtual absence of any mention of works of non-Western literature in the essays on various approaches to comparative literature in this volume could be cited as another indication of a lagging global perspective among French comparatists, although one should not neglect the work of distinguished French scholars of Africa and Asia mentioned in the final chapters. Given the longstanding French interest in north Africa and the Middle East, it also seems to me curious that there is no essay on or discussion of work on Arabic literature, or even on Francophone literature of the Maghreb.

Of course it is impossible for a collection of essays to cover all the work being done in comparative literature in France, and we should be grateful for the considerable amount of information in this volume. It will serve as an important reference tool for many years to come, and it conveys the good news of the healthy, varied, and growing state of French comparative literature.

Mary Ann Frese Witt, *North Carolina State University* (USA).

Haun Saussy, ed. *Comparative Literature in an Age of Globalization*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins U P, 2006. xiii + 261 pp. 978-0801883804.

Every ten years, as required by its by-laws, the American Comparative Literature Association commissions a "Report on the State of the Discipline"—more specifically, the state of the discipline in North America. In 2003, the then president of the ACLA invited Haun Saussy, professor of Comparative Literature and East Asian Languages and Literatures at Yale, to produce the next report, to be presented to the ACLA in 2004. Saussy's "Report on the State of the Discipline, 2004" was, with some delay, published as the book under review, *Comparative Literature in an Age of Globalization*.

Saussy's report—or book, if you will—consists of two parts. The first part, "The State of the Discipline, 2004," which takes up well over two-thirds of the book, presents twelve essays. It opens with a long introductory essay by Saussy himself, mostly a history and general survey of the discipline, and follows up with essays by scholars selected not only because they had recently written on issues pertinent to the discipline as such (and had done so, one assumes, with some sort of authority), but also, Saussy tells us, in the expectation that they "would impress, alarm, delight, and stimulate our readership by disagreeing with me and with each other about the state of the field" (vii). The second part of *Comparative Literature in an Age of Globalization*, "Responses," offers exactly what its title

promises: responses to the essays collected in Part One by a number of scholars who were instructed to discover shared positions and common ground in those essays and thereby, if possible, to arrive at overall conclusions regarding the state of comparative literature in the early years of the new millennium.

One of the functions of a review is to give the reader a reasonably reliable idea of the central themes, ideas, and arguments of the book in question. Obviously, the main aim of *Comparative Literature in an Age of Globalization* does not need much further explication, but a collection of nineteen essays that indeed do largely disagree, as Saussy had hoped, with his own essay and with each other, strongly resists the more traditional reviewing tactics. What we can identify, however, are a number of central issues that concern most of Saussy's contributors.

These issues are already evident in Saussy's lucid and impressive survey of the history and changing nature of comparative literature and in his own assessment of the current state of the discipline. From an institutional point of view, the most pressing concern is certainly the precarious position of many Comparative Literature departments, a position that is not improved by the similar problems experienced by many Language programs. Comparative literature may have won its battles, as Saussy rightly claims, to the point that its "premises and protocols," including its interdisciplinarity, have been accepted virtually everywhere in the field of literary studies, but comparative literature programs usually amount to not much more than "thinly funded patchworks" (4). Programs that are fully self-sufficient and independent are rare and becoming rarer.

From a scholarly point of view—and here the consensus with regard to comparative literature's institutional status immediately disappears—the discipline's character and scope would still appear to be the most important concern. Such a state of affairs would be considered dangerous and deeply undesirable in most disciplines, but with comparative literature such essential undecidedness has become a way of life. Fifty years ago, in 1958, René Wellek (cited here by David Ferris) argued in "The Crisis of Comparative Literature" that "the most serious sign of the precarious state of our study is the fact that we have not been able to establish a distinct subject matter and a specific methodology" (85). But whereas for Wellek the absence of a clearly defined subject matter and methodology was a crippling flaw that might sooner or later become fatal, for recent generations of comparatists that absence has rather created opportunities. In 1993 the predecessor of the 2004 report, Charles Bernheimer's "Comparative Literature at the Turn of the Century," later published with sixteen responses as *Comparative Literature in the Age of Multiculturalism*, took delight in crossing boundaries and in refusing to accept any limits to what comparative literature might be or do. "The space of comparison," Bernheimer wrote in 1993, "today involves comparison between artistic productions usually studied by different disciplines; between various cultural constructions of those disciplines; between Western cultural traditions, both high and popular, and those of non-Western cultures; between pre- and postcontact cultural productions of colonized peoples," a state of affairs that led him to suggest that "the term 'literature' may no longer adequately describe our object of study" (quoted by Saussy, 18-19). The new and not unambitious task of com-

parative literature was to “analyze the material possibilities of cultural expression, both phenomenal and discursive, in their different epistemological, economic, and political contexts” (19). In short, what Bernheimer seemed to foresee was Departments of Comparative Literature transformed first into Departments of Cultural Studies and eventually into all-encompassing Departments of Studies.

Although there would seem to be a tentative return to more familiar—that is, literary—ground, *Comparative Literature in an Age of Globalization* makes clear that for a good many comparatists “literature” is still far too confining. Fedwa Malti-Douglas, who rather coquettishly insists on her status as *enfant terrible*, tells us about her interest in the world of comics and, more importantly, about the “siren of law, medicine, and science” (179) that keeps calling her and that has her for instance teach the transcripts from the Lorena Bobbitt case in conjunction with the video of her trial. “For me comparative literature must be a world without limits,” she asserts, “assuming that one can navigate several languages” (182). Gail Finney, after discussing the “large and growing body of literature that takes the concept of masculinity as its point of departure” (121), hopes for a further diversification of the academy. Steven Ungar focuses on translation, its poetics, politics, and ethics. For others, such as Roland Greene and Jonathan Culler in their respective—and very thoughtful—responses, comparative literature should return to the literature that they see as its core business. As it is, however, comparative literature’s subject matter remains undefined, with those who upgrade other fields of study at the expense of literature (and especially canonical literature), and who prefer a potentially limitless comparativism, presenting that expansion as an important political gesture, an act of resistance against “Eurocentrism” and the dominance of “Europe.” Saussy’s suggestion to think of comparative literature as “a discipline defined by the search for its proper objects” (12) is to the point.

It would, however, be as much to the point to think of comparative literature as a discipline defined by the search for the proper questions. Reading these contributions one is struck by their focus on comparison *per se*. Caroline Eckhardt would like to see a “globally comparative history of medieval literatures”; Fedwa Malti-Douglas, after mentioning Frida Kahlo’s paintings, and the 1998 comic strip biography of Kahlo by Marco Corona, calls the film *Frida* (2002) “yet another comparatist’s dream.” David Damrosch, in a very instructive piece on the continuing dominance of “European” authors in comparative studies, laments the absence of any articles on Munshi Premchand and James Joyce and on Higuchi Ichiyo and Joyce. Emily Apter, after admitting to initial misgivings, shows a measure of enthusiasm for Alain Badiou’s project of comparing those works with the least relation to each other in order “to release the revolutionary possibility of an Event by making manifest Truth” (54)—although she does not necessarily share Badiou’s revolutionary zeal. Zhang Longxi, aware of Alain Badiou’s later and more radical intervention, cites with approval Claudio Guillén’s view that the “comparative study of historically unrelated works” is “the most promising tendency in comparative literature” (233). This list, which might have been a good deal longer, is most of all interesting because of what is missing. In his opening essay Saussy reminds the reader of the skeptical question that monoliterary col-

leagues used to ask before comparative literature became intellectually fashionable: "Why should we be interested in this encounter?"—meaning an encounter between two or more texts from different national literatures. A better question would have been: "With what purpose do you bring these texts together?" Or, from a slightly different angle: "What questions are you going to ask? What is it you want to find?" Some of the essays in *Comparative Literature* express a certain concern with the conditions necessary, or at least desirable, for an act of comparison—such as a *tertium quid.* But there is curiously little interest in the idea that research might be driven by problems and questions—which in turn, to address Wellek's methodological point, determine the appropriate methods—and not by the impulse to compare (even if that would mean giving up on Badiou's Truth). The impulse to compare, even if driven by honorable curiosity, can never be enough, certainly not in a time when the humanities are expected to conform more and more to research attitudes and methods established in other fields.

Ever since the rise of multiculturalism, "Europe" has been a divisive issue. As Saussy reminds us, comparative literature's renegotiation—or even denial—of boundaries and its rapprochement with cultural studies signaled a politically inspired move away from "Europe." And the desire to get away from "Europe" and to be politically relevant played a decisive role in the general move towards the contemporary that characterizes much of comparative literature's recent metamorphoses (calling attention to the ever more precarious position within comparative literature of the medieval and early modern periods, Caroline D. Eckhardt's essay has some interesting suggestions to make). In *Comparative Literature* the spectre of "Europe" haunts several contributions. But the uneasiness about "Europe" is not limited to subject matter. Emily Apter worries because "[e]ven newer forms of postcolonial comparativism have inadvertently perpetuated neocolonial geopolitics in carrying over the imperial carve-up of linguistic fields" (35)—the "carve-up" of the Caribbean is a case in point—and David Ferris sees in comparison itself, that is, the idea of comparison upon which comparative literary study is founded, an act of appropriation, "the right to compare without restriction, the right to exemplify comparison" (83). From this perspective perhaps the new directions that comparative literature may take are not so new at all: "[. . .] the question that really needs to be posed here is whether this future is still not essentially European in effect, a Europe effaced into other names: nation, earth, world, planet [. . .]" (83)—with "planet" presumably referring to Gayatri Spivak's recent proposal to go planetary. It's a relief to find Linda Hutcheon, in her response to these and other statements, expressing her hope that comparative literature "won't forget its roots, that it won't forget Europe" (228).

This uneasiness with "Europe" is, however, only one expression of a more fundamental anxiety: the fear that comparative literature, in spite of all its efforts, still fails to do justice to true alterity. For Djelal Kadir, who practically accuses the discipline of a "default complicity" in Bush's war on terror, and on alterity in general, comparative literature is hopelessly compromised (a view that is not made more credible by an absurd reference to Auschwitz). But the fear to misrepresent or belittle alterity, in whatever form, also haunts a good many less radical contri-

butions. It is that fear of misrepresentation that makes translation, and in particular translation's inevitable shortcomings, a recurring issue. So we find Steven Ungar quoting Spivak's dismissal of the "sort of with-it translatese" into which Third World literature apparently invariably gets translated, and paying far too much attention to the musings of a North African writer who finds himself "relegating [my native language] to my deepest self" when he writes in French. Writing in French surely is his own choice (just like it is my choice, and probably for the same reasons, to write this review in English, and not in my native language). It is obvious that translations cannot be perfect, but it is equally obvious that we cannot do without them. It takes a profound knowledge of a foreign language, a far more advanced level than comparative literature's language requirement has in mind, to get more out of an original text than out of a translation that is the work of a well-informed craftsman who respects the original. And, in spite of the misgivings expressed in *Comparative Literature in an Age of Globalization*, most translations are pretty good, while some are even superb and allow the reader to get a real idea of the texture of the original. This is not to belittle the problem of alterity, or to ignore that things get lost in translation, but it is not much use to make impossible demands and then bewail our collective failure.

The globalization, or, if you will, de-"Europeanization" of comparative literature, on the one hand, and this deep-seated fear of doing injustice to alterity on the other, together create a strange split. While the old rules, aesthetic and otherwise, still apply to "European" literature, these rules, based as they are on "European assumptions" and drawn from "European" contexts, are not applied to non-"European" texts. The result is that with regard to "Europe" nothing much has changed and that the old canon happily marches on (as Damrosch shows us), whereas with regard to non-"European" texts we find a virtually ethnological approach that refuses judgments and demands an almost superhuman impartiality.

A final traditional issue that simply will not go away—not in the least because it is intimately linked to translation—is that of the position of thematic studies. For Saussy "it is never enough to simply discover the same themes appearing in different places." On his view, "an account of how the works make their subject matter manifest is the only thing that can save a comparison [. . .] from platitude" (13-14). Others claim that comparison on the basis of thematics, from for instance a feminist perspective, is justifiable in its own right, or that, in the spirit of the 1993 ACLA report, the fields in which texts function—cultural, social, political—rather than their formal properties should be at the center of the discipline. Although this issue remains unresolved, its presence is one of the indications that literature, as I have already suggested, would seem to be on its way back to center stage. Another indication is the attention paid to the problem of "world literature"—an inevitable consequence of comparative literature going global (even if *Comparative Literature in an Age of Globalization* never gives us a convincing account of the term). We find a number of references to David Damrosch's proposal to see "world literature" as a mode of reading, to "world literature" courses, and, inevitably, to the impossibility of "world literature." But its presence is a hopeful sign if, like Roland Greene and Jonathan Culler, one is convinced that the

proper business of comparative literature is to interrogate literature as a transnational phenomenon, to borrow Culler's phrase, and to study literary works within their networks, to paraphrase Greene.

What strikes me most from my side of the Atlantic about *Comparative Literature in an Age of Globalization* is its amazing sensitivity to the "other"; its almost desperate desire to avoid giving offense and its horror of trespassing; its apologetic tone as soon as the non-West heaves in sight. Perhaps America's recent role on the world stage has added further embarrassment to what already was felt to be an uncomfortable position—Culler explicitly mentions America's "horrific role in the world"—but no one in his right mind is going to associate the invariably honorable contributors to this volume with past or present misdeeds. At certain points in this book the reader is tempted to shout "Get away from that mirror! Stop staring at yourself. And no more flagellation!" Maybe the ACLA should have another look at its by-laws and not commission the next report before 2025.

Hans Bertens, *Utrecht University* (The Netherlands).

Volker Wehdeking. *Generationenwechsel. Intermedialität in der deutschen Gegenwartsliteratur* [Change of Generations: Intermediality in Contemporary German Literature]. Berlin: Erich Schmidt Verlag, 2007. 225 pp. 978-3503 098279.

Nicole Mahne. *Transmediale Erzähltheorie. Eine Einführung* [A Transmedial Theory of Narration: An Introduction]. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2007. 143 pp. 978-3825229139.

The era when comparative studies in Germany mainly compared different literatures has long since passed, and interdisciplinarity is now largely regarded as the most creditable, if not the only acceptable, approach. Comparative literature first extended its scope to include sociology, anthropology, and cultural studies, then turned decisively towards media studies in the 1990s and has not changed this course since. This turn in the field corresponds to a phenomenon in contemporary German literature commonly labelled as intermediality. An extensive reflection on various media and an experimental expansion of the literary medium through the integration and the simulation of other media are considered omnipresent and obvious. Besides music, figurative artworks, comics, photographs, films, and TV, digital and electronic media are now increasingly being discussed, and, indeed, structurally imitated. A remarkable range of published works to date (e.g., Schmidt, Börnchen, Sichelstiel, Greber and Lüdeke, Vogt, Scott) has focused on this phenomenon by considering the interplay between literature and other forms of expression in the works of one author or, in a historical perspective, within a particular era, and thus situates itself in the tradition of interart studies. This has been followed by the introduction of sophisticated theories of intermediality by such philologists as Rajewsky, Müller, Helbig, and Meyer, Simanowski, and Zeller.

This review is in no way an exhaustive survey of the research on intermediality in Germany. Rather it highlights two current trends in this field paradigmatical-

ly exemplified by two books that appeared in 2007: Nicole Mahne's *Transmediale Erzähltheorie* and Volker Wehdeking's *Generationenwechsel. Intermedialität in der deutschen Gegenwartsliteratur.* While both authors quietly subordinate their literary studies to a broader interdisciplinary concept of media studies, they push in different directions: Wehdeking, who examines the success story of contemporary German intermedial literature, is interested in "intermediality within literature," but tries to explain the phenomenon from a sociological perspective and takes the contexts of the production and the reception of multimedia artworks into account. Mahne, in contrast, examines the structures of various "narrative media" to arrive at a systematic transmedial narrative theory that has application for future studies on specific topics and objects.

In 2004, after a decade of growing popularity for research on intermediality, Liv Hausken demanded that we "aspire to narrative theories that are independent of medium, while recognizing that the development of such theories demands a certain level of abstraction. Furthermore, I believe that we need medium-specific theories of narrative, theories with a conceptual apparatus sufficiently specialized to define the actual differences between narratives in the various media" (397). In *Transmediale Erzähltheorie* Nicole Mahne strives to achieve both goals.

Mahne conceives of narrative as a fundamental cognitive ability to organize and communicate events in the real world—and considers this as principally dependent on the qualities of the media in which it is expressed. Since it is not enough to assert the omnipresence of narration, she assumes a broad spectrum of narrative modes and specific narrative structures conditioned by the specific disposition of each medium. Narrative theories traditionally have been developed based on the novel and thus its specific medial qualities have been employed to define narration. Mahne, however, aims to detach the idea of narration from the potential of one single genre. Therefore her introductory study analyzes the specific narrative modes of a variety of media.

In contrast to intermediality, in which different media interact by way of references, imitation, or fusion to form a hybrid medium, transmediality in this study refers, as Irina O. Rajewsky has suggested in her widely read study, to phenomena that are not specific to one medium, but are common to many of them, albeit realized differently. In accordance with its goal, Mahne's book comprises five chapters that outline a transmedial narrative theory and five (comparatively longer) chapters dedicated to specific narrative media: novels, comics, films, audio plays, and hyperfiction. She starts with reflections on the basic question of "What does 'narration' mean?" then follows this with her definition of the necessary components of narrations, her concept of media, and its significance for narration.

Recalling the spectrum of definitions of the term "narrative" reaching from structuralist to most recent theories, she reviews the differentiation between *histoire* and *discours* as one between an abstract story and its realizations in various media. It is on this distinction that Seymour Chatman based his axiom of the "transposability of the story" (from the novel to other media) presupposing two constituents: the sequential arrangement of its media as the premise for the discourse and the chain of events resulting in a story. She also discusses the positions

of his critics who emphasize the crucial importance of the medium (for example, Barbara Herrnstein Smith who argues against the existence of an abstract story prior to its medial realization, and Thomas B. Leitch who argues that narrative always appears as a media manifestation and thus cannot be described independently, "since no story exists outside or independent of a narrative discourse," 17). In accordance with Marie-Laure Ryan and Knut Hickethier, Mahne understands media not as neutral containers for any interchangeable contents, but agrees that their structural qualities do influence both form and content. Various media have a range of particular specific affinities for certain themes.

Building on Werner Wolf's transgeneric intermedial theory of narration (Wolf's contributions are among the most influential in German research on intermediality), Mahne defines place, time, characters, and plot as basic narrative components meaningfully organized through chronology and, mostly, also through causality and teleology. To avoid misunderstanding, it should be mentioned that Mahne distinguishes between media with greater or less narrative potential and, for the purposes of her study, she singles out "narrative media" that fulfill the necessary premises, that is, the capability of communicating a *sequence* of events.

When narrative is understood as a universal structure, it comprises heterogeneous medial forms of representation and, thus, cannot be defined by the specific quality of a particular medium. Therefore, in the theoretical part of her study, she revises definitions developed in view of a particular medium and, in her practical examination of phenomena, advances the analytic criteria originally derived from narrative texts.

The two most detailed chapters, on comics and film, following the initial chapter on the novel, offer a step-by-step introduction to the specific qualities of these media. Both focus on the particularity of visual narration, but differ in their criteria of analysis. Whilst the chapter on the comic examines the relationship between picture and text, the temporal dimension, the triad of individual panel/panel-sequence/page-layout, as well as focalization and communicative structure—categories derived from the novel—the film chapter, in addition to the temporal and spatial dimensions, pays attention to language, music and sound, focalization, and narrative agent.

Each chapter, including the comparatively shorter ones on audioplays and hyperfiction, closes with a tabular summary. As opposed to audiobooks, where the text of a novel is simply read aloud, audio*plays* make additional use of the narrative potential of sound. Hyperfiction makes it possible to explore the possibilities of narration on a digital platform which differs from other strictly linear narrative text genres by virtue of its hypertext format: that is, a medium-specific text architecture consisting of texts loosely connected by links offering various combinational choices for reading a story. Concentrating on hypertexts whose dominant semiotic system is written language and thus disregarding those which also employ pictures and sounds in order to simplify the comparison to regular book texts, Mahne examines the computer monitor's distinct temporal and spatial configurations of presentation. Through contrasts between this and other media, even her analysis of the novel (classically subdivided into narrative voice, structure of

communication, metalepsis, temporal and spatial dimensions, distance, focalization, and perspective) allows her to highlight all the singular qualities of this genre.

Mahne's discussion of concrete examples produces convincing outcomes and demonstrates the advantages of media-conscious narrative theory (for a more detailed review that includes critical comments, see Heiss). As its title states, this book is to be regarded as an introduction and, considered as such, it is accessibly written and fills a gap in literary studies by introducing all the important concepts necessary for further in-depth research in this area.

In a very different approach from Mahne's, Wehdeking, without relying greatly on theories, collects evidence to prove that intermedial writing is a phenomenon characteristic of a certain generation. As a consequence of the constantly growing presence of mass media in everyday life, literature itself becomes more and more intermedial; such is the premise of Wehdeking's commendable attempt to combine research on intermediality with a sociological perspective on the succession of generations in his new book *Generationenwechsel.*

Developing Werner Wolf's widely accepted concept, Wehdeking defines intermediality as the "cooperation of at least two media in narration or media transfer in a structurally enriching and mutually illuminating way." Thus Wehdeking examines "open and concealed mentions of media that have structural impact" as well as "media transfer that generates a new semantic impact." The prevalence of intermediality is observed in the postmodern novel, in accordance with the typical playful mix of genres and multiple coding. By employing various examples, Wehdeking demonstrates that the "structural consequences" of intermediality are especially striking in minimalistic and neorealistic narratives.

In the first part of this dyadic study, which analyzes adaptations of films and screenplays by Thomas Brussig, Frank Goosen, Helmut Kraußer, Josef Haslinger, and Florian Henckel von Donnersmarck, the visual media clearly predominate. In the second part, however, the author demonstrates the "intermedial consequences of a view that is increasingly influenced by film and TV consumer habits" in novels by Judith Hermann, Yoko Tawada, Alexa Hennig von Lange, and others. Film adaptations of novels have been a favorite topic of intermedia research for a decade or more, but here Wehdeking focuses on the reverse case in which the screenplay precedes the novel, as in Brussig's *Wie es leuchtet* (2004), where the original version of the text remains visible in a film-like narrative mode. In addition, he considers the interplay of TV and literature: Birgit Vanderbeke's prose, for instance, "reflects the omnipresent advertising in the continual and rapid fading in of pictures comparable to commercial advertising spots." To illustrate the innovative genesis of a text on audiotape, the author cites the example of Juli Zeh's novel *Adler und Engel* (2001) whose protagonist dictates his thoughts using a DAT-recorder. To describe the influence of the internet and its special manner of communication on narration, as in Norman Ohler's Berlin novel *Mitte* (2001), Wehdeking uses the term "electronic expressionism." The consequences of a protagonist's reading of comics are traced in the minimalist narration of Alexa Hennig von Lange's *Relax* (1997). Similarly, he further develops the common view of the media's presence in narrative prose by showing how it is turned into parody

in Moritz von Uslar's novel *Waldstein oder Der Tod von Walter Gieseking am 6. Juni 2005* (2005), realized through the interpolation and deconstruction of essayistic passages known from classic modern novels such as Thomas Mann's.

Wehdeking devotes special attention to socio-critical media references and their impact on the ethical-philosophical meaning of the whole. In this regard, the various media-saturated "generations"—as they have been named by the authors themselves ranging from "Generation X" (Douglas Coupland) to "Generation Golf" (Florian Illies)—diverge. Without further expounding the difficulties of this concept, Wehdeking links his spectrum of "generations" with the evolution of media, and so contrasts, for example, a generation sceptical of mass media with a "Single Generation" enthusiastic about popular media and "product-hedonism."

Wehdeking further compares the perspectives of authors from the former East and West Germany. Regardless of ideological differences in the evaluation of political developments and in the attitude towards new media (scepticism vs. enthusiasm), it can be observed that texts written in the 1990s by authors from the former East Germany very soon became similar to those produced by authors of the "Generation Golf" of the former West in their intermedial structure. Since all these "generations" are united in their common exposure to increasing de-realization and simulation (Jean Baudrillard, Friedrich Kittler) and this experience is visible in their art, Wehdeking defines intermediality as their main common quality.

The innovation of his study lies in its complexity, its multi-perspective view of the artworks. In terms of concept, method, and vocabulary it situates itself closer to media studies than to "classical" literary studies, since it deals with production procedures of film adaptations, criteria for "screenable" novels and questions of rights, as well as market and reader interest research. This reflects a general trend in which the media and literary research draw closer to each other. It aims at understanding the enormous success of intermedial literature: the popularity of books like Sven Regener's *Herr Lehmann* can be ascribed to the potential for a multimedia reception inherent to the text and reinforced by audio books, soundtrack-CDs, and film tie-ins. This corresponds to the multimedia consumer habits of young readers who often consume the film adaptation before the novel it is based on. Wehdeking observes that a change of medium (novel into film and soundtrack) opens up a new market for the book—as in the case of "Herr Lehmann" where the film and soundtrack aroused interest in the book. Furthermore, he explains the success of certain books by their proximity to topics and practices of the popular new German cinema.

Summarizing his various conclusions, Wehdeking asserts that the self-evident nature of daily interaction with new media leads to their unreflected omnipresence as backdrop scenery and to their narrative imitation in German contemporary literature, but now seldom results in essayistic reflection on media. Exceptions can be found in neorealistic high literature, for instance, in Ulrike Draesner's *Mitgift* (2002). Common to most texts discussed in this study is an increasing simulation of media in the perception of its protagonists. According to Wehdeking, the modified view changes the narrative structure that mirrors the mental disposition.

Wehdeking finally concludes that intermediality is a *conditio sine qua non*

of German contemporary literature. This provokes the question of whether his thesis only has validity because nowadays everything is labelled "intermedial." Although delineating the story of the success of intermedial literature, Wehdeking also quotes more sceptical voices deploring the increasing hybridization of texts and new media resulting in impropriety and excess.

Wehdeking's study not only illuminates the change in the generations of intermedial literature, but itself functions as an index for a change of generations in the research of intermediality: by—much less scrupulously formalistic than the studies by the first generation—combining a by now familiar perspective with a new one and thus still arriving at new conclusions.

Evi Zemanek, *Friedrich-Alexander-Universität* (Germany).

Références / Works Cited

Börnchen, Stefan. *Kryptenhall. Allegorien von Schrift, Stimme und Musik in Thomas Manns* Doktor Faustus. München: Fink, 2006.

Chatman, Seymour. *Story and Discourse. Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film*. Ithaca/London: Cornell U P, 1978.

Greber, Erika and Roger Lüdeke. *Intermedium Literatur. Beiträge zu einer Medientheorie der Literaturwissenschaft*. Göttingen: Wallstein, 2004.

Hausken, Liv: "Coda. Textual Theory and Blind Spots in Media Studies," Ryan 391-404.

Heiss, Nina. "Zur Schnittstelle zwischen Narratologie und Medienwissenschaft. Nicole Mahnes Einführung in die transmediale Erzähltheorie." http://www.iaslonline.de/ [5-1-2008]

Helbig, Jörg. *Theorie und Praxis eines interdisziplinären Forschungsgebiets*. Berlin: Schmidt, 1998.

Hickethier, Knut. *Einführung in die Medienwissenschaft*. Stuttgart/Weimar: Metzler, 2003.

Leitch, Thomas M. *What Stories Are: Narrative Theory and Interpretation*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State U P, 1986.

Meyer, Urs Meyer, Roberto Simanowski, and Christoph Zeller, eds. *Transmedialität. Zur Ästhetik paraliterarischer Verfahren*. Göttingen: Wallstein, 2006.

Müller , Jürgen E. *Intermedialität. Formen moderner kultureller Kommunikation*. Münster: Nodus-Publ., 1996.

Rajewsky, Irina O. *Intermedialität*. Tübingen: Francke, 2002.

Ryan, Marie-Laure. *Narrative across Media. The Languages of Storytelling*. Lincoln/London: U of Nebraska P, 2004.

Schmidt, Olaf. *"Callots fantastisch karikierte Blätter": Intermediale Inszenierungen und romantische Kunsttheorie im Werk E.T.A. Hoffmanns*. Berlin: Erich Schmidt, 2003.

Scott, Calvin. "*Ich löse mich in Tönen . . .": Intermedialität bei Stefan George und der Zweiten Wiener Schule*. Berlin: Frank und Timme, 2007.

Sichelstiel, Andreas. *Musikalische Kompositionstechniken in der Literatur. Möglichkeiten der Intermedialität und ihrer Funktion bei österreichischen Gegenwartsautoren*. Essen: Die Blaue Eule, 2004.

Smith, Barbara Herrnstein. "Narrative Versions, Narrative Theories," *Critical Inquiry* 7.1 (1980): 213-36.

Vogt , Jochen. *Medien Morde. Krimis—Intermedial*. München: Fink, 2004.

Wolf, Werner. "Das Problem der Narrativität in Literatur, bildender Kunst und Musik: Ein Beitrag zu einer intermedialen Erzähltheorie." *Erzähltheorie transgenerisch, intermedial, interdisziplinär*. Vera und Ansgar Nünning, eds. Trier: WVT, 2002. 23-87.

TOURS D'HORIZON RÉGIONAUX ET NATIONAUX / REGIONAL AND NATIONAL OVERVIEWS

Writing the History of East-Central European Literary Cultures: A Retrospect

The remarks below draw on my experience of working with John Neubauer on a massive *History of the Literary Cultures of East-Central Europe*, a work that has recently been described by a reviewer as "a significant and monumental venture," which "attempts to re-conceptualize literary traditions in the [East-Central European] region by deconstructing national myths and focusing on common themes, thereby opening up perspectives which are routinely overlooked in traditional national literary histories. [. . . T]he richness of the material makes up for occasional unevenness, and such shortcomings do not spoil the fact that the *History* is a trendsetter and launches a novel route into the subject, one which scholars will want to follow and explore in the future" (Baár 468-69, 471).

Subtitled *Junctures and Disjunctures in the 19th and 20th Centuries*, this multivolume work, sponsored by AILC/ICLA and published by John Benjamins sequentially in four volumes, has occupied much of our thinking and writing for the past ten years. Conceptually, this project was inspired by the comparative-intercultural approach to literary history outlined in Mario J. Valdés and Linda Hutcheon's position paper, applied to the sister project on Latin American Literatures by Hutcheon, Djelal Kadir, and Valdés, and revisited in John's and my own ACLS paper on the East-Central European project. Both during the conceptual phase, begun in our Toronto meetings, and later during the strenuous process of structuring and editing the four individual volumes in the ECE History, John and I came close once or twice to scrapping the entire project, overwhelmed as we were by a plethora of theoretical and practical problems.

It is not hard to imagine why a work that proposes to cover two eventful centuries in the evolution of a score of literatures from several different language areas (the Baltics, the Balkans, Slavic Central Europe, non-Slavic Moldova, Romania, Hungary, and Albania) and which has required some hundred-and-twenty contributors to map the exchanges between them, has periodically raised quasi-insurmountable problems for us. Both editors have from the start been aware not only of the enormity of this undertaking, but also of the polemical nature of its conception, challenging traditional literary histories based on national(istic) and even text-oriented premises (we focus on other media as well, such as theater, opera, and occasionally visual art, and discuss literature in a broad sociopolitical context). Moving beyond the boundaries of national literatures, historical trends,

and generic divisions, seeking instead those "junctures" or "nodes" that allow for a cross-cultural interpretation, this history could easily upset both national sensitivities and narrow aesthetic or text-oriented concerns. We were made acutely aware of some of these sensitivities as a few of the original contributors withdrew from the project upon realizing that the ECE History would not focus primarily on national literatures. Likewise, our project has been reviewed at times with a certain skepticism in East-Central Europe by scholars who, while theoretically subscribing to our transnational approach, still counted the pages that each volume devoted to a specific national literature. On the flipside of this, we received reviews that praised the transcultural treatment but objected to the focus on local and intraregional cultures. Since the purpose of our history is to situate the discussion between local (national) and global through a concept of dynamic regionalism, both national(ist) and globalist critics found the project at times difficult to frame through their own biases.

It is true, however, that neither John nor I have been known to shy away from a bit of creative controversy. As we argued in our 2002 ACLS position paper, the approach we chose for our history "rejects the positivist and orthodox Marxist traditions that regard literature as a mimetic reflection of an underlying 'reality,' 'internalist' histories that isolate the discipline from the surrounding culture, Hegelian, organicist, and teleological generalizations of periods and cultures, reductive national perspectives, and, last but not least, histories dominated by 'grand narratives'" (Cornis-Pope and Neubauer, *Towards a History* 1). In lieu of a causal, organicist, and teleological plot, we decided to emphasize the interactive dynamic of "crossings" and "nodes" that bring together various traditions, "deconstructing national identities. [They] point up internal differences and suggest that the apparently consistent structure turns out to be *hybrid* upon closer inspection. What the national literature projects tended to ignore, or label as alien 'contamination' or 'corruption,' is shown here to be no less indigenous. In this last conception of the nodal, the meeting points become intra-national points of dispersion. Literary works, authors, regions, and ideas are more complex and multi-faceted than their reductive images within the national projects" (36). Building on the theoretical suggestions offered by Valdés and Hutcheon, we decided to organize our history around five kinds of "nodes"—temporal, generic, topographic, institutional, and figural—conceived by us and our contributors as points of contact or interfaces at which various literatures, genres, and historical moments come together, transcending national definitions.

Launched editorially in 2004, our project started by reconstructing East-Central European literary cultures from the perspective of key temporal nodes deployed in reverse order (1989, 1968, 1956, 1948, 1945, 1918, 1867/1878/1881, 1848, and 1776/1789) to avoid the impression that the region's history was necessary and predictable. The second part of the first volume focused also on generic nodes (literary periods and genres common to the area). Volume 2 (2006) mapped the treatment of topographic nodes (cities, border areas, the Danube corridor, subregions) in the literatures of the area. Volume 3 (2007) [reviewed on pp. 51-58 by Ileana Orlich, ed.] considered the impact of various literary institutions (theatre,

folklore, the avant-garde, magazines and journals, literary history as a genre) on the development of East-Central European literatures. Volume 4, in progress, is focused on the representation of real and imaginary figures (the figure of the national poet, figures of others, gendered figures, figures of mediators, etc.).

While working together on each of the four volumes, we have also divided tasks according to our own interests. John has been primarily interested in generic and institutional nodes, exploring the characteristic hybridity of genres in East-Central Europe and foregrounding alternative developmental "calendars" (institutional and cultural) in the area. I have been concerned more closely with the topographic complexities of the area (multicultural cities, regions as alternatives to unified national cultures, and imaginary transnational geographies), and in the "figures" that foreground the tensions between self and other, male and female, individual and collective, but also in mediating figures that bridge polarities.

The critique of polarization is especially crucial for East-Central European literatures that have been all too often held hostage to conflicting mappings, either enforced or of their own making. The region's identity reflects complex processes of negotiation between "Occidentalism" and "Orientalism," "Catholicism" and "Orthodoxy," or Christianity, Judaism and Islam. These polarizations were challenged periodically by integrative projects or cross-cultural hybrids (Greek Catholicism in Eastern Europe, Latinity in Romania, "oriental" influences in Western music, "Eastern" hybridization of Western metropolitan centers, etc.) that cut across the imaginary border between Eastern and Western Europe. And yet, no matter how porous or artificial, cultural oppositions have a tendency to perpetuate themselves, "pitting one place against another, closing down this space, fortifying that space, [. . .] and exploiting the place of the Other" (McLeod 85).

As we have found early on in our work, the success of a comparative literary history such as this depended on our ability to break across old or new division lines. Editors and contributors alike have tried to de-emphasize monologic concepts of literary development (national traditions, unified periods and trends, organic histories). We have also focused on those geocultural interfaces (crossroads, borderlands, multicultural cities and regions) that foreground the interaction of various local entities, as well as the dialogue of larger cultural paradigms (Eastern and Western, native and foreign). Such refocusing has allowed us to understand the culture of a particular area or historical period as dialogic, a product of interethnic and intercultural cooperation.

The good news is that our work does not take place in a vacuum. Similar efforts to provide alternative, non-nationalistic mappings are being undertaken in East-Central Europe by several groups of scholars (some represented in our history) who seek to recover the idea of a multicultural "Third Europe" as a buffer between countries with hegemonic ambitions (Germany, Russia, the Ottoman Empire, etc.) and as a response to local ethnocentrisms. According to writer and former president of the Czech Republic Václav Havel, the new post-1989 world order should encourage the development of regional groupings, emphasizing simultaneously "decentralization and integration." Regions should maintain their identity, contributing their specific features to a multicentered Europe. In order

to be successful, cooperation must take place between "clearly delineated regions and historically grounded entities" (13).

Both John and I subscribe to this concept of dynamic regionalism, treating East-Central Europe both as a multi-center and "turning plate" between two other major regions in Europe (Western and Eastern Europe). John conceives of literatures as interfaces rather than as competing entities, emphasizing the flow of information and cultural products across borders, physical and otherwise. The literary (micro)histories he writes have their lines of demarcation continually crossed and remapped. Still, in his vision both the individual cultures that participate in this interaction and the larger regional entities maintain their identity, participating as coequal partners in a dynamic form of interculturality. His own intellectual biography has been a demonstration of creative interculturality, moving across cultures compelled by the dramatic events of the second half of the twentieth century (John left Hungary in 1956, to escape persecution after the collapse of the anti-Communist uprising) but also by his own interest in finding the rich area of translatability between cultures. My own cultural education in Transylvania and the Banat regions included a creative contact with multiculturality in various forms, some conflictual, others integrative. As in John's case, my transplantation to the U.S. has enhanced my awareness of interculturality, permeable borders, and intercrossings. In spite of the many difficulties of our ECE project, we have remained faithful to it because we believe that it can afford us that "hospitable space for the cultivation of multilingualism, polyglossia, the arts of cultural mediation, deep intercultural understanding and genuinely global consciousness" that Mary Louise Pratt talks about (62). We hope that the readers of our project will also be able to recognize a space of intercultural understanding in East-Central Europe, a region often torn by nationalist or imperial passions. We would also like to believe that the ECE History can offer suggestions to other regionalist projects and to those who attempt to write comparative literary history in the post-1989, post-Cold War environment. Writing transnational literary history is not necessarily easier today, in an environment of increased globalization. Our own experience in articulating a transcultural history of East-Central Europe has taught us that neither nationalistic agendas nor a leveling notion of globalism that ignores local specificity can adequately frame this enterprise. At its best, our project has emphasized "translation" between local and global, national and transnational, consolidating the middle ground between Eastern and Western, dominant and peripheral that has been neglected because of polarized worldviews.

