Book Reviews

The Changing World of Charles Dickens. **Edited by Robert Giddings. London: Vision Press, 1983. Pp. 240.**

The title of this anthology of eleven essays on the novels of Charles Dickens can be read in two ways. As the editor points out, it is intended to describe the transitional nature of the times in which Dickens wrote, a fact of which most of his contemporaries were obsessively aware. But the title also suggest the way in which successive decades of Dickens critics themselves change the world of the Victorian novelist by re-fashioning and interpreting it anew.

Two complementary essays, "The Politics of *Barnaby Rudge*", by Thomas J. Rice, and "The Crowd in Dickens" by David Craig, successfully place Dickens's own politics and those of his age in a clear historical perspective by analysing the pervasive fear of social unrest in the period. Dickens managed to be much more radical in his thinking when he was face-to-face with Cruikshank's tableau of "The Drunkard's Children", which he criticized for not getting to the root of the social causes of drunkenness and disorder, than he ever allowed himself to be when looking at the maddened faces of the crowd, which threatened insurrection born of equal social and economic deprivation.

But how are we to see Dickens now, 150 years after? A number of the essays suggest that new questions as well as new critical methodologies are in order. Giddings himself would seem to be reaching for a new vocabulary and vantage point when he announces that "what we recognize as the genius of his fiction is the result of the connection made between genius and the means of production." But he does not take his own terms of argument nearly seriously enough. We are told, for instance, of the important place of advertising in the serial parts, but no actual analysis is attempted of this potentially fascinating relationship between advertisement and text. Giddings even manages to gloss over the astonishing juxtaposition of the text of *Dombey and Son*, with its critique of the quintessential Economic Man of the period, and the celebrated suits of one Mr. Moses, "designed to cover the inner defects" of the man who buys them.

The editor, then, is as innocent of the implications of the language he uses as some of his contributors. We move from this inconclusive introduction to David Paroissien's essay: "Literature's 'External Duties': Dickens's Professional Creed", a piece that leaves Dickens's idealist turn of phrase unexamined and then goes on to suggest that his re-evaluation "might have come more quickly had he left a body of critical writing" comparable to James or Flaubert. Equally insensitive to the kind of writer we are dealing with is Jerome Meckier's "Hidden Rivalries in Victorian Fiction: The Case of the Two Esthers". Though the essay makes a reasoned case for the influence of the heroine of *Bleak House* on George Eliot's female protagonist in *Felix Holt*, it manages to use the language of the deconstructionists while employing a naive mimetic vocabulary which pits one "realism" against another.

One of the few essays in the collection to make self-conscious use of an announced critical methodology is Roger Fowler's "Polyphony and Problematic in *Hard Times*" which examines Dickens's moral fable in terms of Mikhail Bakhtin's theory of the "polyphonic novel" and the functional linguistics of M.A.K. Halliday. Fowler suggests that the multitude of voices, dialects, and unique speech patterns ultimately challenge the unitary authorial position. His argument may or may not be valid, but how does it stack up against Dickens' *pervasive* ventriloquism in the novels—and why special pleading for this one?

In fact, it is precisely the performance values of Dickens's novels that make for some of the most interesting reading in this volume. David Ponting's "Charles Dickens: The Solo Performer" amply documents the impulse towards performance in Dickens, but it seems to miss some of the psychological motives in Dickens's actual theatrical reading, which tell us as much about his fascination with mesmerism as the theatre. Mike Poole's "Dickens and Film: 101 Uses of a Dead Author" reminds us how television, as a domestic medium, could serialize Dickens, "thus retaining an approximation to the novels' real-time in a way that has never been possible in the cinema." Yet, sadly, Poole argues, its potential has been wasted in giving the audience an unexamined "history as decor" in which successive adaptations of Dickens's work use of the novelist to stand for the whole Victorian era in popular memory. Poole cites as a rare exception to this practice of seeing Dickens as "offering unmediated access to Britain's past" the Royal Shakespeare Company's inventive staging of David Edgar's *Nicholas Nickleby*.

