worse than the English gentleman of leisure. It does not seem to me that the English can
do much harm to anybody today. . . . The real danger today is from that fat, adolescent
delinquent millionaire, America, and from all those virulent, misshapen freaks like
Amin and Bokassa sired on Africa by Europe. Particularly those ones” (51-52). Whereas
the worst African imitation of a European tyrant is overthrown in a coup d’état, the most
promising hope for the future emerges in the person of Beatrice Okoh. After Chris’s death
and the coup, she keeps a long silence, then she decides to hold a naming ceremony for
Ikem Osodi’s orphan baby girl. This might be the answer to the question she asks her
friends: “What must a people do to appease an embittered history?” (220). When it comes
to the name itself, Beatrice picks up the tiny bundle from its cot and suggests: “There was
an Old Testament prophet who named his son The-remnant-shall-return. They must have
lived in times like this. We have a different metaphor, though; we have our own version
of hope that springs eternal. We shall call this child AMAECHINA: May-the-path-never-
close. Ama for short” (222). Perhaps this hopeful stance is vital for the surviving central
characters of Anthills of the Savannah. It implies that a country like Kangan is able to go
through a learning process based on experience. The rich variety of life in West Africa
presented in the pages of this powerful novel may enable the reader to draw his own
conclusions on that account.

Anthony R. Pugh

THE BIRTH OF A LA RECHERCHE DU TEMPS PERDU
Reviewed by Germaine Bree

For Proustian scholars 1987 will probably be remembered as a banner year, the year
that the unpublished corpus of Proustian manuscripts came into the public domain. This
opened the way for a major breakthrough in Proustian studies, more especially for those
increasingly numerous scholars engaged in the problems of the text itself.

From the very first, the task of editing and publishing A la recherche du temps perdu
had proved notoriously difficult. The vicissitudes attendant on the publication of the first
edition of the complete text (1913-1927) are notorious. We are all beholden to what is
known as the “Pleiade edition,” established with meticulous care in 1954 by Pierre Clarac
and Andre Ferre, two highly competent scholars, an edition which, until now, has been
considered “standard.” Now, thirty years later, fueled by the freeing of what are usually
referred to as the “pre-texts” to Proust’s vast work, new editions are coming out: a “new
Pleiade” edition in four volumes, offering some 400 pages of relevant notes, drafts, com­
ments, the work of a team of research scholars, “l’equipe Proust” centered at the Ecole
Normale Superieure in Paris; a more readable, but up-to-date text put out by Flammarion
for more general consumption; and what is known as the Robert Laffont-Quid, which in­
cludes, it would seem, every item of the apparently inexhaustible fund of Proustiana.

These stages in the presentation of Proust’s major work offer no radical changes in
the overall organization of the text. Rather they incorporate revisions, duplications, better
readings; or identify within the printed text the different layers of insertions, tracing their
origin in the manuscripts. (See, notably Alison Winton’s two-volume thesis, The making
of A la recherche du temps perdu, typescript facsimile reproduction [Cambridge: University
of Cambridge 1977]). A major impetus to this specific trend in textual research was the
acquisition in 1962 by the Bibliotheque Nationale of a mass of manuscripts, typescripts
and notes bequeathed by Proust’s niece. But there seems to be no end to the underground
life of the “pre-texts” or “parallel” texts of A la recherche; witness the emergence in 1984
of thirteen new notebooks, to add to those in the files, and, in 1986, the discovery of a
complete typescript of Albertine Disparue. The wealth of documentation has complicated
the task of researchers engaged in examining and coordinating disparate and often fragmentary evidence concerning chronology and purpose. Different juxtapositions of fragments may suggest different interpretative hypotheses as to the text’s progress and Proust’s intent. The abundance of material reduces the margin of speculation left open to the critic, but different “contextualizations” will always rest on certain personal assumptions, overt or unconscious. New documents may make the most careful hypothesis obsolete. No Proust scholar today could emulate the self-assurance of Albert Feuillerat who in his pioneering study *Comment Marcel Proust a compose son roman* (1934) was convinced he had the solution to the question.

It is within this frame, which he recalls succinctly but with clarity, that Anthony Pugh situates his monograph. He has long been intrigued by the problems inherent in the structure genesis and development of *A la recherche*. (His Cambridge University doctoral dissertation was entitled “The Composition of Marcel Proust’s *A la recherche du temps perdu*” (1959); it has remained unpublished). In his “introduction” to his monograph he defines the specific problem it examines, and the solution it presents. His basic proposal concerns the “birth” of Proust’s initial conception of the work he felt called upon to undertake. Pugh situates it in an intuition of the form which had been taking shape in his unconscious. It developed, Pugh suggests between the fall of 1908 and the spring of 1909, a process which Pugh sets out fully to document. Pugh’s thesis rests on his reading of the famous “dénouement” in *Le Temps retrouve* in which Proust’s narrator, through the reiterated experience of involuntary memory with its fusion of past and present discovers the nature of his vocation as a writer. This passage, as Pugh understands it, is a direct transfer into fiction—both literal and symbolic—of Proust’s own experience in 1908-1909. His purpose then is to establish a linkage between the two.

After defining his thesis, Pugh, in a first chapter, presents the documents that support it: the manuscripts, Cahiers and Carnets, loose “feuillets” and pages eventually published in the Contre Sainte-Beuve. His main though not exclusive sources are the first eight of the 62 Notebooks in the archives, together with the first of the ‘carnets’, which was published in 1976 by Philip Kolb as *Le Carnet de 1908*, and letters clustered around the 1908-1909 nucleus. These constitute a kind of “journal” of uncollected aspects of Proust’s disparate activities. These sources he identifies fully in two Appendices. Four succinct chapters constitute the bulk of the demonstration followed by an eight-page text (80-88) entitled *Conclusions* (note the plural). The chapters “Summer,” “Autumn,” “Winter,” and “Spring” follow the chronological sequence of discovery at the heart of Proust’s “vocation,” and as pieced together by Pugh. But they also suggest a psychological progress and succession of “climates” that underlie the structure of the novel.

It would be an idle task and indeed an impossible one to attempt to summarize the careful work of coordination of texts, facts, the “jigsaw puzzle” through which Pugh charts the progress of his demonstration. The method in itself is defined by a careful observation of all the available documents, unconnected though they may seem, that cluster around certain incidents and texts leading the scholar to decipher a latent source and significance. Not the least of the tasks Pugh set for himself was to determine underlying patterns and chronological coincidences. His working out of his thesis is valuable in itself as a methodological model. Well aware of its technical complexity, he advises nonspecialist readers to skip the demonstration, moving from the introduction directly to the concluding pages. One might wonder if this might not prove self-defeating, stressing the circularity in the argument.

What is particularly welcome, to this reader at least, is Pugh’s quiet conviction that for the greater artist, the organizing principle of his work cannot be separated from an intense inner need, which he must struggle to grasp and which imposes on disparate material of his experience an aesthetic unity. One may approach Proust’s text, or any other, from many standpoints—linguistic, psychoanalytic, autobiographical, social, political, historical—but the text cannot be divorced from the living experience that generated it.

*Book Reviews*