A final note: As we complete this major historiographic undertaking that has occupied the better part of a decade in the lives of its two coeditors and many of its contributors, we note with satisfaction the progress of another, more significant project: the integration of the former Soviet satellite countries into the European Union and the global world. The recent admission of Bulgaria and Romania into the expanding EU promises to keep this project alive as other countries of the area will reclaim their European and global identity.

Marcel Cornis-Pope, *Virginia Commonwealth University* (USA).

Références / Works Cited

Baár, Monika. Review of Marcel Cornis-Pope and John Neubauer, eds. *History of the Literary Cultures of East-Central Europe*, vols. 1-2. *Comparative Critical Studies* 4.3 (2007): 468-71.

Cornis-Pope, Marcel, and John Neubauer. *Towards a History of Literary Cultures in East-Central Europe. Theoretical Reflections*. ACLS Occasional Paper 52. New York: American Council of Learned Societies. 2002.

———, and John Neubauer, eds. *History of the Literary Cultures of East-Central Europe: Junctures and Disjunctures in the 19th and 20th Centuries*. Vol. 1, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2004; vol. 2, 2006; vol. 3, 2007; vol. 4, forthcoming 2009.

Havel, Václav. "Multitudinea de culori a lumii contemporane" [The Multicolored Contemporary World]. Speech at the Conference on Europe's New Democracies. Trans. into Romanian by Mihaela Mihăescu. *Dilema* 9.437 (13-19 July 2001): 12-13.

Hutcheon, Linda, Djelal Kadir, and Mario J. Valdés. *Collaborative Historiography: A Comparative Literary History of Latin America*. ACLS Occasional Paper 35. New York: American Council of Learned Societies, 1996.

McLeod, Bruce. "Collegiate Maneuvers: The University of Chicago, Postmodern Geographies, and Dislocating the University." *Polygraph* 8 (1996): 79-94.

Pratt, Mary Louise. "Comparative Literature and Global Citizenship." *Comparative Literature in the Age of Multiculturalism*. Ed. Charles Bernheimer. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins U P, 1995. 58-65.

Valdés, Mario J., and Linda Hutcheon. *Rethinking Literary History—Comparatively*. ACLS Occasional Paper 27. New York: American Council of Learned Societies, 1995.

Three Years of Comparative Studies in Spain (2003-2005)

The three-year period to which this brief report on Comparative Literature publications in Spain refers was productive and interesting. This was the case, in particular, in fields such as inter-artistic relationships, methodological debate, and theoretical-comparative studies on translation. In harmony with the general rule in other countries, efforts have been aimed at specific fields of research, even in an applied sense. Moreover, some important books have been published that explore, from a comparative perspective, highly topical debates in the context of Literary Theory. All these spheres show ever more clearly the result of dialogue and collaboration between Spanish comparative scholars and those from other countries, thereby overcoming some limitations from the past. On the other hand, there are still few systematizations or general proposals involving comparative studies understood as a relatively autonomous field.

Nonetheless, one of these latest proposals is of exceptional importance, the new edition of Claudio Guillén's *Entre lo uno y lo diverso*, an obligatory reference for any comparative scholar. The first edition, from 1985, included a subtitle that has now been extended with a final parenthesis: *Introducción a la Literatura comparada (Ayer y hoy)*. This minimum expansion of the title suggests what the author has in effect accomplished. Maintaining the book's structure and modifying only a few matters of style and internal layout, he has enriched the bibliography

and included in the notes some critical comments on the enormous amount of theoretical and comparative work from the last twenty years. The book has the same essential structure as in 1985. Guillén first of all deals with the discipline's historical configuration in the epistemological and academic spheres. He then presents in depth the five subfields that he considers basic to comparative research: genre studies, morphology, thematology, international relations, and historiology.

It is worth highlighting, apart from this, the declared controversial intention of some passages, starting with the new prologue written for the occasion. This contains two central points, one of a global nature and the other a more local one. The first consists in distinguishing Comparative Literature from Cultural Studies and emerging Postcolonial Studies. The latter involves comparative studies' academic place within the Spanish university. Guillén is very critical in this regard, basically because he considers the merger of Literary Theory and Comparative Literature in a single academic site to be pernicious—a fusion that in 2000 was made official in Spain in an operation described as lamentable. In Guillén's opinion, it amounted to the absorption of comparative studies and represents an unfavorable breeding ground for the discipline's necessary renewal in Spain. This is undoubtedly a live debate in Spanish universities, although almost nothing has been published in reply or in any other sense. On the other issue, Guillén likewise expresses his rejection of the *aggressive* influence of Cultural Studies in the development of present-day comparative studies and, on the contrary, praises some fertile areas of agreement with Postcolonial Studies. As is traditionally the case with Guillén, these evaluations apply to the specific weight assigned not so much to the theoretical standpoints themselves as to the achievements of certain theoreticians and comparative scholars. These include Jameson, Steiner, and Said.

A second monograph also dealing with the discipline is *Teoría literaria y literatura comparada*. The book involved the collaboration of five teachers from the Universitat de Barcelona, headed by Jordi Llovet, and includes a like number of chapters with an extensive epilogue on teaching. One chapter is entitled precisely "Literatura comparada." Its author, Antoni Martí Monterde, is not the only one to deal with the speciality's characteristic problems. Other chapters deal with literary periodization or with the genres that, by their very nature, have a bearing on in this territory. In any case, Martí Monterde's is itself a contribution to the field, which thoroughly explores the alternatives to the crisis of comparative studies after the 2nd AILC/ICLA Congress and the field's entry into a new scientific paradigm. Imagology, the renewal of Literary History, and the debates on notions like "world literature" or "postcolonialism" are crucial ones in this context.

Indeed, other publications of notable interest also center on two of these areas: María José Vega's *Imperios de papel. Introducción a la crítica postcolonial* and the volume *Bases metodolóxicas para unha historia comparada das literaturas na península Ibérica*, coordinated by Anxo Abuín and Anxo Tarrío. The former develops an extensive series of problems that, starting from the late seventies (with publication of Said's *Orientalism*), favored the establishment of what Vega postulates as "postcolonial comparative studies," which feature an essential debate on the post-national dimensions of culture, hybridity, acculturation, the

subaltern, or the dialectics between the canonized Western tradition and symbolic resistance. The latter, with essays by twenty-two collaborators from thirteen European and North American universities, tackles the discussion on method raised by Comparative Literary History and will shortly be the basis for the volume on Iberian literatures within the AILC/ICLA series, Comparative History of Literatures in European Languages.

Other publications derived from activities by the Universidade de Santiago de Compostela's Literary Theory and Comparative Literature group are *Elementos de Crítica literaria*, coordinated by Arturo Casas, and the first of two planned instalments of the monograph *A Literatura comparada hoxe*, coordinated by Anxo Abuín and César Domínguez. The first work comprises three sections, of which the first and especially the third will be of most interest for the comparative scholar, with essays on new comparative studies, thematology, and inter-artistic spaces (i.e., the relationships between literature and the arts such as the plastic arts, music, photography, cinema, comics, or new technologies). The second features chapters on Comparative Literature's relationships with Rhetoric, the canon from a comparative perspective, mass culture, *character* as a category, and others.

Thematology and the historiography debate, with direct repercussions for comparative literature, are the subject of two works in the ever-useful "Lecturas" series. They are entitled *Tematología y comparatismo literario*, coordinated by Cristina Naupert, and *Teorías de la historia literaria*, compiled by Luis Beltrán Almería and José Antonio Escrig. In addition to these Readers, these years have seen the publication of other monographs that, in the same context, reflect specific thematic-historiographic applications, in some cases with unquestionable benefit for the always complex task of shaping comparative studies in the medieval period. A good example of the latter is César Domínguez's *El concepto de materia en la teoría literaria del Medievo*, which covers the rhetorical, annotative, or poetical functioning of the "matière de Bretagne" type. Another one coordinated by María José Vega, entitled *Poética y teatro. La teoría dramática del Renacimiento a la postmodernidad*, is oriented towards a comparative cultural history of theatre, with contributions on baroque comedy, Gender Studies, or cyber-theatre.

Another volume in the "Lecturas" series, *Literatura y cibercultura*, compiled by Domingo Sánchez-Mesa, represents a line of research that is becoming increasingly prominent among Spanish theoreticians and comparative scholars. In this regard, outstanding contributions have been made during these three years by María José Vega as coordinator (*Literatura hipertextual y teoría literaria*), Laura Borràs in the same role (*Textualidades electrónicas*), and Susana Pajares (*Literatura digital. El paradigma hipertextual*). There is also, from 2004, the proceedings on CD of the 10th Congress of the Asociación Española de Semiótica, entitled *Arte y nuevas tecnologías* and edited by Miguel Ángel Muro.

There is, in principle, a more traditional field of studies corresponding to inter-literary relationships. In this field, some books have proved to be singularly attractive due to their methodological approaches or their documentary ambition. Rich and very plural in its featured field is the first volume of the proceedings of the Spanish Italianist Association's 11th International Congress, coordinated by

Mercedes Arriaga and others under the title *"Italia-España-Europa": literaturas comparadas, tradiciones y traducciones*. Other examples, centered on intertextuality and comparative paratextuality, are Alfonso Saura Sánchez's *Las heroídas francesas y su recepción en España* and Beatriz Hernández Pérez's *Voces prologales: Juan Ruiz y Geoffrey Chaucer*. Less frequent is the kind of polarity outlined by Ángeles Huerta in *La Europa periférica. Rusia y España ante el fenómeno de la modernidad*, which takes a critical-comparative perspective on the Russian and Spanish ways of feeling "from within" but of being seen "from outside" as peripheral to a Europe based on enlightened reason and its supposedly universal values. My last example in this field is Darío Villanueva's *Valle-Inclán, novelista del Modernismo*, which argues that Valle-Inclán belonged to the international and cosmopolitan movement named in its title by analyzing aesthetic and literary links with writers like W.B. Yeats, André Gide, and James Joyce.

Finally, there are three additional groups of publications that are worth examining schematically. The first centers on inter-artistic relationships, the second on comparative studies that involve translation, and the third on an open series of concepts and problems that may or may not be strictly comparative but can be considered in heuristic terms from this perspective.

In relation to the first group, I would just like to mention the fertile commitment to research in the field of links between literature and cinema. Outstanding in this regard are three books by José Antonio Pérez Bowie, two on adaptation—*La adaptación cinematográfica de textos literarios. Teoría y práctica* and *Cine, literatura y poder. La adaptación cinematográfica durante el primer franquismo (1939-1950)*—and a third dealing with the impact of debates about cinema among Spanish intellectuals during the period 1910-1936, more specifically with its repercussion on theatre theory at that time, *Realismo teatral y realismo cinematográfico*. Some of these same matters, viewed in the theoretical and historical light of intermediality, reappear in María Teresa García-Abad's monograph *Intermedios. Estudios sobre literatura, teatro y cine*. On the other hand, a more thematic perspective is featured in the volume edited by Carmen Becerra and others, *Mujer, adulterio y cine*, the second instalment of *Lecturas: Imágenes. Revista de Poética del Cine*, and by Carmen Becerra in the same series, entitled *Rescribir ficciones. Imágenes de la literatura en el cine y la televisión*. Another periodical, *Signa* magazine, devoted issue 13 to a complete dossier on "Literatura y cine."

Comparative studies on translation are another emerging field that occasionally overlaps with the field we have just mentioned. A good example would be the books coordinated by Patrick Zabalbeascoa and others, *La traducción audiovisual: investigación, enseñanza y profesión*, and by Raquel Merino and others, *Trasvases culturales: literatura, cine, traducción*. Very different are another two books representing an equally attractive territory that is perhaps subject to more diffuse methodologies. I am referring to those published by José F. Ruiz Casanova, Henriette Partzsch, and Florence Pennone (*De poesía y traducción*) and by Jaime Siles (*Poesía y traducción: cuestiones de detalle*), both of a decidedly critical nature in their approach to analysing the practices of poetical translation while covering a wide range of European, American, and Asian poets.

Finally, I would like to mention briefly a less delimited series of publications from the period under consideration, which I will represent with five books. First, the newly expanded version of Darío Villanueva's book *Teorías del realismo literario*, whose first edition has been translated into English as *Theories of Literary Realism*. Villanueva explores the phenomenological and pragmatic approaches to a realist reading of narrative fiction and *intentional realism* as opposed to the conceptual deficiencies of genetic and formal perspectives. Secondly, Alfredo Saldaña's book *El texto del mundo. Crítica de la imaginación literaria*, which, with essential support from phenomenology, Bachelard, and Durand, offers reflections on thinking in images during the creative act and on the reception of literary texts. The third publication is the volume *La literatura en la literatura*, based on the Proceedings of the 14th Symposium of the Sociedad Española de Literatura General y Comparada, edited by Magdalena León Gómez, with studies in three fields: Don Quixote as a literary theme, interculturality, and the paratextual analysis of literary titles. The fourth publication, coordinated by Antonio J. Gil González, corresponds to an issue of the *Anthropos* magazine under the general title *Metaliteratura y metaficción. Balance crítico y perspectivas comparadas*. It includes general analyses of the metaliterary phenomenon and of different applications to several literary genres and to other artistic expressions, such as comics, cinema, theatre, music, painting, or hyper-textual fiction. I will finish this panorama by referring to a publication of an imagological nature, an attractive field that has not been sufficiently covered by Spanish researchers to date: the book coordinated by José Manuel López de Abiada and Augusta López Bernasocchi, *Imágenes de España en culturas y literaturas europeas (siglos XVI-XVII)*.

Arturo Casas, *Universidade de Santiago de Compostela* (Spain).

Références / Works Cited

Abuín, Anxo, and César Domínguez, eds. *A Literatura comparada hoxe. Boletín Galego de Literatura* 33 (2005).

———, and Anxo Tarrío, eds. *Bases metodolóxicas para unha historia comparada das literaturas na península Ibérica*. Santiago de Compostela: Universidade de Santiago de Compostela, 2004.

Arriaga, Mercedes, et al., eds. *"Italia-España-Europa": literaturas comparadas, tradiciones y traducciones*. Proceedings of the Spanish Italianist Association's 11th International Congress. Sevilla: Arcibel, 2005.

Becerra, Carmen, et al. *Mujer, adulterio y cine*. Lecturas: Imágenes. Revista de Poética del Cine 2. Vilagarcía de Arousa: Mirabel, 2003.

———. *Rescribir ficciones. Imágenes de la literatura en el cine y la televisión*. Lecturas: Imágenes. Revista de Poética del Cine 3. Vilagarcía de Arousa: Mirabel, 2005.

Beltrán Almería, Luis, and José Antonio Escrig, eds. *Teorías de la historia literaria*. "Lecturas" series. Madrid: Arco, 2005.

Borràs, Laura. *Textualidades electrónicas*. Barcelona: Edinoc, 2005.

Casas, Arturo, ed. *Elementos de Crítica literaria*. Vigo: Xerais, 2004.

Domínguez, César. *El concepto de materia en la teoría literaria del Medievo*. Madrid: CSIC, 2004.

García-Abad, María Teresa. *Intermedios. Estudios sobre literatura, teatro y cine*. Madrid: Fundamentos, 2005.

Gil González, Antonio J. *Metaliteratura y metaficción. Balance crítico y perspectivas comparadas*. *Anthropos* (2005).
Guillén, Claudio. *Entre lo uno y lo diverso: Introducción a la Literatura comparada (Ayer y hoy)*. Barcelona: Tusquets, 2005.
Hernández Pérez, Beatriz. *Voces prologales: Juan Ruiz y Geoffrey Chaucer*. Santa Cruz de Tenerife: La Página, 2003.
Huerta, Ángeles. *La Europa periférica. Rusia y España ante el fenómeno de la modernidad*. Santiago de Compostela: Universidade de Santiago de Compostela, 2004.
León Gómez, Magdalena, ed. *La literatura en la literatura.* Proceedings of the 14th Symposium of the Sociedad Española de Literatura General y Comparada. Alcalá de Henares: Centro de Estudios Cervantinos, 2004.
"Literatura y cine." *Signa* 13 (2004).
Llovet, Jordi, ed. *Teoría literaria y literatura comparada*. Barcelona: Ariel, 2005.
López de Abiada, José Manuel, and Augusta López Bernasocchi, eds. *Imágenes de España en culturas y literaturas europeas (siglos XVI-XVII)*. Madrid: Verbum, 2004.
Merino, Raquel, et al., eds. *Trasvases culturales: literatura, cine, traducción*. Bilbao: Euskal Herriko Unibertsitatea, 2005.
Muro, Miguel Ángel. *Arte y nuevas tecnologías.* Proceedings of the 10th Congress of the Asociación Española de Semiótica. Logroño: Universidad de La Rioja, 2004.
Naupert, Cristina, ed. *Tematología y comparatismo literario*. "Lecturas" series. Madrid: Arco, 2003.
Pajares, Susana. *Literatura digital. El paradigma hipertextual*. Cáceres: Universidad de Extremadura, 2004.
Pérez Bowie, José Antonio. *La adaptación cinematográfica de textos literarios. Teoría y práctica*. Salamanca: Plaza Universitaria, 2003.
———. *Cine, literatura y poder. La adaptación cinematográfica durante el primer franquismo (1939-1950).* Salamanca: Librería Cervantes, 2004.
———. *Realismo teatral y realismo cinematográfico.* Madrid: Biblioteca Nueva, 2004.
Ruiz Casanova, José F., Henriette Partzsch, and Florence Pennone. *De poesía y traducción*. Madrid: Biblioteca Nueva, 2005.
Saldaña, Alfredo. *El texto del mundo. Crítica de la imaginación literaria.* Zaragoza: Tropelías, 2003.
Sánchez-Mesa, Domingo. *Literatura y cibercultura*. "Lecturas" series. Madrid: Arco, 2004.
Saura Sánchez, Alfonso. *Las heroídas francesas y su recepción en España.* Murcia: Universidad de Murcia, 2003.
Siles, Jaime. *Poesía y traducción: cuestiones de detalle*. Zaragoza: Prensas Universitarias de Zaragoza, 2005.
Vega, María José. *Imperios de papel. Introducción a la crítica postcolonial*. Barcelona: Crítica, 2003.
———, ed. *Literatura hipertextual y teoría literaria*. Madrid: Marenostrum, 2003.
———, ed. *Poética y teatro. La teoría dramática del Renacimiento a la postmodernidad.* Vilagarcía de Arousa: Mirabel, 2004.
Villanueva, Darío. *Teorías del realismo literario*. Revised and expanded edition. Madrid: Biblioteca Nueva, 2004.
———. *Theories of Literary Realism*. Trans. Mihai I. Spariosu and Santiago García-Castañon. Albany: State U of New York P, Albany, 1997.
———. *Valle-Inclán, novelista del Modernismo*. Valencia: Tirant lo Blanch, 2005.
Zabalbeascoa, Patrick, et al., eds. *La traducción audiovisual: investigación, enseñanza y profesión*. Granada: Comares, 2005.

OUVRAGES COLLECTIFS / COLLECTIVE WORKS

Marcel Cornis-Pope and John Neubauer, eds. ***History of the Literary Cultures of East-Central Europe: Junctures and Disjunctures in the 19th and 20th Centuries.*** **Volume III:** ***The Making and Remaking of Literary Institutions*****. Comparative History of Literatures in European Languages 22. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2007. 522 pp. 978-9027234551.**

This recent volume in the ICLA's Comparative History of Literatures in European Languages focuses, as its subtitle indicates, on *The Making and Remaking of Literary Institutions*. The volume's four parts—(1) Publishing and Censorship, (2) Theatre as a Literary Institution, (3) Forging Primal Pasts: The Uses of Folk Poetry, and (4) Literary Histories: Itineraries of National Self-Images—offer a thorough examination that leaves out any possibility of exclusions from a vast pantheon of literary institutions in East-Central Europe over the last two centuries. The enormous cross-cultural institutional architecture, "transnational rather than comparative" (as the first page of the General Introduction emphasizes), traverses on the horizontal line from Germany, Poland, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Slovenia, Serbia, and Croatia, to Hungary, Romania, and Ukraine. Vertically the axis runs from Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia, and Finland down to Albania, Macedonia, and Bulgaria, covering a region known by such diverse names as *MittelEuropa*, *Zwischeneuropa*, *Südosteuropa*, East-Central Europe, Central-Eastern Europe, Eastern Europe, Central and Eastern Europe, or Central Europe.

One can only imagine the tremendous amount of research and selection that informs the long list of literary institutions profiled in the volume's insightful and judiciously chosen commentaries attached to a particular culture, event, or literary development. Piled high and deep to include "not so much shared institutions" but rather "such region-wide analogous institutional processes as the national awakening, the modernist opening, and the communist regimentation, the canonization of texts, and censorship of literature" (xi), the volume's elaborate configuration features "a series of independent articles," or what the editors, early on in the Preface, call a "multiple scanning" of commentaries (ix). At a time when the European Union appears ready to forfeit the region's cultural diversity, the publication of *The Making and Remaking of Literary Institutions* is a particularly welcome and intellectually enriching work that brings into prominence the national awakening and institutionalization of literature that have taken place over the past two centuries in the cultures of the region. As the volume's editors state in the Preface, "at the heart of a national awakening we always find such institutional as-

pects [of] literature as language renewal, the introduction of the vernacular and its literature in schools and universities, the building of an infrastructure for the publication of books and journals, clashes with censorship, the establishment of national academies, libraries and theatres, and the (re)construction of a national folklore and writing histories of the vernacular literature" (xi).

In a General Introduction by John Neubauer (with Inna Peleva and Mihály Szegedy Maszák), the history of literary institutions in East-Central Europe is broadly divided into three periods. The first involves the period of national awakenings and the institutionalization of literature through the processes and venues detailed in the passage just quoted (1800-1890). Then come the literary institutions of Modernism (1890-1945), an era whose most important sites were the cabarets and literary cafés (which also functioned as the emergent space of the East-European avant-garde), especially those arising after World War I. This was the time when the Baltic countries and Czechoslovakia became independent for the first time, Poland regained its independence, and Croatia, the Voivodina, Transylvania, and other former Austro-Hungarian territories became parts of greater Yugoslavia and Romania, thus setting the stage for the glorification in the new countries of a national literary culture with roots in indigenous folk art. The final period encompasses the radical reform of existing institutions under the communist regime (1945-1989), an interval that covers both Stalinism and the Post-Stalinist Thaw.

The first major part of the volume, "Publishing and Censorship," includes its own, very thorough Introduction by John Neubauer (with Robert Pynsent, Vilmos Voigt, and Marcel Cornis-Pope) that focuses on national awakenings presented in the form of an extensive list of printers and publishers of newspapers, literary journals, and books going back as far as the sixteenth century. It then turns to the opening to modernist aesthetics (inspired in part by literary and artistic trends in France but acquiring a different orientation in East-Central Europe) that began in Poland (with the Warsaw positivists and the Cracow *Stanczycy*) and Hungary. This trend had become present everywhere in the region in the 1890s. The region also saw the publication in 1877 of the world's first journal of comparative literature, the *Acta comparationis litterarum universarum* in Kolozsvár (Transylvania). Meanwhile, Populism or Agrarian Nationalism emerged in spite of modernist literary trends advocating the autonomy of literature. By 1948 the literary institutions in all East-Central European countries, including publishing houses, book distributors, and theatre, had been nationalized, triggering publications in exile, such as *Kultura* (arguably East-Central Europe's most important and fiercely independent exile journal) and underground publishing or *samizdat* (e.g., "self-publication" in Russian). At the conclusion of the section the writer(s) is wondering, tongue-in-cheek, if the post-1989 "burgeoning telecommunication towers of globalization will adequately replace the Babel of the old East-Central European cities" (61).

The first section of Part One, "Publishing," provides a detailed review of some of the region's outstanding publications, such as Neil Stewart's analysis of the Polish *Moderni revue* (1894–1925), complete with a history of its founders

and beginnings, central themes and basic features, cosmopolitan dimension, and public stance as a modern institution. József Szili follows with an examination of "the uncompromising standards" of the Hungarian journal *Nyugat* (1908–1941), credited with creating modern Hungarian literature and establishing a relationship with world literature. Marcel Cornis-Pope then offers a comprehensive treatment of two influential magazines and literary cénacles in post-World War I Romania, *Sburătorul* (Winged Spirit/Incubus, 1919–27) (whose founder and leading figure, the literary critic and novelist Eugen Lovinescu promoted the theory of synchronization, which held that Romania's literature had to follow in step with Western cultural and literary canons) and *Gândirea* [Thought, 1921–44] (whose director-editor Nichifor Crainic initiated and encouraged a regressive version of Modernism and ethnocentric, implicitly xenophobic attitudes). Also discussed is Tomislav Brlek's *Krugovi* (A Croatian Opening, 1925–58), a literary monthly credited with breaking with the previously dominant ideological molds of fascist nationalism and Bolshevik artistic orthodoxy and with introducing some of the remarkable writers of the next decades. Other less analytical but informative pieces address underground publishing in Estonia under Soviet Censorship (Kersti Unt), Slovak journals caught between Languages and Censorship (Dagmar Roberts), and the national role of the Albanian literary journals (Robert Elsie).

The essays in the next section of Part One, "Censorship," meticulously examine various ways in which discourse was suppressed. The first is Jan Čulik's "The Laws and Practices of Censorship in Bohemia," with a detailed commentary that extends from the days of Empress Maria Theresa through the 1800s (from the pre-1848 Czech National Revival to the harsh censorship triggered at the dawn of the new century by the "strict absolutist and harsh censorship" [97] during World War I). Čulik then turns to the post-Stalinist Thaw, the 1966 Press Law that legalized censorship, the post-Prague Spring, and the purges of 1972 (that once more emptied all public libraries of materials "critical of Marxism-Leninism, the policy of the Socialist States, and the Marxist-Leninist Parties" [99]), closing with the *samizdat* literary culture (notably Josef Skvorecky's "Sixty-Eight Publishers" press) and the fall of communism. In "Censorship: A Case Study of Bogumil Hrabal's *Jarmilka,*" Kees Merks discusses the discrepancies in the different published versions of Hrabal's text and substantiates his views with extensive quotations—namely by comparing the complete first and third versions published in 1952 and 1992 with *Jarmilka* II published in 1964, at the height of communist censorship, which lacked the political jokes and allusions of the other two texts. Dagmar Roberts's "Religious and Political Censorship in Slovakia" is a short but historically relevant piece followed by an excellent discussion by Mihály Szegedy Maszák of the tense political milieu and the role of communist censorship in Hungary during the brief but memorable 1945–49 period. The presence of Soviet troops at that time facilitated the infiltration back into the country of what the author calls "the Muscovite communists." This was a group that had lived in the Soviet Union before and during the war and that included such notable luminaries as the film critic and writer Béla Balázs, the philosopher György Lukács, the journalist Andor Gábor, and the highly controversial critic and ultimately tragic

József Révai, among others. Although constrained by page limitations, Maszák's discussion is highly informative, especially for those interested in a short course on Lukács's specification of the cultural attitudes that needed to be combated in order to achieve the desired goal of literary realism: "aristocratism, the rejection of equality, the contempt for the masses, the underestimation of economic, political and social causes, the cult of irrationalism and myth, an emphasis on the vanity of life, a distance from life, and a focus on the psyche" (121).

Another interesting, well-documented, and chronologically extensive analysis of censorship is Violeta Kelertas's "Strategies against Censorship in Soviet Lithuania: 1944–90," a review that also includes a noteworthy list of the subversive methods that were employed to bypass Stalinist taboos, such as the practice of magic realism, historical displacement, and the use of an unreliable narrator. Concluding the section are Wlodzimierz Bolecki's "Getting Around Polish Censorship: 1968–89," which contains an interesting discussion of the "68 generation" from both a political and a literary perspective, and Karl Jirgens's "Censorship after Independence: the Case of Aleksander Pelēcis," which is particularly informative on Latvian writers' rejection of Soviet-style Socialist Realism in general and on the poet and author Pelēcis in particular—especially his *Siberia Book*, which chronicles its author's twenty-three-year imprisonment in Siberia and was published in the United States by the Latvian Press Book in 1993.

Turning to a more animated topic, the volume's second major part, "Theatre as a Literary Institution," follows a structure similar to the first one. The General Introduction by Dragan Klaić divides the region's theatre history since 1800 into three phases: (1) national awakening and realism as a period when, according to Klaić, the playwright took the central role; (2) modernism and the dominance of theatre directors; and (3) theatre after World War II. Beyond acknowledging Klaić as the author of the Introduction(s) that precede each of the commentaries, this reviewer can only offer a rather mechanical "scanning" of the three phases, which are overwhelming in their accumulation of cultural information.

The first of the many reviews on the first phase of national awakening and the centrality of the playwright is Zoltán Imre's analysis of Hungarian theater in 1837 and all the anxieties connected with building the theater and with opening night. Imre's report is followed by Lado Kralj's one-paragraph commentary on Jesuit school performances in 1657 that were turned into opera in Slovenia and Ondřej Hučin's more extensive assessment of the Czech theater that touches on such issues as early theatrical venues and fin-de-siècle consolidation and diversification. The next short commentaries outline the theater world of Slovakia, which started as "an amateur endeavor," and the spiritual unity the theater provided in divided nineteenth-century Poland, then turn to the school, court, and clandestine theater performances in Lithuania and the politics and artistic autonomy of the Estonian theater. The section ends with two crisp reports on the multilingual dimension of the Romanian stage and on the emergence of a national theater in Bulgaria.

The second phase of Part Two, significantly titled "Modernism: the Director Rules," consists of a long list of generally short reviews. Coverage includes theater performances and superb dramatists in Croatia (Stjepan Miletić and-

Branko Gavella) and Hungary (Thalia Tarsagag) and modernist stage developments vis-à-vis their respective cultural milieux throughout the region. Topics range from the Czech ("Modernist Inroads into Czech Theatre"), Slovak ("The Interbellum Emancipation of the Slovak Stage"), Romanian ("Cosmopolitanism and Nationalism Clash on the Romanian Stage"), and Bulgarian situations ("Institutionalization and Innovation in the Bulgarian Theatre") to the Lithuanian ("The Stage in Independent Lithuania"), Latvian ("Kiking with Poetry: Female Trailblazers on the Latvian Stage"), and Estonian theaters ("The Ebbs and Flows of Modernist Energy in Estonian Theatre").

Of particular interest are the essays on the Bohemian brothers Karel and Josef Čapek and on Polish modernist drama. The first, Veronika Ambros's "Fuzzy Borderlines: the Čapeks' Robots, Insects, Women, and Men," treats Karel Čapek's centrality in modern Bohemia ("flanked on one side by the compulsive storyteller Jaroslav Hašek, on the other by the constructor of the modern myth Franz Kafka," 183), as well as his experimentation with literary conventions in texts that parody traditional genres, mock medieval mystery and morality plays, and ridicule the techniques of *commedia dell'arte* and popular culture. Ambros focuses next on particularly relevant works, such as Karel Čapek's *RUR* (*Rossum's Universal Robots, a Collective Drama with an Initial Comedy*) that foregrounds both human characters and a collective hero, the robots. This neologism comes from the Czech word *robota*, meaning drudgery, so we realize that robots were originally seen not as mechanical creatures but as biologically produced androids. Discussion then turns to the Čapek brothers' jointly written comedy *The Insect Play* and Josef Čapek's expressionist text *A Land of Many Names,* which confronts utopia with dystopia, and concludes with Karel Čapek's *The White Plague* and *Matka* (critically acclaimed as an openly anti-fascist work). In the essays on Polish drama, Ewa Wachocka discusses the new Polish theater, mentioning several early twentieth-century figures, such as the Polish-German playwright Tadeusz Rittner and, more importantly, the last of the avant-garde, Witkacy and Witold Gombrowicz. In a cluster of essays, Eleonora Udalska and Violetta Sajkiewicz examine such playwrights as Stanislaw Wyspianski (credited with having inaugurated modern Polish stage design) and Leon Schiller's innovations in plays that were often based on a unifying political idea. Also discussed is the influential *Reduta* Theatre established in 1919 as a chamber stage of Warsaw's Variety Theatre. Following Dorota Fox's short reviews on popular amusement and the Polish cabaret, Michael C. Steinlauf examines the Yiddish Theatre, legalized in 1905 along with the Yiddish press, and the status of Warsaw as the Yiddish theater capital.

The third and final phase of Part Two reviews the situation of Czech theater in "The Short Interlude of a Liberal Czech Theatre," which sets the chronological parameters for the next cluster of essays focused on theater in East-Central Europe. It begins with the period of transition (1945–48), turns to the decades of building communism (1948–68), continues with repression as normalization (1968–86), and ends with a last stretch from perestroika to the Velvet Revolution. Although the bulk of the less structured but informative short reviews that follow focuses on theater developments of general interest in countries throughout the re-

gion, some commentaries stress specific aspects of the stage world, such as a very interesting contrast between Tadeusz Rózewicz (especially his revolutionary play *Kartoteka*) and Sławomir Mrożek and their affiliations with the theater of the absurd in Poland. Other commentaries address ideology and moral rectitude, the rejection of Expressionism, theater censorship and contemporary plays in Slovenia, and (especially notable) the role of silent censorship, intertextual grotesques, and theater as metaphor for society in Yugoslavia. The third phase concludes with a short but thought-provoking epilogue on the continuity of the theater as an institution that has served the region's national emancipation; on the impacts of modernism, revolution, and socialism; and on current efforts to grapple with "European integration and the cultural consequences of economic globalization" (268).

Since the history of theater as an institution is linked with national emancipation, the next important part of the volume, Part Three, "Forging primal pasts: The uses of folklore," explores the function of the region's folklore in forging a primordial past for the countries of East-Central Europe. The Introduction by John Neubauer centers on folklore and national awakening. Neubauer begins with a brief summary of Ismail Kadare's novel *The Three-Arched Bridge* (1976-78), which presents "the bridge construction as a capitalist invasion of a small community" (269) while connecting the story's narrator with a fictional collector of folk ballads, one of which depicts the immurement of a woman during the construction of a local castle and seems to be relevant to the building of the bridge. Neubauer's clever conceit draws an interesting and critically appealing parallel between the fictional collector's rewriting of the ancient ballad to help his company build the bridge and the philologists and folklorists who revived folklore for the purpose of nation building in East-Central Europe. To this end, the Introduction includes two mini-sections that examine (1) the case of folklorist Vuk Stefanović Karadžić and the Serbian folksongs he collected in the four-volume *Book of Serbian Folk Poetry* (1815) vis-à-vis Marcel Cornis-Pope's discussion of the Romanian folk ballad *Meşterul Manole* and its ramifications throughout the Balkans; and (2) a list of the necessary conditions that led to the national institutionalization of folk poetry, such as linguistic standardization; reconstruction of texts so that their heroes become moral, religious, and national exemplars; and adjustment of the history and theory of national literature to produce a normative type of literature.

The various processes that led to the institutionalization of folklore are next briefly reviewed in the cases of Estonia, where "literature and folklore are seen as two distinct fields of research and forms of discourse" (289), and of the other Baltic states. In addition to examining interesting stock characters like the Latvian trickster Velns, this cluster of essays offers interesting historical and geo-political insights into the word "Baltic" (290). The remaining short articles report on the role of Czech folk culture in the country's national rebirth or the contribution of folklore to the making of Slovak literature. A thorough examination of Romanian folklore demonstrates its active part in forging a literary culture involving collectors, interpreters, and rewriters dating back to the seventeenth century. Next, in "The Row about the Wild Rose," Vilmos Voigt summarizes the 1864 debate on the origins of folk ballads, which is followed by an extended analysis of folklore's

role in establishing the Bulgarian nation. Concluding the section are short pieces on the rediscovery of folk literature in Albania and a noteworthy examination of the deep roots of Macedonian and Bulgarian culture in folk traditions.

The final part, “Literary histories: Itineraries of national self-images,” begins with John Neubauer’s comprehensive Introduction that asks challenging questions like “Was Kafka a Czech writer?” and “Should Joseph Conrad and Eugène Ionesco be included in Polish and Romanian literary histories?” For Neubauer and the authors of the literary histories, the main question is instead “whether the national narrative was embedded in a broader, European perspective or was it restricted to the national tradition in the vernacular” (349). To this end, Neubauer tackles “organicism in literary history,” concluding that “in practice the folkloric anchoring of a nation’s literary history meant excluding transnational mixing and heritage” (351), as well as “transnational literary histories.” However, Neubauer does bring up two striking cases of the latter. The first, entrenched in the political realities of the mid-1800s, involves the Polish poet Adam Mickiewicz, who called on the “youthful tribe” of Slavs to offer a decaying West the means to moral and spiritual renewal and who upheld Poland’s messianic European mission at a time when Russia and Serbia were the only independent Slavic states. The other is that of Sándor Eckhardt, a Professor of French in Budapest, whose plenary lecture on “Comparative Literary History in Central Europe” at the first International Congress of Literary History (1931) claimed that Hungary, just like Vienna to which Hungary was allied historically via the Dual Monarchy, had its own sphere of influence that extended to Slovak, Romanian, Croatian, and Serbian literature.