In fact, it is David Edgar's essay, "Adapting Nickleby", which is the most valuable and interesting in the collection. No academic scholar could make the case more intelligently and imaginatively for reinterpreting Dickens for our time. It is an essay full of sharp social analysis which makes us see the rapidly changing world of the Victorians in a new way—the social mobility at the heart of the Kenwigs plot, the way in which the travails of the Nickleby family themselves reflect a world of new and boundless economic opportunity, but also social dislocation and

profound anxiety. In Edgar's collectively re-worked text, the women are newly animated and placed in history by being seen in terms of what they do rather than in the more limiting terms of what they say, the contradictions in the text itself underlined by a faithful if ironically distanced ending.

Carleton University *Barbara Lecker*

***Emily Dickinson and Her Culture: The Soul's Society*. By Barton Levi St. Armand. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984. Pp. xii, 368. $29.95.**

Emily Dickinson left almost two thousand separate lyrics, individually and collectively untitled by the author, the large majority stitched by Dickinson into over fifty packets of a few poems each. Lacking conventional cues or orderings, readers and critics have described or defined the "Dickinson" we read in so many, so small portions by such questions as the following: What was she, often called "Emily," like? What does she, "the mind of the poet," add up to? What does she, as "lyric" voice, sound like to us? How does she, as Connecticut Valley Yankee, as American poet, as woman, fit in? Some of the most interesting recent books on Dickinson, Keller's *The Only Kangaroo Among the Beauties*, Martin's *An American Triptych*, and now St. Armand's *Emily Dickinson and Her Culture* describe and define her by how their "Dickinson" fits in.

St. Armand divides his cultural materials, following Henry Glassie, into three kinds: folk, popular, elite (p. 18). For each kind, he argues Dickinson's general cultural context by means of Emersonianly representative examples presented with care, commented on imaginatively, and often illustrated pictorially, even iconographically. He recreates Dickinson's cultural world and shows its complex, dialectic relation to selected poems. This has been done in part by earlier critic/biographers but never, I think, so carefully and interestingly. He also draws on these folk, popular, or elite cultural materials for symbolic analogies to define Dickinson's work thematically and formally. In his introductory "Apologia: An Art of Assemblage," for example, he entertains metaphors of portfolio, quilt, and scrapbook.

St. Armand has even wider concerns as well. "I have tried to write as both critic and cultural historian, each role being not an end in itself but an attempt to restore and appreciate Dickinson's art rather than to deconstruct it or explain it away. In doing so, I feel that I have written (with caution, if not with delicacy) not simply a cultural biography but a biography of American Victorian culture, related in its own special way to what is current in my own unique intellectual climate." (pp. 1-2) Given the impossibility of ever completing such an enterprise, he has chosen to give

us vividly textured episodes out of an unwritten encyclopedic cultural and biographical epic; an epic our closest approximation to which, so far, would be the eight hundred closely-printed pages of Sewall's *Life of Emily Dickinson.*

Mary Warner was a close friend of Emily Dickinson; her scrapbook was passed on to Dickinson's niece. In an introductory episode, St. Armand establishes his book's thematic and formal concerns by demonstrating how "rather than a source hunter's game preserve, Mary Warner's scrapbook becomes a theme seeker's token or talisman, a guiding anthology of ideas, models, and patterns that furnishes us with the prototypes, stereotypes, and archetypes of Dickinson's time" (p. 31), and he illustrates these concerns by placing Dickinson's spider poems against the three kinds of cultural context exemplified by the scrapbook's contents: "Her poem tantalizes by promising the time-tested, applied wisdom of the proverb (folk), or the epigrammatic, bourgeois, obvious truth of the moral apologue (popular). At its core, however, it is an exclusive, transcendent, antididactic theory of art for art's sake (elite)" (p. 37).

Three episodes, three encounters, in three chapters examine Dickinson's response to popular culture: in her poems on death, on love, and on the afterlife. For "Dickinson's fascination with death was an authentic response to a popular cultural genre that had its own unique strength and purpose" (p. 41). This authentic response exemplified a much wider pattern of creative activity: "Dickinson's appropriation of the props of the Sentimental Love Religion and the popular gospel of consolation involves a process of personalization, internalization, exaggeration, and inversion that can be seen in her responses to other aspects of her contemporary culture" (p. 73). St. Armand continually weaves together cultural, historical, and personal strands with suggestive skill: "If the Civil War forced Dickinson to confront her complex relationship to a Christ-like Master, it also pitted the last vestiges of patriarchal Calvinism against the new legions that preached matriarchal romance, the sentimental gospel of love" (p. 103).

