rative structure rests, namely, that *The Idiot* is an organic whole whose parts have an assignable relationship and function in the system that is the novel. The very complexity of her solution to the narrative puzzle of *The Idiot*, as well as our knowledge of the genesis of the novel, leads me to conclude that Dostoevsky was more or less groping his way through the work, especially with regard to narration, and that it is this tentativeness which to a large extent explains what the critics have considered inconsistencies in narration. The narrator of Part Four bears little resemblance to the narrator of Part One, and, to me at least, Miller has not demonstrated that they are organically linked. The evidence of the notebooks for *The Idiot*, which Miller treats in great detail, are singularly unhelpful here, for, as Miller implies, they are perhaps as close to the final version of *The Possessed* and *A Raw Youth* as they are to the final version of *The Idiot* itself; moreover, they have relatively few notes on narration, many fewer than we find, for example, in the notebooks for *Crime and Punishment*, *The Possessed*, and *A Raw Youth*. At times, the final version of *The Idiot* strikes one as though it were a sort of preliminary study for the narrative structure of *The Possessed* and *The Brothers Karamazov*, in which Dostoevsky alternates chronicler and omniscient narrators; and in fact, Miller does state that the narrative techniques of *The Idiot* look forward to the more perfect systems of these later novels.

My major reservation with Miller's thesis however concerns not so much the presentation of the narrator as what I think is probably more important, particularly for *The Idiot*: the point of view of the implied author. For it is the implied author's point of view that has been the main matter both of concern and contention in the last few decades, with fewer and fewer critics seeing Myshkin as that "wholly beautiful man," as Dostoevsky described him in a letter written a day after he had sent Part One of the novel to the publisher. Miller does not confront the issue of the possible ambiguity of the implied author's point of view and the differing nature of that ambiguity in the various parts of the novel. While admitting some of the negative "practical" consequences of Myshkin's behavior, she generally assumes his essential goodness to be the unqualified view and ideal not only of the historical Dostoevsky but also of the implied author, and she interprets the role of the narrator totally in terms of that assumption. But one would think that in a study of the narrative structure of *The Idiot*, where the narrator is presented as being an instrument of the implied author, the narrator would be examined primarily to elucidate the point of view of the implied author. But since that is not done, we (the real readers) learn a good deal about the techniques of the narrator, but comparatively little about theme and characterization. Perhaps this would not constitute in itself a significant criticism if Miller herself had not explicitly stated that one of the main functions of the narrator is to make the reader work out for himself the point of view of the implied author.

I also wonder why, given the sophistication of Miller's analysis, no attempt was made to utilize the extensive critical literature in French, German, Russian, and English—some of it dating back to the end of the First World War—on the techniques of transcribing consciousness in which the narrator's point of view plays so important a role, such as *erlebte Rede, erlebter Eindruck* (narrated monologue and consciousness in English, *nesobstvenno priamaia rech'* in Russian) and internal or interior analysis. It is even possible that an examination of the narrator's use of such techniques could have provided the basis for demonstrating a more integral relationship between the various narrative masks.

Despite these reservations, Miller's book remains an important contribution to the study of Dostoevsky's narrative technique and will be of considerable interest to anyone concerned with the problem of unreliable narrators in the modern novel.

Gary Rosenshield

MICHAEL UGARTE
Trilogy of Treason: An Intertextual Study of Juan Goytisolo.
Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1982, Pp. 171. $18.00.

Through the years Juan Goytisolo concerned himself with the problems of writing in general, theories about the novel, and literary criticism. In his essays, as well as in his fiction, Goytisolo dedicated himself to destroying Spanish myths and castigating the constrictive effect of Catholicism and censorship on Spanish creativity. About 1965 he disavowed his early

dogmatic and monolithic support of social realism, and, as he changed his mind on the subject, came to appreciate the infinite possibilities of artistic creation. His stress on the importance of linguistic codes became an integral part of his work, and he came to believe that literature, aside from its social or historical context, depended on the exigencies of its own discourse and that a text might be at the same time criticism, creation, literature, or discourse on literature. Enamored of certain formalist and structuralist findings, he borrowed Emile Benveniste's definition of discourse, incorporated Kristeva's concept of the transformation of texts and Shklovsky's ideas about artistic associations, and decided that language in literary discourse reflected the central core of a self-contained and constantly evolving text.

Goytisolo in both his fiction and nonfiction proposed the destruction of the myth of "España Sagrada," a concept which embraced social, political, and sexual truths; in many instances Goytisolo practically acknowledged that his own aggressiveness stemmed from personal as well as social frustrations, and that he hoped for relief through the creation of his own set of myths.

Thus though Michael Ugarte talks of "growing disaffection toward everything Spanish" in Goytisolo's trilogy, the reflection is that of a long-standing disaffection. Ugarte's analysis of Goytisolo's early works is somewhat superficial. More cogently Ugarte contends that Goytisolo's assimilation of foreign notions of modern literary theory, though important, were conditioned by his obsession with his own culture which made his complete understanding of these ideas problematical. This and other findings, which Professor Ugarte submits as new or "groundbreaking," to quote the publisher, are old and well-known facts. Nonetheless, Professor Ugarte's overview is quite useful as is his collection of much of Goytisolo's intertextual discourses into a coherent, concise package.