The remainder of Part Four incorporates an extensive set of commentaries dealing with such issues as shifting ideologies in Estonia, Latvian literary histories and textbooks, and an overview of Polish literary histories that integrate what the writer, Jolanta Jastrzębska, calls “the sorrows and glories of a nation’s soul” (361). There are also sketchy but relevant remarks on Romanian literary histories and a comprehensive examination of a Croatian literary canon from 1900 to 1950. The latter moves from a discussion of geographic boundaries to the area’s inherent provincialism, Nazi incursions, and the obsession with “independence” from the 1097 battle of Gvozd and the proclamation of a Croatian state in 1941 to a review of Croatian poetry as a nation-saving instrument. Next comes a particularly informative account of the nineteenth- and twentieth-century rift in Serbia between criticism and literary history followed by Robert Elsie’s succinct literary history of Albania. Alexander Kiossev offers an incisive examination of national identity and literary history textbooks in Bulgaria that draws on insightful arguments from Benedict Anderson’s *Imagined Communities* and Homi K. Bhabha’s article “DissemiNation” to express reservations about and even to oppose Bakhtin.

More comprehensive in content are a few articles that deserve special notice. The first is a detailed examination of nineteenth-century Czech literary history and national revival that also addresses the issue of forged manuscripts. The second is a persuasive plea for recognition of Slovak literary histories (“How should one respond to those literary historians of the nineteenth- and twentieth-centuries who adhered to the concept of a single Czechoslovak literature?” or “Is there

a literature in Slovakia that is different from Slovak literature?" [377]), an endeavor filled with what the writer, Dagmar Roberts, holds to be "full of pitfalls," especially for attempting to overcome Czech and Hungarian perspectives. A third article, by John Neubauer, provides a well-structured evaluation of Hungarian literary histories. Opening with Ferenc Toldy, the co-editor of a 1828 handbook of Hungarian literature and Secretary of the Hungarian Academy (1835-61), and Pál Gyulai, the leading literary figure of the 1860s, 70s, and 80s, he then discusses Zsigmond Bodnár, author of the introduction to the first volume of his Hungarian literary history (1891), and Zsolt Beöthy, "the quasi-official literary historian of the 1896 celebrations of Hungary's millennial existence" and author of his own "little mirror" (388) of Hungarian narratives (1885-87), and concludes with Istvan Sötér, the pre- and post-author (with institutional associates) of the six-volume *Literary Studies of the Hungarian Academy* published in 1964-66.

The volume's last commentary, Endre Bojtár's aptly titled "Pitfalls in Writing a Regional Literary History of East-Central Europe," rounds off the wealth of information this volume offers to its readers. In examining the dangers of a comparative literary history of the region, Boytár lists three culprits: the view that literary history is not a scholarly discipline of literature but a servant of history writing, the impossibility of defining a region in a vast expanse that can cover "everything from Germany/Austria to Russia, from Finland to Greece" (421), and the lack of specialists in the region. Each point is argued intelligently and persuasively, leading up to the concluding paragraphs, which articulate once again several open-ended questions. Among them is one that bears emphasis (and even adds a note of provocation) given the recently announced independence of Kosovo: "Should we include in South-Eastern Europe" (Maria Todorova's more neutral term for the Balkans) "all the literatures that were written in former Yugoslavia, including Kosovo and the Hungarian Voivodina?" And, going a step further, how does the emphasis, boldly upheld by the European Union, on common experiences (or, alternatively, cultural blandness) come to terms with what István Bibó has called, in the volume's last quote, "the misery of the small Eastern European states," with the lesson of Kosovo reminding us of the key role that ethnic attachments and religious animosities have played in defining national identities?

Ileana Orlich, *Arizona State University* (USA).

Jean-Paul Engélibert and Yen-Maï Tran-Gervat. *La littérature dépliée: Reprise, répétition, réécriture.* Rennes: Presses Univérsitaires de Rennes, 2008. 522 pp. 978-2753505704.

Aptly, this 2008 collection of essays begins with an invocation of Roland Barthes, forty years after the summer of 1968, and with an invitation to see modern acts of writing as recurrent, burgeoning, and even perpetual. Along with such proliferation, however, come two risks, that of unadmitted repetition and that of barbarism for the editors. Engélibert and Tran-Gervat take Barthes' characterization of the modern, and Agamben's connection of degeneracy to the transition from artisinal

to mass production, as a point of departure for this collection of proceedings from the 34th Congress of the French Society of General and Comparative Literature, held at the University of Poitiers in September, 2006. Indeed the volume offers an exemplary array of essays, inspired by the post-structuralist and continental theory that is a legacy of the 1960s and brings these approaches to bear in a distinctive way. As in many ways an *état present* of the field of post-structralist studies in intertextuality, the volume includes essays that emerge directly from that period's approaches. Additionally, however, it seeks both to expand the view of the functionings of intertextuality and to trace the consequences of considering writing as both eternally citational and self-creating. Both the work of the congress and this proceedings volume address the topic from the three-fold perspective of the subtitle, taking up reprise, repetition, and rewriting as variants of intertextual literary relationality. Ranging from familiar landmarks such as Proust to theatrical and filmic texts, the forty-one essays offer both points of divergence and of agreement as to what lies behind the term intertextuality.

The collection begins with two position papers and thereafter is organized into two halves, "cross-pieces" and "periods," the first of which contains essays which share a theoretical or generic concern, while the second addresses the topic of "unfolding" in terms of historical periods. With subsections bearing titles such as "fields," "guiding marks," "myths," and "theatre" in the first half, the second part of the study proceeds from groupings of essays on the Renaissance, the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, and the current moment, so as to conclude with an essay that focuses on new images and the cinema. The range, both methodological and substantive, of the volume is extraordinary, yet rendered manageable and intellectually acute through the organizing theoretic of unfolding, especially as presented in the two initial essays. Throughout, the volume is to be praised for complementing each author's consistently sophisticated and rigorous arguments with the stylistic liveliness and individuality of the original lectures as spoken so as to restage for the reader the conference itself.

Jean-Christophe Bailly's essay, "Reprise, Repetition, Rewriting," offers itself as the start of the volume properly speaking with the elegant suggestion that all beginnings are in fact re-beginnings, and that the sense of continuity or rupture is perhaps always situational. Building on a personal, nearly Proustian recollection of overhearing voices from a radio in the distance one evening in the country (11), Bailly suggests that language is nourished, and best experienced perhaps, in unmediated and evanescent moments which are in many regards the antithesis of the written language of literature. For Bailly, a text is first of all a "trésaillement," a shudder, a trace of what triggers language, which for him is all possible thinkable things, within which meaning is partially, constantly, and repeatedly rearticulated within the linguistic field in the course of an internal and eternal game (14). Within this game, Bailly suggests there are three processes: sewing (in the sense of repairing what has come unraveled), repetition (with the theatrical emphasis of performance), and rewriting (which opens the question of both the palimpsest and of rupture). His triad embraces traditional textile metaphoricities for the literary which stretch back to Penelope while inviting new considerations of how

reduplications such as quotation and translation might complicate and enhance that unitary and linear conceptualization. At the same time that Bailly critiques a certain view of literature, he also invites a flexible and inclusive sense of what repetition, more and less exact, more and less faithful, might entail, when viewed with the theatrical force of performances, or re-performings, which are infinitely replicable while never identical with their original (18).

Bailly's challenge to the conference to reconsider concepts of intertextuality from such post-modern vantage points as translation and performance theory, is offered as a palimpsest and introduction to Anne Tomiche's presidential consideration of textual repetition from an historical perspective. Tracing the concept of literary repetition not only back to Jacques Prévert, but further to sixteenth-century stylistic and aesthetic mandates and to the metaphysics of eternal return in Kierkegaard and Nietzsche, Tomiche suggests that repetition is connected to memory and also to forgetting. She invokes the thought of Derrida, Blanchot, and Deleuze to suggest that in the "re-said" lies the real power of language to unite identity and difference (22). Her connections thereby of repetition and re-saying not only to art and literature, but also to psychoanalysis and to critics of the 1960s and beyond, allow her to emphasize the twentieth-century's contribution to the topic as having been its theorization, not its invention, and to allow this volume to unfold as a legacy of that theoretical turn, one filled with variety and energy.

The first fold of the volume comprises essays linked by shared theoretical concerns and critiques. Raphaëlle Guidée presents the first cross-piece in the form of an account of how repetition and destruction figure in the works of Georges Perec and W.G. Sebald as both a reflection of the global wars and as a caveat to those who see narrative as able to contain catastrophe. Jean-Marc Moura's essay on contemporary incarnations of the "touristic condition" (57), Lambert Barthélémy's deconstruction of the modern pastoral, and Marcin Stawiarski's interdisciplinary consideration of "musico-literary" "re-sayings" (81) offer close readings of particular literary moments which complement the more synoptic questioning of the separation that exists between translation theory and re-writing by Christine Lombez. The "fields" section is followed by a quartet of dialectically positioned essays on narrative, on reprising *Don Quixote* and Proust, before the collection moves to focus on myth and on theatre. The myth section is especially rich, including not only four innovative essays on biblical and Greek mythologies of return and their modern European reworkings, but also Bernadette Rey Mimoso-Ruiz's assessment of rewriting nationalism by Boabdil in medieval Al-Andalus (183ff.) and a foray into popular culture with Nathalie Dufayet's structuralist comparison of Lovecraft and Tolkien as "lunar" fantasists (199).

The four essays on theatrical texts range from a comparative Renaissance study, to analyses of seventeenth- and nineteenth-century French theatre, culminating in Beatrice Jongy's analysis of W. Palka's modern Viennese plays as hypertextual in their relations to earlier dramatic models from Racine and Ibsen. Indeed this rich thread of hypertextuality is picked up later in the collection by Chloé Conant in her reading of four texts, by Bolaño, Eco, Lefebvre, and Ozick which present themselves neither as fragments nor as wholes, neither as original nor as deriva-

tives, but rather as derivatives of a non-existent whole source (409). One of the challenges, of course, of such a collection of essays is that of ordering, and yet one might have wished precisely for some variant of Conant's non-linear hypertextuality in connecting texts flexibly throughout the volume, despite the material constraints of print culture.

If, in the collection's first half, critical and theoretical inquiry are the organizing principles, the second half, perhaps appropriately but also ironically given the theme of repetition, returns the reader to the logic of linear history. Even from the start, however, time is being radicalized as each essay bridges and connects periods and contexts. Insights about Ariosto emerge from Alain Schaffner's account of the twentieth-century novelist, Jean Giono; and Pouneh Mochiri assesses Renaissance art treatises through their reappearance in the nineteenth century.

Embracing the challenge of connecting the process of rewriting with an emerging global consciousness, the nineteenth-century essays expand the focus beyond Europe with Anne-Gaëlle Weber's consideration of scientific travel literature such as Cook's voyages and Claudine LeBlanc's careful historicist tracing of the diasporic impact, both literary and economic, of the European novel in India in the case of O. Chandumenon. Indeed, in praise of the richness of these last two essays, perhaps the only real weakness of the collection as a whole, as a harbinger of repetitions to come in the twenty-first century, is that they stand as two of the only non-Eurocentric pieces. Indeed, while they invite further thought about the role of globalization in this infinite unfolding with-a-difference, even they take the European as the original against which the global calibrates its *différence*.

With the nineteenth and twentieth century, the presence of the United States, so constantly viewed whether by Benjamin or Baudrillard as the locus of mass reproduction, and always uneasy in regards to its status as the derivative of an elsewhere, makes its entrance. Déborah Lévy-Bertherat invites a new evaluation of Poe's masochistic and self-parodic exploitation of a reprise of the outmoded style of "tales of the German school" (339). Robert Smajda's Gadamerian narrative analysis of Proust and Faulkner as rewriting each other intertextually, so as to access something fundamental about societal or family relations for example, suggests that their roughly contemporaneous novels demand of the reader the detection of concordances and dissonances without recourse to an arbitrary evaluative hierarchy of the original and the copy (404-05).

The last section of the collection should move beyond a preoccupation with originality because of its focus on mass reproduction and the filmic. Another crucial emphasis shift in these essays, a result of the shift in medium, is from a consideration of what persists in a repetition to one that focuses on what is absent or in negative. Each of the essays to varying degrees, and often with Deleuze in the background, looks at what is removed and at the concrete reality of film being the negative of the thing it represents. Many of the essays also look at the role of editing rushes into a film, of the need to remove frames, by contrast with a procedure of apparently adding words to a text. From Mireille Brangé's testing of the Hollywood fiction-machine through its attempts to re-present Pirandello to Jacques Lafan's ambitious and provocative essay on editing and "negative writ-

ing" (487), the section includes complex considerations of the role of the medium and the market in determining the creation and reception of repetitions. With Véronique Campan's treatment of the role of "play" (490) and "mise en abîme" in addition to a complex consideration of how direction functions as a kind of writing, world cinema enters the collection in the persons of directors such as Kiorastami from Tehran and Wong Kar Wai from Hong Kong in particular.

The back cover of the volume asks simply how many accounts of the relation among texts, source or otherwise, have been "masked" by the word intertextuality, have been folded into that term. This volume's forty-one folds unfold for the modern critic and theorist the hidden riches of this traditional field and at the same time announce the need for yet more expansion into new media, textual fields, and conceptualizations.

Elizabeth Richmond-Garza, *University of Texas at Austin* (USA)

Anna Guttman, Michel Hockx, and George Paizis, eds. *The Global Literary Field*. Newcastle, UK: Cambridge Scholars Press, 2006. 251 pp. 978-1847 180537.

This highly informative and inspiring anthology is an outcome of "The Global Literary Economy," a conference that was held in 2005 at the School of Oriental and African Studies in London. The introduction frames the volume as suspended between two points of reference, namely Pascale Casanova's *The World Republic of Letters* and a volume edited by Christopher Prendergast entitled *Debating World Literature*. Evoking these publications allows Guttman, Hockx, and Paizis to address the full range of subjects and concerns central to the current discussion over how to conceptually and methodologically approach both the changes on the global literary market and the interplay of literatures in a globalizing world. The implications of the global commercialization of literary spheres, the simultaneous emergence of new international literary fields, and the question of autonomous aesthetics are some of the concerns and opportunities discussed in the introduction.

Somewhat inadvertently, the anthology also documents the contemporaneity of debates regarding the literatures of the world in different academic contexts. Because recent studies and anthologies by, among others, Emily Apter, Haun Saussy (reviewed elsewhere in *RL/LR*), David Damrosch, and Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak appeared just before or after the conference and subsequent completion of the anthology, it was not possible to include them in the introduction and individual discussions.

The Global Literary Field is divided into four parts, the first of which features case studies concerned with the global reception of literatures produced in specific national contexts. Philip Holden investigates three Japanese novels in light of their reception in North America. In his conclusion he emphasizes an aspect particularly relevant to the question of how to approach transnational literatures: "Rather than prescribe what should be written, it may thus be more fruitful to think of an ethics of reception, and in particular of critical reading within a schol-

arly context" (19). Reiko Abe Auestad explores the interplay of the local and the global with regard to the reception of Japanese novels by focusing on the case of Murakami Haruki, an exceptionally successful writer who has been translated "into at least fifteen languages" (22). Auestad's analysis shows that different local cultures make sense of and embed Murakami's novels into their own contexts in distinctive ways. Stuart Davis's article about "Generation X" literature in Spain illustrates that, in spite of aspects of local specificity and against the background of dominant nationalist traditions, this corpus of Spanish-language texts shares features with other literary and generational communities across national and linguistic boundaries, and Davis argues for a greater appreciation of the aesthetic and social gestures exhibited by these writers.

The second part of the anthology investigates aspects of readership and reception in different cultural contexts. Anna Guttman shows that the figure of the Jew functions as a marketing device to attract and secure North American readers for South Asian novels. She highlights the ways in which literary representations of Jews as a symbol for both the marginal and the universal have functioned to articulate middlebrow concerns about social acceptability. Danielle Fuller dissects marketing mechanisms at play in ensuring the commercial success of select Atlantic-Canadian bestsellers. Her discussion reveals that talk shows, literary prizes, the marketing strategies of publishing houses, the promotion of the writer as celebrity, and the use of the author's photograph are all among the means employed to promote popular authors. Carolyn Hart's contribution confirms that African and Diaspora writers continue to be limited in their publishing opportunities by the expectations imposed on them by publishing houses and critics. On the bright side, however, Hart's discussion of the initiatives taken by women writers from Zimbabwe shows that new networks and publishing venues are emerging that will allow African and Diaspora writers to bypass the establishment and to promote their works on their own terms.

The third part focuses more closely on the impact of the global marketplace on literary consumption. George Paizis's analysis of Harlequin Enterprises highlights the changing nature of conditions for mass paperback production of category romances. As the analysis shows, electronic publishing, Internet publishing, and the increased presence of non-Western popular culture on the global market have changed the established parameters of a once entirely Western-dominated genre. The complex reception and adaptation history of the Malay narrative poem *Syair Sultan Abdul Muluk* is at the center of an investigation presented by Mulaika Hijas. Hijas describes the poem's transformation from its originally hybrid origins to its present-day status as a text that is associated with and symbolically claimed by one particular ethnic group. Mary Leontsini and Jean-Marc Leveratto present an analysis of reader responses, posted on four different amazon review sites, to J.M. Coetzee's novel *Disgrace*. Their conclusion to the study highlights the positive potential of customer reviews in enabling consumers to "promote collective elaboration of meaning," an aspect especially relevant to providing context for translated works (180).

Translation is the point of convergence for the three contributions brought

together in the last part. Kathryn Woodham's analysis documents the persistent lack of translations from foreign languages into English (and the simultaneously much larger percentage of translations from English into other languages) which is particularly noticeable with regard to the scarcity of translations of sub-Saharan Francophone novels into English. Kenneth S.H. Liu's article surveys the trends that distinguish translations of Taiwanese literature into English from the 1940s to the present day and contains an appendix with figures detailing various aspects of publication and translation practices. Liu shows that the number of translations is dependent on a range of political factors and that the choice of authors who are translated does not necessarily match up with the status these authors have in Taiwan itself (which is a phenomenon familiar from other national and linguistic contexts). The last contribution, Ira Sarma's analysis of translated Indian literature's meager share of the German market, illustrates the persistent ignorance about the Indian publishing market among Germans. As "the third-biggest producer of English-language books" (230) and a producer of a plethora of literatures in local languages, India has a lot to offer, but the lack of German agents and translators who are familiar with the Indian context and Indian vernacular languages emerges as the central factor in explaining India's minuscule share of the German publishing market.

The anthology addresses a wide range of topics relevant to scholars working in various fields. The individual contributions highlight the persistence of long-standing concerns (e.g. the dominant role of market-forces) and the emergence of new opportunities (e.g. new publishing venues in the digital age), local specificities (e.g. the distinct nature of the German reception of Indian literatures) and cross-cultural communalities (e.g. the existence of generational literatures in different contexts). Everything considered, this anthology clearly indicates that the comparative study of the world's literatures generates illuminating and thought-provoking analyses that shed light on the ways in which people across the planet make sense of life by producing and consuming literature.

Nina Berman, *The Ohio State University* (USA).

Assumpta Camps, Jacqueline Hurtley, and Ana Moya, eds. *Traducción, (sub)versión, transcreación.* Transversal 2. Barcelona: Promociones y Publicaciones Universitarias, 2005. 392 pp. 8447708942.

In memoriam Tania Franco Carvalhal

Traducción, (sub)versión, transcreación, édité par Assumpta Camps, Jacqueline Hurtley et Ana Moya, est dédié au traducteur, poète, critique, théoricien et chercheur brésilien Haroldo de Campos qui jusqu'au moment de sa mort a obtenu un rôle très important dans les domaines de la littérature et de la traduction. Bien qu'Haroldo de Campos ait publié plusieurs travaux d'une renommée internationale (dès sa production de poésie concrète avec Augusto de Campos et Décio Pignatiari), le développement de sa théorie de la Traduction Anthropophagique (qui a été basée sur le *Manifesto antropofágico* d'Oswald de Andrade, de 1928)

a marqué sa production. Cette théorie a fondé une nouvelle façon de voir les relations entre le texte original et le texte traduit, c'est-à-dire, entre la métropole et la colonie, entre la littérature européenne et la littérature latino-américaine. Aujourd'hui, dans le cadre des recherches sur la traduction on ne parle jamais d'Haroldo de Campos sans faire de référence à sa théorie anthropophagique.

Dans le texte de présentation du livre, Assumpta Camps nous parle des changements importants de paradigme subi par l'activité de traduire. Depuis beaucoup de siècles la traduction devait être fidèle au texte original pour être valorisée, jusqu'au moment où la traduction est considérée une nouvelle œuvre littéraire. C'est en ce moment que certaines études post-structuralistes, citées par Camps, deviennent pertinentes, de Bassnett à Derrida, et de Paul de Man à Haroldo de Campos, en soulignant l'idée de la traduction comme une ré-ecriture: traduire comme recréer, c'est-à-dire, "trans-créer."

Cette position critique contemporaine constitue la base des études des différents chercheurs qui ont collaboré à ce livre, lesquels affirment que la traduction existe toujours au même niveau que l'original. À partir de cette perspective la traduction devient une activité créatrice, principalement parce que la traduction poétique convoite plus qu'elle transmet la signification d'un texte.

L'expression *traduttore-traditore* parcourt les perspectives distinctes présentées dans ce livre, lesquelles cherchent à nous montrer, avec les réflexions sur la *praxis* traductrice, que la vision de la traduction s'est modifiée de façon considérable pendant le vingtième siècle. Le traducteur prend un nouveau rôle selon lequel il n'est plus le traître de l'original, mais il devient le créateur, le critique, l'auteur d'une nouvelle oeuvre, le *traduttore creatore*, comme nous disent, par exemple, les articles de Jordi Malé, Ana Moya et Dolores Ortega.

Haroldo de Campos dans sa théorie anthropophagique de la traduction rejète la vision traditionnelle de traître qu'a eu le traducteur tout au long de l'histoire, parce qu'il défend l'idée de la traduction comme création. C'est principalement à cause de l'impossibilité d'obtenir une appréhension complète de la signification et de la forme de l'original dans la traduction, qu'il propose de réécrire l'original, sans penser à la fidélité au texte original, puisqu'il n'y a pas de correspondance directe entre les langues et les cultures différentes. Ainsi, l'intervention du traducteur a une vraie importance dans le processus de traduction, puisqu'il est lui-même le responsable principal pour la médiation entre les cultures différentes. Quelques articles dans ce volume, comme ceux de Julia Butiña et de Pere Gifra, présentent des recherches sur les différences constatées entre les traductions d'un même texte en affirmant que tels or tels choix des traducteurs résultent d'un contexte culturel de la langue-cible, et sont conditionnés par ce contexte.

En analysant les traductions différentes d'un texte, les critiques réfléchissent sur la *praxis* des traducteurs tout au long de l'histoire, en comparant la manière comment chacun connaît et sent son objet d'étude, et en soulignant les marques temporelles de chaque réécriture. Ces marques peuvent être au service de la réception, selon Tania Carvalhal dans son article, ou bien être à service d'une institution ou d'un organe sponsorisant—dont l'objectif est de promouvoir un certain point de vue de l'auteur et de la culture d'origine, selon Jacqueline Hurtley. De ce

point de vue, le traducteur-créateur peut aussi intervenir dans le système littéraire d'arrivé, bien comme dans le système d'origine, puisque le texte n'est pas l'original, mais il est l'original refait.

Le processus de réécrire un texte nous montre qu'il faut que le traducteur prenne le rôle pas seulement de liseur et de critique, mais aussi d'auteur. L'acte traducteur ne se résume pas uniquement en transposition linguistique, puisque le texte traduit a la capacité d'intervenir d'une manière plus ou moins large dans la culture qui le reçoit, selon Adriana Crolla et Patrícia Lessa Flores da Cunha, ou bien dans la pratique poétique du traducteur, d'après les articles d'Alicia Piquer et de Yolanda Romano.

La traduction aujourd'hui est vue comme un élément qui rapproche les cultures. Elle fait qu'une culture puisse connaître "l'autre," l'exotique, en dépassant les limitations du propre texte traduit. Pour empreindre cette "trans-création" proposée par Haroldo de Campos, l'acte de voir et de comprendre "l'autre" influence directement l'activité du traducteur car, comme nous dit Pilar Godayol, en dépendant de la position adoptée devant l'autre, le différent, la traduction peut chercher la fidélité à travers la recréation du texte original. Dans quelques cas, les traducteurs peuvent rapprocher l'exotique de la culture avec l'objectif de conquérir le publique liseur pour que les différences constatées entre les cultures ne causent pas leur méconnaissance et leur éloignement. Plusieurs fois, les traces de la culture-source presque disparaissent et chaque nouveau texte, chaque traduction, présente les marques de leur temps historique.

Évidemment, les auteurs de ce volume, au-delà de partager le même point de vue sur la traduction comme réécriture, sont d'accord en considérant que la traduction est un véhicule important de communication entre les cultures. Selon Dora Sales, le traducteur reconstrue, dans la culture-cible, le texte de la culture-source et dans ce mouvement de traduction il faut faire des choix qui sont en relation directe avec les questions éthiques et politiques, pas uniquement aux problèmes linguistiques et littéraires.

Dans son ensemble, les articles qui composent ce livre réalisent une lecture "trans-culturelle" des oeuvres analysées, car ils recherchent toujours les relations entre les différentes cultures à mesure que celles-ci en prennent contact.

Ce volume est le numéro 2 de la collection *Transversal* qui a eu son début en 2004 avec *Ética y política de la traducción en la época contemporánea*, édité encore une fois par Assumpta Camps. L'édition annuelle de la collection *Transversal* vient remplir une lacune dans les études de traduction qui sont trop souvent restreintes aux annales des événements sans, cependant, empreindre une vision critique des processus et des opérations traductrices.

Pour cette édition collective ont collaborés les chercheurs qui font partie du groupe de recherche CRET de l'*Universitat de Barcelona*, ça veut dire le Groupe de Recherche sur la Traduction et la Multiculturalité, sous la direction d'Assumpta Camps. D'autres universités espagnoles et étrangères ont aussi participé. La présence de plusieurs centres universitaires de cadre national et international nous montre que les études de traduction ne se limitent pas à un groupe unique de chercheurs mais s'étendent aux différents groupes de pays qui dialoguent à mesure

qu'ils se réunissent à chaque édition. À partir de cet univers de collaborateurs, on peut apercevoir que les études de traduction sont en train d'acquérir un espace important dans les institutions d'aujourd'hui, ce qui nous démontre que les traductions ne sont plus considérées comme des productions de seconde classe, comme auparavant.

Mitizi Gomes, *Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul* (Brazil)

Assumpta Camps, Montserrat Gallart, Iván García, and Victoriano Peña, eds. *Traducción y di-ferencia.* Transversal 3. Barcelona: Gráfocas Rey, 2006. 352 pp. 8447530485.

In memoriam Tania Franco Carvalhal

"The ear of the other," "after Babel," "facts versus interpretation," "negotiation," "*straduzion*e," "transcreation" . . . These are just a few of the terms from among a large number of expressions and concepts, some from yesterday, others current today, that are associated with translation studies. This volume on "Translation and Di-fference" ("Traducción y di-ferencia) published by Assumpta Camps, who heads a multicultural and international team of translation specialists, showcases new ideas about this form of intercultural dialogue, discussing in depth the array of themes that are emerging daily in literary studies and even more with contemporary tendencies that promote hearing the Other. This third volume from the Transversal collection seeks to contribute to contemporary translation studies by presenting ideas and reflections developed at different universities in a variety of countries. The emphasis falls on observing and understanding non-canonical forms, languages, and literatures that are sometimes seen as peripheral, as in the case of Chicanos, Indians, and *gauchos* on the Río de la Plata frontier.

In the Prologue, Camps discusses the difference in the *status* of translation studies as practiced now in comparison with before. Her defense of translation as *écriture*, as a process that continues for years and in different readings, shows the revolution that has led to the greater visibility of translation in recent years and of much-cited authors like Octavio Paz and Jacques Derrida. Camps argues that theoretical questions about translation, which once were marginal in literary studies, have now become central, as the result of some very specific works.

At the same time, she explains that translations will always be dated as a result of their connection with particular historical moments and specific forms of mediation. In this way, she defends the translator as an intermediary, as an interpreter, because s/he makes possible what was previously unintelligible. Following this thought, she points out that a translation cannot be considered an original text, but instead always consists of interpretative possibilities. Translation is itself an interstitial site: literary theory, cultural studies, hermeneutics, deconstruction, gender studies, feminist criticism, and all the possibilities associated with the binary of original-reproduction. By the way, we get to translate the translation concept.

As a result, it is a mistake to insist on fidelity in translation. As a poststructuralist symbol, translation reveals literature's essential condition of incomplete-

ness. Translation is more the after life of a text: a *huella* or imprint, a clue that the instability of meanings, which are always provisional, is a fact, and interpretation is the way.

The next chapters go in different directions, though they all treat the topic of contemporary translation studies. Julia Butinya's essay, for example, shows the changes in translation during the passage to Modernity, especially with the Catalonian writer, Bernat Metge. Butinya points out that the high prestige of Latin meant that medieval translations were viewed as adaptations: they were merely "vulgarizations" of the original classical works. However, in the fourteenth century greater rigor was reached in translating Latin texts. According to Butinya, Metge's fourteenth-century translations already contain methods and reflections that are extremely modern, even contemporary, in light of current discussions of translation practice.

Another chapter worthy of discussion is *La vida del texto*: Borges y la traducción [The life of the text: Borges and translation], by Assumpta Camps. As mentioned, this author sees translation as *huella*, as an infinite and creative process that enriches the original. For Camps, Borges is a focal point for translation theory, even though he never wrote a full-scale "theory" of translation, only essayistic texts and comments. For George Steiner, commentaries on translation would necessarily amount to commentaries on Borges's text, "Pierre Menard, autor del Quijote," because it spotlights the central problem in translation: to repeat an existing book in a foreign language. Camps also rereads Walter Benjamin's comments on the survival of the original. Borges's text, in this sense, subverts the traditional hierarchy between "original" and translation, because the translation serves to enrich the first text. To translate is, after all, to reread and to re-create a work, to use a text as a pretext. To recall Eliot, Barthes, and Foucault when they address the death of the author, no text is ever definitive, because this situation would correspond to religion or to exhaustion, according Borges. There are references to "la poética de los borradores" (rough copy poetics) and to translation as a "borrador más en la vida del texto a través del tiempo" (a rough copy more in the life of the text through time). From this viewpoint translation survives as an intertext, and it is only possible to translate, since literature is always a translation.

Translation involves difference rather than deviation with the implication of betrayal. To translate, according to Effraim Kristal, transforms a text into another: the original is, until that moment, the best version of the text. Therefore, finally, the most important thing to keep alive is not the content, but the form, form that perpetuates itself, whose objective lies not so much in its similarity to the original, as in its survival in translation after translation.

In "Tensiones dialectales en la traducción hispánica: un ejemplo de la literatura chicana" [Dialectical Tensions in Hispanic Translation: an Example of Chicano Literature], Laura Canós discusses the re-standardization of Spanish, with its 350 million native speakers, at a time of globalization. By comparing two Spanish translations of a work written in Chicano English, the author discusses the difficulties of this kind of translation and the necessity of taking special care to respect a culture that is steadily growing.

In the next chapter, "Autoría contra traducción y traducción como autoría: las perspectivas de Kundera y Borges" [Authorship against Translation and Translation as Authorship: Kundera's and Borges's Perspectives], Pere Comellas likens translation to artistic interpretation. From this viewpoint, translation is a necessary intermediary which puts a reader into contact with a text. And Borges again appears as a defender of inter-translation studies and of translation as a literary genre in its own right. In this way, the author revisits the positions taken by George Steiner and Rosemary Arrojo, by defending translation as another name for authorship.

In a provocative text from the Argentine littoral, "Leer es traducer—traducer es trans-decir: un paradigma de lectura" [To Read is to Translate—To Translate is Trans-saying: a Paradigm of Reading], Adriana Crolla points to translation as a specialized form of reading. The author sketches a brief history of translation studies, emphasizing Steiner and Benjamin among others. For Susan Bassnett and André Lefevère translation represents a form of intercultural communication, and this line of thought leads us to Comparative Literature, to figures like Haroldo de Campos and Octavio Paz. Borges resurfaces at this point, when Crolla defends an "erasure of traditions" ("borramiento de tradiciones") on the grounds that literary translation, in its essence, affirms the value of placing literatures in contact. It is a comparative operation that involves the other and that necessitates an infinite comparative reading. As Susan Sontag once said, translation is the circulatory system among the literatures of the world and, we would add, among its cultures.

In the same spirit, Witold Gombrowicz becomes a pretext for Laura Pariani, author of *La Straduzione*, who has developed a new word that is meant to comprehend and involve the entire translation experience. It is a word (for example) that can combine a *strada* (road), *tradizione/traduzione* (both tradition and betrayal), and deviant (in the double sense of a road or a translation). In fact, for Borges, there can be no deviation, because each language is a form with which to respond to the universe. Pariani, in her book, translates the work and life of Gombrowicz in Argentina, while that writer was translating his book *Ferdydurke* into Spanish with a group of friends who didn't understand Polish. Bozena Zakwaska, in another essay on this author, insists that in translating his own writings into Spanish Gombrowicz produced new versions of them. As a result, she can defend his status as a writer in Spanish and considers his translations to be creative versions of the original works.

Borges appears yet again in the chapter by Pilar Godayol, who discusses the question of time as an infinite series, with divergent, convergent, and parallel times, in the work of Borges and his fictional character Ts'ui Pên. In this case, translation becomes a protagonist, and the original text is contaminated: these are rewritings. There is no equivalency, resemblance, or transparency, but difference. Contamination is what matters, and its existence becomes visible in the writer's handling of intertextuality. Without naming Umberto Eco, Godayol refers to his idea of negotiation and contends that each work has a new identity, because each text is a preface to another. In this way, translation does not reduce meanings and significations, but displaces them.

From the south of Brazil, where Rio Grande do Sul meets Uruguay and Argentina, comes the idea of translation as the representation of a new world. Mitizi Gomes compares Euclides da Cunha's *Os Sertões* with its translation by Benjamin de Garay, and finds that de Garay had become aware of Brazilian cultural specificities in the process of translating the work. As a result, this translation could provide a site for understanding differences between Brazil and Latin America in general and even Argentina in particular. Once more, translation brings difference.

Haroldo de Campos is the subject of an essay by Patricia Cunha which presents translation as a transcreative practice. Campos, in this theory of translation, discusses ideas of assimilation and digestion in the *Manifesto antropofágico* by Oswald de Andrade and in the thoughts of Paul Valéry, as well as in the transculturation of Angel Ráma, the hybridism of Néstor García Canclini, and the melting-pot of Antonio Cornejo Polar. To Campos all translation is criticism, and his theory of transcreation synthesizes the positions of Jakobson and Benjamin. Cunha concludes that if the poet is a pretender, as Fernando Pessoa would say, then the translator must be a transpretender.

The book's remaining essays range over an even wider array of topics. Ana Luna Alonso uses Itamar Even-Zohar's theories to justify differences in the relationships among literary systems and to explain the situation of translation in Galicia, with a literary system that is considered peripheral. In a canonical example from French literature that still needs to be studied, we have the use of the *on* pronoun in the translation of surrealist authors. The issue of translation to movies is observed by Ana Moya, in the case of *The Remains of the Day*, directed by James Ivory, where the author arrives at the idea of *homo fabulans*: there is no man without discourse. Victoriano Peña reflects on Franco Fortini's translations, bringing Octavio Paz and Benedetto Croce into the discussion, when he defends the idea of a voice inside another voice in the text, as a nostalgia for the original. Peña defends the idea of translation as a *rifacimento* or remaking.

In "*L'art de traduire* yourcenariano y su práctica traductológica" [The Yourcenarian Art of Translating and Its Translating Practice], Montserrat Gallart treats Marguerite Yourcenar's aims and prejudices as a translator and cultural mediator. Gender in translation is analyzed by Yolando Romano, who researches the role of feminine voices in Italian translations. Dora Sales, in her turn, pays homage to Puroshottam Lal, an Indian translator, and thus proposes to go outside the West in thinking about translation. Of special interest in this chapter is the concept of transcreation, which closely resembles Campos's idea, discussed above. According to Tomás Serrano, a professor and translator based in Mexico who specializes in that country's translation politics, Mexico (despite its size) continues to rely heavily on Argentina or Spain for works translated into Spanish.

In covering the topic of translation at many sites throughout the contemporary period, this collection of articles has had no other constraint on its subject matter, so authors have been free to explore a variety of issues. Their multicultural origins also help account for the multiplicity of themes. Three papers originated in an exchange between the Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, in the southernmost state of Brazil, and the Universitat de Barcelona, facilitated

by Tania Carvalhal on the Brazilian side and by Assumpta Camps on the Spanish. One chapter came from the Argentine context, another from Mexico, and even among the Spanish articles we have major differences in topics and cultures. There are Galician, Catalonian, and Mallorquin examples and even Spanish scholars of French, English, or Indian literature. All this variety has the merit of further enriching translation and literary studies, because such wide-ranging dialogue stands at the heart of the topic. In a world after Babel, all roads lead to translation.

Joana Bosak de Figueiredo,
Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul (Brazil)

Astradur Eysteinsson and Vivian Liska, eds. *Modernism.* 2 vols. Comparative History of Literatures in European Languages 21. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2007. xii + 1043 pp. 978-9027234544.

Although these two volumes are published under the aegis of the ICLA's Coordinating Committee for a Comparative History of Literatures in European Languages, the editors proclaim in their afterword that "the present volumes do not contain the history of modernism or even *a* history of modernism (2:1009). Their bold disclaimer, however, represents contradictory intentions only if taken in a rigid and narrow sense.