In the central episode of *Emily Dickinson and Her Culture*, we "confront a problem that is paradoxically both formal and metaphysical, her relationship to God . . . intimately bound up in her use of a folk form" (p. 153), the church hymn. However, "the content enframed within that form was drawn variously from elite, popular, or corresponding folk levels of culture" (p. 159), thus producing "a continuing dialectic" (p. 158) and "the dynamics of *bricolage*" (p. 160), which led, in turn, to "her eclectic version of carpenter Gothic . . . of the vernacular, the grotesque, and the comic" (p. 163). And we are shown in vivid detail, as one example, how "Dickinson merged her folk image of the cat-god with one belonging to the popular realm of high Gothic romance" (p. 172).

St. Armand's final chapters continue this skilled interweaving of poetry, public and private life, and popular, folk, and elite culture, with special reference to Dickinson's handling of nature and with special

emphasis on the context provided by British and American elite culture of the mid-nineteenth century: nature writing by way of Higginson and other Yankees, nature painting by way of Ruskin and the artists and art collectors of her day, including her brother Austin.

This section, and the book, ends with a very helpful analysis of Dickinson's many sunset poems. They, and her other nature poems, show "that close botanical, meteorological, or geological attention to detail linking together . . . the writings of the American poet-naturalists, the paintings of the Hudson River school, and the aesthetics of John Ruskin" (p. 289). Like these landscape painters and the British Turner, she "concentrated the mental weather of a complex psychic, spiritual, and emotional experience into a single moment of intense apprehension" (p. 240), which was at the same time a "remarkable domestication of an elaborate romantic typology and a Ruskinian truth to nature" (p. 252). To sum up, "it is this sense of the sun's regulation of time, nature, emotion, and art that effectively unites folk, popular, and elite levels, making Dickinson's poetry a complete yet unique expression of her rich American Victorian culture" (p. 276).

St. Armand speaks often of the dialectic in Dickinson's poetry between culture and self. His *Emily Dickinson and Her Culture* has its own dialectic with other critics' other "Dickinsons." To set this dialectic into action, for example, one need only put St. Armand's discussion of Dickinson's poems of death beside that of Robert Weisbuch or of Sharon Cameron. The result—an even fuller reading of and response to New England's and North America's greatest lyric poet.

University of New Brunswick *Lauriat Lane, Jr.*

The Collected Works of E.J. Pratt: E.J. Pratt on His Life and Poetry. **Edited by Susan Gingell. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1983. Pp. xlix. 218. $30.00. Paper, $12.95.**

E.J. Pratt: The Truant Years 1882-1927. **By David G. Pitt. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1984. Pp. xix, 415. $24.95. Paper, $14.95.**

1982, the centennial of the birth of E.J. Pratt, was an appropriate time to begin the re-evaluation of the work of a poet who stood at the crossroads of Canada's literary tradition. Each year since then has been marked by the publication of a book that should facilitate the work of the critic and earn for Pratt the recognition that he justly deserves.

In the first of these volumes, Susan Gingell provides a collection of Pratt's commentaries in prose on his life and on his work as a poet. Having drawn her material largely from the typescripts and manuscripts contained in the E.J. Pratt Collection at Victoria University, Toronto, she has

included published and unpublished works, among them lecture notes, forewords or explanatory notes to textbook editions of Pratt's poems, introductions to readings, addresses on various occasions, and the scripts of two interviews with Pratt which were broadcast over the CBC radio network. Excluded from the anthology are Pratt's two theses in theology, two or three previously published articles on psychology, and his vast correspondence, selections from which will occupy another volume in the *Collected Works*.

Anyone who has had occasion to consult the Pratt Collection will appreciate the enormity of the task which the editor set for herself. Pratt wrote frequently with pencil stubs on newsprint or in school exercise books. His typescripts (many of those in the Collection are faint carbon copies) are single-spaced. He was in the habit of using one general introduction with minor additions or deletions for several readings of his poetry. These frugal practices have all too often obscured the value of Pratt's prose works and have taxed the time and the patience of many scholars.

Susan Gingell's work has put order into the apparent chaos and has made much of Pratt's most important writing in prose generally available. Her explanation of editorial principles and procedures is clear and logical, and her dating of the texts is helpful. Her lengthy introduction places Pratt's prose writings in their proper historical and literary context, convinces us of their value in complementing the poetry or in illuminating the poetic process, and steers us away from the shoals of the intentional fallacy. Readers with a general interest in Canadian poetry will find this volume enlightening and useful. Those wishing to study Pratt's original scripts will find it an invaluable guide.

