virtue of being elliptic or laconic, it is equally certain that a teacher should avoid the appearance of encouraging sloth or banality.

Also, the book is marked by a lack of proportion. Gabrielle Roy and Marie-Claire Blais undoubtedly deserve the 18 and 12 pages they are granted, respectively; but Hubert Aquin, an undisputed major figure of contemporary world literature, is handled in just more than 2 pages, and Réjean Ducharme, in 1 paragraph! The brevity of the latter's treatment is particularly mystifying in view of Urbas's apparent aversion to compression elsewhere (her comments on Claire Martin, for example) and of her own admission that Ducharme is "acknowledged both at home and in France to be one of the significant writers of his generation" (p. 119). A mischievous reader might infer that the difficulties in discerning the highly philosophical, learned, ironic, and allusive Ducharme's *sententia* and plot line make it inappropriate material for literary surveys or undergraduate reading, and, therefore, for an understanding of "the story of French-Canadian literature."

There is yet a more serious objection to Professor Urbas's guide: its lack of intellectual discrimination. This is revealed most obviously in some of the research topics appended to each chapter. I offer but two examples: referring to *The Outlander,* she asks the student to comment on the statement that "Germaine Guèvremont reveals an intimate understanding of nature, the seasons, and the countryside around Sorel" (p. 31); and, again, she invites students to discuss the view of critics who "have tended to see in *A Season in the Life of Emmanuel* a microcosm of Québec society" (p. 121). Students in St. John's, Inuvik, Edmonton, Port Hardy, Saint Boniface, Antigonish, and Vancouver unfamiliar with either Québec society or Sorel may be somewhat hard pressed to comment with any precision or integrity. They may respond to the implied cultural and geographical solecism of their guide by assuming that novelists tell no lies. More distressing, because it is not quite as overt, is Professor Urbas's mime (whether or not meretricious) of the moral indignation manifested by some of the authors she examines: "*Thirty Acres* shows that the peasant's support of religion is basically a surface manifestation" (p. 23). One is tempted to ask: of what?

Reflecting on modern Québecois fiction in the preface to the book, Professor Urbas observes that it is essentially optimistic and progressive, "the basic thrust is outward and upward" (p. viii). Released from an ecclesiastical dungeon, the French-Canadian novelist now has open before him the endless vistas of modern doctrines of change and progress. *From Thirty Acres to Modern Times* concludes on a similar note with a comparison of the modern francophone artist in Canada and Saint-Denys Garneau's child, "for his eyes are open to take everything" ("The Game"). But, for the reader of Réjean Ducharme, for example, who has contributed so significantly to our understanding of the Québecois "temper" and whose fiction mirrors the inward and downward way of life in the modern world (the myths of Narcissus, Satan, and Faust, and Dante's "Inferno" provide the essential imagery), the evocation of a child's eyes may seem sinister, when the egotistical outlook of nine-year old Bérénice, ambiguously revolting against the traditional theological values of Québec in *L'Avalée des avalés,* is remembered: "Les hommes qui s'achètent des lunettes pour mieux voir sont des imbéciles. Plus une illusion est clairement perçue, plus elle a l'air d'une réalité" (Editions du Belier, p. 124). As one resolved to know everything, to explore all unknowns, she wills to be as free as Satan in hell: "pour être libre: tout détruire" (p. 192). It is perhaps the traditional rather than the modern way which leads "outward and upward." *From Thirty Acres to Modern Times,* like many other literary guidebooks provides too many revelations of half-untruths.

C. R. La Bossière

## RICHARD BRODHEAD
*Hawthorne, Melville, and the Novel*
Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976. Pp. 216. $4.50.

The thesis of Richard Brodhead's *Hawthorne, Melville, and the Novel* is that Hawthorne's and Melville's "work is characterized by a powerful tension between their visions and the nature of the genre they choose to work in," and he describes their relation of author to genre

"not as a productive marriage but as a protracted affair" (p. 4). Hawthorne himself began this line of thinking in the preface to *The House of Seven Gables,* in which he says that he writes romances, not novels. Brodhead says Hawthorne's conception of novel and romance as antitheses "implies too clear-cut a division of prose fiction into two distinct camps" (p. 41)—though his book of necessity does rather treat them as if they were antitheses. He does say, however, "In the light of Frye's discussion of displacement it might be more helpful to understand Hawthorne's 'novel' and 'romance' as indicating two tendencies present and synthesized in every work of fiction, or as the end points of a whole spectrum of fictional options" (p. 41). This is sane, and should always be remembered. Literary criticism is bedeviled by a terminology that will not stay still because it cannot; the things it seeks to denote are too various and complex.

I think it is more true to say that Hawthorne and Melville were creating their own "subgenre" than that they were fighting—or having a stormy affair—with the *novel.* But the important factor is that the tension between what the terms *novel* and *romance* imperfectly indicate is really there, and that is what Brodhead writes about, with useful insight.

The book is organized simply: an introduction; a section on Hawthorne, treating *The Scarlet Letter, The House of Seven Gables,* and *The Blithedale Romance;* a section on Melville, treating *Moby Dick* and *Pierre;* and a conclusion. It begins by pointing out that Dickens and Thackeray will use several different stories in a novel, whereas Hawthorne and Melville tell the same story in a variety of ways. Brodhead compares the openings of *Mansfield Park* and *The Scarlet Letter;* in one there is a multiplicity of human relationships, in the other a multiplicity of emblems which reflect on the novel's one triangular relationship.