It is certainly the case that these tomes are not a history in the traditional and positivistic way. They do not present a basically linear narrative accounting for the rise and subsequent demise of an abstractly and somewhat arbitrarily defined movement widely accepted as modernism. It is clear from the beginning that the methods and paradigms of the great nineteenth-century literary historians have not informed their procedures and conceptions to any substantial degree. Yet this study does many things that literary scholars have long expected histories to do but does them, rather, in a very nuanced and sophisticated way. Part of the reason they have been able to rise to a more comprehensive and highly developed standard is that from the beginning the recognition that literary history does not proceed in a neat and orderly fashion that can be presented in a relatively simple series of cause and effect relationships permeates the work. Boundaries can be seen and transitions can be observed, but they are typically tentative and always invite interrogation and multiple definitions. Developments of style and theme across time can be scrutinized, but they also encourage examination in terms of multifaceted and complex networks that emerge as a result of adjacency rather than sequentiality. Provisional conclusions can be reached that are of considerable intellectual value, but the questions that they imply may well prove to be of similar merit. The reservations and uncertainties lurking in their shadow may stimulate more thought and consequently even more comprehensive inferences. While eschewing on the one hand neat but overly simplistic explanation and on the other encyclopedic inclusiveness of relevant and detailed minutiae, these two volumes probe the boundaries of the concept and explore recent trends and orientations in studying the way in which modernism is widely configured and investigated today.

Volume One begins not so much with efforts to define modernism, but with four essays that examine parameters that are useful in delimiting the concept. Noting that the term appears in all European literatures, the first contribution engages this international scope by drawing on several generally well-known characteristics of the tradition and critically evaluating their contemporary relevance across several of its national manifestations. First used in a literary-critical sense in Germany in the 1880s and '90s and understood in terms of the then current thematic, stylistic, and social developments, its temporal range is viewed as extending from the late nineteenth century down to the 1950s and '60s. In Habermas's famous discussion of the term in "Modernity: An Unfinished Project," this period is distinguished as "a long lasting artistic epoch based on a dichotomy between new classicism and the avant-garde" (19). Departing from this description, the essay continues by identifying the "hybrid or specific integration of the classic/romantic tradition" (20) and proceeds to examine several widely attested features in various complementary ways. The second essay stresses contrasting characteristics of modernism rather than the inherent unity and argues for recognition of a variety of modernisms that reach beyond the narrow confines of canonical Western culture. In ways that enlarge upon and give slightly different emphases to the first essay, the third stresses the necessity of perceiving modernism in terms of internationalism and the more recent trends toward globalization. In marked contrast to other recent publications on the topic—Pericles Lewis's *The Cambridge Introduction to Modernism* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2007) or Sabina Becker and Helmuth Kiesel's *Literarische Moderne: Begriff and Phänomen* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007), for example—which seem to suggest a general coverage of the concept but nonetheless clearly focus primarily on the Anglo-American and German manifestations respectively, here an uncompromising insistence on transcending national borders is a fundamental precept. The final essay in this opening section takes a very different tack in examining the relationship of text to the reader, who is challenged to derive signification and meaning from the modernist discursive practices.

Critical engagements with the concept of modernism have up this time obviously elicited an expansive array of characterizations and evaluations. The second section of the study engages some of these prior critical forays in four well focused reassessments of the movement. The first explores contemporary critical theory's representation of modernism and investigates the role of irony in this context in texts of Robert Musil and Hermann Broch. The second works out of a Marxist context drawing initially on an early generation of critics (Lukács, Adorno, and Gramsci) for critical assessments and contrasts these with more recent post-Marxist constructivist views. Bahktin's polyphonic conception of the novel is then evoked to examine the modernist role of the authorial subject in the third essay, and the concluding article again adduces the thinking of Adorno but this time in contrast to that of Lyotard in order to study the role and function of phenomena from the grotesque through the unconscious to the sublime.

The third section continues the efforts to situate modernism with regard to other literary constructs. The first essay reveals the constructedness of what is

typically taken as the canonical tradition of Western culture and assesses modernism's often ambivalent relationship to it. The second and third essays engage the avant-garde and expressionism, the first in terms of manifestos that seem to herald a break with the past and the second in terms of expressionism's untimeliness (*Unzeitgemässheit*) that propels its continuing and unabated interest into the present. The fourth article focuses at once on the breadth as well as the unity of Beckett's oeuvre that justifies his identification as a "trans-modernist" whose later work rather than departing from his early modernist tendencies is a symbolic and self-reflexive embodiment of those inclinations. The section's final essay takes up what is often recognized as the border separating modernism from postmodernism, which is ultimately identified as a false and misleading distinction, particularly in light of a reconceptualization of foundational modernist precepts in terms of postmodernist categories of judgment.

The next three sections of the volume are closely related in their parallel examination of pairs of foundational concepts from a modernist perspective: time and space, mind and body, and technology and science. The analysis of spatial structures is couched in terms of the freeing of space from its long-standing role as an inert setting or background against which a narrative plays itself out and its resulting elevation to field of autonomous aesthetic interest and in the following article in terms of the often-discussed modernist fascination with urban space. Temporal structures are studied with regard to the way modernist authors have configured childhood in relation to the conflict between the modern world's deprivation of stable points of orientation and the desire for the newly born. Attention is directed toward the presentation of childhood, childhood recollections, and the language of childhood as well as the way the figuration of childhood in terms of parthenogenic reproduction is a subversion of the pervasive power of patriarchy. The inextricable relationship of trauma and belatedness offers a point of departure for considering the particularly apt position of modernist poetry's portrayal of trauma in terms of temporality on the basis of the works of Baudelaire and Celan.

The rapport of mind and body is probed in relation to "poetics of process" and the distinctly modernist awareness of human consciousness, to the conception of self that emerges from a "contextual" as opposed to a formal reading of modernist authors, and finally to the techniques available to the modernist author for presenting the human face bounded on the one side by description and portraiture and on the other by fragmentation and dissociation. The presentation of the continuum from science to technology begins with a staging based on readings of Broch, Gide, and Rilke (*The Notebooks of Malte Laurids Brigge*) of the process of accounting and the expected resistance of modernists to the settling of accounts, which, though, by contrast is encompassed by a complex logic endeavoring to circumscribe and to a degree to control fragmentation and the resulting chaos. It continues with a succinct delimitation of the influence of Einstein's concept of relativity and a gesture toward the importance of the paradigms advanced by other earlier scientists. Similarly, the next chapter invites attention of the debt of modernist writers to pre-Freudian psychology that has all-too-hastily been overlooked. Thomas Mann's *The Magic Mountain* is taken up in the next chapter,

which portrays how technology engaged the imagination of modernist writers in their attempt to navigate a technologically fragmented world. The section's final chapter discusses the way in which prominent scientific theories have elicited analogous aesthetic developments and concentrates on the way in which the symbolists, imagists, and futurists drew on widely circulating new scientific understandings of the process of perception.

Chapter seven, the final chapter of the first volume, is devoted to literature and the adjacent arts, an area of critical analysis that has long required wide-ranging critical expertise and heightened sensitivities to multiple forms of artistic expression, both of which the authors bring to bear on their essays in variety of ways. The first laments the relative lack of attention that has been accorded the complex and very rich relationship between the visual arts and modernist theory and eloquently begins to redress the imbalance. The following contribution explores the complementary concepts of dwelling in modernist literature—most notably in Proust, Joyce, Woolf, and Beckett—and modernist architecture as exemplified by Wright and Le Corbusier. Avoiding the all-too-common pitfall of understanding the relationship between film and literature primarily in terms of plot, the next essay examines the demands that early films made on spectators in relationship to the expectations placed on readers by modernist authors. As if a case study, the next essay uses the comparative juxtaposition of the literary oeuvre of Pierre Loti with the painting of Vincent Van Gogh, but the essay continues in exploring the profound effect that oriental art had on fundamental Western conceptions of the subject, perspective, and the visual surface. The relationship between music and literature is couched in terms of the way in which music destabilizes the conception of language as an established, readily accessible, and secure mode of communication and illustrates how some modernist writers have resorted to basically musical structural and organizational devices in contrast to the more typical agenda of mimetic representation. As a conclusion to the consideration of literature in relationship to the other arts, the final chapter in the volume argues that modernist theater cannot reasonably be engaged as fundamentally textual or simply the enactment of a written script, but must rather be understood as performance, i.e. a complex series of activities that go well beyond what can be realized on the printed page alone.

The second volume of the study consists of four sections: the first three—sections eight, nine, and ten—deal with broadly social, political, and ideological issues, and the fourth considers the widely varying contours of modernism in various parts of Europe and the Americas. The first contribution to section eight addresses the relationship of modernism to fascism, particularly the new concepts of the individual sense of subjectivity *vis-à-vis* the collective in the works of Marinetti and Jünger. The two subsequent essays both undertake an examination of the early twentieth-century concepts of empire: the first in terms of a highly original juxtaposition of Pessoa's reaction to the maintenance of the far-flung Portuguese empire with Hofmannsthal's late engagement with political issues painfully arising from the demise of the Austro-Hungarian empire and its aristocratic traditions as a result of World War I and the second in terms of an interrogation of Edward

Said's concept of orientalism and the heightened awareness of racial difference that was occasionally appropriated as a defining marker of modernist thought and values. The relatively new field of eco-criticism has not yet been widely applied to modernist fiction, but the last essay in the section clearly illustrates its significant heuristic value in revealing the possibility for new readings. In a detailed analysis of *To the Lighthouse* (specifically the section entitled "Time Passes"), Mrs. McNab and her coterie's departure from the house is not portrayed as a failure to create order and keep chaos at bay but rather as liberation of the non-human natural world from human domination. Though arrestingly at variance with traditional readings, it is indeed compelling.

The next section consists of four essays juxtaposing modernism with popular culture (drawing on Eliot and Joyce), with feminist theory in a way that suggests modernism embodied some previously unrecognized feminist themes, with secularized manifestations of the sacral in Monet, Woolf, Van Gogh, and Rilke, and with anthropology to the extent that it deals with artifacts of primitive cultures that can be linked to a concept of the collective unconscious.

The last of this set of three sections—section ten—begins with an essay that returns to the topic of the questionable transparency of language as a means of communication, particularly as it pertains to translation. In a way that well represents the central theme of Benjamin's justly famous essay "Die Aufgabe des Übersetzers," translation is configured as ideally striving to be a parallel rewriting rather than a clear but necessarily secondary representation of a source text. Although the role of Chinese and Japanese cultures on the contours of modernism in general has been widely discussed, the second essay draws selectively and intelligently on studies of the haiku in Western languages and analyzes the significance of that briefest of literary forms for modernist poetics. The final two essays consider Pierre Loti's modernist construction of the colonial Other and scrutinize the impact on the one hand of voluntary exile (Beckett, Joyce, and Ungaretti) and on the other of a forced exile motivated by the need to escape persecution or oppression (the friends, Paul Celan and Nelly Sachs). Taken together, these socially engaged essays provide a penetrating view of the way modernism was used by, engaged with, and contravened dominant ideological positions from the late nineteenth well into the twentieth century.

The final section entitled "Location: Case Studies" looks most like what one might traditionally expect from a literary history, but it generously offers nonetheless many surprising and unanticipated conclusions. It consists of eighteen essays of varying lengths dealing with the unique ways modernism manifests itself either in a relatively small regions or across wide-ranging territories. The choice of areas for examination is highly selective, and no rationale for the specific choices is offered. Conspicuous by their absence, however, are examinations of Anglo-American and German modernism although one may well argue that they have been adequately covered as predominant manifestations of modernism in earlier essays. Some of the contributions treat vast areas encompassing several countries, e.g."The Spanish-American Modernismo" and "The Spanish-American Novel and European Modernism," which are also closely allied with

"Approaching Spanish Modernism" and "Brazilian Modernism." Another broad area surveyed in a single essay is discussed under the title "Central and Eastern European Symbolist Literature and Its Project" while another closely related area is examined in "Russian Modernism." Other essays are more narrowly focused and consider one country—Australia, France, Italy, and Greece—or specific autonomous regions—Catalonia and the Faroe Islands, for example. It is particularly gratifying to see essays devoted to countries whose contemporary literary traditions are not generally well known in the international community of letters, e.g. Greece and The Netherlands (or more precisely Dutch literature that includes both that of The Netherlands and Flanders).

The Nordic countries intriguingly are singled out for rather special treatment by the Icelander and editor of these volumes Ástráður Eysteinsson. He explains in his introduction to "Borders of Modernism in the Nordic World" that the "collage of short articles" comprising this chapter "are written by a group of seven scholars who in recent years have, along with other colleagues, organized a series of conferences focusing primarily on modernist links between the Nordic region and other parts of the world" (2:834). Two important books—*English and Nordic Modernisms* and *European and Nordic Modernisms*—have resulted from these conferences and well illustrate how work on the more comprehensive descriptions of a particular tradition can effectively stimulate new and more narrowly focused assessments and research. After the introductory explanation, follow short essays on Swedish literature in both Sweden and Finland (focusing prominently on Artur Lundkvist, who died in 1991 not 1961 as is once indicated), Finnish literature (i.e. exclusively in the Finnish language rather than Swedish or Sámi, the other two official languages of Finland), Danish modernism (which showed early traces of modernism but is seen as not coming into full bloom until the 1950s and '60s in Klaus Rifbjerg, Inger Christensen, and Villy Sørensen), Norwegian modernism (which by contrast is viewed as having its origins in the late nineteenth century in Ibsen and Hamsun), Icelandic modernism (which gives just, particular, and highly insightful attention to Halldór Laxness), and finally to Faroese modernism (which is here understood as a late import to the Faroe Islands [population: 48,000] and thus not taking root until the 1960s although the works of the earlier and highly esteemed lyric poet C. Matras manifest traces of what was to come).

Among the features that stand out in the other case studies are the very sophisticated and nuanced presentation of insufficiently-recognized Catalonian modernism; the view of French literature that sees the application of the category of modernism to that national tradition as at best highly problematic; the portrayal of the importance of modernism for development and maturation of Brazilian letters and its implied critique of certain strains of the corresponding European tradition, both judiciously and gracefully based on the earlier work of Afránio Coutinho; and the wide and variegated portrayal of the complex relationship of the various strands of Peninsular and Latin American Hispanic literature. Also deserving mention is the clarity of the synthesizing challenge of presenting the often diverging departures of east central Europe from Enlightenment thinking toward differing modes of contemporary consciousness; the compelling case for the en-

gaging power of Russian modernism and its cultural importance even in comparison with far better known traditions; and the sensitive and insightful reading of the towering figures of Italian modernism, D'Annunzio, Montale, and Ungaretti.

In a study undertaking the examination of a phenomenon as complex, as resistant to stable and widely accepted definition, and as given to extreme variation from one place to another as is modernism, practically any reader can find points that, consistent with personal orientations or preferences, could have been treated more fully or left out altogether, issues that are considered in a one-sided way or are presented too abstractly without reference to particular literary manifestations, critical views that are not acknowledged or methods whose precepts are unduly belabored, or any of a number of other choices that might have been otherwise made. The process of editing such a study involves making choices—sometimes ones that one would rather not make—among a wide range of possibilities. The editors, though, here have plotted a highly engaging and luminous course through a vast array of facts, views, and interpretations that is notably flexible in its accommodation of a multiplicity of local practices and conventions yet firm enough to afford considerable guidance in understanding how modernism is being construed as a historical, thematic, and stylistic construct at this point in time. In working with what ultimately must be regarded as a period designation at a time when periodization as such has come under increasing scrutiny as a viable mode of literary historiography, they have productively taken into account many of the recent critiques and have constructed their conceptual framework so that it is in no danger of collapsing into newly identified and intellectually untenable sinkholes. They have done an admirable job in ordering and providing illuminating contours to contributions from nearly seventy collaborators who have not all worked on the basis of the same fundamental assumption about modernism and have, thus, represented divergent precepts that enrich the conceptual fabric of the whole rather than undermining its unity. There is no attempt at arbitrary closure or finality but rather further thought and investigation are not only allowed but also vigorously invited.

In a study of this magnitude, there are bound to be areas of uneven intellectual and critical depth. The part of these volumes in which a certain asymmetry was most notable is the case studies of modernism in different locales. Although each of the contributions is informative, well written, and rich in insights that readers will find valuable, as a whole it seems somewhat less critically sophisticated and intellectually challenging than the earlier chapters. It appears as if a number of the contributors to this section were working in relative isolation and had little awareness of the urbane and conceptually demanding analyses preceding their contributions. The weight of precedent may have proven difficult to evade in that occasionally essays seem to lapse into the model of the traditional portrayal of a literary period within the context of one nation's literary heritage with all of the critical deficits inherent therein. Nonetheless the section is a valuable contribution and especially reader-friendly.

The writing throughout the volume is lucid, precise, and generally in highly idiomatic English. The degree of precision is remarkable considering the number of non-native speakers of English involved—including the two editors. Occasionally

very minor inaccuracies arise, e.g. *conference* in English means a meeting, an assembly, or a gathering, not an address, a lecture, or a talk (German: *Rede*) as is the primary meaning of its cognates in French, Italian, and Spanish. Another, perhaps, more subtle case is the English word *actuality*, which means reality or existing facts in contrast to the French *actualité* and the German *Aktualität,* which mean up to the minute, relevance to the present, or topicality. A consistency throughout with regard to the capitalization of period designations and punctuation of book titles in particular would have enhanced the sense of unity of the volume.

An issue of somewhat greater concern, however, centers on the documentation provided at the end of each contribution and the selection of editions for citation. Considerable variation—perhaps inconsistency—characterizes the bibliographies, to a limited extent with regard to form per se, but more extensively in terms of providing readers with complete bibliographic details. Often editors, series names and numbers, or series editors are missing, a fact that certainly will not render the volume inaccessible, but does make the reference needlessly incomplete. Even more disturbing, however, is the rather widespread use of popular and mass market editions, which are entirely acceptable when better versions do not exist, but they are certainly not the best choice for scholarly citation when critical editions are available and could be used. Similarly when older editions have been superseded by more recent ones, the latter are obviously to be preferred. In a work that aspires to the high scholarly standards that characterize this series, such bibliographic details merit careful attention.

These minor reservations notwithstanding, *Modernism* is a formidable accomplishment. Although there are issues not broached and stones still unturned, it presents in eminently accessible form a vast amount of material, heuristic strategies offering a rich array of ways for conceiving of one of the most formidable revolutions in Western cultural history, and highly original paths for negotiating both the correspondences and the contradictions of that tradition. Its breadth of coverage, its depth of analysis, and its height of originality make it a volume that while implying a reader with some literary-critical acumen will nonetheless have something to offer almost anyone taking it to hand. It is certainly a highly distinguished addition to the series of literary histories in European languages that can proudly assume a place of honor among other distinguished tomes.

Steven P. Sondrup, *Brigham Young University* (USA)

OUVRAGES INDIVIDUELS

INDIVIDUAL WORKS

ZHANG Longxi. *Unexpected Affinities: Reading Across Cultures*. Toronto: The U of Toronto P, 2007. xv + 138 pp. 978-0802092779.

The scholar of East-West studies, like Odysseus, must steer between the Scylla of exoticisization—making the Orient more different (and more alien) than it need be—and the Charybdis of cultural reductionism, which makes the Orient a mere (often inferior) shadow of the Occident. The first trap generates the misconception that the Orient, and specifically China, is so radically different that it is impossible to understand: this is an attitude that, in the past, earned China and the Chinese the cliché sobriquet, "inscrutable." The other pitfall suggests that the Orient in general, and the Chinese in particular, are merely disguised versions of Western culture: the effect of this distortion is that it erases the distinctiveness of the different, and the co-existence of fundamentally different, if not entirely contradictory, paradigms.

The contribution of biculturally competent scholars like Zhang Longxi is that they do not feel the need to exaggerate either extreme to illuminate literary texts, whether Western or Chinese. Zhang's cross-cultural insights do not require a globalization of "other cultures," valuing and understanding them to the extent that they resemble and reinforce or contrast with one's own. Nor does he feel the need to exaggerate differences—Zhang calls them "incommensurabilities"—an exaggeration enshrined in Kipling's oft-quoted, but frequently misused lines: "Oh, East is East and West is West, and never the twain shall meet." Zhang, characteristically, refuses to cite this quotation without recalling for us the subsequent lines which have a more postmodern ring: "But there is neither East nor West, Border, nor Breed, nor Birth, / When two strong men stand face to face, though they come from the ends of the earth." The "ends of the earth" are not what they used to be, nor are they, in this age of the internet, so remote or inaccessible. Zhang ends the first chapter with a counterpoise to the famous Kipling quote, this one from Goethe's *West-östlicher Divan*, one that seems more appropriate to a diasporically post-colonial age: "Orient und Okzident / Sind nicht mehr zu trennen" ("The Orient and the Occident / Separate will never be").

One of Zhang Longxi's previous books was titled *Mighty Opposites: From Dichotomies to Differences in the Comparative Study of China* (Stanford University Press, 1998). In a review, I suggested that the book could just as easily have been titled *Mighty Apposites*. The current book, a set of four essays based on the Alexander Lectures presented at the University of Toronto in 2005 under the rubric "Textual Encounters / Cultural Encounters," adopts the reverse empha-

sis and is titled *Unexpected Affinities: Reading Across Cultures*, with, of course, an echo of Goethe's *Elective Affinities*. Yet it is, in many ways, a continuation of the explorations in *Mighty Opposites*. The delight in reading Zhang Longxi is that he uses comparison to illuminate the texts compared, not as hobby horses to argue some grand binary theory. One comes away learning as much about one's own culture, whichever one that is, as about the "other" culture.

Unexpected Affinities is, in some ways, both a very traditional piece of literary criticism, and a pioneering achievement. It is traditional in the sense that it is a familiar, even old-fashioned study of theme and variation; it is, however, pioneering in its unparalleled scope of reference and allusion. Original because there is no work like this in English, Zhang being uniquely equipped to write it; derivative because it reflects both the spirit as well as the letter of his mentor, Qian Zhongshu, the brilliant polymath Chinese scholar. If Qian Zhongshu was the first intercultural literary scholar in the world who, in such works as the *Guanzhuibian* (The Pipe- and Awl-Chapters) and *Tanyi lu* (Discourse on Literary Art) displayed an encyclopedic knowledge of world literatures (not merely world literature), Zhang Longxi bids fair to becoming the second intercultural scholar of this kind to appear on the scene. The only difference is that, whereas Qian wrote in Chinese, Zhang is writing in English.

The result is a stimulating survey of some key affinities between Eastern and Western literatures: the scope is wide, encompassing examples primarily from English literature (though citations from the French, German, Greek, and Latin are also included) and from Chinese literature. The learning, while impressive, is worn lightly, and clearly Zhang is so absorbed with these "unexpected affinities" that he resembles no one so much as an antiquarian with a vast collection who relishes his subject and cherishes every object (text) he has stored in memory. The technique is textual juxtaposition, expanded with cultural exegesis, and graced with an elegant analytic sensibility.

The opening chapter offers an ingenious refutation of the theory of cultural incommensurability. By citing theorists of cultural incommensurability from both China and the West, Zhang shows that the two cultures are not incommensurable after all. But, here, to aid his argument, he conflates two arguments; one, that cultures are fundamentally different, and two, that the differences cannot be explained. He amply and cogently refutes the second, but his refutations of the first are only partially convincing. He is absolutely right when he questions grandiose statements, like that of François Jullien, "that truth is an exclusively Greek and Western concept, while in China there is no 'concept of truth.' " But he is less successful when he tries to make Tao Yuanming homologous with Plato: "If Tao Yuanming felt that truth could only be grasped by the mind, but not expressed in language, isn't that close to what Plato meant when he remarked that concrete things are 'only images,' that what is perceived as true realities 'can be seen only by the mind'?" (20). While this is an intriguing homology, it is misleading. For Tao Yuanming, reality was ineffable and, in its concreteness, impervious to language and to abstraction. For Plato, reality was the opposite, the abstract forms behind phenomenal appearances, behind the concrete objects phenomenologically perceived. However, one

cannot challenge Zhang's overall argument, that the theory of cultural incommensurability is the result of provincial myopia that must be replaced by "a kind of horizon and perspective that one gets after standing back from the canvas or climbing up a ladder." But surely, as he himself admits, there are differences as well as similarities; in this book and in this chapter, he concentrates on the similarities.

The second chapter is a charming, and breathtaking, survey of the image cluster of moon-pearl-tears. It shows Zhang Longxi at his best: he evidently remembers everything he has ever read, in whatever language, but unlike merely taxonomic minds, he has also the analytical acumen to examine, and to reveal, the uniqueness of each citation. The third chapter describes the complementarily opposite aspects of medicine as both curative and toxic; the chapter is arguably the best thing written about Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet* in some time. What he shows is the deeply Taoist bent of some of Shakespeare's oxymoronic rhetoric, where opposites do not contradict each other, where what cures can at the same time injure. The concluding chapter is a sources-and-allusion study of the popular medieval aphorism that "God is a circle whose center is everywhere and whose circumference is nowhere," combined with an excursus on the universal theme of return and reversal. Each disquisition is brilliant in its specificity and in its range of citation, but to conflate the idea of return and reversal with the notion of a "circle whose center is everywhere and whose circumference is nowhere" is a disservice to an apt comparison. The two ideas are not equivalent: one involves a cyclical view of history, the other a mystical notion of immanence, involving an almost pantheistic faith. A circle is not a cycle.

It is fun to argue with Zhang's exposition, because he forces the reader to challenge his/her own assumptions, and to understand more clearly in the face of Zhang's citation of counterexamples the extent to which theories do and do not apply. One need not agree with everything Zhang Longxi says to appreciate the value of his work, which is always capacious, astute, and incisive. He is fascinated by the ways in which one work can be illuminated by another, especially another from a totally unrelated culture.

The major contribution of the book is its theory of cross-cultural reading. In refuting Dunsterville's claim "that no 'comparison is possible between two opposites,' " Zhang examines "concrete texts in both East and West to see whether there is anything comparable, any ideas, themes, or any other elements of the texts that show some degree of convergence. In answering the challenge of cultural incommensurability, therefore, I propose to demonstrate the connectedness based on conceptual similarities or thematic affinities" (6). Part of this theory refutes, once and for all, the insistence of an earlier generation of comparatists on documentable influence in comparative studies. Zhang quotes with approval Claudio Guillén's dictum: "This lack of genetic relations, of mutual influences is precisely what stimulates a whole series of practical and theoretical perplexities of great interest" (37; cf. Guillén, *The Challenge of Comparative Literature*, 16). "To recognize similarities in the use of metaphors by poets from the East and the West," Zhang admits, "does not compel us to ignore cultural differences, but reading across cultures does enable us to appreciate world literature with a spirit of

openness and sympathetic understanding, and to acquire a broad perspective for discerning thematic affinities and patterns of literary imagination beyond the gaps of languages and cultures" (45). A cross-cultural perspective makes one, simply, a better reader of literature, and "reading across cultures," Zhang reminds us, will make it possible for us to see the connection among literary works, to explore poetic images and literary themes with the exciting sense of a new discovery, as though we are seeing and understanding some of the great works of literature for the first time, and in ways that are not available when we are "boxed up in the narrow mental space of cultural dichotomy and parochialism" (56). Of course, not many will possess the depth of knowledge and the wide erudition that Zhang displays, but he argues eloquently for a theory of informed cross-cultural reading by demonstrating the exciting insights and discoveries available to the informed bicultural reader. Zhang is both the most persuasive theorist, and the most impressive exemplar, of reading across cultures.

Eugene Eoyang, *Lingnan University* (Hong Kong).

Müge Galin, *Between East and West: Sufism in the Novels of Doris Lessing*. Albany: State U of New York P, 1997. xviii + 280 pp. 978-0791433838.

The announcement of this year's recipient of the Nobel Prize for literature inevitably raises the question: what is so exceptional about Doris Lessing? Surely it is not just the fact that she is a female Nobel Prize winner for literature. Many have preceded her in this role. And it is not that she was one of the first to write about racial discrimination in Africa in addition to being a pioneering feminist writer in the second half of the twentieth century (in the English-speaking world and in the Western world generally), who was also a socially committed writer. The name of Simone de Beauvoir as a predecessor (and, indeed, of Mary Wollstonecraft as an ancestor) come immediately to mind.

It is not even that at a later stage in her career (from the seventies on) she had misgivings about her previous feminist and socially committed views, misgivings that she expressed openly and for which she was, in fact, criticized by her former colleagues in both movements. Many other writers of her generation (both male and female) have undergone similar "developments" as modifications of previously held views. It is not even that she has openly expressed her unhappiness about how the world is currently run and has been very critical of the powers that be and of those who think they have the fate of the world in their hands, for in this she is not only the companion of the last British Nobel prizewinner, Harold Pinter, but increasingly also of other eminent personalities and figures in her country including, most recently, such pillars of society as the Archbishop of Canterbury.

What makes Doris Lessing stand out from her generation of British writers (in addition, of course, to all the accomplishments listed above) is her unique interest in Islamic Sufism and her attempt to work this new perspective into the body of her writing. Here, it is true, she is in the company of other East-ward turning modern writers like E.M. Forster and Herman Hesse. Just as importantly, she is re-connecting (quite unconsciously perhaps) with an older tradition of Western

writers influenced by Sufism, or in affinity with it, stretching from Dante and Shakespeare, to Byron and Emerson. For this reason, it is appropriate now to revisit Müge Galin's study of Sufism in the novels of Doris Lessing, originally published a decade ago.

The connection between Islamic Sufism and literary expression is a unique phenomenon, both in the history of religion and of comparative world literature. The continuous, and deeply penetrating, influence of Sufism on literary creation and on the literary mind, both ancient and modern, both Muslim and Western, remains a fascinating area, the many dimensions of which have yet to be fully explored. While some of the most prominent domains of West Asian classical literature, most notably of Arabic, Persian, Kurdish, and Turkish literatures, have long been identified as permeated by Sufism, the extent of this impact stretches to the twentieth-century, in the works of modern writers like Mahfouz, al-Bayati, al-Ghetani, and others. Mahfouz, for example, who is the best known of all these writers, worked on a research paper on Sufism while still a student of philosophy in the University of Cairo, and later published several articles in the field, and some of his most memorable characters have a Sufi dimension to them. Just as intriguing is the case that could be made for the presence of the Sufi outlook (or at least of an approach with affinities to Sufism) in Western literature from medieval to modern times, from Raimon Lull and Roger Bacon, to Shakespeare, Byron, and Emerson, and from Dante to Doris Lessing. The interested reader may consult, among others, the works by Robert Graves (for Roger Bacon), Martin Lings (for Shakespeare), Asin Palacios (for Dante), Robert Briffault (for the courtly love tradition), Naji Ouejan (for Byron), and Arthur Christy (for Emerson).

There are two central issues that any study of this field would want to address. The first is the peculiar compatibility of the Sufi outlook with the literary mind. The key to this affinity needs to be sought in the specifically Sufi expression of the transcendental, the spiritual, and the allegorical, which seems to make it so amenable to the literary imagination. Sufism may well be unique, among the mystical religious philosophies with which it is conventionally classified, in the way it can provide an approach that is simultaneously both worldly and non-worldly, which writers, across the ages, have found particularly congenial to the creative process. Secondly, Sufism seems to stand out, again almost uniquely among the varieties of religious outlooks and experiences, in the way it has bridged East and West, serving to cover another gap that is comparable in its breadth to the one between the religious and the literary, and the spiritual and the worldly, outlined earlier. All this may well lead ultimately to new formulations of our conventional understanding of the relationship between the spiritual experience, on the one hand, and the creative literary process, on the other.

Sufism seems to be, above all, a synthesis, bridging science and poetry, religion and philosophy, art and the Divine, the worldly and the non-worldly, the sacred and the profane, and, one hopes to discover, in works of literary scholarship like the one revisited here, the Eastern and the Western. It is almost as much of a literary, and artistic, phenomenon, as a religious one. This may well be why it is so adaptable to the synthesizing and combinative nature of the literary process,

and indeed of the creative process generally.

Müge Galin traces Doris Lessing's affinity to Sufism back to 1962, with publication of *The Golden Notebook*, which had anticipated, without any prior knowledge, her turn to Sufism, upon which later novels, like *The Memoirs of a Survivor* (1974), build (64). She argues that, "at the heart of Sufism is the necessity for individual and cosmic evolution and the idea that men and women do not know themselves, nor their potentials" (67). These Sufi perceptions are precisely what have been incorporated into the body of Lessing's major novels. Thus Anna in *The Golden Notebooks* records in her diary, "I came home thinking that somewhere at the back of my mind when I joined the [Communist] Party, was a need for wholeness, for an end to the split, divided, unsatisfactory way we all live" (68). Galin concludes, "Sufis see human beings as incomplete and expect them to transcend their merely human state of incompletion through 'work' in the Sufi way. This is not only the situation of humanity and its potential in most of Lessing's novels, but is also intentionally emphasized in the lives of her characters" (68).

On Lessing's switch from Communism to Sufism, which Galin compares to Graham Greene's dual allegiance to Communism and Catholicism, the author concludes that "for Lessing, Sufism appears to have presented not a conflict of allegiances but a new layer of knowledge to add onto her earlier commitments" (65).

After Lessing absorbed Sufi doctrine in the early 1960s, however, Galin asserts, the analogies to Sufi experience become more overt and more clearly applicable in later novels. Thus, "like a Sufi tale, *The Memoirs* [*of a Survivor*] is written to be read on different levels. As one peels the layers, one moves deeper along a spectrum from the political and rhetorical readings at one end, to the psychological and spiritual at the other. Given Lessing's Sufi knowledge, it is justifiable to suggest a mystical reading of *The Memoir*s without dismissing other readings" (66).

Galin argues that "one of the major implications of the influence of Sufism on Lessing is that Sufism enabled her to offer more faith and hope in her novels than she was able to before" (153). This is not, however, to say that Lessing writes Sufi literature. In fact, the only conclusion one can draw with any certainty about Lessing, Galin argues, is "that there is not a single tradition out of which she writes. She is neither British nor Rhodesian nor Persian, neither Christian nor Muslim, neither a fully pessimistic Western novelist nor a fully Sufi writer, but she is a seeker who is not afraid to question the status quo and to try out new ways of communicating to her readers" (154).

Furthermore, Galin argues that in evaluating Lessing's complex role as "message bearer to the West," we must recognize the "filter of Western literary traditions" through which she received the Sufi message and transmitted it to her (Western) readers. In this she may be compared to other twentieth-century Western writers and thinkers who turned to the East and to Eastern traditions for their inspiration, such as E.M. Forster, Herman Hesse, and Carl G. Jung (156). But, more than any other modern Western writer perhaps, Lessing understood the essential unity of East and West as well as the embodiment of that unity in Sufism, as she explained: "That East must ever be East and West must be West is not a belief which is subscribed to by Sufis, who claim that Sufism, in its reality, not

necessarily under the name, is continuously in operation in every culture" ("In the World, Not of It," 1972).

So, at a time when, unbelievably, we read in the papers of openly anti-Arab, anti-Muslim, and anti-oriental remarks from some well-known writers and academics, the presence of a figure like Lessing, who genuinely believes in the unity of human civilization, particularly of Eastern/Western, Islamic/Non-Islamic civilization, is comforting indeed. At a time when a fabricated, so-called "clash of civilizations" is introduced as a cover for wars and adventures of occupation, plunder, destruction, and genocide, targeting primarily (at least for the time being) countries inhabited largely by Muslims, a voice for sanity—and a cultured, intellectual voice at that—is very important. We need to be grateful to western writers like Doris Lessing, who clearly put the choice before all Western intellectuals, and indeed intellectuals everywhere, whether they will side with this new wave of anti-oriental, anti-Muslim, anti-Arab racism, or whether they will seek openly to expose it and fight it, by re-affirming their belief in genuine human values and in the unity of humanity and of human destiny on this planet.

Abdulla Al-Dabbagh, *United Arab Emirates University*.

Lingaraja Gandhi. *Connecting the Postcolonial: Ngugi and Anand*. New Delhi: Atlantic, 2006. xii + 188 pp. 8126906138.

This book is an intelligent and perceptive study of the work of two authors, both major contributors to the establishment of postcolonial (English) writing in their respective locations—India and East Africa. As Lingaraja Gandhi notes, "they grew up amidst turbulence" (1), since their youth (Anand being the older by a generation) coincided with the anti-colonial struggle in their respective countries. Mulk Raj Anand (1905-2004) was a contemporary of two other prominent and equally long-lived Indian authors, Raja Rao (1908-2006) and R. K. Narayan (1906-2001), while Ngugi was born in Kenya in 1938. Dr. Gandhi's focus is not primarily theoretical, although he draws occasionally on some of the classic texts of postcolonialism—he sets out instead to link the two writers in terms of concurrences in their "vision" (8) and the similar thematic features of their work.

Anand and Ngugi are prolific authors; Gandhi selects for discussion representative texts by both, especially among their earlier books: Anand's *Untouchable* and *Coolie*, and the two first novels of the 'Lalu trilogy' (*The Village*, *Across the Black Waters,* and *The Sword and the Sickle*) and Ngugi's *The River Between*, *Weep Not, Child*, *A Grain of Wheat,* and *Petals of Blood.* While Gandhi does also bring in other texts, the ones mentioned best serve his interest in the two writers' use of young male focalisers, the body- and land-focused perspectives they both employ, and the anti-imperial, anti-oppressive "resistance" quality of their writing. These are the three main themes in terms of which the detailed comparisons of the two authors' texts are organized.

In his Introduction, Gandhi supplies some details and quotations to indicate similarities in the socio-historical contexts and political positions overtly adopted

by Ngugi and Anand. Several of the points raised here are corroborated in the appendices to the text, which record interviews with both writers and letters from Anand to Gandhi (141-162). The deployment of the book's argument in the four main chapters is also outlined in the Introduction. Within each chapter a fairly graceful interweaving of references to novels by both authors is maintained.