The second work, the first volume of the long-anticipated biography of Pratt by David G. Pitt, takes the reader from the poet's ancestry and his birth in Western Bay, Newfoundland, in 1882, through his education and his early career as preacher and teacher in Newfoundland and in Ontario, and from the publication of *Newfoundland Verse* (1923), *Witches' Brew* (1925) and *Titans* (1926), to the death of his mother and the threshold of a new phase of his life and of his poetic career at the beginning of 1927.

With the help of written and oral sources including correspondence, diaries and personal interviews, Pitt has, with scrupulous attention to detail, fleshed out the life of his subject. In doing so, he has filled in many of the blanks which Pratt, notoriously reticent about matters which affected him personally, left—the details of his engagement to Lydia Trimble, the reason for his request to be transferred from the Newfoundland Conference to the Alberta Conference of the Methodist Church, and the not always obvious reasons for his financial worries. While none of these details affects in any major way the interpretation or the critical appreciation of Pratt's poetry, their publication should put an end to distracting conjectures and help the reader to determine to what extent Pratt's ironic vision was the natural product of his reflection on "the

convergence of the manifold" in his own life as well as in the lives of others.

Pitt elaborates on a more important matter which Pratt in his later years was all too willing to gloss over—the extent to which he was influenced as a graduate student in the Department of Philosophy at Victoria College, Toronto, by his study of psychology. While he may have been repelled, as he said, by the deterministic theories of the school of Wilhelm Wundt, he was attracted enough by the promise of insight into human behaviour offered by William James and John Dewey to stand on the brink of a career as a psychologist for the Toronto Boards of Health and Education, and to collaborate with Drs. Clarence Hincks and C.K. Clarke in the establishment of the Canadian Mental Health Association. In an essay entitled "The Scientific Study of Psychology" which Pratt wrote for *Acta Victoriana* in March, 1913, and which it is to be hoped will be reprinted somewhere in the *Collected Works*, Pitts discovers not only the controlling metaphor of his biography, but also an illuminating insight into the personality of Pratt, and the nucleus of the later poem, "The Truant".

Having quoted liberally from this essay, Pitt remarks, "Not only is it a professional, at times almost clinical, manifesto of the new breed of scientific psychologist whom Pratt admires and of which he already sees himself as one; it is also for him a personal profession of faith." In addition, he continues, it "gives us a brief glimpse . . . of that other side of Pratt's consciousness, of his sensibility, which prompted him to repudiate almost everything the new psychology represents, its ends as well as its means" (p. 119). Pitt gathers that "Pratt was a man with one foot planted in each of two different worlds." His dual or split sensibility, "pulled him in two directions at once: towards the terra firma of the scientist's regulated world of the quantifiable and controllable, and the terra incognita of the humanist's and the artist's world of 'mysterious imponderables' " (pp. 121-122). It is Pratt's inability to reconcile these contrary attractions, Pitt believes, that gives rise to "many of the major tensions, ironies and paradoxes of his poetry, and the curious ambivalence of thought and feeling which more than one puzzled critic has remarked on" (p. 122). Pitt concludes later that, "much of what is recognizably Prattian in the style, tone and temper of his poetry derives . . . from an almost obsessive anxiety to control, if not suppress his other susceptible self" (p. 353).

The years before 1927, Pitt suggests, are the "truant years" not only in that they are those in which Pratt experienced most keenly the conflict of his divided sensibility, but also in that through friendship, marriage, fatherhood, and a new profession in the humanities they saw him take several "tangential steps" away from the seductive certainty offered by the world of the Panjandrum. One senses, however, and surely Pitt does not suggest to the contrary, that Pratt never completely resolved his interior conflict and that he was to continue to play the Truant in one way or the other for the rest of his days. Since Pitt allows his thesis to emerge from

Pratt's own work, and because he is careful not to oversimplify it or to impose it rigidly to the exclusion of other influences in Pratt's life, it is both convincing and interesting.