Ugarte, including in his volume slightly revised previous articles he had written on Goytisolo, concentrates on the influence of structuralism and poststructuralism on *Señas de identidad* (1966), *Reivindicación del Conde don Julián* (1970), and *Juan sin tierra* (1975). He examines Goytisolo's exposure to the French milieu of Robbe-Grillet and Roland Barthes, his growing acceptance of some of the tenets of structuralism—though not a commitment to that mode of thought—and his blending of various doctrines into his own writings of the sixties and seventies. Ugarte offers us a good succinct examination of structuralism and the ideas of its practitioners concerning literary, social, and historical relationships, the problems of influence, "literariness," the role of the author, the concept of text, and the arrangement and rearrangement of a system of borrowed codes together with the convergence of literature and discourse on literature. Ugarte analyzes some of Goytisolo's own articles from *El furgón de cola* and *Disidencias*, his feelings about censorship, the hostile relationship between text and his creation in the form of parodies of authors he relates to and those to whom he does not. Ugarte examines Goytisolo's analysis of José María Blanco White, Mariano José de Larra, Miguel de Unamuno, and others.

In his chapter on *Señas de identidad*, where he makes use of Benveniste's distinction between history and discourse, Ugarte shows how the presence of outside texts operates on several levels. He comments on the development of character through the citation of works that characters recall and Goytisolo's use of the words of these outside texts as well as their titles, the importance Goytisolo attaches to language, more and more apparent in his manipulation of the linguistic relationships among various texts, and the new life given outside texts within *Señas de identidad*. Goytisolo arranged clashes between opposing texts, employing a destructiveness to be more fully developed later.

Professor Ugarte views the Don Julián text as pure discourse and as the beginning of the end for historical writing. Yet, paradoxically, the conflict between a self-referential system of language and a strict analysis of Spanish history dominates the second phase of Goytisolo's trilogy. Ugarte repeats what others had previously stated about *Don Julián* and Spain's obsession with national and religious righteousness, the Inquisition, the denial of Semitic influences, and Goytisolo's identification with and affinity for Américo Castro's theory of Spanish history to which he adds sexuality, especially the vindication of the human body through language. Ugarte analyzes the various Goytisolean commentaries on specific incorporated texts and on Spanish cultural achievement from Seneca through Alfonso el Sabio to Unamuno, including literary exceptions to his general attack, for example, Góngora and

Larra, his use of parody of Spanish literary criticism, and his special relationship with *Don Quijote de la Mancha*.

In *Juan sin tierra* Goytisolo became increasingly aware of the phenomenon of self-consciousness in literature, an element he incorporated and which resulted in a duplication of the self between an existential entity and a linguistic person. Goytisolo's allusions to language and commentary on the art of writing intensify in *Juan sin tierra*, where he forces the reader to concentrate on the act of literary creation. But Goytisolo also continues commentary on the decadence of Spanish culture and the pathological denial of the body and human sexuality, on language, and the text as he identifies with Octavio Paz's theories and attempts to resolve what Paz believes are irreconcilable tensions in Western culture. Ugarte views Goytisolo's parodies, citations, commentaries, and transcriptions of other texts as manifestations of his attempt to corrupt and contaminate a cultural tradition.

A number of small errors (*Paraíso* instead of *Paradiso*, p. 39, for example) are relatively unimportant. When we come to the bibliography, however, although admittedly an author must limit numbers, we find significant deficiencies and the omission of some important and basic works on Goytisolo which, moreover, bear on Ugarte's thesis. In some cases Ugarte cites an early work by an author and ignores many of the same author's later and more important ones. At times some of Professor Ugarte's commentary seems terribly close to that of others, listed in the bibliography, to whom he does not give full attribution.

Professor Ugarte has attempted to relate the form, aesthetics, and technique in Goytisolo's trilogy and has summarized familiar material quite well. Nonetheless, the basic Goytisolo, whatever the intertextual and formal cosmopolitan creativity, is still chained to his Spanish sources by unbreakable ties from which he keeps trying to escape for psychological and personal and not merely literary reasons. Mother Spain continues all important to Goytisolo—one does not attack something which has no meaning for him—even more clearly seen in *Makbara* (1980) where Goytisolo widens his attack to include Western values. He blends literary allusions, psychological symbols, and linguistic forms with a critique of religious, political, social, and sexual institutions, incorporating once more his psychological apprehensions, womb fixation, castration fears, homosexuality, bodily secretions, a return to mother, scatological and sadistic imagery, and a plea for sexual freedom. To ignore the importance of this aspect of Goytisolo in his trilogy, whatever his use of intertextuality or his assaults on literary tradition, is to miss a basic component not only of the man but of his work.

Kessel Schwartz

ARNOLD WEINSTEIN
Fictions of the Self: 1550-1800
Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981. Pp. viii + 302. $9.95 & $20.00.

Large-scale studies of the early novel in a European framework transcending Ian Watt's valuable and influential but starkly anglo-centric and realism-bound exclusivity, are happily increasing. Weinstein's book is a welcome and exciting addition. In yet another substantial addition likewise published in 1981: *An Exemplary History of the Novel: The Quixotic versus the Picaresque* (Chicago University Press), Walter Reed remarks: "The historical study of the novel in this century has produced a vast array of sequences, selections, and juxtapositions of texts, arrangements which neither harmonize nor conflict with one another, and which leave the object under investigation unclear" (p. 19). This gloomy view does not of course prevent Reed from adding his own "arrangement" delineated in the subtitle. There is indeed occasion for intense wonder and exhilaration rather than gloom. For we are seeing, alongside expanding developments of established notions such as Alexander Blackburn's *The Myth of the Picaro* (Chapel Hill: North Carolina University Press, 1979) or Peter Uwe Hohendahl's *Der europäische Roman der Empfindsamkeit* ("The European Novel of Sensibility"; Wiesbaden: Athenäum, 1977) other approaches, cutting across boundaries with new perspectives illuminating significant movements and affinities, and thus enlarging our awareness of the dimensions, texture, and richness of the major