"Awakening," the first chapter, focuses on both writers' tendency to use adolescent boys as protagonists. Gandhi observes pertinently that these young men or boys are "placed at 'special' moments in the histories of their countries; their yearning for adulthood is dramatized in a socio-cultural arena of heightened historical significance" (24). But the mirroring of national in individual destiny is in neither author a crude coincidence, because the social conditions are shown directly affecting the youths' lives, while their aspirations are as natural and legitimate as those of their respective societies. The chapter concludes on the somewhat melancholic point that in the texts discussed, "the awakening is to harsh realities"; neither author romanticizes the difficult and constraining circumstances within which their young protagonists find themselves, but their pain serves to drive home the injustice of these conditions.

The next chapter is (to my mind, somewhat clumsily) titled "The Excremental and the Genital," and it is the section of his study in which Gandhi outlines the abundance of bodily experience depicted by both authors. The term "excremental" reflects Anand's protagonists' humiliating experiences of working with or being confronted with others' bodily waste, or otherwise being denounced because they have no middle-class facilities to hide basic bodily functions from public view and are denigrated accordingly. He makes a strong case for Anand's recognition that those denounced as unclean are the ones who bear the burden of visible association with bodily waste, while it is they who do society's dirty work of maintaining the cleanliness of the privileged. Gandhi quotes an eloquent passage from Anand's novel *Coolie*, in which a trade union leader addresses lowly workers in a voice full of *saeva indignatio*:

> "You are the roofless, you are the riceless, spinners of cotton, weavers of thread, sweepers of dust and dirty; you are the workers, the labourers, the millions of unknown who crawl in and out of factories every day. You are the coolies, *black men who relieve themselves on the ground*, you are the miserable devils who live twenty a room in broken straw huts and *stinking tenements*." (232, emphasis added—cited 47)

In Anand's work, according to Gandhi, the excrement trope extends into death-images, death being "ultimate waste" (75), as is most tellingly shown in Lalu's wartime experiences.

Gandhi uses the adjective "genital" in his chapter title to refer to images of circumcision in Ngugi's work. Although the opportunity presents itself, he does not contrast Anand's evidently critical account of local custom with Ngugi's endorsement of it. Gandhi accepts the Kenyan author's position that "circumcision (or *Irua*) in Gikuyu life symbolizes purity and unity of the tribe" and that it "irrevocably forges the individual with the community and the land" (57). Hence he cites the remark of a Gikuyu elder insisting on the forceful circumcision of all

the girls in the community with no comment other than that this indicates "the intensity of the conflicts" between a traditional and a modernizing or Christian ethos in the depicted community (in *The River Between*). Gandhi does comment on "Ngugi's major preoccupation" with the "re-enactment of the past" in *Petals of Blood* (68), drawing attention to the invocation of a great national past as an aspect of initiation ceremonies. He does not point the contrast this presents with Anand's endorsement of technological advances in his novels.

The bodily images in both writers' texts work evaluatively, Gandhi shows, in assessments of the young heroes' social and political encounters. He links the two novelists thematically at this point by reminding the reader that the physical is suitably prominent in their renditions of communities that are still largely organic and agrarian. It is in such societies that land takes on the immense freight of meaning it acquires under circumstances of dispossession. This is the focus of his next chapter, titled "Naked Land." In the largely peasant communities from which both authors' protagonists originate, land is sacralized, as it is considered the source of identity and dignity. The prominent image of a sacred tree in both authors' novels is an interesting feature noted by Gandhi. What he might have pinpointed more clearly, however, is that in Ngugi's texts there is direct dispossession by the colonizer, whereas in Anand's local landlord and moneylender figures are the instruments of land deprivation. In the Indian as in the Kenyan novels, the land is taken over by those for whom it has mere commodity value. Gandhi also indicates how, in both *The Village* by Anand and *Weep Not, Child* by Ngugi, "there are times when the father's stature and relevance is questioned seriously," because of land loss, but that in both texts there is a final "reaffirmation" of the fathers' stature because of the "masterly" albeit poignant quality of their deaths (106-107).

The examination of land issues spills over into the fourth chapter, "A Land like All the Others," the overall focus of which is somewhat diffuse. The connections traced between the two writers work least convincingly in this chapter. Gandhi shows a preference for discussing the exploitation of colonized characters as international cannon fodder in wars among the colonial powers—a topic which features centrally in Anand's, but which is peripheral in Ngugi's work. He cuts to the political bone, however, by directing the reader's attention to the two authors' exposure of the colonists' cunning in "entic[ing]" men into fighting their wars "by the master's promise to reward the natives with their own (natives') land" (116).

Gandhi is evidently appreciative of Anand and Ngugi's ability to convey the humanity of "ordinary villagers" and their endorsement of the value of the family-unit in society (129, 133). He sees both authors as essentially humanist champions of the poor and lowly. In the Conclusion of Gandhi's text, it is noted that both authors, as literary pathbreakers, "had to define the realm in which the novel was to operate in their lands," a goal they achieved by relating their respective local traditions to modern experience (136).

The strength of *Connecting the Postcolonial* lies in its sensitivity to social and political realities and its close engagement with the textures of writing. Its chief flaw is the author's failure to explore the contrasts complementing the parallels between Anand and Ngugi. For example, juxtaposing the largely "Fanonian"

orientation discernible in Ngugi's texts (concerning the use of violence in the anti-colonial struggle) with the more "Gandhian" or Buddhist values embraced by Anand would have added nuance and sophistication to the study. Nevertheless, this is a worthwhile analysis, and it presents an interesting way of outlining the comparable perils of modernization within contexts of poverty and land loss on two widely separate continents, both irreversibly marked by British colonialism.

Annie Gagiano, *University of Stellenbosch* (South Africa).

Mineke Schipper. *Never Marry a Woman with Big Feet: Women in Proverbs from Around the World*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam UP, 2006. 350 pp. 978-9053 568637.

Upon first glance, this book's lighthearted title would seem to suggest a kind of coffee table book—perhaps a collection of witty anecdotes and entertaining adages. It is, however, something quite different: a serious scholarly investigation of the shortest of all discursive texts, what the author calls "the world's smallest literary genre" (14). The invaluable fifteen-page Prologue provides an immediate immersion in definitions, types, sources, and impact for those who might not yet have considered the finer points of proverbs. To summarize some of the more salient points: proverbs consist of concise statements, the genre exists worldwide, and proverbs derive from oral literary traditions. According to the author, "The legacy of oral traditions is a moral one: it teaches people what to do or what to think in a given situation. . . . Endowed with authority, proverbs, like other prestigious oral and written texts, present how things ought to be from certain perspectives" (17). So proverbs do not reflect reality; rather "these tiny texts represent ideals—as well as regretted deviations from such ideals" (20).

The author offers a very specific definition of proverbs—"short, pithy sayings, ingeniously embodying an admitted truth or cherished belief"—and summarizes four main characteristics: "(1) its concise fixed artistic form; (2) its evaluative and conservative function in society; (3) its authoritative validity; and (4) its anonymous origin" (22). Of great interest are her comments on the function of proverbs in practice: essentially they are used as quotations. The author speculates that since the proverb is associated with established wisdom, it "has the function of legitimizing certain role patterns as well as preventing those patterns from possibly being questioned" (23). Furthermore, proverbs can be used to express something that needs to be said indirectly because they create distance between the speaker and the "traditional" words. A final aspect to the form of proverbs *per se* (as opposed to their content) is their easily recognized compact form, which usually assumes one of the following metaphoric patterns: "A is like B," "A is not like B," "No A without B," "Better A than B," "If A, then B," and "Said-sayings" (26-7). As the author points out, "the main forms of artistic language in proverbs are *metaphors*, *metonyms* and *similes*," to which one might add personification, exaggeration, telegraphic style, and parallelisms.

When considering these formulaic elements one cannot help but think imme-

diately of proverbs from one's own language, and it occurred to me that normally many of them rhyme. Of course, the rhyming aspect as well as that of rhythm gets lost in translation, since all of the hundreds of proverbs cited in the text have been translated into English. As the author comments, "The proverbs have been translated as literally as possible" (318). Still, the comparatist finds herself wishing for the original texts, even though she could hardly be expected to know all of the languages quoted. It might at least give a feeling for the lost poetic elements, though publishers would undoubtedly balk at increasing the length of the text by half again as much and thus making this book somewhat unwieldy.

This investigation of proverbs is comprehensive in scope, to say the least. The author consulted over three hundred sources of proverbs (see bibliography) and has created an international database of over 16,000 proverbs from 240 languages and 150 countries (318). Professor Schipper has generously agreed to share this database, with information available at <www.aup.nl/womeninproverbs>. Of course one might find oneself totally at sea in this mass of data, but the author provides a number of aids to make the information more readily accessible and thus usable. First, the proverbs are divided into thematic chapters on the female body, the phases of a woman's life (e.g., girl, wife, mother, grandmother, etc.), the basics of life (love, sex, fertility/pregnancy/childbirth), female power, and messages of metaphors. Among these headings with numerous sub-headings and the index, one can quickly find proverbs on any number of topics. Second, the proverbs, even when they take the form of lists, are embedded in an interpretive text that both expands and explains. Even individual proverbs that might prove difficult are presented with explanatory comments. Third, in addition to the excellent Prologue that lays out the topic's parameters and vocabulary, the author provides a summarizing Epilogue, extensive Endnotes, as well as a List of Languages, Cultures, and Countries, with its own introductory comments. Since proverbs are so ubiquitous, researchers in various fields might profit from a quick look at their topic in Schipper's book; thanks to the author, that task has been rendered very easy.

This is a feminist text in that it focuses on women, but the nature of proverbs means that they simultaneously—in some cases indirectly—comment on men. Thus Schipper's compilation is not intended for women only. In the concluding remarks we read: "In proverbs we have seen how two main views of men as well as women are constantly echoed. Men are inexorable tyrants and shameless profiteers, and men are insecure, fearful beings. Women are not only lamentable victims, but also extremely powerful. . . . Both contradictory gender views are made visible in proverbs, one openly and directly, and the other mostly hidden between the lines" (304). Proverbs, Schipper reminds us repeatedly, are largely created by men and thus represent male perspectives almost exclusively. In part because proverbs are a public literary form, women in many cultures have been obliged to remain silent. Because of my work on the *femme fatale*, I was particularly interested in proverbs about spinsters ("a horse without reins" 98) and widows ("the rich widow's tears soon dry" 125)—both groups consisting of women who do not conform to the norm of marriage and are thus seen as potentially destabilizing ele-

ments in a society. I imagine that other thematic areas would resonate with other scholars in a similar way.

Although the author provides an extensive bibliography of works consulted and explains at the beginning of the book her fieldwork in collecting proverbs in various countries, one might still have a few questions on this point. Numerous proverbs are quoted for every theme, but it remained unclear to me if *every* proverb concerning a topic was printed or only a selection. If the latter, how was the selection made? I also wondered how representative the collected proverbs are for each culture. My point here is restricted to anecdotal evidence, but I personally had never heard of a number of the proverbs listed as current in the USA. Here are several examples, chosen at random: "Hear me daughter, so that the daughter-in-law will understand"; "Always sweep where your mother-in-law looks"; "Every woman keeps a corner in her heart where she is always twenty-one"; "A young girl never quite gets over her first man" (144, 145, 152, 163). Of course, there might be regional differences ("USA" is rather broad), and no years are given, so these might be proverbs that either are no longer in current usage or have been altered or updated in some way.

Or, again, while the definition and examples of types of proverbs provided in the Prologue are extremely helpful, no clear distinction is made between adages, saws, proverbs, and sayings. Some examples of proverbs that are cited at various points in the book raise questions about the different kinds of sayings and whether they all count as proverbs. For example, the lead proverb in a section on "Old Age" is a quotation from the British mystery writer Agatha Christie: "It is wonderful to be married to an archaeologist. The older you get, the more interested he gets" (148). This seems to me to be a witticism of the most delightful tongue-in-cheek kind, but is it a proverb? I am not sure that it meets the requirement of being based in common wisdom. Perhaps it is an example of a proverb-in-the-making, especially since it is from the perspective of a woman.

While one can learn very useful things from this book, it is also at times extremely entertaining. Several of the proverbs demonstrate a kind of sly knowledge of how the world works and express it with irony, for example, "Be good to your own wife and you can have your neighbour's" (106) or "Once, long ago, there was one good mother-in-law, but a wolf ate her" (143). It is also, perhaps contrary to expectation, a very topical and timely work. Proverbs are used every day in normal speech so they are ubiquitous; that has not changed. However, "quite a few of the ideas presented in proverbs are no longer as self-evident as they must have looked in the past, which means that 'traditions' are changing, especially in industrialized societies" (19). Thus proverbs traditionally have played a normative function, much like fairytales, but today, while this role continues, proverbs also reflect societal change: "the world imagined in proverbs is changing rapidly in some respects, and slowly but surely in other respects, thanks to the ongoing integration of male and female roles and domains" (304). Proverbs are being creatively changed and through this change, challenged. Schipper gives one example in her Epilogue in which groups of women in South Africa, using her collection of proverbs from Africa, exchanged the words "man" and "woman" in the prov-

erbs with hilarious results. Schipper notes that "the genre is not dead . . . proverbs continue to be used in daily life in oral cultures all over the world" (21). When I recently taught a unit on proverbs and graffiti in an advanced German language course, I was surprised to realize that many a graffito was merely a proverb that had been creatively altered to give it new meaning or to question the proverb's old meaning. Thus interest in proverbs is justified not only by their ubiquity and their historical role in shaping cultural values, but also by their dynamic vitality.

Elaine Martin, *University of Alabama* (USA).

Paul Gravett. *Graphic Novels: Everything You Need to Know*. New York: Collins Design, 2005. 192 pp. 978-0060824259.

***World Literature Today* 81.2 (March-April 2007). Special Issue on Graphic Literature. ISSN 0196-3570.**

With the ever-increasing popularity of graphic fiction and the graphic novel, the latter of which conveys a slightly greater literary ambition, many studies of the genre have likewise become popular among fans and scholars. One of these studies is Paul Gravett's ambitious *Graphic Novels: Everything You Need to Know*, a study of 150 key graphic novels with many illustrations, which also includes European and Japanese albums translated into English.

After a short introduction to the history of comic books and the graphic novel itself, Gravett, who is also the author of *60 Years of Manga*, the very informative overview of the Japanese comic book scene, explains the reasoning behind his selection of graphic novels. His criteria emphasize content, original material, current availability in English, and the fact that the material has some sort of ending as opposed to forming part of a continuing series. As will be seen later, his selection does not always follow these criteria, since he includes (for example) a monthly series like Brian Azzarello's *100 Bullets* that is still ongoing. He also stops short of providing an outright definition of the graphic novel, which, however, has proved to be a rather elusive term. For example, one can encounter a distinction between original graphic novels, meaning ones that appear in one stand-alone volume and haven't been printed before as part of a series, and collections in graphic novel format that might represent a story arc of an ongoing series. This distinction, which is basically one that reflects marketing, does not seem to play a role in Gravett's selection. This problem seems to be quite common, with many books about graphic novels providing an *ex negativo* explanation of what a graphic novel is *not*, but seldom what exactly it is.

Gravett then goes on to disprove some common prejudices about comics and their literary value and introduces his own selection of the thirty most influential graphic novels together with a manual of how to use the book. The main part of the study is then divided into ten thematic chapters with essayistic introductions that provide background information and comic book history, along with recommendations for further reading. An individual "In Focus"-study and a further "scene by scene"-analysis of selected panels from Gravett's thirty greatest graphic

novels are interconnected with other studies in the following pages via key words at the bottom of the pages. This “Following On”-study then showcases another four graphic novels per “In Focus”-text as an invitation for further reading. In this manner Gravett is able to introduce readers to 150 graphic novels from all over the world with excerpts from the actual comics (sometimes in black and white but mostly in the original color version). However, because these excerpts appear in a smaller format than the original, they can sometimes be a bit hard to read.

The ten thematic chapters that are intended to cover the whole spectrum of graphic novels are as follows:

1. Childhood and coming-of-age stories with an autobiographical background.
2. Life stories, also with an autobiographical background; this chapter focuses as well on comics legend Will Eisner and on the invention of the graphic novel.
3. War stories headlined by Art Spiegelman’s brilliant *Maus* text and Hiroshima survivor Keiji Nakazawa’s *Barefoot Gen*.
4. Superhero stories. Considering the dominance of superhero comics in today’s market the fact that Gravett devotes only one chapter to this particular genre illustrates his ambition to cover every aspect of the graphic novel. Key texts are the groundbreaking *Batman: The Dark Knight Returns* and Alan Moore’s *Watchmen*, both of which started a trend towards darker stories in the mid-eighties.
5. Fantasy stories, which also cover Science Fiction and introduce non-American texts like Katsuhiro Otomo’s *Akira* or the *Nikopol Trilogy* by Enki Bilal. Neil Gaiman’s ground breaking *The Sandman* series also figures prominently in this chapter.
6. Horror stories: inclusion of Alan Moore’s *League of Extraordinary Gentlemen*, which is not primarily a horror story, is somewhat questionable.
7. Crime stories, where once again we find a rather questionable selection with Alan Moore’s *V for Vendetta*, which is the dystopian story of a future Britain that has turned fascist.
8. Satire and Humor, including David Sims’ *Cerebus* series which lasted for 300 issues extending over 26 years, which again raises the question of how to define a graphic novel and of the rigor of Gravett’s selection criteria.
9. Historical stories or stories with a historical background including Alan Moore’s *From Hell*, his graphic version of the Jack the Ripper story.
10. Passionate Stories dealing with human sexuality, including Robert Crumb’s sometimes crude and funny stories.

An additional resources section including advice for further reading and the web addresses of both publishers and reviewers rounds out the book.

The extra large format of the book makes it a bit unwieldy, but the size is necessary if the graphic images are to be presented on the same page with Gravett’s commentary. The mostly full-color graphic images are the main distinguishing feature of the book, which contrasts starkly with other theoretical works about graphic novels or comic books in general. For example, Geoff Klock’s *How*

to read Comic Books and Why has no illustrations, and D. Aviva Rothschild's *Graphic Novels: A Bibliographic Guide to Book-Length Comics* includes only black-and-white images.

More bibliographical information about the "Following on . . ." books would be useful because only synoptic highlights are given which is why it is impossible to show all aspects of any of the texts. This makes the book more of a catalogue than a theoretical study, but it provides really a lot of very useful information. While the selection of thirty key graphic novels is sometimes a bit debatable—which "greatest" selection of any given cultural achievement isn't?—it does serve the purpose of providing building blocks for the book's overall structure. From my point of view some of the more serious omissions are the twenty-eight volume samurai epic *Lone Wolf and Cub* by Kazuo Koike and Goseki Kojima and the continuing horror survival saga *The Walking Dead* written by Robert Kirkman.

Well-written and well-researched, Gravett's book gives an excellent introduction to the world of graphic novels and a list of must-read works that represents a reasonable consensus among scholars and fans. The emphasis on graphic examples, which often speak for themselves with only sparse commentary, pays tribute to a medium that is graphic in itself. This approach follows to some extent the example provided by Scott McCloud's brilliant *Understanding Comics*, a study of the medium that itself uses the comic book format. However, this is not so much a book for those interested in the critical theory of the medium but for those who wish to become acquainted with the history and broad variety of the genre.

Current interest in graphic fiction as a subject for literary study has also resulted, among many other studies, in a cover feature on graphic literature in *World Literature Today.* The key word here is graphic literature, rather than graphic fiction or graphic novels. This series of ten articles provides a different look at the genre: taking a more traditional literary studies approach, it concentrates on graphic fiction with a more literary appeal and more or less avoids the superhero genre, except for Alan Moore's *Watchmen*. A short list of graphic literature readings consists of only fifteen titles, but does provide information about some core texts. The inclusion of Scott McCloud's *Understanding Comics* also illustrates *World Literature Today*'s different approach to graphic fiction. Other articles include examples of avant-garde graphic literature, an interview with graphic fiction creators Fabio Moon and Gabriel Ba, an article on the Nouvelle Manga movement which combines Franco-Belgian and Japanese traditions of visual story telling, and two articles on the popularity of graphic novels and the poetic qualities of graphic fiction. Due to their rather short overall length, these articles can only provide a glimpse into the world of graphic fiction and so remain a bit superficial.

Thus Gravett's book and the articles in *World Literature Today* offer two very different views of graphic fiction: one by a comic book fan with definite scholarly ambition focusing on graphic images and the development of the genre versus a renowned literary publication offering a quick look at an ever growing genre that is still trying to validate its literary ambitions. Two sides of a coin.

Stefan Buchenberger, *Nara Women's University* (Japan).

Ricardo J. Quinones. *Dualisms: The Agons of the Modern World.* Toronto: The U of Toronto P, 2007. xvi + 451 pp. 978-0802097637.

Dualisms reconfirms the reputation of an author known for both challenging and eminently readable comparative studies of generous proportions, like *Mapping Literary Modernism* (1985) and *Changes of Cain* (1991). His daring range and willingness to search through minute details of writers' lives will mean by necessity that specialists may quarrel here or there over some particular, but the contents of the present book *Dualisms* are so rich that cavils disappear against the prevailing mass of evidence. We need a four-dimensional model—some well-grounded picture of the cultural body of Europe and of the New World it spawned, in all its extensions and while evolving in time—to suggest what Quinones accomplishes in this fresh intervention into the famous "conversation over the centuries" of a civilization (he unrepentantly names it "Western culture") that is still animated by the drama of its own multiple discourses.

Four of *Dualism's* five main chapters revolve around paired figures (Erasmus/Luther, Voltaire/Rousseau, Turgenev/Dostoevsky, Sartre/Camus) in whom bundled complexes of belief, temperament, social ties, the stimuli of historical events, and awareness of their counterparts occur and recur in real instances of epochal contestation, yet the particular cases exhibit the rhythms and metamorphoses of Western culture as a larger context. The central third chapter, by turning to many "secondary" as well as "primary" figures, suggests the dynamic weaving of the cultural loom that produces the fabric in which special carriers of themes stand out as bright threads. Quinones expressly follows a tradition of critical inquiry into "dualisms" which he locates at least as early as in Schiller and Coleridge, and he vigorously implements, with respect to "our" heritage since the Renaissance, the wish dream of theorists of semiotics who want us to consider literature tied into the whole cultural repertory and its dynamics over time. Not just the "Western" reader, but the world reader who is intrigued by the complexity of Europe, can feel how Quinones respects the kind of serious joy that Thomas Mann excited with the great symposium on evolving dualisms in *The Magic Mountain*, and James Joyce with his symphonic treatment of dualisms in *Finnegans Wake.*

One of the main polarities that Quinones establishes in chapters one and two is the shifting polarity between "writers of consciousness" and "daemonic" experiencers. But as he aptly informs us, "Several dialectics are at work here" (104). Chapter three underscores that cardinal proposition at the book's midpoint by winding back and broadening out to remind us of the tangle of cultural discourses preceding the age of Voltaire and Rousseau (whom we have just examined), and then moving forward again through some revealing moments of their reception—notably by Valsecchi. This major digestive recapitulation gives way to a concentrated juxtaposition of the waning eighteenth century and Romanticism ascendant, seen in Schiller and in Coleridge. Schiller's brilliant exposition of inherent contests of values and ways of engaging with the world in *Naïve and Sentimental Poetry* also speaks to his own awareness of a sharing yet dichotomy vis-à-vis Goethe. The key British critic so deeply marked by German theorizing, "Coleridge

is the first to construct true dualisms" (199), because he expounds a continuum of complicated pairings that derive explicitly from Erasmus and Luther rather than Voltaire and Rousseau. And Carducci in turn is credited as among those who recognize syncopated rhythms, various "vertical dualit[ies]" (203), that arise out of the lines of connection from Dante to Petrarch and onward and who worry about a possible "war" of dualisms inside modern civilization.

Quinones's exposition makes it abundantly clear how systemic elements that vie for centrality in European culture after the high Middle Ages gradually become gathered into paradigmatic oppositions that European artists and philosophers can and do actively ponder—and there could hardly be a better demonstration of the actual (not imaginary!) existence of a polycentric, dynamic "Western culture" than their grappling with its complexities. The crucial precipitating crisis is, as in the view of Novalis (uncited), the rise of Protestantism alongside and interacting with the already tension-producing Renaissance. One proposition that Quinones does not expand upon is the potential, after so many turns and twists, that certain exceptional individuals, for example Goethe, may incorporate in themselves the manifold phenomena of constantly reformulated juxtapositions of the inherent dualisms of their age.

However, the crossovers and mixtures are a large part of what will motivate and perplex Modernism, as Quinones reconsiders that movement through the keen lenses of chapters four and five. Camus seemed to grasp the profounder challenge in the moral dilemma of the great heritage (379), even though like the professional intellectual Sartre, who agonized over his own existence as a "fraud" (388), he was a second-generation modernist who rejected nineteenth-century idealism. The contrary imperatives for a Turgenev and a Dostoevsky already exhibit the lurking threat of the absurd which will so plague later writers, as it had already obsessed many romantics. Because of Quinones's narrative skills, the pairings in each of the main chapters of *Dualisms* acquire the qualities of gripping drama; we remain aware of how the all-too-human but at the same time exemplary biographies intertwine with the lives of their contemporaries and also reconnect with ancestral lines, and perhaps, for some readers today, connect directly with what we ourselves feel and do. The most pertinent thesis for those of us who are nearer-descendants, which Quinones puts forward in closing, is that of the prominence of mid-twentieth-century "hybridity." "Each [Sartre and Camus] was both Voltaire and Rousseau and neither at the same time" (394); for in effect, our checkered Western culture still, if not definitively, consists of "two intellectual nations" (395).

The reviewer is tempted to make a "meta-narrative" comparison regarding the structure and aims of *Dualisms*. There have been many fine efforts to construct "psychohistories" or discern "mentalities" by which we can better grasp big episodes in culture that are felt to have a specific character profile or to trace currents that seem to resurface in distinct episodes—regrettably space prohibits even a partial list of deserving titles. Quinones's venture exhibits the ambition found in such efforts as the monumental study *Generations: The History of America's Future, 1584 to 2069*, published by the social historians, William Strauss and Neil Howe, in 1991. The time span under consideration is analogous, likewise a key

finding. Strauss and Howe conclude from an enormous array of evidence (including art and literature) that patterns of ideas and of self-definition, which took root in the original seaboard territories that later would evolve into the United States, unfolded in a sequencing of generations of variant stretches of birth years, each generation being defined mainly by its experience of specific historical events (mainly crises), by its own size as a biological wave, as well as by attitudes in its dominant groups and other components. They found furthermore that, eventually, the way successive generations and their internal cohorts matured as they overlapped with other older and newer generations established a *real* (not an imagined!) cycle which has proved to be foundational and self-replicating over several centuries and down to the present. Without attempting to explain how Strauss and Howe define these American patterns or to agree or disagree with specifics, the reviewer notes that Quinones is offering us more an approach to the much vaster cultural terrain of Europe and the New World viewed over time and still firmly in sight as of today. This is not a simple map limited to now with all the regions and local districts painted in. Rather, *Dualisms* is a wonderful set of survey equipment on display, as much as it is an interlocking set of exciting, virtually monographical studies of important writers and their moments. Strauss and Howe claim a heuristic efficacy for their approach powerful enough to venture predictions in 1991 outlining how the serried American cohorts are likely to behave in the next several decades. In similar fashion Quinones may possibly help us as we puzzle over the shape of cultural contests yet to tread the stage.

It is a signal mark of importance that we yearn to hear more about so many artists, thinkers, and yes, even politicians, who (like Kierkegaard and Nietzsche or Mann and Joyce) happen not to be in the spotlight as main protagonists in this brilliant surgical slice of light through "our" past, but who could readily be invoked. The framework for adding them is well-marked and enticing. Quinones is himself a master conversationalist; he brings out the natural interest in the quite human story of key interlocutors who helped create the very mixed European and Euroamerican inheritance. Thus *Dualisms* is a book that speaks eloquently and clearly to both the humanities and the social sciences.

Gerald Gillespie, *Stanford University* (USA).

Zacharias I. Siaflekis. *La relation comparative: Interférences et transitions dans la modernité littéraire*. Paris: L'Harmattan, 2004. 220 pp. 978-2747564380.

Si un premier coup d'oeil sur le sommaire de cette étude réussit à déconcerter le lecteur, l'introduction non seulement remède de manière plutôt succincte au malaise initial, mais aussi tient à consolider la raison d'être de l'acte de comparaison, voire sa vocation de "réhabiliter les rapports littéraires internationaux [. . .] à l'heure de mondialisation, [de] constituer un critère d'acceptation de la sensibilité et de la culture de l'autre" (7). De plus, comme l'avancera Siaflekis à travers les auteurs français, anglais, italien, espagnol et latinoaméricain, portugais et grecs qu'il se propose de discuter, la production de ces derniers se caractérise, grâce ou en raison de leurs tendances modernistes, d'une certaine "recherche poétique

formelle" (*Le dictionnaire du littéraire,* sous la direction de Paul Aron, Denis Saint-Jacques et Alain Viala, Paris: PUF, 2002, 393) en faisant ainsi émerger leur propre statut de modernité.

Dans le premier chapitre, le dispositif *Méditerranée* et la conceptualisation de ce même espace géographique en tant qu' "[une] sorte de supranationalité" (20), c'est-à-dire en tant qu' "unité géographique et diversification culturelle" (20), introduisent la dialectique, déjà annoncée par le titre du chapitre, entre symbolique insulaire et *topos* poétique. L' "identité narrative," telle qu'elle est envisagée par Paul Ricoeur, s'actualise, selon Siaflekis, par l'intermédiaire de l'opposition entre *mémoire* et *identité.* La dite "expérience méditerranéenne" (21), cet "état de sensation, de savoir, de poéticité" (21), s'exemplifie à travers les thèmes de la nature et du couple oppositionnel lumière *versus* obscurité chez Valéry, à travers l'approche pragmatique mais aussi métaphysique chez Camus, à travers l'univers insulaire représenté dans son état diachronique chez Ungaretti, par l'intermédiaire de transgression des lois du Symbolisme mais aussi des influences du modernisme et du surréalisme dans la production des écrivains grecs, tels Séféris, Elytis et Gatsos.

Le deuxième chapitre se consacre entièrement aux huit poèmes écrits en français du poète grec Nicos Engonopoulos et vise à établir, d'abord, les conditions qui leur ont donné naissance et, deuxièmement, la relation qu'ils entretiennent avec l'œuvre poétique totale du poète, tout en soulignant simultanément leur statut dialectique avec le courant artistique et littéraire général de cette époque, celui du surréalisme. Engonopoulos, soutient Siaflekis, insère dans son surréalisme la perspective périphérique, locale ou régionale. Cette dernière s'articule dans les poèmes narratifs et/ou allégoriques en guise de la grécité et, plus particulièrement, des figures de la mythologie grecque, en faisant donc dialectiser de manière innovatrice sa voix surréaliste propre et "révolutionnaire" avec son "adversaire" universel. Ainsi, le poète à travers son expression témoigne de son appartenance à la « tradition néo-hellénique" (57) parmi des écrivains qui ne s'expriment pas en grec, en faisant ainsi se lier deux littératures. Enfin, pour ce qui est de la perspective intermédiale dans le cas d'Engonopoulos et de son expression en poésie et en peinture, il y a croisement et synesthésie.

Le thème de discussion du troisième chapitre relève aussi des éléments surréalistes ainsi que d'une poétique dite fragmentaire articulés dans l'expression de la poésie moderne et même surréaliste, et cela en guise d'une comparaison entre les poètes français et grecs de la période des années '70. Siaflekis soutient qu'il s'agit là-dessus d'un mode d'expression qui, en prenant l'image poétique comme valeur contestatrice autant par le poète que par le lecteur, est héritier d'une surréalité poétique articulée auparavant, c'est-à-dire, durant les vingt années précédentes. S'il y a évolution dans la conceptualisation et l'appréhension esthétique de l'image poétique en même temps en France et en Grèce, elle ne s'articulerait qu'à travers la nécessité et/ou la condition épistémologique mêmes de "l'appréciation du caractère moderne de la poésie contemporaine" (62) ainsi que d'une conceptualisation existentialiste ou du rôle et de l'aspect sociaux et collectifs dans le discours de la poésie envers une amplification du moi personnel.

Siaflekis procède par la suite à consacrer le quatrième chapitre à la comparai-

son de la poésie de Supervielle, de Pessoa et d'Embiricos. Le fil conducteur qui les relierait serait-il la réflexivité ainsi que le concept de l'*horizon* [c'est nous qui soulignons] dans la production poétique. Pour ce qui est de la première, elle ne se conjuguerait qu'à travers le moment de croisement, d'interférence dans le texte entre le moi et le cosmos, en faisant émerger un certain caractère ésotérique inhérent à la transformation poétique même. Ainsi, l'auteur émet l'hypothèse de la dialectique entre voyage et identité—relèvant des *isotopies*—tandis que le poème s'inscrit en tant que "lieu de leur rencontre et sa lecture le moyen probable du dépassement de leur opposition" (86). S'il y a "point de fuite," comme l'avance le critique de poésie Michel Collot, ou "point d'indiscernabilité" selon la formule de Gilles Deleuze, cela sera chez Supervielle réflexivité et horizon en tant que générateur de sens. De toute façon, chez les trois poètes l'image du navire prédomine dans leur poésie (78). Pour ce qui est de la mer, Siaflekis conclut que "la mer est l'élément qui assure la transition vers le registre philosophique des poèmes" (88).

Les deux chapitres au milieu de cette étude, le cinquième et surtout le sixième, sont les plus théoriques. Dans le cinquième chapitre autant le mythe que le genre littéraires se trouvent être impliqués dans la dialectique de la production du texte. Il faut souligner qu'ici Siaflekis se baigne dans des courants bien connus étant donné qu'il a déjà fait publier en grec une étude érudite sur le mythe (*Η Εύθραστη Αλήθεια: Εισαγωγή στη Θεωρία του Λογοτεχνικού Μύθου*, Αθήνα: Gutenberg, 1994). Comme l'avance le critique dès le premier chapitre de ce livre-là, l'approche comparatiste se relie avec la méthode de l'esthétique de la réception—référence évidente à Hans Robert Jauss—afin de "faire émerger les spécificités qui déterminent les étapes de la production et de la réception du mythe" [notre traduction] (*Η Εύθραυστη Αλήθεια,* 1). Dans *La relation comparative,* Siaflekis y établit la paire du fictionnel et du mythologique, tandis que le récepteur apparaît jouer le rôle du médiateur. Pour ce qui est du mythe littéraire, il se caractérise par deux moments importants, l'*historicité* et la *réception*, tandis qu'entre "la forme poétique et le contenu du récit mythique, il est difficile d'appréhender avec précision les limites" (93), car il y émerge des *interférences.*

Le cinquième chapitre est divisé en trois sous-chapitres. Dans le premier, s'intitulant "La mémoire entre le mythe et l'identité," sert à exemplifier par l'intermédiaire des poèmes entre autres de Lawrence Durrell et de René Char, des exemples-poèmes-*interférences* venant intervenir et permettre le passage entre mythe et genre littéraire. L'exemplification dans le deuxième sous-chapitre "Exotopie-intériorisation" à travers les poèmes d'Octavio Paz et de Nuno Judice vise à avancer la relation de cette paire par la mémoire et l'identité en faisant simultanément émerger une nouvelle version du mythe et deux forces oppositionnelles, le familier et l'inattendu. Pour ce qui est du troisième sous-chapitre "Interpréter le mythe?" il se consacre au rôle médiateur du langage poétique, médiateur entre le mythe et son récepteur, alors qu'afin d'exemplifier Siaflekis puise dans la poésie de Robert Desnos et de José-Angel Valente. Enfin, s'il y a tendance de *démythification* au 20e siècle, "la démythification—interprétation du mythe très vite se change en défense et acceptation de son pouvoir sémantique," tandis que "la forme poétique devient [ainsi] un lieu de dialectique permanente

entre plusieurs éléments antinomiques, d'une dialectique qui se résout dans la conscience du lecteur, dans cet espace de médiation entre l'identitaire et l'hétérogène" (104, 108).

Dans le sixième chapitre la trame théorique devient visiblement plus intense. Siaflekis ajoute à sa discussion du mythe littéraire les paramètres de l'oralité, de l'écriture et de la mémoire. Les deux premiers sont conçus comme deux états ou codes de communication non oppositionnels du même phénomène, bien que le premier relève de l'activité collective tandis que le deuxième de l'apport individuel. De plus, l'écriture comporte la dimension orale. Il s'agit, soutient le critique, de comment traduire ou transmettre le mythe par l'intermédiaire de l'oralité (110).

Par la suite, Siaflekis consacre un chapitre entier à l'œuvre peu étudié *Voyage en Chine* de Nicos Kazantzakis, lecture avançant un point de vue plutôt original concernant cette œuvre du romancier grec, dans lequel parmi les problématiques les plus importantes soulevées serait-elle la valeur que porte "l'image littéraire d'une culture" ainsi que son rapport au dialogue interculturel. Ainsi, il s'agit dans cette œuvre de Kazantzakis d'une question de genre, d'un récit de voyage, ainsi que de la réceptivité, du rôle du lecteur et de la spécificité du genre. Est-il question d'un texte de dialogue interculturel ou plutôt d'un texte de mémoire solitaire? Selon Siaflekis, la particularité de ce récit de voyage permet justement le dialogue entre cultures aussi bien qu'entre auteur et lecteurs. Il ajoute que "l'image de la Chine transmise au lecteur grec au moyen d'une narration *réaliste* [c'est nous qui soulignons], truffée de références au patrimoine culturel européen, est une démarche complexe mais efficace: Kazantzakis achève de manière pratique, ses propres recherches philosophiques en offrant à ces lecteurs un texte où les idées philosophiques sont investies dans une réalité sociale concrète" (143).