Brodhead points out that in Hawthorne's and Melville's work distinctly different representational modes exist. "The first chapter of *The Scarlet Letter* illustrates this in little: in it things are seen now simply as objects, now as suggestive segments of a social reality, now as symbols of an order of moral truth" (p. 18). Most readers would agree that even the most "realistic" novels are likely to slip into symbolism; certainly Dickens's fog and trash heap are symbols. But Brodhead makes two related points. The first is that Hawthorne and Melville work closer to pure romance than some novelists. George Eliot's light and dark ladies make us see how much more the archetype has been displaced than in the works of Scott, and Melville's light and dark ladies "sieze the archetypical formulation in its pure form" (p. 21). The second point is Brodhead's thesis (which would distinguish Hawthorne's and Melville's kind of romance from that of Scott) that despite their pure archetypes they are trying to work in the novel form: they play different literary modes off against each other, and this creates great tension.

This can be seen nicely in the character of Chillingworth. Frederick Crews says that Chillingworth is not a devil, since there is such adequate motivation for his character; but Brodhead simply compares him to Eliot's Casaubon, who has similar motivation. Chillingworth is radically different, and Brodhead cites Leslie Fiedler's comment about the different ontological status of characters in *The Scarlet Letter* (p. 62). Hester is human; Chillingworth is a devil. The same matter comes up in the discussion of *Moby Dick.* At first every *thing* has metaphysical implications for Ishmael. But then comes a part of the book which, Brodhead says, "is a completely different vision of reality. This reality is solid, tactile, and mobile. . . . It is not inhabited by supernatural agencies or charged with symbolic significance; its spouts are spouts . . ." (p. 143). And his favorite example of this is "Stubb's Supper" and Fleece's sermon to the sharks, in which "theology itself comes to seem comically irrelevant to the real nature of things" (p. 143). I could not disagree with Brodhead more at this point. Fleece's sermon is a counterweight to Father Mapple's; Fleece's benediction, "fill your dam' bellies 'till dey bust—and den die," is a hideous, though comic, comment on the savage nature of all creatures. But in a sense Brodhead is right; Melville is indeed writing about things as things, and all that material on whaling is fascinating in its own right, not as symbol.

The point is that Hawthorne's and Melville's method allows them to have their cake and eat it too. Brodhead says, "It is almost impossible to visualize Ahab and Stubb standing alongside each other"

(p. 146). There both is and is not truth in this. Similarly it is impossible that there should be a real conversation between Ahab and Flask—other than "Down, dog, and kennel!" But Melville employs many devices to work out the relationships of things and beings that do not seem to belong in the same world and yet do—such as Flask's dream about his relationship with Ahab—and Starbuck is an intermediary, participating both in the worlds of Stubb and of Ahab.

Brodhead points out the striking similarities of *The Blithedale Romance* and *Pierre,* including their being finished in the same month, and concludes that these novels become contorted and chaotic "because in them the orders of meaning have become competitive, not complementary (pp. 110, 190). One can disagree. I grant *The Blithedale Romance's* infelicities, but think it one of Hawthorne's most interesting and successful achievements. But one must still appreciate Brodhead's observations.

In conclusion he cites Hawthorne's observation that "He can neither believe, nor be comfortable in his unbelief" as "perhaps the most important and accurate assessment ever made of Melville" (p. 199). And he suggests this is also true of Hawthorne. They are not so much at home in the demystified world as later novelists are (p. 202). Yet Brodhead has earlier cited "the peculiar willingness of *Moby Dick* to be in uncertainty, to embrace contradictions without resolving their antinomies" (p. 151). *Hawthorne, Melville, and the Novel* demonstrates that the achievement of these writers in no small part is due to their peculiar kind of negative capability—both an unwillingness and a willingness to be in uncertainty about all the objects and characters of their fictional worlds. This is a fine and useful book.

Theodore Colson

## ANDRÉ HELBO
*L'Enjeu du discours: lecture de Sartre.* Bruxelles: Editions Complexe, 1978. Pp. 294.

André Helbo's *L'Enjeu du discours* is an important work because of the light it sheds both on modern criticism of the novel and on one very important modern novelist, Jean-Paul Sartre. Of the two achievements, it is undoubtedly the second which is the most noteworthy—the author's expressed opinion to the contrary notwithstanding—for whereas there is much linguistic criticism of the kind practiced by Helbo available to us at the moment, there continues to be a pressing need for more modern criticism devoted to Sartre's fiction. Helbo's book goes far in meeting this need.

The book is divided into four parts. The first part introduces in clear, albeit technical, terms the linguistic bases of Helbo's method; the second and third parts apply this method to Sartre's fiction; the fourth part assesses, in conclusion, the validity of the method. Two remarks are in order about this organization, one of praise and the other of criticism. On the positive side is the fact that the introduction and conclusion provide a concise, coherent theoretical framework for the body of the work devoted to the Sartrian texts. On the negative side is the fact that the introduction fails to provide a clear enough explanation of the different goals Helbo pursues in Parts II and III and thus of the overall conception of the book. Only gradually does the difference become apparent: Part II deals with the explicit significance of language for Sartre (in his theoretical statements) and his characters (in the fiction); Helbo says that this part deals with "content" and that it serves to justify the use of a linguistic method for studying Sartre's fiction. Part III deals with the implicit significance of language in Sartre's fiction. It involves first a thematic, semantic analysis of the *énoncé* or meaning of the fiction; it then presents a semiological analysis of the *énonciation* or the subjective dimension of language. Language is conceived of throughout Helbo's book as not only involving the conveying of explicit meaning, but also as involving complex, implicit relationships between the speaker *(le locuteur),* the listener *(l'allocutaire),* and the message exchanged between them.