Pitt has done an admirable job of tracing the slow and difficult emergence of the poet in Pratt, and of locating the early poems within their biographical context, answering as he does so many questions that have arisen about the dates of their composition relative to those of their publication. But his greatest service is his allowing us to see the young Pratt in the literary and critical milieu of Toronto and of Canada in the 1920's as a successor to the poets of Confederation, yet as representative of a new generation of poets trying to make their distinctive voices heard. The more we reflect upon Pratt's situation, the more we are likely to wonder that he became a poet at all.

Pitt's book is a labour of love that has been well worth waiting for. Apart from the service that he has performed for Canadian letters, he has written an excellent, if incomplete, biography which has merely whetted our appetite for the rest of the Prattian banquet which we hope will follow soon.

Toronto, Ontario *Sister Angela McAuliffe*

***The Orwell Mystique: A Study in Male Ideology*. By Daphne Patai. Amherst: The University of Massachusetts Press, 1984. Pp. 344. Cloth $30, Paper $14.95.**

In *The Orwell Mystique: A Study in Male Ideology* Daphne Patai presents a case not only *contra* George Orwell, but against an entire society that has uncritically accepted Orwell's self-image—the lonely warrior in uncompromising battle against prejudice, oppression and exploitation. Examining the dynamics of this mystique, Patai's feminist critique is presented as a coherent thesis no feminist can afford to leave unread, and no Orwellian, unanswered. Holding Orwell to his own standards of decency and justice, Patai's verdict is that in the final analysis, Orwell "Cares more for his continuing privileges as a male than he does for the abstractions of justice, decency, and truth on behalf of which he claims to be writing" (266).

We should no longer be surprised that, like many other feminist critics, Patai finds yet another male idol to have clay feet, ranking Orwell with the growing number of writers (including D.H. Lawrence, Milton, Shakespeare, and going back to and including the authors of the Old Testament) who, we are being told, either do not understand or do not respect women. All this does not come as much of a shock; even dedicated Orwellians are ready to admit that Orwell's reputation does not rest on his feminine portrayals. Yet Patai does go further than most feminist critics when she suggests that Orwell's largely unconscious yet deeply consistent gender

ideology is a direct source of both aesthetic flaws and political distortions. The definition of human values according to a standard of manliness is at the heart of the matter.

Consistently, often convincingly, and always brilliantly, Patai argues that this standard of manliness clearly excludes the female. Less convincingly, Patai also argues that this exclusion of the female implies contempt towards women as inferior, an assumption which underlies and undermines the validity of Orwell's egalitarianism.

In a series of insightful re-examinations, Patai submits all of Orwell's fiction to scrutiny, according to his own, tacit standard of manliness, beginning with *Down and Out in Paris and London* and culminating in *Nineteen Eighty-Four.* Appropriately, the analysis of Orwell's final novel as the essence of his political and aesthetic position is also the clincher of Patai's own argument, offering possibly some of the most provocative insights into this novel that have come out of its academic and media exposure in its busy title year.

In a significantly original approach to *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, Patai introduces the analogy of game theory to re-examine the relationship between victim and victimizer in a totalitarian system. She also suggests that the relationship between Winston and O'Brien should be understood in terms of a game only males can play. In effect, she argues, it is the manliness of the players that is at stake, and therefore the outcome of this confrontation applies to men only. She also concludes that the ultimate vision emerging from *Nineteen Eighty-Four* is one of despair over the political-psychological future of humanity, a despair she relates to Orwell's uncritically androcentric definition of human nature.

In her attempt to integrate gender ideology with elements of the writer's political ideology and aesthetics, Patai offers a significant new insight both to Orwell, and, I believe, to feminist criticism in general. Nevertheless, Orwellians will and should take issue with Patai's conclusions on a number of areas.

As an Orwellian of the feminine gender, I agree that like many other writers, Orwell feels more comfortable with the inscape of characters of his own sex, but then, the same applies to a good number of women writers. (Mary McCarthy's *The Group*, for example, is teeming with credibly realized female, and two-dimensional male characters). Therefore one should be rather cautious with the suggestion that the weak characterization of women, such as Dorothy in *Clergyman's Daughter*, indicates the author's view of woman as inferior. As the example of so many male and female writers indicate, the predilection for greater empathy with characters of the writer's own gender does not necessarily follow from sociological or ideological premises. (Conversely, Tolstoy's empathy with and understanding of the exceptionally vivid female characters in his fiction stand in marked contradiction to the devastatingly antifeminist tenets in his political and religious tracts.)