Dans le chapitre suivant Siaflekis tient à discuter le *Livre de l'intranquillité* de Fernando Pessoa. Il s'agit de la problématique de l'identité générique de l'œuvre en question, identité qui se base, d'abord, sur sa logique, deuxièmement, sur les intentions de la part du récepteur et, enfin, sur la logique dialectique inhérente à l'œuvre. Bien que dans la première partie du chapitre il s'agisse du "caractère indéfini du *Livre de l'intranquillité* [qui invite] son lecteur à une révision totale du mode de réception" (150), ce qui soulève aussi la question de la coprésence de plusieurs formes de narration. dans la deuxième partie il est question du caractère avant-gardiste de son écriture émergeant des éléments oniriques et utopiques. De plus, s'il y a autarcie inhérente au récit, comme le présuppose Siaflekis, il ne s'exprimerait qu'en se questionnant ce dernier—le récit—constamment lui-même (155). Enfin, la troisième partie soulève encore une fois ce caractère moderniste de l'écriture de Pessoa, caractère qui concerne tant la perspective dialogique s'articulant envers d'autres œuvres de son époque que l'expression dialogique interne, ce qui détermine aussi l'horizon d'attente de l'œuvre en question.

L'avant-dernier chapitre se propose de tracer les similarités et les points divergents quant à l'élément fantastique ainsi qu'à la méthode assumée par les auteurs Marguerite Yourcenar et Alexandre Papadiamandis afin d'actualiser le fantastique. Si, chez Papadiamandis, le récit porte des éléments autobiographiques, ces derniers s'articulent grâce à la technique dite autodiégétique. Et s'il y a

opposition entre le passé, l'Histoire, et l'histoire racontée, ces derniers ne s'exprimeraient qu'à travers "l'écriture, comme acte synthétique, [qui] doit concilier les antithèses . . ." (164). Pour ce qui est de Yourcenar, il s'agit de voir son écriture en tant qu' "ensemble de données discursives, culturelles et littéraires, qui fait que le texte peut être lu comme un espace conditionné par l'hétérogène et l'identitaire, le propre et l'autre" (163), donc, selon une lecture dialogique. Dans le cas de Papadiamandis la "tactique" narrative s'inscrit dans le cadre "d'un style réaliste et poétique à la fois" (167) qui reflète des influences européennes contemporaines, quoiqu'il se propose de construire un "univers typiquement grec . . . tout en faisant apparaître la spécificité de l'irréel, lieu de croisement des conditions sociales du pays et de la projection psychique du héros" (168-69).

Pour ce qui est du dernier chapitre, il s'agit d'une lecture comparative de l'oeuvre d'Andreas Embiricos *Argo ou vol d'aérostat* et du roman de Jules Verne *Cinq semaines en ballon*. Bien que les deux auteurs emploient le mythe dans le but de le pulvériser, Jules Verne se penche sur une narration de fonction descriptive en la plaçant dans le futur proche, tandis qu'Andreas Embiricos emploie une narration de fonction interprétative et psychanalytique qui s'installe dans le passé. De plus, pour ce qui est d'une approche-lecture idéologique et (post)coloniale, les deux textes se complètent. Là où dans le texte de Verne se soulève la question d'une supériorité de la race des Européens blancs, chez Embiricos s'articule l'appel à "la réconciliation des peuples. Si Jules Verne fait appel à la science pour faire passer son message, Embiricos confie au sentiment érotique le soin de conduire à l'égalité raciale" (199). En outre, Embiricos en imitant Verne emploie dans sa langue des éléments savants, quoique cette dernière reste souvent imprégnée des éléments grammaticaux et syntaxiques du grec démotique, ce qui lui permet de "parodier le contenu même de son discours. À cet égard on peut considérer *Argo* comme un *hypertexte* [c'est nous qui soulignons] par rapport au roman de Verne" (202).

Pour conclure, *La relation comparative* vient, dans un premier temps, énoncer des questionnements autour du statut paradigmatique dit évolutif et de transformation de la discipline même de littérature comparée durant le 20e siècle. Dans un deuxième temps, l'ouvrage critique polyvalent de Siaflekis vient confirmer le caractère et le rôle médiateurs assumés par la littérature comparée en tant que discipline revisitant et déstabilisant le schéma dualistique centre-périphérie car, comme l'avance l'auteur, "la lecture comparatiste va du local à l'universel en changeant les termes et les points d'approche de la littérature universelle, en modifiant aussi les schémas théoriques qu'on en fait : la *réception* [c'est nous qui soulignons] des œuvres transgresse les frontières, car elle est elle-même un acte de transition illimitée" (14-15). La modernité littéraire constituant le pivot esthétique de l'ouvrage en question se montre, comme le soutient l'auteur, non seulement lieu des rencontres littéraires interculturelles mais aussi dispositif de l'articulation de l'énonciation autoréflexive et théorique. Terrain glissant ou, plutôt, aspect transitoire immanent à l'approche comparatiste?

Styliani Kokkali, Chercheuse indépendante.

Gian Balsamo. *Joyce's Messianism: Dante, Negative Existence, and the Messianic Self*. Columbia, SC: U of South Carolina P, 2004. 192 pp. 1570035520.

In his short, but densely woven book, Balsamo inscribes Joyce's work originally and convincingly within the tradition of negative existence and the related messianism, primarily represented by Dante, who taught the Irishman how negative and apophanic experiences substantiate the feeling of the sacred. Central to Dante's Christian negative poetics is God's absolute giving of being and the phenomenal experience of man's exposure to death's unconditional givenness, two radically existential extremes that determine human existence, but whose referential content cannot be comprehended by ordinary commonsense language. In continuation of Dante's negative poetics of non-referentiality, Joyce proves to be immensely preoccupied with these two modes of givenness, as it is wonderfully expressed in one of his grand existential statements from "Ithaca" (which Balsamo does not quote, but might as well have done): "From inexistence to existence he came to many and was as one received: existence with existence he was with any as any with any: from existence to non-existence gone he would be by all as none perceived" (*Ulysses* 17:67-9). In Joyce's work, life takes place within the borders of the givenness of the original *inexistence* and the final *non-existence*, however "origin and destination remains stubbornly beyond the self's conscious or intentional grasp, marking therefore the limits of knowledge and self-knowledge. While they play an essential role in the constitution of the self's finite experiencing, origin and destination remain irreducible to consciousness" (11).

These two distinct orders of absence, i.e. the painful experience of one's irreducible finitude and existence's boundless charity, is, in Dante's poetry, informed by the messianic bridging of God, who is the name for the apophanic orders that envisage life's order of presence; though, as Balsamo shows with much cleverness and insight, Joyce is highly inspired by this tradition, in evidence in Saint Augustine as well, he replaces the metaphysical concept of God with the secular concept of the woman, who is the worldly bearer of this incomprehensible charity and mystery of life. As he tellingly writes in one of the note sheets, "God a woman" (*Joyce's Ulysses Notesheets in the British Museum*, p. 421), or as Bloom says addressing the woman: "You are the link between nations and generations. Speak woman, sacred lifegiver!" (15:4647-49). It could, in this connection, have been interesting, if Balsamo had investigated and analysed this feminine and secular interpretation of messianism and apophanic discourse, as it is staged, for instance, in the monologues of Molly and Anna Livia, which beautifully close *Ulysses* and *Finnegans Wake*, but this is, however, only a minor complaint caused by a genuine admiration for this highly competent and deeply inspiring book.

Balsamo argues "that Joyce bestows on his protagonists a distinct catalogue of messianic connotations, informed by the Christian stations of death and resurrection, fall and redemption, burial and manducation, incarnation and transubstantiation" (20). In order to pursue this idea throughout Joyce's work, he lays the theoretical ground in part one (the first three chapters) of the book. Here he especially deals with Dante (and contemporary thinkers like Jacques Derrida and Jean-Luc Marion who have written eloquently on negative theology, apophanic discourse,

and, to a certain degree in continuation of these, the impossible phenomenology of the other and the gift), who taught Joyce the importance of distancing oneself "away from protocols of both realism and figurality" (10). Furthermore, Joyce is said to iterate the Dantesque experience of the poet's *imitatio Christi* where the poet follows Christ's descent to hell and his submersion into the absence of grace, which precedes the experience and feeling of the sacred.

By way of modern thinkers such as Durkheim, Chomsky, and Lorraine Weir, Balsamo speculates that human evolution and history must be perceived as a genetic and cultural co-evolution within a linguistic framework. Thus, Balsamo feels encouraged to state that: "Language acquisition could be said to result therefore from the phenotypal adaptation of a vestigial endowment to cultural or nurtural evolution" (25). This controversial idea is developed in dialogue with Giambattista Vico, who in his *Scienza nuova* claims that the entire development of human history is condensed in the etymological history of language, which contains vestigial resources that can be recognised independently of literal or allegorical references. According to Balsamo, the apophanic experience is in this manner initiated and recognised in the hidden and pre-individual crevices of language itself. Turning to *Finnegans Wake*, Balsamo is thus able to state that Joyce's idiosyncratic and pan-historic language offers the reader the possibility of situating himself "in the sepulchral burrow of our archaic past" (127). —A past that, through centuries and millennia of "renunciation, abnegation, self-detachment" (28), and especially through the Judaeo-Christian tradition of surrogate sacrifice, has imprinted and interiorized the related properties of responsibility, solidarity, and altruism in "the neural folds of subsequent generations" (28).

Balsamo concludes his initiating, theoretical considerations with the concept of the messianic self, which originates in the "*redemptive journey unto death*" (29). Quoting Augustine's *Confessiones* (book VI), Nicodemus's apocryphal Gospel, and a 1215 article of faith, according to which Christ descended to hell after his crucifixion, he argues that God's son becomes a biographical model for Augustine's and Dante's messianic selves, who move from singular and isolated, phenomenal contingency to a universalization of individual fate through the purgatorial experience of radical self-negation or radical otherness. But whereas Augustine and Dante accentuate the epiphanic moment of silent separation from language during the messianic vision, Joyce expands the linguistic frontiers almost infinitely in an ecstatic fusion of universal and sacred scripture with common and fragile individual corporeality. According to Balsamo, Joyce in this manner manages to present a messianic self, which is "universal, yet distinct, individual yet 'dividual' (*Finnegans Wake*, 186:4-5)" (42).

Balsamo starts his impressive and competent analysis with Gabriel Conroy from "The Dead," who oscillates insecurely between "deathly paralysis and total liberation" (58). Drawing on the epiphanic mystery of the Virgin Mary in Dante's *Comedy*, where the protagonist is given a revelation of "the necropolitan selfhood of paradisiac saints" (53), Balsamo is able to depict a Gabriel, who assumes the role of an "anti-communal messenger of death" (49). Gabriel's feeling of self-dissolution at the closure of "The Dead" is thus a secular version of the Dantesque

self-effacement in the presence of the heavenly hosts; it is a moment when the contingent self is replaced by an authentic, universal identity brought about through the apophanic discourse: "It is through the elision of factual determinism and literal fact, through the dismissal of naturalistic referentiality and the fading away of phenomenal identity, that Gabriel, on the night of the Epiphany, will have come into his genuine self" (59).

The two following chapters focus on Stephen's "poetico-onastic fantasies" (61); here the artist to be proves to be ambivalently torn between historical (i.e. biographical) determinism and poetical ideality. There is a split between the self-contained and unified truth of poetry, which promises a transcendental permanence beyond worldly and temporal contingence (as formulated for instance by Blake, Yeats, and A.E.), and the painful awareness of his limited historical situation: In opposition to the privileged poets of the symbolist and modernist movements, Stephen (and Joyce himself as Balsamo points out) is struggling along with his family for actual, material survival in the Irish proletariat. In his inspiration from Augustian ontology and temporality, originating in the *incorruptibilis substantia* of the transcendental word and ego, Stephen remains unequipped to face and challenge the ordinary and common experience of his historical condition, since his metaphysical preoccupation with transcendental signification renders him unable to embrace and thus emancipate himself from his historically determined life —through the radical choice of negative existence.

Balsamo continues his analysis of Stephen with the evocation of resonances of Dante, Blake, Mallarmé, and Yeats, who inspire him to develop a poetics of maternal self-effacement. This very Mallarmean concept of the poem as a gift —although it contains an instantiation of messianic, life-giving transcendence— presupposes paradoxically an erasure of the original procreation. This poetical gesture is actualised in the dialectical *Aufhebung* of the natural origin through the symbolical sacrifice. Thus Bernard de Clairvaux and Dante depict the Virgin Mary as the one who heals the wounds that Eve opened through original sin (which entailed the procreations of the following generations), i.e. a symbolical and virginal birth actualised through the negation of original, maternal procreation. Poetic creation is, with the words of Stephen, a *postcreation* that only imitates the mother in order to escape and negate the biological foundation (with the inevitable successions of life and death) she embodies. This is why Balsamo claims that Stephen's notion of *postcreation* is animated by the Christian "extinction of procreation and the eclipse of Eros" (92). He continues: "the virgin womb *mothers* a nihilistic divinity uncontaminated by the accidents, lapses, and contingencies of the history of Creation; immense human multitudes leave the necropolis and cross the neck of the virgin womb backwards, to coalesce, contracting to a dimensionless dot, into the ground zero of his atemporal, aspatial, silent Word" (*ibid*.). This is a very strong and intelligent observation, but this reviewer tends to disagree when Balsamo concludes his brilliant analysis of Stephen's case with the following remarks: "Stephen's notion of postcreation is the virtual countertype to all Scriptural types, inclusive of Incarnation and Crucifixion" (*ibid*.). On the contrary, I think, it is difficult not to perceive Stephen's aesthetic speculations as a Hegelian interpre-

tation of the dialectical structures and selfsame movements within the Christian narration. Though Stephen turns the metaphysical system upside down, his aesthetics remains deeply indebted to the metaphysical structures, which is why it is justly characterised as "perverted transcendentalism" (*Ulysses* 14:1223-4).

Turning to the less high-flying character of Leopold Bloom, Balsamo touches on the question of the Eucharist, which will be fully developed in the closing analysis of "Shem's Scripture"—to be more precise he discusses "the function of food, corpses, and excreta in the adventures of Leopold Bloom" (93). In the mind of this myriad minded wanderer, burial and nutrition, excretion/decay and ingestion/digestion, are closely tied together, which for instance is evident in the description of his thoughts during his presence at the communion: "*Corpus*: body. Corpse" (5:350). Balsamo extends this discussion by bringing anthropological theories about ritual sacrifices and, in the centre of this, the symbolic scapegoat or deceased, who supposedly was incorporated through the cannibal meal, which commemorates the virtues and attributes of the dead or deceased. In opposition to Stephen, who rejects the cyclical, biological life, Bloom celebrates life's sacredness through his meals during his day, not only commemorating the loss of his son, Rudy, but also his youthful courtship of Molly on Howth Head, on September 10, 1888, when the couple consummated their relationship. In this scene Leopold and Molly perform their own, and probably Joyce's own version of a worldly Eucharist, which pays homage to life's wonder of love and sexual enjoyment. Molly is chewing a seed [sic] cake, which she forces into Leopold's mouth when they kiss, and this is immediately followed by his seminal counterflow whereby he impregnates her with their daughter Milly. In this manner, they display "a profane sacrament of *transcorporealization*" (106), and Balsamo concludes the chapter with an affirmative and optimistic view of the future for the couple: "To Leopold Bloom nutrition is sacramental. Each single meal renews the inspired anamnesis of his incorporation of Molly's fecundity, as well as the cathartic of his unfolded mourning in the wake of their son's death. In this perspective, with each single meal Bloom celebrates in advance the apotropaic purgation of any betrayal, sordidness, or meanness that he and Molly will have ever inflicted on each other" (107).

The role of the Eucharist is extremely transformed in Joyce's parodic version, where Shem makes ink of his own faeces and urine writing the universal, human story on his own body. The union of body and mind in the Eucharist is echoed in Shem's gesture, by which the utterance (the word, which is expressed by the synecdoche "tongue") converts organic waste (decay) into artistic expression (permanence). In other words, binary categories such as holy/unholy, priest/sacrificial victim, etc., converge and fuse in this most "unheavenly" (*Finnegans Wake* 185.29) scenario. The fusion of these categories presupposes the *Selbst-Entzweiung*, which is actualised in the author's assumption of the role as sacrificial victim, "transaccidentated" (*Finnegans Wake* 186.3-4) into a text or scripture made of his own skin and his waste. In his reverse (and blasphemous) re-enactment of the Eucharist, Joyce inscribes this ambivalent sacrificial event—in which the worshiper and the god, the subject and the object, the self and the other merge —within living, cyclical history, thus replacing God as the source, since the human body and mind

become the center of the apophanic extremes of the existential origin and destination. In his bio-graphical (Greek *bíos* "life" and *graphê* "drawing, writing") annulment of the "cycle of opposition between the Word and the Flesh" (117), Joyce surpasses his Scriptural sources, because he embraces the mystery and wonder of a negative existence, "which is forever recycling its own decomposition" (117).

Balsamo's outstanding book is truly a work of excellence, a work that will inspire and help Joyce-admirers interested in the wonders and mysteries of Joycean existence henceforward. Not only is the book highly original, as it is enormously informed about theological as well as modern theoretical aspects, it is also elegantly and convincingly written and argued due to a text-sensitive awareness and impressive intimacy with Joyce's work. What is furthermore extremely appealing about this book is that it bears witness to the messianic and affirmative side of Joyce's genius, an affirmation which does not shrink from the negativity of human existence, but which faces it boldly and incorporates it into a sacramental celebration of life, thus offering the reader a certain joy and hope that dares to digest and therefore transcend human finitude. Balsamo's *Joyce's Messianism* is a most welcome book.

Benjamin Boysen, *University of Southern Denmark.*

Works Cited

Joyce, James. *Finnegans Wake*. New York: Penguin Books, 1975.

———. *Joyce's Ulysses Notesheets in the British Museum.* Phillip F. Herring, ed. Charlottesville: U P of Virginia, 1972.

———. *Ulysses*. Hans Walter Gabler, ed. New York: Random House, 1986.

Marina Grishakova, *The Models of Space, Time and Vision in V. Nabokov's Fiction: Narrative Strategies and Cultural Frames*. Tartu Semiotics Library 5. Tartu: Tartu University Press, 2006. 324 pp. 978-9949113064.

Marina Grishakova's project is simultaneously ambitious and self-limited. She aspires to combine a narrowly focused, single-author study of Nabokov's novels with a fresh elaboration of a general poetics of fiction. Her models for this combination are the French narratological masterpieces of an earlier generation—Todorov's book on Boccaccio, Greimas's on Maupassant, Barthes's on Balzac, and of course Genette's irreplaceable book on Proust. (Of more recent vintage and different provenance is Samuli Hägg's 2005 dissertation on Pynchon, in the same vein.) However, where these precursors (apart from Hägg) developed the tools and concepts of what we now call *classical* narratology, Grishakova seeks to contribute to the elaboration of a *postclassical* narratology, as David Herman (1999) has taught us to call it—that is, of a narratology that is oriented toward larger cultural contexts in ways that the French narratological classics were not. "Narratology has not always been conscious of the relationship between its narrow technical problems and a broader cultural context," Grishakova writes (142), and this is, if anything, an understatement. All that appears to be changing now, and for the better, as contemporary narratology strives to accommodate issues of

gender, ideology, ethics, and historicity, as well as newer visual and digital media. Arguably, postclassical narratology should also be better able to illuminate modernist and postmodernist practice in fiction—or at least, that's Grishakova's gamble.

Bringing Genette's narratology up to date, as it were, and making it responsive to the complexities of Nabokov's fiction are certainly worthy aspirations, but I'm not sure that this ambitious program has been fully accomplished here. Deeply read in literary theory and semiotics, in Nabokov's writings, and in Nabokovian scholarship, Grishakova has thought hard and resourcefully about narrative poetics, yet her book lacks the lucidity and systematicity of Genette's classic. Even when Genette was *wrong,* he was *clear,* and one always knew where one was in the topography of his system; one could *navigate* it. But in Grishakova's book, though three large categories are announced in the title and adumbrated in the introduction—space, time, and vision—the exposition is disproportionately skewed toward vision, which receives three chapters to time's one. Moreover, of the three chapters on vision, two seem more or less haphazard spin-offs of the key chapter on the observer (chapter two). There is considerable overlap and redundancy among these three chapters, which are often digressive, to the point of obscuring the structure of the exposition and rendering navigation difficult. As for space, although Grishkova provides an enormously useful overview of approaches to literary space in her introduction (45-9), she doesn't actually devote a separate chapter to the category of space, but submerges it in her discussion of the "spatiotemporal modeling" of "Multidimensional Worlds" in chapter five.

No doubt it is unfair to measure Grishakova's book against a masterpiece like Genette's. Despite its shortcomings, her book makes a valuable contribution both to theoretical reflection on narrative and to Nabokov studies. It converges with another valuable recent study of modernist and postmodernist narrative with theoretical ambitions, Philip Weinstein's *Unknowing: The Work of Modernist Fiction* (2005). Grishakova's three categories of space, time and vision coincide with Weinstein's, except that the issues she handles under the category of *vision*, he groups under the heading of the *subject.* What Grishakova is able to bring to bear, however, that neither Weinstein nor for that matter Genette have at their command, is a powerful, sophisticated, and highly flexible notion of *models* and *modeling.* This is a legacy of her training in the tradition of Tartu-Moscow semiotics, especially identified with her teacher Yuri Lotman (to whose memory this book is dedicated). A model is one of those "metaphors we live by" that, having shed its metaphoricity, serves as a theory of some domain of our experience of the world (19-26). Cultural models of space, time, and vision of the modernist era form the background against which the *micro-models* of specific authors and texts are profiled (286). Nabokov is a particularly compelling case of micro-modeling, due in part to his intense self-consciousness about models. Grishakova cites an interview in which Nabokov, reflecting on *Ada,* might as well have been talking about his self-conscious approach to modeling throughout his oeuvre. He tells Robert Hughes in 1965,

> The metaphors start to live. The metaphors gradually turn into the story because it's very difficult to speak about time without using similes or metaphors. And my

purpose it to have these metaphors breed to form a story of their own . . . . (77)

There in a nutshell is Nabokov's method: he animates and narrativizes metaphors (models) of time, space, and vision as other novelists do characters and themes. They are his raw materials, available for manipulation.

Typical of the way Nabokov's micro-models stand out against the background of general cultural models are his models of time. Grishkova surveys a range of twentieth-century models of time: linear *vs.* non-linear time; universal *vs.* individual time; *tempus reversus,* time running backward, as in Vonnegut's *Slaughterhouse-Five* (her example) or Martin Amis's *Time's Arrow*; the figure of *aevum*, the "intermediate" time sandwiched between eternities; and circular and spiral time. Against this general modernist background she profiles Nabokov's particular micro-models of circular, spiral, and Möbius-strip time; her case-study is his early novel *Mary* (80-112). She follows a similar approach with Nabokov's optical metaphors, which serve as "means of mnemonic linkage and narrative transition" (215), profiling these against the background of twentieth-century models of vision based on optical "prostheses," especially cinema. Here her main case-study is *Camera Obscura* (*Laughter in the Dark*) (204-9).

Grishakova's boldest and richest theoretical contributions, which are also likely to be the most controversial, are to be found in chapter two, "The Model of the Observer." Here she reviews classic point-of-view theory—familiar material, perhaps overly familiar, but Grishakova manages to problematize and refresh it. A cornerstone of classic narratology, established by Genette and reaffirmed by nearly everyone who has followed in his intellectual tradition, is the strict division of labor between "who speaks" and "who sees," between narration and focalization. Grishakova, dissenting from this mainstream view, draws the controversial conclusion that "narration and focalization are inseparable" (149). The metaphor or model of "point of view"—of "the observer"—fuses perception and knowledge, seeing and narrating, mimesis and diegesis (152-3). Consequently, far from abiding by a serene division of labor, narrative is the arena of "semiotic conflict" between the visual and the verbal; asymmetry and discrepancy between seeing and saying are constants (156-63). Some narratives thematize that conflict—"metaverbal" and "metavisual" texts where "conditions of verbal representation and perception are laid bare or called into question" (157). Grishkova's Nabokovian example is *The Eye* (169-73), supplemented by discussions of Henry James's *The Turn of the Screw* (163-9)—a case-study in "impeded visualization" and "inhibited verbalization" (165)—and Alfred Hitchcock's *Rear Window* (173-7).

Grishakova's conclusions about Nabokov's poetics and practice may not be wholly unprecedented, but they are certainly enlivened and enriched by her theoretical reflections. On time in Nabokov's fiction, she concludes that "the main principle of Nabokov's temporality is oscillation between different time scales, their interference and multiple shifts" (75), in other words, something akin to what Herman (1998) calls "polychrony." She concludes that spatiotemporal modeling in Nabokov's fiction is typically based on "deictic shifts or recenterings between . . . overlapping worlds as well as the protagonist's intermediary position between the worlds" (235); such "destabilization," she goes on, "becomes a text-

generating principle in his novels" (235-6). As with other types of modeling in his fiction, Nabokov elevates multi-world modeling to the level of self-conscious reflection: "Nabokov's fiction lays bare the [normally] invisible process of recentering and makes it an object of fictional representation" (237). The semiotic conflict between the visual and the verbal also attains a high level of self-consciousness in Nabokov's fiction. If verbal art always aspires to the condition of visuality, in Nabokov's fiction "the 'failure' of the verbal to reach the state of the visual is used as a constructive principle" (285). The Nabokovian narrator's aspiration to "full vision" "stimulates resistance of the visual to the verbal, a suspense or blockage of verbalization," leading to a high degree of textual indeterminacy (285).

Grishakova speculates that Nabokov's practice of polychrony, multiple recenterings, the phenomenology of the observer, and textual indeterminacy all ultimately derive from his own experience. Displacement among cultures and languages, times and spaces, affected his "semiotic sensibility" (282). The embedding of several time-orders within a single observer's subjectivity, so typical of his fiction, "apparently had a personal significance for Nabokov who experienced multiple shifts in space and time before he escaped the awful 'dream' of pre-war Europe" (269). "For Nabokov, the problem of alternative temporalities . . . , space construction and habitation . . . as well as the phenomenology of vision were always the most urgent questions" (282). Tartu semiotics, as adapted and updated by Marina Grishakova, here proves to be a compatible match with Nabokov's unique "semiotic sensibility."

Brian McHale, *The Ohio State University* (USA).

Références / Works Cited

Hägg, Samuli. *Narratologies of* Gravity's Rainbow. Joensuu: U of Joensuu P, 2005.
Herman, David. "Limits of Order: Toward a Theory of Polychronic Narration." *Narrative* 6.1 (1998): 72-95.
Herman, David. "Introduction: Narratologies." *Narratologies: New Perspectives on Narrative Analysis*, ed. by David Herman. Columbus: Ohio State UP, 1999. 1-30.
Weinstein, Philip. *Unknowing: The Work of Modernist Fiction*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 2005.

COMPTES RENDUS BREFS / BOOK NOTES

Line Henriksen. ***Ambition and Anxiety: Ezra Pound's*** **Cantos** ***and Derek Walcott's*** **Omeros** ***as Twentieth Century Epics*****. Amsterdam/New York: Rodopi, 2007. xxiii +344 pp. 978-9042021495.**

The inauguration of the Balakian Prize was one of the gratifying special moments for members attending the opening session of the General Assembly at the XVIIIth Congress of the International Comparative Literature Association in the summer of 2007 at Rio de Janeiro. (See the announcement on the inside back cover of this journal for the competition rules.) This award was recently created by ICLA to recognize in each of its triennial cycles an outstanding first book in comparative literary studies by a scholar not older than forty years at the time of the work's acceptance for publication. The selection committee bestowed the prize on Line Henriksen for the study here under review, based on her doctoral dissertation earlier submitted to the University of Copenhagen.

The overarching principle of organization in *Ambition and Anxiety* is "vertical" rather than "horizontal"—that is, it is primarily a study in literary history, taking up the complex subject of the evolution of a genre, "epic," while it brings, secondarily, an interconnected series of more detailed literary interpretations of works placed in the context of their times and occasional examinations of their technical means of composition measured against a variety of theoretical statements older and newer. Yet the "horizontal" dimension expands considerably, and quite appropriately, when Henriksen devotes two thirds of her chapters (numbers 3 through 6) to Ezra Pound and Derek Walcott, and sweeps around them to include comparative and contrastive observations on a numerous set of modern authors. *Ambition and Anxiety* lends greater depth to the examination of intertextuality in our times by approaching the two main authors on interlacing highways and byways leading back to antiquity in what we could term variously a conversation over the centuries or a grand narrative.

Without mentioning Earl Miner's pathbreaking treatise *Comparative Poetics: An Intercultural Essay on Theories of Literature* (1990), Henriksen provides compelling evidence for his thesis of how great literary traditions (in this case, the pan-European, and as extended into the New World) unfold over centuries, acquire favorite contents and forms, and elaborate, refine, and revise their own codes of poetics, distinct from the evolutionary story other great streams (e.g., the Chinese-Japanese-Korean complex). The interaction of cultures at various junctures is a separate question. Henriksen's first two chapters lay out the multiple pathways and feedback loops in what becomes the life of a genre, manifested in a sequence of works that generates and internalizes its own self-designating geneal-

ogy and finally bequeaths a discourse on cultural lineage and authority, a process including challenges, parodic responses, rival lines of treatment, and more. We move from the dual modes of Homer (*Iliad*, *Odyssey*), to Virgil's appropriation of them (*Aeneid*), to Dante's (*Divina Commedia*), and next Milton's (*Paradise Lost* and *Regained*), amidst a plenitude of early modern attempts to participate.

Henriksen's important contribution is to illustrate how narrative and discursive attributes begin to get built into "epic" and help foster new creativity when later artists grasp their potential. This is not an original view, but the way Henriksen executes an epoch-transcending demonstration of the connectedness of such a cumulative body of works felicitously avoids letting any simplistic unifying theory to hold sway. Instead, she treats a host of theoretical statements as parts of the bigger "metanarrative"; especially clear in this book are her profilings of "metadiscursive" shifts from age to age, and likewise of the resultant remarkable capacity of epic to carry a huge thematic repertory. Although Henriksen never asserts any claim to be pursuing a polysystem analysis on the scale of a continuously metamorphosing civilization, she employs theories of narrative alongside a quite considerable running argument about formal elements and thereby keeps us on guard against dogmatic assumptions fixated at any particular moment of history.

By taking up the question of the "novelization" of epic (but of course not having room for all the possible relevant authors), Henriksen will spark the natural ambition of other scholars to tackle grander topics. One line of inquiry would certainly investigate how, after starting from archaic layers in Homer, moving over Virgil to Dante (and on other tracks via such great medieval narrators as Chestien de Troyes and Hartmann von Aue), the epic impulse went next both in verse and prose guises to Renaissance and Baroque writers like Ariosto, Rabelais, Spenser, Tasso, Cervantes, and Grimmelshausen, persisted in prose (e.g., Sterne) as well as verse (e.g., Byron), became cosmic drama with Goethe (*Faust*), and recrossed into the novel with Joyce et al. Because Henriksen chooses to exclude treatment of Caribbean history in other complicated poets and novelists of the region, aside from for her "negative" instances like Naipaul (e.g., does not look at artists like Heredia in *Les Trophées*, Saint-John Perse in *Anabase*, Carpentier in *El siglo de las Luces*, etc.), others may want to tie back onto Walcott and test his *Omeros* against such concepts as the "foundational romance"; and that can lead further, for example, to such narratives in North America (e.g., John Barth, Thomas Pynchon, et al.), as well as in Latin America and even in Europe.

It is pretty clear that Joyce upended Pound's possible bid to be the lasting icon of modern creative conscious with epical breadth. When Henriksen touches on the themes of cultural succession and authority, and on specific tropes and forms (pilgrimage, polyphony, encyclopedic collections and parades, ironizing or ludic exhibition of narrative means, etc.), the repeated mention of patterns of "novelization" is most attractive and stimulating. She brings us afresh to consider the possibilities that actually once arose and still arise when writers hit on the notion (following the lead of Rabelais and Cervantes, whom she does not treat) that works of epic scope can be "comic epics in prose" in Fielding's famous phrase, sometimes deliberate anti-epics and sometimes self-critical, ironic, reflective "encyclo-

pedic" containers of culture—down which road we come to Joyce and Mann et al.Those interested in the ways cultures assimilate foreign matter will be intrigued by Henriksen's look at elements of practice and theory at the turn into the twentieth century when Western poetry responded to Japanese and Chinese poetry, at the same time that Dante was enjoying a renascence among modernists, and how these and other features came into the mix of means that we see so prominently in Pound and Eliot. This facet of Henriksen's work should cause us to pose anew the question of the role of verse as a constituent of cultural memory in a very late moment in the life of a complicated genre of such reverend age that epic is. The reviewer begs to invoke a very old notion to sum up the virtues of this fine book: Henriksen marries searching thought about what human heritage the epic text carries (*prodesse*) with genuine pleasure in the text as poetic expression (*delectare*).

Gerald Gillespie, *Stanford University* (USA).

David Damrosch. *How To Read World Literature?* Malden, MA: Blackwell, forthcoming. 168 pp. 978-1405168267.

The animating idea behind much of David Damrosch's recent activity as a scholar and editor is that works of world literature have a transcendental ability to speak to us "with compelling immediacy" across the boundaries of time, space, and culture—even in translation (2, pagination follows my advance copy and may not coincide with the published book). This volume offers undergraduate instructors and students contrapuntal readings of texts from distinct cultures that illuminate each other in unexpected ways. The organizational principle of Damrosch's volume is to make each of the fundamental challenges to approaching foreign texts the subject of a separate query: how do we read across time? across culture? in translation? When a "third term or set of concerns" is required to form the basis for cross-cultural analysis (59), the book deploys a different set of concerns to organize each textual comparison. *Oedipus* and *Shakuntala* are juxtaposed with reference to the generic expectations of drama, Molière's *Le Bourgeois Gentilhomme* and Chikamatsu Mon'zaemon's *Love Suicides at Amijima* are read together in light of social concerns with the rise of the bourgeoisie. Pairings of familiar texts that make the volume useful as a companion to a survey course are balanced by less familiar pairings that seek to expand the canons of world literature and are of more interest to scholars of comparative literature.

The strong version of Damrosch's case is that even works that reflect no direct cultural influence or contact such as Sophocles' *Oedipus the King* and Kalidasa's *Shakuntala* can be read productively side-by-side. He observes in a key moment in *Shakuntala* the pairing of recognition and reversal that Aristotle praised in the *Poetics* and admired in *Oedipus*. Damrosch emphasizes that in some respects—the common stress on fate—Sophocles is "closer to Kalidasa than to many later dramatists in the West," and that even in their differences "there is again less contrast between Kalidasa and Sophocles than with later Western playwrights" (68, 72). Attention to textual affinities across civilizations is key not only to meeting

the pedagogical challenge of presenting world literature in translation to undergraduates but possibly also to the future of comparative literature as a scholarly enterprise. The epilogue calls for serious readers of world literature to learn "at least two foreign languages, one from one's home region and one from a very different part of the world and an unrelated language family" (172).

The volume is particularly persuasive in demonstrating the immediacy with which ancient literature can speak to us, and the value of reading in translation—both cases made with an eye for the counter-intuitive. Though the final form of *Gilgamesh* preceded *The Iliad* by several centuries, in the earlier epic the conception of the interaction between gods and mortals appears more "distanced" and "modern." In this respect Sin-leqe-unninni, the last author of *Gilgamesh*, proves "closer to us" than the "illiterate Homeric bards centuries after him" for he "was heir to a thousand years of literary culture, and his audience had come to expect certain standards of earthly realism even when the heavenly gods were involved" (47).

Shifts in meaning across time in turn demonstrate the occasional advantage of reading a text in translation, as evidenced by the occurrence of an archaic insult in Voltaire's *Candide* that translators are better able to communicate to the twenty-first century reader than the original French text is now capable of doing. Damrosch demonstrates the need to read various translations to get a sense of the original with reference to the continued relevance of Burton's "flamboyant" translation of the *1001 Nights* that modern translators have claimed to supersede. Burton's version remains the only one that conveys the rhyming prose of the original, though Burton anticipated the British ear might find it "'un-English,' and unpleasant, even irritating." Modern translators "protest too much" in Damrosch's estimation, for "it can't be said" that they have "finally done fuller justice than Burton to the *Nights*" (103-107). Here, as in the reclamation of Kipling's *Kim* for the cause of "cultural hybridism" (149), Damrosch is at ease making the case for the currency of an unfashionable text.

The book ends with a warning against the complacency of the superficial engagement with foreign culture embodied by "bubble" field schools that afford little interaction with local culture (173), a reminder that one reads and teaches in translation to foster a genuine cross-cultural curiosity that leads to the study of other languages and cultures. The strength of Damrosch's work on world literature—also the distinctive trait of the *Longman Anthology of World Literature* for which he serves as general editor—is that it places works from different cultural locations in dialogue with each other, ensuring that non-Western works take part in the exchange. The virtue of this volume is that it starts with a frank acknowledgment of the difficulty of reading foreign works and builds these central questions into the architecture of the work, shunning an organization by geography that might have been at once more familiar and more vulnerable to the accusation of literary tourism. It then takes seriously the task of asking how we might read literature across cultures, pairing the familiar with the unfamiliar, the intuitive with the counter-intuitive, and the insights of specialists with the observation of cross-civilizational affinities that will resonate with students and scholars alike.

Paulo Horta, *Simon Fraser University* (Canada).

Dolores Romero López, ed. *Naciones literarias*. Barcelona: Anthropos Editorial, 2006. 364 pp. 978-8476587799.

The volume under review grew out of the work of a research unit on Spanish and European literatures at the Universidad Complutense in Madrid. Its purpose is to fill a gap in the Spanish academic market by providing Spanish translations of seminal essays on the interrelations of literature and the nation, surely one of the most hotly-debated topics in literary and cultural studies of the last few decades. *Naciones literarias* includes some excellent articles, but the editor's introduction is weak, and the overall quality and organization of the volume is disappointing. One can only hope that the Spanish students who are the intended audience of this collection will recognize that *Naciones literarias* does not offer a definitive (or even very coherent) overview of current research on literature and the nation, and will continue to seek out readings on the topic in languages other than Spanish.

The volume's editor has divided her compilation into three sections. The first section is titled "Naciones y nociones" [Nations and notions]. It includes an article by French critic Michel Espagne on the idea of a national literature in the work of Hippolyte Taine, an essay by Rumanian critic Adriano Marino arguing for a new approach to the field of comparative literature, and excerpts on the topic of national culture from Martinican author Frantz Fanon's classic *The Wretched of the Earth*. Using Taine as his prime example, Espagne argues that in France the idea of a "national literature" is preferably applied to foreign literatures. The predominance of a rationalist classicism in French culture served to erase any sense of a specifically French identity. Espagne's essay is interesting and informative, but it is not clear whether his claim about the equation between the national and the foreign can be applied to cases other than that of France. Adriano Marino outlines his vision for what he calls a "militant comparativism," which rejects nationalism, chauvinism, imperialism, neocolonialism, and Eurocentrism, and instead promotes the free circulation of ideas, cooperation, and creative emulation, all under the banner of a new literary humanism that sees literature as a tool for forging a truly universal solidarity. At the end of Marino's fervent manifesto, one is unsure whether to label it stirringly idealistic or dismayingly naïve. Moving on to Fanon's statement on the advantages and disadvantages of "national consciousness," one can only feel relieved to be reading the work of a writer who can see more than one side to an issue. All in all, it is difficult to discern a unifying thread in these three essays. The editor's title does not offer much help in this regard—the "notion" in "Nations and notions" seems a rather vague notion (so to speak).

The middle section of *Naciones literarias* is titled—with a nod to Jacques Derrida and Homi Bhabha—"Diseminaciones literarias" [Literary disseminations]. All five essays in this section look at how literature transcends, breaks down, or spreads across national boundaries, although they do so in strikingly different ways. Three crisp and informative essays, by José Lambert (Belgium), Joseph Jurt (Switzerland), and Tania Franco Carvalhal (Brazil), are sandwiched in between two largely impenetrable post-structuralist meditations, one by British-educated, Indian-American critic Homi Bhabha, and the other by a British Latin

Americanist, Bernard McGuirk. The essay by Bhabha included here is his much-cited "Dissemination: Time, Narrative and the Margins of the Modern Nation." It is written in Bhabha's trademark murky prose, and it is no less obscure in Spanish than it is in the English original. McGuirk offers a lengthy disquisition on the problem of self and other in Latin American literature. Much of the essay is taken up by a diatribe against US post-structuralism and its supposed misinterpretation of Derrida's work. One can only wonder how all of this is connected to the question of the nation and why this essay was included in *Naciones literarias*.

After struggling through Bhabha's essay, it is a sheer delight to turn to José Lambert's incisive essay calling for more accurate maps of the world of literature. How does he propose to do this? Most importantly, one needs to demolish the paradigm of the nation that continues to dominate literary studies. As Lambert convincingly argues, literature is an elusive, fluctuating, mobile phenomenon that does not respect national boundaries. New (collaborative) research agendas are required to provide an adequate cartography of the fundamentally international nature of literature. The next piece in the collection, by Joseph Jurt, offers support for Lambert's position. With the help of illuminating examples from Belgian, Canadian, and French Antillian literature, Jurt shows how Pierre Bourdieu's concept of the "field" of literary production can be used to cast light on the transnational dimension of literature, even though Bourdieu developed his concept with French literature in mind. Of all the contributors to this section, Franco Carvalhal relies most heavily on a discourse of identity. In an informative (though not very original) essay, she discusses the notion of anthropophagy (the devouring and reshaping of European literary models) in Brazilian literature from the point of view of its contribution to the forging of an authentic Latin American cultural identity.

Perhaps the most useful section of the book is the third and final one, titled "Historias literarias" [Literary histories]. It opens with a learned essay by Spanish critic José-Carlos Mainer on the "invention" of Spanish literature. The purpose of this essay is to demonstrate that the category "Spanish literature" is a cultural construction, rather than a natural, pre-existing phenomenon simply waiting to be discovered by an alert critic. Canadian critic Linda Hutcheon offers a thoughtful, although occasionally long-winded, discussion of the pros and cons of relying on traditional (primordialist and teleological) concepts of identity when writing the literary histories of particular communities, including nations. German critic Udo Schöning outlines a helpful and illuminating program for studying what he calls the "internationality" of national literatures. The book concludes with an engaging, though slight, essay by Chilean-American critic Randolph Pope, in which he calls for a recognition of the "multinational, multilingual, pluri-essential, and multicultural" nature of the literary universe.

In the introduction to *Naciones literarias*, Dolores Romero López offers clear and competent summaries of the individual contributions to the collection. One misses, however, some broader reflection on the book's overall orientation. It is hard not to recognize the paradoxical element in Romero López's endeavor: the principal arguments the reader extracts from this volume about *literary nations* are that nations do not have a real existence; that nations may be politically dan-

gerous; and that nations in themselves are not an adequate object for literary research. In the opening pages of her introduction, Romero López recognizes that the creation of literatures and the forging of nations have often gone hand in hand. But she is clearly much more interested in calling for "a new form of humanism" that goes beyond the boundaries of the nation. The confusion we see here between a historical claim, on the one hand, and a utopian wish, on the other, is symptomatic of this volume's overall lack of focus.

Maarten van Delden, *University of Southern California* (USA).

Darko Dolinar and Marko Juvan, eds. *Writing Literary History: Selected Perspectives from Central Europe*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2006. 306 pp. 978-0820476629.

The eighteen papers collected in *Writing Literary History: Selected Perspectives from Central Europe* foreground two aspects of the book's topic. On the one hand, they explore the still unresolved dilemma of contemporary literary scholarship, namely how to move beyond the crisis in literary methodologies that focus on the text so as to envisage approaches to literary phenomena that can integrate multiple social, political, and cultural-historical circumstances. On the other hand, this English-language edition of theoretical discourses from Central Europe and particularly Slovenia represents an important confirmation before an international audience of how the field of literary scholarship is developing in that part of the world. Through its specific point of view, it provides a perspective on literature that differs from the universalistic approaches aligned with the dominant traditions in contemporary literary scholarship. In addition, of course, this book overcomes the barrier that the Slovene language presents for readers from elsewhere.

Darko Dolinar and Marko Juvan, the editors, are based in the Institute of Slovenian Literature and Literary Studies, which is part of the Scientific Research Center of the Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts. The book consists of nine papers by Slovene researchers and nine by researchers from other Central European countries, including five from cultural centers nearby, from Klagenfurt, Trieste, and Zagreb. Territorially, therefore, the approaches represented cluster in and around Slovenia (in Austria, Italy and Croatia). Readers will also notice connections to research performed in the Czech Republic, Slovakia, and Poland.

The main issue at hand consists of Slovene and Central European perspectives on the issue of how to write literary histories. One key factor in highlighting this issue at this particular moment has been the context provided by the ongoing ICLA-sponsored publication of the *History of the Literary Cultures of East-Central Europe* in four volumes, and *Writing Literary History* includes two essays by authors involved in this project, Vladimir Biti and Lado Kralj. The first paper in the collection, "On the Fate of the 'Great' Genre" by Marko Juvan, considers the duality at the core of the concept of "literary history." In one aspect this concept can evoke the "great" genre, which implies a more or less strictly scientific discourse that collects various findings of historical literary

research and brings them together to form a new whole that has one or another ideological design on its readers. As a genre insisting on the meaningfulness and organic totality of literary phenomena, however, it obviously raises suspicions. Nevertheless, all the authors in the collection agree that literary history—also in the genological meaning of the term—remains an important part of literary scholarship, even as they scrutinize its practice in search of more viable ways to proceed. Furthermore, the authors stress that literary history cannot be asked to institute national self-awareness through a narrative of evolving national identity as expressed in literature, but that it must either dissolve into an encyclopaedic collection of fragments or limit itself to pedagogical aims by presenting overviews of literature through time and by refraining from more ambitious research goals.

The essays in *Writing Literary History* touch upon a wide array of questions. Darko Dolinar focuses on historicity within the framework of reader reception theory. Jola Škulj examines how the notion of historicity changed under the influence of modernist literature. Ivan Verč questions the object of study and suggests that instead of the usual focus on a word that has already been given a meaning in the world an emphasis should be placed on studying the subject of an utterance in the unique event of a communicative entrance into reality. Alenka Koron points to narrative aspects of historiography. In the course of scrutinizing particular issues like these, the collection also provides an overview of the complex field of literary historiography. A paper by Janko Kos on the spiritual horizon of recent literary historiography is also included, Kos being a scholar who was and still is very influential in Slovene comparative studies. However, it would have been interesting for this collection to have included an essay that deals with his reworking of the methodology of intellectual history (*Geistesgeschichte*). Peter V. Zima attempts to define periods in terms of "problematics" and "sociolinguistic situations" by focusing on "the same problems and questions" that a historic entity faces. Marijan Dović's paper discusses the perspective of empirical literary science on literary history, while Miloš Zelenka introduces the point of view of manuscriptology.

Readers who might have expected more emphasis on new historicism and on Michel Foucault's discourse theories should take into account the region's characteristic theoretical orientations: Foucault has been overshadowed by Lacanian studies and by the influence of Slavoj Žižek, while in discourse theory Mikhail Bakhtin has been the dominant figure. Feminist approaches come at the very end of the volume, in a treatise by Silvija Borovnik. Postcolonial studies appear to have less influence in the region, which was and still is marked by conflicts between national entities involved in complex historical interrelationships; however, Vladimir Biti addresses the "colonial-asymmetrical zone" of the narrative encounter with the Other.

Writing Literary History brings Slovene and Central European comparative literary studies into international view. The papers also offer insights into a regionally specific network of perspectives as it emerges on the level of literary scholarship. Janez Strutz's paper on the polyphonic and polylingual literature of Istria (inhabited by Croats, Slovenes, and Italians) uses specific examples to illustrate the theoretical concept of a "latent comparatistic situation." The method

and the object of study merge, pointing to the conclusion that the essays in *Writing Literary History* do not conceive of the region in essentializing terms as a self-confined entity, but are interested in the potential for scholarship that focuses on regional specificities to open up new possibilities for literary study everywhere.

Aleš Vaupotič, *University of Ljubljana* (Slovenia).

Jean Bessière. *Qu'est-il arrivé aux écrivains français? d'Alain Robbe-Grillet à Jonathan Littell*. Loverval, Belgium: Editions Labor, 2006. 90 pp. 978-2804024635.

In a concise discussion of contemporary French literature, its authors, critics, and very existence, Jean Bessière asks, "What has become of French writers?" in his 2006 publication, *Qu'est-il arrivé aux écrivains français? d'Alain Robbe-Grillet à Jonathan Littell.* He proposes that contemporary French literature is in a constant state of contradiction and paradox involving blindness, addiction, and an obsessive affirmation of the present. In an effort to resolve these issues he searches for a foundational literature that can be liberated from the past and can become a valid part of the current approach to French literature.

The rich past of French literature is a force to be reckoned with for authors and critics alike who find themselves in competition with a canon that one dares not match and includes such extraordinary writers as Hugo, Proust, Saint-Beuve, and Sartre. Bessière explores the difficulty in defining oneself as an author, and further, in defining literature itself. He suggests that literature becomes all-powerful, and manifests itself in the contemporary context with difficulty. As such, literature becomes "everything" that occurs, and contemporary literature waits its turn to be identified by authors and critics alike. Ultimately these endless discussions of what may or may not be literary enough demonstrate a theatrical quality in literature reflective of the paradoxical quality of the domain.

Bessière further complicates the state of French literature in an examination of the tendency toward an obsession with modernity and refusal of the present. He suggests that modernity is not conceived of as it should be, as a human project and social infinity based on historical conditions. Rather, the obsessive see it as that which permits the allegory of the writer, of literature. Further, the question of the constancy of literature and its ability, as a constant presence, to complicate the relationship between the past and present is central to Bessière's presentation of modernity's continued influence on the state of literature.

Bessière does see a move away from the distractions of the canonical past and the all-powerful literature that remain contradictory and paradoxical. In the concluding sections of his work, Bessière narrows his definition of contemporary literature and provides examples of his vision in the work of Michel Houellebecq and Jonathan Littell. Unlike the canonical literature of the past, contemporary literature includes works of detective and science fiction as well as Holocaust and post-colonial writing. These works, for Bessière, play with the traditional notions of reality, time, and the subject and address the realm of the possible. Science

fiction, for example, exists outside of the time and the society that we as readers consider to be “real”; however, those fantastic visions are created by a member of that “real” society, thus complicating the concept of reality as such. Holocaust writing also operates similarly for Bessière in that it offers a view to the past with modern eyes; readers are given a look at what could have been, but was not.

In his conclusion Bessière discusses what he has called “the new literature” as autopoiesis. His goal of finding a new foundation for literature is achieved in Jonathan Littell and his work *Les Bienveillantes* (2006). Littell’s creation of a homosexual Nazi officer does not seek to reveal unknown details about the Holocaust; rather, as Bessière suggests, he repeats the historical context and connects it to contemporary society. This new approach to creating and defining literature frees us from the blindness and obsession with the past that Bessière thought provokingly examines. Bessière contributes to the ongoing discussion of literature that continuously evolves in demonstrating that literature itself becomes a part of its own creation.

Lisa R. Van Zwoll, *United States Air Force Academy* (USA).

Michael Bell, Keith Cushman, Takeo Iida, and Hiro Tateishi, eds. *D. H. Lawrence: Literature, History, Culture.* Tokyo: Kokusho-KankoKai Press, 2005. 501 pp. 4336047308.

This volume, the product of a 2003 conference in Kyoto that hosted scholars from England, the United States, Japan, and Korea, affords an occasion to consider the increasingly permeable boundaries between national and comparative literary study. Midway through the last century, F. R. Leavis had a major impact on English studies when he held up Lawrence as the main twentieth-century exemplar of the English novel’s “great tradition.” As Michael Bell concedes in his introduction, Lawrence no longer has this position in the British canon. Yet his reputation flourishes in East Asia, adding an unexpected global dimension to the fortunes of an author who, in his lifetime, resisted the kind of domestication later imposed by Leavis. Especially in the 1920s, Lawrence traveled widely, most notably to Italy, Australia, Mexico, and the U.S. Southwest, if not to Japan or Korea.

Many of this book’s twenty-five chapters are national or single-language studies of Lawrence’s relations to events like British involvement in World War I or to writers like Woolf, Forster, or one of the Williamses, William Carlos or Tennessee. Others, however, are intercultural, especially those in the first of the book’s four units, entitled “East and West.” In contrast to Bell, who lingers over Lawrence’s friendship with the artists and Western Buddhists Earl and Achsah Brewster, no fewer than three essays by Japanese scholars address Lawrence’s ambivalence toward Japan and the Japanese in the context of British abrogation of its alliance with Japan and of US restrictions on Asian immigration, both of which occurred in the early 1920s. Though Edward Said goes unmentioned, one thinks of his distinction between responses to Eastern cultures that focus on religious traditions versus ones that give priority to contemporary worldly realities. With

some overlap, all three essays deal with Lawrence's works in these years, but they draw different conclusions. Nobuyoshi Ota locates formal parallels between British political discourse in the wake of World War I and Lawrence's "leadership" novel *Aaron's Rod*, while Saburo Kuramochi sees reflections of Japan's rapid modernization in the shift from a relatively positive "primitivist" vision of Japan to fears of expansionism in Lawrence's characters of this period. Hidenaga Arai re-examines Lou Witt's identification of evil with the "core of Asia" in *St. Mawr*, written in the US in the wake of the anti-immigration laws, but holds that Lawrence's heroine ultimately resists nativist attitudes.

More specifically literary is Takeo Iida's comparison of Lawrence with the Japanese woman poet Akiko Yosano, on the basis of shared participation in global movements for sexual liberation and cosmic consciousness. Equally literary is the late Chiseki Asahi's comparison of Lawrence's best-known poem "Snake" with Japanese *haiku*. Asahi notes the more "dynamic" attitudes in Lawrence's poem and its readiness to "be challenged" by nature, whereas *haiku* tend to be "static" and simply to "enjoy nature" (138) but are more "highly disciplined" (142). Both essays recall Claudio Guillén's interest in East-West comparisons precisely in situations like these that do not depend on direct contact between the writers.

The remaining essay in this unit, by Jack Stewart on "Lawrence and Japanese Art," is doubly comparative by virtue of combining intercultural study with a *tour-de-force* of intermedial criticism. What stands out is Stewart's exactitude in demonstrating the influence of both Hokusai and Hiroshige, well-known in the West following the vogue for *japonisme*, on landscape descriptions in Lawrence's travel writings. Intermediality also marks Keith Cushman's study of Lawrence's hitherto ignored work with South African painter Jan Juta for the illustrated first edition of *Sea and Sardinia*. All of Juta's illustrations are handsomely reproduced in this volume, as are relevant pieces by Hokusai and Hiroshige. Interartistic in a broader, conceptual sense are Masako Hirai's sensitive close readings of *Women in Love*. They spotlight the transition from the ideals of England's arts-and-crafts movement to a harsh industrial vision driven home by the disturbing artist Loerke in the novel's final chapters, set in continental Europe. Hirai relates Loerke both to Bauhaus modernism in Germany and to the master plan for the London Underground, both of which envisioned a modern, industrial art that this novel, in following out a nightmarish imaginative logic, transforms into nihilistic images of doom.

Like Hirai in pursuing cross-cultural linkages within the West, Korean scholar See-Young Park contributes a fascinating essay on yet another Lawrence work of the early twenties, his Australian novel *Kangaroo*. Recalling remarks on Lawrence and an anti-tradition of "private thinkers" in Deleuze and Guattari's *Mille Plateaux* (263), Park relates both the novel's metaphysics and the experiment with fragmentary form in its "Bits" chapter back to Lawrence's work with S. S. Koteliansky in translating Lev Shestov, the Russian proto-existentialist. In the process Park explains the novel's criticism of Dostoevsky, offers an intriguing glimpse into Russian debates on Chekhov's modernism, and in general sheds light on Lawrence's affinities with Russian Silver-Age philosophy and a Western "revolt against Platonism" reaching back to Jakob Boehme.

To judge from the notes on the contributors, no scholar in this volume is a full-fledged comparatist. Yet bearing out Hans Saussy's observation in *Comparative Literature in an Age of Globalization* (see Hans Bertens' review in this issue, p. 31), this volume on a writer once monopolized by English studies provides an excellent example of how the lines have blurred between the single-nation-and-language research once typical of so many literature departments and the cross-cultural, multi-media, and interdisciplinary interests of comparatists.

John Burt Foster, Jr., *George Mason University* (USA).

COMPTES RENDUS DES REVUES / REVIEWS OF JOURNALS: Grande-Bretagne / Britain; Slovénie / Slovenia.

Comparative Critical Studies **(The Journal of the British Comparative Literature Association) 4.1 (2007): "Empire and Beyond," Guest ed. Elinor Shaffer. ISSN 1744-1854.**

Comparative Critical Studies has been published since 2004 by the British Comparative Literature Association as the successor to *New Comparison* (1986-2003) and to the annual *Comparative Criticism* (1979-2003). The present issue, guest edited by Elinor Shaffer, features a special section on "Empire and Beyond," as well a selection of other articles, and the winners of the 2006 John Dryden Translation Competition. The range of materials included is considerable: translations from Latin (Catullus), Japanese (Mukoda Kuniko), and German (Catrin Barnsteiner) rub shoulders with essays on modern aesthetic outlooks and engagements (Henry James and realism; Fritz Lang and expressionism; avant-garde modernisms in Europe and Latin America and the concept of the "fourth dimension") and these again with ideological readings of literary works in relation to the theme of empire. The range of materials also attests to the state of flux and transition in the discipline of literary studies and perhaps especially in the field of comparative literature today.

The section of essays on empire marks the most obvious departure from some of the previously dominant traditions of comparative scholarship. The works addressed in these essays—Lord Byron's *Childe Harold's Pilgrimage* (1812-18), Wilkie Collins's *The Moonstone* (1868), Virginia Woolf's *The Years* (1937), and Geoffrey Nicholson's *Bleeding London* (1997)—give this section an anglocentric and anglophone focus. That said, the essays do exemplify a trend in recent comparatist work toward a focus on transnational and transcultural dynamics within

and transecting a given cultural domain (here, the British world during the imperial and post-imperial eras) rather than consideration of a literary or cultural phenomenon in or across two or more national contexts. Such a shift in focus and method is responsive to the transformation in our conception of "national" cultures over the last few decades, partly in light of contemporary movements of population and partly in light of critiques of overly homogenizing conceptions of national cultures. But the shift carries with it the risk of losing sight of a geospatially- and linguistically-inflected sense of cultural diversity even as it attends to internal diversities within national cultures and to the transnational dynamics to which national cultures are subject. Even as these essays take up issues of empire and culture, therefore, their restricted anglophone horizon evokes the concern that Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak raised in *Death of a Discipline* (New York: Columbia UP, 2003), that a "cultural studies" orientation would risk losing hold of the best of the older traditions of comparative literature ("a care for language and idiom" and "the skill of reading closely in the original") just at the moment that the discipline has begun opening up to the wider world beyond Europe and the major European languages (5-6). To the extent that the essays in the section on "Empire and Beyond" offer analyses of imperial and post-imperial *metropolitan* discourses, they do not, of course, undertake to extend the focus of disciplinary attention to other domains—nor should they be expected to. (That project will be addressed more directly, it appears, in a forthcoming issue of *Comparative Critical Studies* dealing with novelization in the Islamic world.) But the contrast between the anglophone horizon of the essays in the section on empire and the multilingual reach of the essays and translations elsewhere in the volume is nonetheless striking.

The focus of these first essays exclusively on English literature does not, however, detract from their engagement with an inherently transnational and intercultural subject matter by way of their thematic concern with imperialism and globalization. Each essay deals, in fact, not only with Britain but with British images of and attitudes about "other" worlds: the Ottoman Balkans in Tatiana Kuzmic's essay on *Childe Harold*; India under British rule in Krishna Manavalli's essay on *The Moonstone*; Ireland from nationalist struggle to post-independence conservative consolidation in Lisa Weihman's essay on *The Years*; and London's own visible minorities and tourists from abroad, two groups that are sometimes confused with each other in an age of globalization, in Myles Chilton's essay on *Bleeding London*. Each essay discusses not only metropolitan British conceptions of and relations to these "other" worlds, but also the ways in which these "other" worlds are folded into the domestic spaces of Britain itself through the cultural contact zones created by empire and globalization. Taken together, these essays provide a stimulating set of perspectives on the cultural dynamics and geopolitical involvements transforming British society and self-conceptions across the modern age. They also provide a range of analytical approaches: I was particularly taken with the biographical contextualization provided by Weihman, who looks at Woolf's interest in the Irish scene and the issue of women and nationalism in relation to the composition history of *The Years*. Weihman offers a compelling reading of Woolf's effort to embody the full range of her concerns within the

confines of novelistic form as she struggles to revise "The Pargiters" manuscript (1933), eventually recasting it as *The Years* (1937) and taking up more discursive elaborations of her concerns in *Three Guineas* (1938).

The remaining critical essays in the volume, like Weihman's piece, gain from their efforts to situate the critic's textual analyses in relation to an account of the various authors' literary engagements and concerns. Their attention to an intermediate terrain of literary movements and aesthetic codes, between the individual literary work and broad sociocultural dynamics and issues, gives their analyses a richer grounding and more illuminating leverage on the issues they take up than is possible in a more direct counterposing of literary work and extra-literary world. Anne-Claire Le Reste's discussion of the competing conceptions of realism in Henry James and William Dean Howells; Richard Murphy's discussion of expressionist aesthetics in Weimar film and theater; and Willard Bohn's discussion of the literary appropriation (and transformation) of concepts of the "fourth dimension" borrowed from mathematics and physics by writers from France, Spain and Austria, Mexico, Argentina and Uruguay—all offer the reader informative and illuminating discussions of their topics. These pieces take up more traditional concerns of comparative criticism, and though they address time periods overlapping with those addressed by the essays in the first section, it is striking that they make little or no mention of the context of imperialism. In that absence, despite the strengths of these essays, one finds both the motive and the challenge for the kinds of work the opening section of the journal seeks to showcase.

Alok Yadav, *George Mason University* (USA).

***Primerjalna književnost* (*Comparative Literature*). Special Issue on Hybridizing Theory and Literature: On the Dialogue Between Theory and Literature. Vol. 29 (August 2006). 367 pp. ISSN 0351-1189.**

This special issue of *Comparative Literature* on textual hybrids, produced by the Slovene Comparative Literature Association, features fifteen essays in English, French, and Slovene that were presented in September 2005 at the third International Comparative Literature Colloquium in Slovenia. Since 2003, the Slovene Comparative Literature Association—in co-operation with the Slovene Writers' Association, the Department of Comparative Literature and Literary Theory at the University of Ljubljana, and the Scientific Research Centre of the Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts—has been organizing this colloquium, which is a part of the program of the International Literary Festival Vilenica. It takes place every September in a village called Lipica. In addition to the 2005 meeting, the symposia have addressed the following topics: Literature and Space: Spaces of Transgressiveness (2003), Kosovel: Between Ethics and Poetics (2004), History and its Literary Genres (2006), and Literature and Censorship: Who is Afraid of the Truth of Literature? (2007).

The essays in this issue of *Comparative Literature* illuminate, from a variety of theoretical and philosophical angles, the phenomenon of literary-theoretical hybrids. The element common to the featured articles, as explained in the editors'

Foreword, is the conviction that theory and literature have been evolving on the same historic trajectory ever since their emergence as disciplines. Moreover, thematizing hybridity elucidates an issue that has been in the foreground of contemporary narrative discourses for some time now. An international group of scholars and writers attempted to answer the question of whether literary works, which are such an easy prey for commodification at present, have lost "the transcendental aura of artistic imagination" or whether the interweaving of the poetic and of theoretical concepts has in fact enriched both theory and literary practice (185).

An elaborate overview of the "interaction between literature and theory from Romanticism to the Fin de Siècle" is given in Vanesa Matajc's essay. She believes that their interconnectedness stems from the self-conception of the Subject and the consciousness of time (historical vs. modern) (297). Romanticism, eluding objectivist conventions, brought about the theoretization of literary discourse and literarization of theoretical discourse. The latter is evident in Friedrich Schlegel's *Athenäum* fragments. A genesis for Schlegel's sense of the fragment is tracked in Jelka Kernev Štrajn's study, which calls that author's semi-literary texts a "transgressive genre," a paradoxical phenomenon—a hybrid genre—while simultaneously denoting an absence of any real genre. The fragment impugns the coherence of systems and also evokes an absent totality at the level of genre. Furthermore, Štrajn observes how hybrid discourses truly asserted themselves in the form of fragments in modernist and, even more, in postmodernist writing.

This idea is reiterated in Marko Juvan's essay, which offers another historical and typological overview of textual hybrids, stressing the postmodern. Postmodernity is interpreted as an umbrella term, incorporating both a "literarization of theory" (influenced by poststructuralism, e.g. Barthes) as well as a "theorization of literature" (influenced by postmodernism, e.g. Barth). Juvan sees literature and theory as historically determined and interdependent cultural entities.

Schlegel is once again the focus of attention in the essay by Vid Snoj, in which the author juxtaposes "Schlegel's 'Dialogue on Poetry' and Plato's 'Symposium' " and points to the historical understanding of differences between these two uses of "literary" dialogue in philosophical-theoretical discourse. Snoj finds similarities between Schlegel and Plato in composition and speech structure, as well as in authorial anonymity. He also asserts that, by giving poetry the distinctive position of mediating the Absolute, Schlegel's text creates a firm foundation for future dialogue between literature and theory (251). Novalis, like Schlegel, viewed a work of art as an embodiment of fusion, as a coalescence of fragments and an annihilation of all genre limitations, yet tried to reach the realization of full Being (the absolute self) by means of poetic language, as Alenka Jovanovski observes. She uses Novalis' *Hymns to the Night* to illustrate the real relation between poetry and philosophy and concludes that literary criticism should be aware of hierarchical structures in the methods it uses, for any hierarchical relation between theoretical thought and poetic imagination is inappropriate and jeopardizes the structure of modern subjectivity (275).

A contemporary parallel to Novalis' linkage of the relation between philosophy and poetry to the problem of self-consciousness and the structure of subjec-

tivity can be found in the theoretical and poetic discourses of Hélène Cixous. As analyzed by Metka Zupančič (University of Alabama), Cixous's prose and plays are not only a blend of feminism, philosophy, and psychoanalysis, but display also the author's biological, linguistic, and cultural hybridity.

Henri Michaux was a highly idiosyncratic poet, whose texts always dwelled in an ambiguous zone which was a "chaotic transcription of the fragments of his mind" (337). Through his unique hybrids he subjected the literary canon to radical criticism. Luca Bevilacqua's essay "Henri Michaux Opposing Literature" defines the poet's style as "counter-literature" (333). Less radical, yet no less innovative was Michaux's contemporary, one of the leading Russian Formalists, Viktor Shklovsky, who merged literature and criticism in his epistolary novel *Zoo or Letters not about Love.* In "Love Letters Between Theory and Literature," Erika Greber (University of Munich) sees Shklovsky's ingenious blurring of the borders between the documentary and the poetic epistolary style as a hallmark of modernity.

Probably the most intimate of the masters of modernity, Paul Valéry, is examined by Boris A. Novak, himself a poet as well as a comparatist, who, inspired by a fable from the Enlightenment, compares the relation between literature and theory to that between a tree and a vine growing around it. Novak expresses the need to fight against self-sufficient literary theory and the marginalization of poetry, and sees Valéry as a perfect personification of the synthesis between poetic creation and Cartesian *ratio* (229). An insight into the poet's world also appears in "The First Person Singular" by Milan Jesih (poet, translator, and playwright), who contemplates poetry's poetics, especially the relation between the biographical and the poetic self. He describes his writing as a "constant struggle with the first person singular" (225), and admits that he never sets himself any boundaries, no theme is ever taboo. Stephanos Stephanides, a poet and a professor of English at the University of Cyprus, takes his cue from Jesih and introduces the notion of a delinquent poet (e.g. Derek Walcott) who makes it possible for poetry and theory to coexist and who fights institutionalized hegemonies, including that of science, which, in Stephanides' view, "cannot predict the trajectory of the imagination" (216).

A philosophy professor at the University of Ljubljana, Marko Uršič argues against attempts to deconstruct Platonism, claiming that Plato's dialogues and myths are essential to his philosophy, for they interweave *logos* and *mythos*. His essay "On the Meaning of Literary Discourse in Philosophy" anticipates the further development of a textual hybrid that could be called "literary philosophy," a twofold or manifold discourse which can avoid lapsing into ideological fiction. Ivan Verč ("On Ethics and Its Translation into the Language of Literature") introduces a "moral" into the story of textual hybrids, focusing on the ethical dimension of literature, which was neglected in 20th-century literary studies, in contrast to the esthetic and cognitive functions.

In "Performing Reason: Narrative and Philosophy in Voltaire's '*L'homme aux quarante écus,*" Madeleine Kasten explores Voltaire's thought by analyzing his hybrid philosophical fable *A Man with Forty Silver Coins.* She interprets it as an allegorical realization of the Enlightenment project, seen by Voltaire as "a radically historical development" (255). Returning to Slovenia, Lado Kralj, a pro-

fessor of Comparative Literature from Ljubljana, investigates the diary genre as a problem for narratology, dissecting instances of literary criticism in the diaries of three Slovenian writers between World Wars I and II: Kosovel, Bartol, and Grum.

The aim of the 2006 special issue of *Comparative Literature* was to give impetus to a more general, yet suitably complex debate on the conception and theoretical understanding of hybrid discursive possibilities. It not only represents an essential contribution to the development of Slovenian literary studies but also addresses issues that are of clear interest to an international scholarly community.

Leonora Flis, *University of Ljubljana* (Slovenia).

CONGRÈS COMPARATISTES / COMPARATIVE LITERATURE CONFERENCES

Interdisciplinary Memory Symposium in Neurosciences and the Humanities

From October 31 to November 2, 2007, an international group of neuroscientists and humanists met at the Banbury Conference Center of the Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory on Long Island. The topic of the symposium, which had been conceived and organized by Suzanne Nalbantian, Professor of Comparative Literature at Long Island University, with assistance from Professor Paul Matthews of Imperial College, London, was the current state of research on memory in both the sciences and the humanities. Its aim was to encourage further contact across the disciplines and the development of new knowledge about the memory process based on neuroscience and the arts. The thirteen participants from the United States, Britain, France, and Germany included three comparatists along with neuroscientists working in medicine, psychology, and genetics as well as a historian of science, an art historian, a theater specialist, and a philosopher.

Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory is best known as a leader in biomedical research on cancer, genomics (including coordinating the human genome project), plant science, and, more recently, the neuroscience of learning and memory. The interdisciplinary memory symposium, on the scientific side, was intended to put researchers in touch with some of the complex ways in which memory has been understood and portrayed in various areas of the humanities as well as how literature, the visual arts, dramatic performance, and music depend on memory for some of their most characteristic effects. For the humanists, the meeting provided an excellent venue for learning about some of the many recent developments in understanding how memory works, based on an array of new experimental methods, new observational technologies, and the rapid accumulation of knowledge about how genes, proteins, and cells function.

With the advantage of a seminar-style format, the participants each had an hour to develop their topic and then to field questions. For comparatists, the papers of greatest immediate interest would probably be the ones centered on literature and the arts. Professor Nalbantian, the author of several books with a bearing on the conference topic, spoke on "Modernist Literature as a Laboratory for Memory Research." Drawing on modern and avant-garde writers from Proust, Woolf, and Joyce to Breton, Anaïs Nin, and Octavio Paz, she related their approaches to memory to a rich array of recent findings involving the function and anatomy of the brain. Among the topics that she explored were the encoding, storage, and retrieval of memories; the distinction between sensation and emotion; and most especially the interaction of memory with the imagination in the creative process. In another presentation that drew on modernity in the arts, art historian Linda Henderson retraced the rise and evolution of modern painting in figures like Matisse, the early Cubists, Boccioni, Kandinsky, and Dalí, giving special attention to the idealist bent in their assumptions about memory that meshed with the "ether" theory then current in physics.

Memory writing or, in an alternative formula, "memography" was the focus of presentations by theatre professor Attilio Favorini and by John Foster, the editor of *RL/LR*. Emphasizing that many effects in both narrative and drama demand an alert memory, Favorini drew from his forthcoming book *Memory in Play* to argue that when playwrights dramatize memory, they often parallel or even anticipate the new psychologies of their time. He illustrated this thesis by juxtaposing Ibsen's *When We Dead Awaken* with Freud, Tennessee Williams's *The Glass Menagerie* with the work of Ulrich Neisser and Jerome Bruner, and Harold Pinter's *Old Times* with Gerald Edelman's *The Remembered Present.* Foster turned to the role of memory in the literary memoir, which gives the impression of relative objectivity when compared to autobiography but which can convey complicated personal revelations once the resources of literary language are taken into account. Using specimen passages from William Butler Yeats, Vladimir Nabokov, and Mary McCarthy, Foster also assessed the accuracy of the kind of long-term memories found in memoirs and their susceptibility to contamination by the writer's current mood and interests. The ensuing discussion with neuroscientists showed that the treatment of memory in these memoirs diverged notably from their experiments both in the temporal intervals (twenty years versus overnight) and in the level of language usage (richly worded paragraphs versus single words).

From the vantage point of the comparative arts, David Hertz, a comparatist and musician, shared examples of the challenging and intricate patterns that occur in lyric poetry and music, in which the manipulation of time is crucial. The selected scientists covered a range of approaches to memory, involving genetics and epigenetic evolution, neuroimaging, dream analysis, and system modeling. The scientists, communicating primarily with skillful, well-illustrated Power Point presentations, described the physiological foundations for their theories of memory processing, opening up their territory to the attentive humanists.

The Banbury Center's excellent conference facilities, which included delicious meals in a pleasant dining room, spacious grounds with glorious autumn

foliage, and an open, congenial atmosphere unusual at scholarly meetings, fostered a lively spirit of communication and collaboration among the conferees. Humanists and scientists, whose paths rarely crossed at their home institutions, were surprised to find how interested they could become in each other's research. For comparatists, the Interdisciplinary Memory Symposium reaffirmed one of the animating principles of our field, the emphasis on what other disciplines can contribute to our understanding of the literary phenomenon. As several scientists at the symposium conceded, there is an enormous gap between the firing of individual neurons and (for example) a reader's complex response to a well-honed paragraph. Nonetheless, as neuroscience develops over the next few decades it promises to bring new insights as revolutionary as the ones resulting from the discovery of the double helix, which was displayed in several sculptures that dotted the grounds of the Cold Spring Harbor Lab. These insights will undoubtedly have a major impact on how we understand the functioning of literature and the arts, ranging beyond the complexities of memory itself to include the elements of visual and musical perception, the nature of language, and the creative process itself.

John Burt Foster, Jr., *George Mason University* (USA).
Suzanne Nalbantian, Author of *Memory in Literature: From Rousseau to Neuroscience.*

Références / Select Bibliography

Changeux, Jean-Pierre. *Neuronal Man: The Biology of Mind.* Laurence Garey, trans. Princeton NJ: Princeton U P, 1997.

Edelman, Gerald. *The Remembered Present: A Biological Theory of Consciousness*. New York: Basic Books, 1990.

Favorini, Attilio. *Memory in Play: From Aeschylus to Sam Shepard*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, forthcoming.

Foster, John Burt, Jr. *Nabokov's Art of Memory and Literary Modernism*. Princeton NJ: Princeton U P, 1993.

Henderson, Linda Dalrymple, and Bruce Clarke, eds. *From Energy to Information: Representation in Science and Technology, Literature, and Art*. Stanford CA: Stanford U P, 2002.

Matthews, Paul M., and Jeffrey McQuain, *The Bard on the Brain: Understanding the Mind through the Art of Shakespeare and the Science of Brain Imaging*. New York: Dana Press, 2003.

Nalbantian, Suzanne. *Aesthetic Autobiography: From Life to Art in Marcel Proust, James Joyce, Virginia Woolf, and Anaïs Nin*. New York: St. Martin's, 1994.

———. *Memory in Literature: From Rousseau to Neuroscience*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.

Patrick Colm Hogan and Contemporary Comparative Literature

Over the past three decades Patrick Colm Hogan, Professor of English and Comparative Literature at the University of Connecticut and the plenary speaker at the 2008 conference of the Southern Comparative Literature Association, has produced a body of work remarkable for its breadth, clarity, and intelligence.

Equally at home discussing classic Sanskrit aesthetics, deconstructive language theory, the relevance of Anglo-American analytical philosophy to critical theory, Bengali politics around 1900, social science epistemology, recent empirical research in neuroscience, Shakespearean tragedy, or the structural affinities of epics worldwide, Hogan has fashioned a new paradigm for comparative literature studies in the twenty-first century. His work not only contests the field's traditional Eurocentric orientations, but also provides flexible theoretical frameworks that authorize comparing writers and literatures whose lack of historical or geographical proximity might otherwise seem to reduce "comparison" to a description of the incommensurate or to throw us back upon dubious "West versus the rest" or "modernity versus traditionalism" critical clichés.

Instead, Hogan demonstrates how literatures that do not know of one another may nonetheless "speak" to each other. He thereby rescues "universalism" from conflation with "ethnocentrism," which in turn allows him to show how things often taken to be antagonistic—commitments to diversity and rationalism, anti-essentialism and empiricism, poetics and materialist critique—may in fact be complementary. Hogan thus opens new programs for comparative literary research by putting intellectual traditions in dialogue that have been conceptually, institutionally, and socially segregated, such as post-structuralism and empirical social science, ideology critique and neuroscience, or Chomsky's universal grammar and postcolonial theory.

Only Hogan's seven most recent books will be discussed here. In 2000 he returned to critical theory in *Philosophical Approaches to the Study of Literature* and extended his reconfiguration of comparative literature in *Colonialism and Cultural Identity*. The first book masterfully expounds the philosophical assumptions and implications of literary interpretation from ancient Greece to contemporary philosophy of science. It addresses not only the "usual suspects" in the Western tradition but also Sanskrit poetics (*dhvani* theory, or the theory of suggestion, and *rasa* theory, or the theory of sentiment) and classical Islamic aesthetics, where *takhyîl*, "mimetic imaginative creation," so captures audiences "that they forget reality and accept the creation, granting it what is sometimes called 'imaginative assent,' *takkayyul*" (31). Crucially, Hogan suggests that non-Western conceptuality may supplement and revise Western ideas. Classical Islamic aesthetics offers a "broader" understanding of the moral function of literature than pre-Romantic writers in the West, who tended to think of "inculcating particular ethical precepts"; by contrast, Arab writers "maintained that literature should operate to make us feel mercy and piety" (31). Indeed, non-Western thought has already reformed Western aesthetics in ways generally unacknowledged. The Sanskrit emphasis on "associative expertise" (38) and on emotion's role in activating associative memory (39) begins to enter the West via Burke and Romanticism, in part through the "Asian aesthetics" (48) that accompanied early translations of Hindu literature.

This book also continues Hogan's critique of what he calls the metaphysics of "linguistic autonomism" underlying deconstruction. Because language opens to embodiment and experience, it also opens to empiricism and rationality. Such openings make language ethically significant, which makes analytical philoso-

phy's concern with what may be responsibly affirmed and Wittgenstein-Austin investigations of language-in-use significant for literary theory. Specifically, linguistic competence is a function of similarities dwarfing differences. A child communicates by sharing principles called "universals," which are part of a "universal grammar" (a species-wide "genetic endowment"). Upon that foundation, Chomsky constructs a theory that "does not isolate speakers," but rather "posits a profound link among all speakers," a link not at "the level of national languages," as in Saussure, but at that "of shared humanity" (288). The relevance for the very possibility of non-Eurocentric comparative literature is clear. Moreover, cognitive science intersects with comparative literature because both are concerned with the relationship between shared communications that universal grammar allows and shared human embodiment. It is this shared participation in cognitive, emotional, affective patterns of meaning-making and ethical concern that makes, for example, the encoding of prototypes and the entailment of metaphors readable and salient across cultures.

The reconciliation of universalism in literary theory with a postcolonial ethics of recognition of difference is central to the model for comparative studies represented by *Colonialism and Cultural Identity*. Reading Anglophone literatures of India, Africa, and the Caribbean, Hogan addresses the colonialist traumatizing of cultural identity and how responses to such trauma relate to universalism seen as "a self-conscious effort to understand precisely what is common across different cultures—empirically, normatively, experientially" (xvi). While keeping different experiences of colonialism in view, Hogan draws on cognitive research to argue that because what is "normal and natural in indigenous cultures" is "almost always denigrated, in colonial culture," one's "reflective identity" may be demeaned while power relations force one to accept "colonial categories" and their "practical consequences" (10). Hogan notes that his analytical framework breaks with postcolonial theory's normative dependence on post-structuralism, a break justified by scrutinizing Homi Bhabha's use of Lacanian psychoanalysis to interpret colonialist politics.

Hogan's concluding readings probe the limits of the traumatized cultural identity framework itself. In *The Joys of Motherhood*, Buchi Emecheta depicts Nnu Ego's failure to act upon her perceptions of the need for women's solidarity and education as following from how much "our acts are not based so much on the beliefs we self-consciously affirm as on the beliefs we have internalized," a problem not unique to "colonized countries," but "repeated daily in every culture" (212). Similarly, Rabindranath Tagore's *Gora* moves through intense considerations of cultural identity to imply that, while "important," culture is not "primary. For the value we attach to a belief or practice does not determine relations of authority or economic domination; rather, those relations of political authority and domination determine the values we attach to ideas and traditions" (255). Finally, Attia Hosain's *Sunlight on a Broken Column* portrays cultural identity as "almost entirely contextual," largely "a function of economic conditions and economic interests" (257). Caught between European and Islamic-Persian traditions, the characters "all begin from a sense of alienation of hybridity" (293), but their efforts to

craft identities tend to imply that without pursuit of "economic justice," "culturalism can be little more than a mask for exploitation and self-interest" (301).

The problem of economic justice returns one to the problem of ideology, the theme of Hogan's 2001 book, *The Culture of Conformism*. A bold effort to speak at once to academic and popular audiences, and to integrate social science research with humanities analysis, the volume seeks to account for "the pervasiveness and tenacity of social consent" that "baffle[s]" American "[s]ocial critics and dissidents" (1). The work intersects with Marxist studies of socio-cultural impediments to enlightened class-consciousness, focusing on the contemporary American scene. Hogan cites empirical studies indicating that "contrasting oneself with those in some hierarchy . . . is extremely important to one's self-image" (49), that explicit ethical ideas have little effect upon conduct (52), and that people tend "to infer properties of individuals from their social roles" (55). Moreover, common or stereotypical ideas or images, even when not believed, often structure perception and judgment: "if a black nationalist affirms black culture, the (repudiated) white prestige standard is always there" (122). Indeed, the very way that prototypes and exempla shape categorization reinforces the hold of dominant ideas.

Here Hogan may have written himself into a corner. On the one hand, his study belongs to the Marxist tradition of analyzing impediments to class consciousness; on the other, it presents cognitive and social psychological research strongly suggesting that the human mind was long ago hardwired under hunter-gatherer conditions in ways not amenable to usual Marxist prescriptions. Such problematics and their relationship to literature lie at the heart of Hogan's three major works of 2003—the collection *Rabindranath Tagore: Universality and Tradition*, co-edited with his wife, the comparatist and postcolonial scholar Lalita Pandit, and *Cognitive Science, Literature, and the Arts* and *The Mind and Its Stories*.

With Tagore, Hogan confronts a towering figure who embraced both Western and Indian culture in the service of a "universalism that does not impose dogma, but that fosters a sense of common humanity across the many particularisms that define our daily lives" (11). Tagore exemplifies classical Sanskrit aesthetics' ideal of "the *sahrdaya*, the spectator who listens 'with heart' (*sa-hrdaya*), sharing the feelings of characters and of the creator" (11-12). Such an ideal is in turn rooted in the interplay, or tension, among three dharmas—one keyed to family, another to caste, but the third, "*sādhāranadharma* or 'universal dharma,' . . . is binding on all" (14). The duties that follow from *sādhāranadharma* are preeminently "truth," refusing "to conceal what should be brought out into the open," and "*ahimsā*," non-violence or "restraint from the infliction of pain" (15). Thus, commitment to an aesthetic of realism and social justice and commitment to ethical universalism follow from a traditionalism that is also a modernism, yielding a "vision," especially in art, "of a compassionate ethico-politics" (17), whose implications Hogan explores in "*Gora,* Jane Austen, and the Slaves of Indigo." Pointing out that *Gora* is a "corrective revision" (178-79) of *Mansfield Park*, Hogan notes that Tagore's novel also corrects the easy kind of anticolonialism that associates exploitation exclusively with the modern West.

To delineate how literature may further "compassionate ethico-politics"

through comparatism like Tagore's requires a literary theory responsive to neurobiological as well as material historical research. Hogan's account of cognitive critical theory offers "a guide for humanists" that explains in accessible language how empirical work in cognitive science has disclosed practical entwinements of cognition, emotions, and ethics that place what literature and the arts do at the heart of being human. Hogan distinguishes five levels of cognitive analysis, each correlated to distinct research fields, beginning with subjective/intentional experience (and the folk psychology normatively employed to describe such experience). He then moves to representationalism (study of encoding, memory, schemas, association, and prototypes) and connectionism (efforts to build simplified models of neural networks and to understand their mechanism), before concluding with neurobiology (investigation of neural activity) and evolution (study of evolutionary biology—as in "older" and "younger" parts of the brain—and evolutionary psychology). To bring home the significance of such work for literary study, Hogan devotes a chapter to the author and the question of creativity, two chapters to the text (the first on information processing, the second on narrative structure), and one to the reader's affective-evaluative experience. Hogan notes how both representationalist and connectionist frameworks help explain how "[c]reative, thus nonstandard or non-proximate associations in one art form or tradition may be drawn from another art form or tradition" (69), as when Goethe incorporated "particular instances of Indic literature" into *Faust* (71). So in processing a literary text, one relies upon lexical and metaphorical encodings that structure everyday intelligibility, but literature raises such patterns to a level of self-conscious interrogation (101); moreover, literary communication cultivates intense forms of "conceptual blending." When Cordelia declares, "I cannot heave / My heart into my mouth": her mouth is construed as "a blended space"—at once a physical space containing something and the site of speech; similarly, her heart becomes at once a source of choking and the home of feeling (113).

To explore literature's effect on readers, Hogan follows Keith Oatley in suggesting that emotions communicate on-going appraisals of one's success in attaining goals. Often readers identify straightforwardly with characters' goals, in part because literary representation evokes or "primes" memories and associations attached to certain emotions, as Sanskrit *dhvani* theory suggests (155-65). Indeed, emotional activation focuses attention, and—crucially—makes it nearly impossible to ignore certain sensory impressions. We experience "empathy" for characters we know do not exist because impressions of distress, danger, sorrow activate pre-cortical brain areas with an immediacy "too crude" (187) for questions of existence/non-existence or relevance to self (egocentrism) to intervene. We imagine another's experience viscerally before we "reason" that, since we are safe, no emotional unease is warranted.

Just as Hogan uses Chomskyan linguistics to argue that the potential for shared communication is an innate cognitive endowment, so he argues that cognitive science also reveals empathy to be innate and universally shared. While viewing both as effects of biological evolution, Hogan is wary of evolutionary psychology, noting the lack of any fossil record for behavior, so explanations from

evolution may well be tendentious, and in practice are often politically jarring (197-202). Without disputing the need for caution, we may note that Hogan's account of human susceptibility to conformism invites evolutionary psychological analysis and that his third book of 2003, *The Mind and Its Stories*, suggests that literature both speaks to innate empathetic propensities and meditates upon the practical necessity of their curtailment, at least in pre-modern contexts.

Hogan stresses that cross-cultural study of narrative requires the trans-cultural study of emotion since "[s]tories in every culture both depict and inspire emotion" (1). To compare how diverse literatures engage emotions, one must chart their distinctive reworking of "literary universals" (7), defined not in essentialist or ethnocentric terms but as "properties and relations found across a range of literary traditions" (17). Drawing on a remarkable array of examples from India, China, Japan, the Near East, and the West, Hogan puts forward a set of thematic and formal features as incidences of universals, some drawn from "the abstraction of secondary principles, such as the maximization of unobtrusive patterning," others from "a cognitive (or other) structure or process, such as the capacity of working memory" (44). Returning to *dhvani* and *rasa*, and linking both with empirical cognitive studies, Hogan suggests that literatures worldwide employ lexical features that activate memory and association, structuring cognition through schemas, prototypes, and exemplars—modes of patterning that enable our emotions to become engaged with "the salience, detail, particularity, and other aspects" of intentional objects (70).

Once patterns are identified, cross-cultural variations come into view, and thus questioning of their significance and implications becomes possible. Hogan identifies in epic what he calls "the epilogue of suffering," involving "a turn from the triumph of the hero to the sorrow of those who have been defeated" (123). The end of *The Iliad* is the West's *locus classicus*, but the same pattern appears in the Japanese *Tale of the Heike*, the *Mahābhārata*, the Mwindo Epic of the Nyanga (Congo), and the Turkish *Book of Dede Korkut*. In each case, identification with an in-group's triumph is complicated, ethically, by identification with the suffering of the defeated, for the works reflect tension between an ethics of "protecting one's group—nation, religion, family, and so on," and one of "comforting and sustaining the miserable" (136). This tension corresponds in Hindu contexts to *ksatriyadharma* (warrior's duty) versus *sādhāranadharma* (universal duty to all humans, even all living things) (137). Notably, in epics worldwide "[h]orror" seems "an inevitable concomitant of individual or group domination," for "traumas of heroism are akin to killing one's own son or father, for they *are* a matter of killing someone's son or father" (150-51).

Prototypic narrative patterns are also implicit in lyrical poetry, which functions as miniature or implied narrative. Hogan elaborates a research program that sees "the novels of Jane Austen or . . . the devotional lyrics of the women bhakti poets" as variants of romantic tragi-comedy; similarly, sacrificial tragi-comedies, like the Mayan *Cuceb*, the Kashmiri *Rājatarangin̄ī,* or the story of Jesus, become variations on heroic tragi-comedy. Structurally, prototypic narratives share telic plots, empathetic and non-empathetic agents, comparative causal sequences, and goals.

Hogan concludes by emphasizing the analogy between his project and Chomsky's.

In his most recent book, *Empire and Poetic Voice*, Hogan returns to postcolonial theory in order to separate "literary identity" from "ethnicity or any other categorical identity" (18). He argues that Anita Desai's *Baumgartner's Bombay*, in "revising *Heart of Darkness*, seems not only to repeat but to further what is, under one interpretation, its dehumanizing characterization of non-White people" (45). Similarly George Lamming's *Water with Berries*, while rewriting "two metropolitan plays [and] one settler novel" (50), follows its sources so closely that it does more to "reenforce negative stereotypes of non-White men" than the works it sets out to critique (50). By contrast, Tagore's *The Home and the World* "revises a work of unsurpassed importance in the Hindu literary tradition [the *Rāmāyana*], and, in doing this, it follows one common practice within that tradition as well" (55), as Tulasidasa's and Bhavabhūtti's retellings attest. In its relation to indigenous traditions, Tagore posits two futures for India, either "hypocritical and egoistic Hindu nationalism, pervaded by mâyâ, or . . . universal dharma and renunciation, pregnant with truth" (88), alternatives that function in part as "a corrective revision" of a "foundational epic" (90).

Hogan concludes with a plea that postcolonial theory move beyond its tendency to police what academic criticism can acknowledge non-Western writers to be saying: "postcolonial writers do not necessarily write back to the metropolis," indeed, "sometimes they accept or even extend colonialist attitudes" (234). Moreover, "no literary work is bound to any one culture or tradition" because—for reasons Hogan's heterogeneous scholarship elaborates—"all our works are, actually or potentially, part of every tradition" (235).

In breadth, diversity, and quality, Patrick Hogan's work is unequalled. In its rehabilitation of empiricism and rationalism, its trenchant critique of post-structuralism, its opening of theory and humanities scholarship to Chomskyan linguistics and cognitive science, its reformulation of postcolonial theory, its insistence upon the agency and intellectual power of non-Western thought and culture, its tough-mindedness about species-wide human dispositions, its fusion of ethical passion and scholarly rigor, Hogan's writings set a series of challenges for any future comparative literature while presenting models of what such a new comparatism might be able to achieve.

Donald R. Wehrs, *Auburn University* (USA).

Références / Works Cited

Hogan, Patrick Colm. *Cognitive Science, Literature, and the Arts: A Guide for Humanists*. New York/London: Routledge, 2003.

———. *Colonialism and Cultural Identity: Crises of Tradition in the Anglophone Literatures of India, Africa, and the Caribbean*. Albany: State U of New York P, 2000.

———. *The Culture of Conformism: Understanding Social Consent*. Durham/London: Duke U P, 2001.

———. *Empire and Poetic Voice: Cognitive and Cultural Studies of Literary Tradition and Colonialism*. Albany: State U of New York P, 2004.

———. *The Mind and Its Stories: Narrative Universals and Human Emotion*. Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 2003.

———. *Philosophical Approaches to the Study of Literature*. Gainesville: U P of Florida, 2000.

Hogan, Patrick Colm and Lalita Pandit, eds. *Rabindranath Tagore: Universality and Tradition*. Madison, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson U P, 2003.

NOTICES BIO-BIBLIOGRAPHIQUES SUR LES COLLABORATEURS / BIO-BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

Abdulla Al-Dabbagh is Professor of English Literature and Chair of the English Literature Department at the United Arab Emirates University. His teaching and research interests include literary criticism and theory, Shakespeare, comparative literature, and cultural studies. He is the author of "Modern Universalism and the Myth of Westernness," *The Comparatist* 27 (2003) 5-20; "Going Native: Conrad and Postcolonial Discourse," *English Language Notes* 29.4 (June 2002) 71-88; and "The Oriental Framework of *Romeo and Juliet*," *The Comparatist*, 24 (2000) 64-82. The last essay was reprinted in *Shakespearean Criticism* 65 (2002) 214-223.

Nina Berman is Associate Professor of Comparative Studies and German Studies at The Ohio State University/US. She is the author of *Orientalismus, Kolonialismus und Moderne: Zum Bild des Orients in der deutschsprachigen Kultur um 1900* (Metzler, 1997) and *Impossible Missions? German Economic, Military, and Humanitarian Efforts in Africa* (U of Nebraska P, 2004). She is currently working on a manuscript about German views of and material relations to the Middle East.

Hans Bertens is Distinguished Professor of the Humanities at Utrecht University/The Netherlands. His books include *The Idea of the Postmodern: A History* (Routledge, 1995) and *Contemporary American Crime Fiction* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2001; with Theo D'haen). His most recent book is *Literary Theory: The Basics* (Routledge, 2007).

Joana Bosak de Figueiredo is Professor of Comparative Literature and Literary Studies at Rio Grande do Sul's Federal University/Brazil. She is the author of "Fronteiras no Prata: guachos e sombras—a identidade gaúcha e a literatura de Barbosa Lessa e Ricardo Güiraldes" in *Cone Sul—fluxos, representações e percepções*, L.Chiappini e M.H. Martins, eds.; "Entre el fracaso y la traición: una mirada imperfecta hacia la tradicción" in *Traducción y di-ferencia*, Assumpta Camps, ed.; and "Barbosa Lessa, Ricardo Güiraldes e Valery Larbaud: realizadores de travessias entre a história e a literature" in *Transcriações*, Tania Franco Carvalhal, ed.

Benjamin Boysen is Associate Professor of Literature at the University of Southern Denmark (Odense). He is author of the Danish book, *At være en anden: Essays om intethed, ambivalens og fremmedhed hos Francesco Petrarca og William Shakespeare* (*Being another: Essays on nothingness, ambivalence, and alterity in Petrarch and Shakespeare, Syddansk Universitetsforlag* 2007). He is working on a monograph, *James Joyce and the Ethics of Love* (to appear in English), and has published numerous articles on Joyce in different international journals.

Stefan Buchenberger is Foreign Lecturer for German and German literature at Nara Women's University in Japan. He is the author of *Downfall of Two Families: Tanizaki Junichiro's* Sasame Yuki *and Thomas Mann's* Buddenbrooks: *A Comparaive Study* (Munich: Herbert Utz Verlag, 2004), published in German. He has also written the article on Graphic Mystery Novels in Salem Press's *Critical Survey of Mystery and Detective Fiction* (Revised Edition, 2008) and other articles on Mystery and Graphic Fiction.

Arturo Casas is Professor of Literary Theory and Comparative Literature at the University of Santiago de Compostela/Spain. He is the author of fifteen books and numerous articles on Galician and Spanish literatures, modern aesthetics, the theory of the poem, and the methodology of literary history. His most recent books are *La descripción literaria* (Episteme, 1999), *Elementos de Crítica literaria* (as editor, Xerais, 2004), and *DiTerLi. Base de datos do Dicionario de Termos Literarios* (as a co-author, Centro Ramón Piñeiro, 2006) [http://web.usc.es/~tlcasas].

Marcel Cornis-Pope is Professor of English and Director of the interdisciplinary Ph.D. program in Media, Art, and Text, at Virginia Commonwealth University/US. His publications include *Anatomy of the White Whale: A Poetics of the American Symbolic Romance* (Univers Press, Bucharest), *Hermeneutic Desire and Critical Rewriting: Narrative Interpretation in the Wake of Poststructuralism* (Macmillan, 1992), and *Narrative Innovation and Cultural Rewriting in the Cold War Era and After* (Palgrave, 2001). With John Neubauer he co-edited the multi-volume *History of the Literary Cultures of East-Central Europe* (John Benjamins, 2004-2009).

Eugene Chen Eoyang is Chair Professor of Humanities and Director of General Education at Lingnan University/Hong Kong, and also Professor Emeritus of Comparative Literature and of East Asian Languages & Cultures at Indiana University/US. He was a co-founder of the journal, *Chinese Literature: Essays, Articles, Reviews* (CLEAR), and numbers among his publications, *The Transparent Eye: Reflections on Translation, Chinese Literature, and Comparative Poetics* (Hawaii, 1993); *Coat of Many Colors: Reflections on Diversity by a Minority of One* (Beacon, 1995); *'Borrowed Plumage': Polemical Essays on Translation* (Rodopi, 2003); and *Two-Way Mirrors: Cross-Cultural Studies on Glocalization* (Lexington, 2007). His translations have appeared in *Sunflower Splendor: Three Thousand Years of Chinese Poetry* (Anchor Books, 1975), Irving Lo and Wu-chi Liu, eds., and *The Selected Poems of Ai Qing* (Foreign Languages Press, Indiana UP, 1982).

Dorothy Figueira is Professor of Comparative Literature at the University of Georgia/US. She is Vice-President of the AILC/ICLA and editor of *The Comparatist*. She is the author of *Translating the Orient;* of *The Exotic: A Decadent Quest;* of *Aryans, Jews and Brahmins;* and of *Otherwise Occupied: Theories and Pedagogies of Alterity* (forthcoming from SUNY Press).

Leonora Flis holds degrees in English and in Comparative Literature and is a doctoral candidate in American Literature at the University of Ljubljana/Slovenia. Her dissertation, on contemporary American documentary narratives in the context of Postmodernity, also considers parallels in Slovenia. She works as a translator and journalist/reviewer, and has published in both Slovenian and international journals.

John Burt Foster, Jr., the editor of *Recherche Littéraire / Literary Research*, is University Professor in English and Cultural Studies at George Mason University/US. He holds a doctorate in comparative literature from Yale and has published widely in nineteenth- and twentieth-century literature and thought, including *Heirs to Dionysus: A Nietzschean Current in Literary Modernism* (1981) and *Nabokov's Art of Memory and Literary Modernism* (1993). He has also co-edited *Thresholds of Western Culture: Identity, Postcoloniality, Transnationalism* (2003) and *Dramas of Culture: Theory, History, Performance* (forthcoming).

Annie Gagiano has recently changed status to Emeritus Professor in the Department of English at the University of Stellenbosch (Republic of South Africa), where she will continue her research in postcolonial studies. She is the author of *Achebe, Head, Marechera: On Power and Change in Africa* (Lynne Rienner, 2000) and of numerous articles on Anglophone African writing.

Gerald Gillespie is an Emeritus Professor at Stanford University/US, in the Division of Literatures, Cultures, Languages. His publications include *Romantic Prose Fiction*, edited with Manfred Engel and Bernard Dieterle (2008); *Echoland: Readings from Humanism to Postmodernism* (2006); *Proust, Mann, Joyce in the Modernist Context* (2004); *By Way of Comparison: Reflections on the Theory and Practice of Comparative Literature* (2003); and *Mallarmé in the Twentieth Century*, edited with R. G. Cohn (1998).

Mitizi Gomes est docteur en Littérature Comparée par l'Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul/Brasil. Aujourd'hui est-elle professeur de la Littérature à l'Universidade Federal do Rio Grande (Brasil) et elle fait des recherches sur les études en traduction et les rélations entre les systèmes littéraires latinos-américains (Brésil/Uruguay/Argentine). Elle a publié des articles sur la réception de l'oeuvre *Os Sertões,* de Euclides da Cunha, en Argentine et sur des aspects de la traduction de ce texte-ci pour l'espagnol.

Paulo Horta is Assistant Professor of World Literature at Simon Fraser University in Vancouver, British Columbia/Canada. He is the first faculty member of the program, which he designed, and is the author of literary translations and of articles on translation, cosmopolitanism, and multiculturalism.

Styliani Kokkali a effectué des études universitaires en langue et littérature anglaises à l'université d'Athènes en Grèce ainsi que des études post-universitaires en littérature comparée à l'université de Montréal au Canada. Actuellement elle est chercheuse indépendante et parmi ses intérêts de recherche comptent la philosophie féministe, le surréalisme anglais, français, grec et hispanique, la théorie du cinéma ainsi que le cinéma grec.

Elaine Martin is Professor of German and Director of the Program in Comparative and World Literature at the University of Alabama/US. She has published in the areas of literary adaptation, Romanticism, German women writers and World War II, and comparative literature and the humanities. She is currently working on a book about terrorism and culture.

Brian McHale was for many years an editor of *Poetics Today* and is now Distinguished Humanities Professor of English at The Ohio State University/US, and a founding member of OSU's Project Narrative initiative. He is the author of *Postmodernist Fiction* (1987), *Constructing Postmodernism* (1992), and *The Obligation toward the Difficult Whole: Postmodernist Long Poems* (2004). With Randall Stevenson he co-edited *The Edinburgh Companion to Twentieth-Century Literatures in English* (2006), and with David Herman and James Phelan, *Options for Teaching Narrative Theory*, forthcoming from MLA Press.

Ileana Alexandra Orlich is Professor of Romanian Studies and Comparative Literature in the School of International Letters and Cultures at the Arizona State University/US. She is the author of *Silent Bodies: (Re)Discovering the Women of Romanian Short Fiction* (Columbia UP, 2002) and *Articulating Gender, Narrating the Nation: Allegorical Femininity in Romanian Fiction* (Columbia UP, 2004). For ten years she has directed the ASU summer study program to Romania and Central Europe that takes students to six capitals and offers courses focused on the cultural interactions of the Austro-Hungarian, Ottoman, and Czarist empires.

Elizabeth Richmond-Garza is Distinguished Teaching Associate Professor of English and director of the Comparative Literature program at the University of Texas, Austin/US. She is also Secretary-Treasurer of the American Comparative Literature Association and author of *Forgotten Cites/Sights: Interpretation and the Power of Classical Citation in Renaissance English Tragedy* (1994). She has also written on topics like Orientalism, the Gothic, and literary theory and is currently finishing a study of decadent culture at the end of the nineteenth century.

Steven P. Sondrup is Professor of Comparative Literature at Brigham Young University/US. He is one of the secretaries general of the AILC/ICLA and editor of *Scandinavian Studies*. Recent scholarly publications have been on romanticism, literary historiography, modernism, and philosophy and literature.

Maarten Van Delden is Associate Professor of Spanish and Portuguese at the University of Southern California/US. He is the author of *Carlos Fuentes, Mexico, and Modernity* (Vanderbilt UP, 1998), and co-author (with Yvon Grenier) of *Gunshots at the Fiesta: Literature and Politics in Latin America* (forthcoming from Vanderbilt).

Lisa R. Van Zwoll is Instructor of French at the United States Air Force Academy. She is currently working on a manuscript focused on the memoir of the Marquise de La Tour du Pin de Gouvernet.

Aleš Vaupotič, MA, is a Ph.D. student in Comparative Literature at the University of Ljubljana/Slovenia. He is a member of the executive committees of the European Network for Comparative Literary Studies and the Slovenian Comparative Literature Association. His current research focuses on the theory of realist literature and on literature in new media.

Donald R. Wehrs is Associate Professor of English at Auburn University/US, where he teaches courses in comparative and postcolonial literatures and critical theory. He is the author of *African Feminist Fiction and Indigenous Values* (2001), *Pre-Colonial Africa in Colonial African Narratives* (2008), and *Islam, Ethics, Revolt: Politics and Piety in Francophone West African and Maghreb Narrative* (also 2008).

Mary Ann Frese Witt is Professor Emerita of French, Italian, and Comparative Literature at North Carolina State University/US. Her recent books include *The Search for Modern Tragedy: Aesthetic Fascism in Italy and France* (Cornell UP, 2001) and (as editor and contributor) *Nietzsche and the Rebirth of the Tragic* (Fairleigh Dickinson UP, 2007).

Alok Yadav is Associate Professor of English at George Mason University/US He is the author of *Before the Empire of English: Literature, Provinciality, and Nationalism in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2004).

Evi Zemanek is Assistant Professor (Wissenschaftliche Assistentin) of Comparative Literature and German at the Friedrich-Alexander-Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg. She received her Ph.D. from the University of Munich for a dissertation on “Poetische Porträts,” is co-editor of *Literatur der Jahrtausendwende* (Transcript Press, 2008), and has published *T.S. Eliot und Ezra Pound im Dialog mit Dante* (Meidenbauer Press, 2008).

AVIS AUX COLLABORATEURS PROSPECTIFS

Recherche Littéraire / Literary Research

En tant que publication de l'Association Internationale de la Littérature Comparée, *Recherche Littéraire / Literary Research* a comme but de communiquer aux comparatistes du monde entier les développements récents de notre discipline. Dans ce but la revue publie les comptes rendus des livres notables sur les sujets comparatistes, les nouvelles des congrès professionels et d'autres événements d'une importance significative pour nos membres, et de temps en temps les prises de position sur des problèmes qui pourraient apporter beaucoup d'intérêt. On devrait souligner que *RL / LR* ne publie pas de recherche littéraire comparée.

Les comptes rendus sont typiquement écrits ou en français ou en anglais, les deux langues officielles de l'AILC. Néanmoins, on pourrait faire quelques exceptions étant donné les limites des ressources à la disposition du rédacteur. En général, un compte rendu prendra une des formes suivantes: des annonces brèves de 500 à 800 mots pour les livres courts ou rélativement spécialisés, des comptes rendus proprement dits de 1200 à 1500 mots pour les livres plus longs ou d'une portée plus ambitieuse, ou des essais de 2000 à 3000 mots portant ou sur un seul ouvrage d'un grand mérite ou sur plusieurs ouvrages qu'on pourrait traiter ensemble. En vue de l'importance des ouvrages collectifs pour accomplir une étude assez large de certains sujets comparatistes, *RL / LR* acceptera les comptes rendus de recueils d'essais bien organisés, y compris les numéros spéciaux des revues. Nous sommes prêts à publier les comptes rendus un peu plus longs de ces textes quand la situation le demande.

Ceux qui voudraient écrire un compte rendu pour la revue sont priés de considérer les besoins d'un public international de comparatistes. Par conséquent les comptes rendus devraient être lisibles, informatifs, et judicieux. Il faut qu'ils soient lisibles pour qu'ils puissent être accessibles aux lecteurs comparatistes en général, non pas seulement aux spécialistes qui sont en train de faire la recherche sur le même sujet. Il faut que les comptes rendus soient informatifs parce que bien que les comparatistes s'intéressent tous aux belles lettres comprises dans un sens étendu et interculturel, ils ne partagent pas nécessairement de sujet particulier en commun. Les comptes rendus devraient être judicieux parce que, afin d'atteindre une compréhension plus approfondie de leurs études, nos lecteurs ont besoin d'une discussion raisonnée et bien réfléchie de l'oeuvre en question, qui explique (par exemple) comment un telle oeuvre traite de son sujet, ce qu'elle ajoute à notre connaissance, et s'il reste des questions importantes qui rendraient nécessaire une nouvelle étude.

Avant de commencer à écrire un compte rendu, nos collaborateurs prospectifs sont priés de communiquer leurs projets au rédacteur, à <recherch@gmu.edu>. Veuillez envoyer le compte rendu lui-même comme message en fichier annexe à la même adresse, sans format supplémentaire qui doit être enlevé lors de la préparation du document pour l'imprimerie. Au cas où il serait impossible de communiquer électroniquement, on pourrait m'écrire à l'adresse suivante: J.B. Foster, Editor *RL / LR*, MSN 3E4 (English Dept.), George Mason University, Fairfax VA 22030-4444, USA.

[For English, please see the next page.]

INFORMATION FOR PROSPECTIVE CONTRIBUTORS
Recherche Littéraire / Literary Research

As a publication of the International Comparative Literature Association, *Recherche Littéraire / Literary Research* has the mission of informing comparative literature scholars worldwide of recent contributions to the field. To that end it publishes reviews of noteworthy books on comparative topics, information about events of major significance for comparatists, and occasional position papers on issues of interest to the field. It should be emphasized that *RL / LR* does *not* publish comparative literary scholarship.

Reviews are normally written in French or English, the two official languages of the ICLA, though exceptions will be considered within the limits allowed by the editor's resources. Reviews generally fall into one of the following three categories: book notes of 500 to 800 words for short or relatively specialized works, reviews of 1200 to 1500 words for longer works of greater scope, and review essays of 2000 to 3000 words for a work of major significance for the field or for joint treatment of several related works. Given the importance of collaborative work in promoting broad-based comparative scholarship, *RL / LR* does review well-conceived edited volumes, including special issues of journals, and will publish somewhat longer reviews of such scholarship when the situation merits.

Contributors need to take the needs of an international audience of comparatists into account. Reviews should therefore be readable, informative, and judicious. They need to be readable so that they will be accessible to a general comparatist readership, not just to specialists who are researching that specific topic. Reviews have to be informative, because although comparatists share a wide, cross-cultural interest in the verbal arts, they have no specific subject matter in common. Reviews should be judicious, because to gain a broader sense of their field our readers need a reasoned, thoughtful evaluation of (for example) how the work in question approaches its subject, what it adds to our knowledge, and whether important issues remain that would repay further study.

Before undertaking to write a review, prospective contributors should inform the editor of their plans at <recherch@gmu.edu>. The reviews themselves should be sent as e-mail attachments to the same address, without extra formatting of the kind that must be found and removed during the publication process. Should e-mail contact be impossible, address all correspondence to J.B. Foster, Editor *RL / LR*, MSN 3E4 (English Dept.), George Mason University, Fairfax VA 22030-4444, USA.

[Veuillez voir la page précédente pour le texte français.]

Call for Submissions for the Anna Balakian Prize

The Anna Balakian Prize, consisting of US$1000, is awarded to promote scholarly research by younger comparatists and to honor the memory of Professor Anna Balakian. It will be awarded at the 2010 ICLA Congress in Daegu (Taegu), South Korea for an outstanding first book in comparative literature studies by a single author under 40 years of age. Books published from January 2007 through December 2009 will be eligible.

Rules for submitting books:

1. Books can be submitted if they are a first book in comparative literature studies by an author under forty years of age at the time of the book's publication.

2. The books must have a literary-critical approach that deals with such areas as the following through a comparative optic: literary aesthetics or poetics, literature and the arts, literary movements, historical or biographical influences on literature, cross-fertilization of regional or national literatures, or literary criticism on an international plane. Studies that are primarily ethnic or gender-related or that are restricted to a single literature are not eligible for the Prize. Electronic publications are excluded.

3. Books that are not in English or French, the official languages of the ICLA, should be accompanied by a summary in English or French of at least 2000 words.

4. The author may propose him- or herself for the Prize, preferably with a recommendation by a former dissertation or research supervisor or by a senior comparatist. Any member of the ICLA may also propose candidates for the Prize. However, it is exclusively the responsibility of the author to provide Professor Steven P. Sondrup, Secretary of the ICLA, with three copies of the book—or one copy and two photocopies of it—as well as three copies of the accompanying letter and of the recommendation before January 2, 2010. In principle the books will not be returned; they will be donated to a library or be given another appropriate destination. The author should also provide a permanent mailing address as well as an email address to the ICLA Secretary. Professor Sondrup's mailing address is Box 26118, Brigham Young University, Provo, UT 84602-6118, USA

5. The winner will be invited to attend the ICLA Congress in order to receive the award. Travel costs will be reimbursed by the ICLA Treasurer up to a maximum of US$1000.