But the premises of Patai's argument, particularly as they relate to *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, Orwell's major work, deserve the most vigorous examination. Is it true, for example, as Patai suggests, that Julia's portrayal reveals Orwell's misogyny, and that all the female characters in the novel are shadows, while the male characters are well realized? Finally, is it true that Orwell's androcentric definition of the "game" of totalitarianism leads him, inevitably, to despair?

Although Patai's analogy of the game theory has introduced a most suggestive matrix for the dynamics of totalitarianism, I feel that her interpretation tends to overlook some of the major strategies of the novel itself. *Nineteen Eighty-Four* is quite clearly the story of Winston Smith as Everyman, and there is no doubt that Orwell's Everyman is a male. Yet, once we accept that the story is seen through Winston's eyes, all other characters—including O'Brien and Julia—will appear obviously less well realized than Winston. They exist mainly as milestones of Winston's journey; Julia, as the measure of the gradual and systematic liberation and self-healing in Part I and II; O'Brien, as the indicator of the equally systematic breakdown of personality in Part III. Few perceptive readers have failed to notice that Winston's relationship to Julia is at the very centre of his quest in Part I and II; the male-female bond is crucial to Orwell's definition of Winston's selfhood. The betrayal of this bond in Room 101 is tantamount to Winston's betrayal of himself, and marks his irreversible collapse as a human being.

Julia may indeed stand for a somewhat traditional, even stereotyped definition of femininity, yet she is clearly the only representative of positive values in Winston's private world; she stands for the very essence of his conflict with the values of Oceania. It is through Julia that Winston explores his only escape into a private universe from Oceania, from a world defined by exclusively public loyalties imposed by Big Brother upon the collective psyche. And if the model of Winston's private universe is traditional rather than anything else, one must remember that the novel's main strategy demands a return to the past as an escape from the intolerable future. Winston's only alternative to the submerging of the private self in Oceania is the emotional-psychological model of the family as it existed in the past—a traditional model with the woman as the emotional-sexual centre of man's private universe.

Orwell's attitude to the female is indeed traditional; he looks at the male-female relationship in terms of romantic, largely archetypal patterns. Defining the female as the Other, in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* Orwell would agree wth D.H. Lawrence that only two in union can be perfect—hence the symbolic suggestion behind the glass paperweight, emblematic of the timeless perfection of the lovers' world: It contains and unites the opposites of maleness and femaleness. Traditional as Orwell's attitude may be, he seems to be in good company here with Donne, Coleridge, and D.H. Lawrence—none perhaps convinced feminists, but no misogynists either.

Another of Patai's provocative suggestions is that Orwell's flawed gender ideology makes him incapable of getting to the essence of the dynamics of totalitarianism, either the Nazi or the Stalinist version. Although there is no doubt that fascism had a strong anti-feminist bias, it is important to point out that, at least overtly, Stalinism was not explicitly anti-feminist. And it seems to me rather groundless speculation that by developing a feminist critique of either of these societies Orwell would have arrived at a viable method of annihilating totalitarian systems. Indeed, Patai herself admits that history does not offer conclusive evidence that women's achieving equality should resolve the political dilemma of power and violence. Indeed, there is no evidence for the claim that women's admission to the political arena would lead to the end of totalitarian terror.

Finally, is it true that *Nineteen Eighty-Four* reveals Orwell's ultimate despair about the future of mankind and about human nature in general? Like many other commentators within or beyond the pale of femininist criticism, Patai assumes that Winston's defeat signals Orwell's despair and that somehow this defeat is due to a flaw in Winston's (and ultimately in Orwell's own) personality and ideology. Underlying these 'defeatist' interpretations of the novel is the assumption that in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* Orwell succumbs to some kind of a private nightmare, overlooking the fact that Orwell's vision of totalitarianism is not a neurotic mental construct; it is an accurate representation of the ascending dictatorships he had witnessed in his own life-time, a growing threat he had every reason to anticipate.

What the 'defeatist' interpretation also overlooks is that one of the central goals in Orwell's strategy is to convince us of the deadly potency and longevity of the totalitarian system once it achieves power: in Oceania no individual human being could be left undefeated. Therefore, once we allow totalitarianism to come to power, no one could fare better than Winston Smith, our Everyman, the last man of Europe.

Winston's defeat by Big Brother should not be mistaken for Orwell's defeat in formulating a non-totalitarian alternative for the future. On the contrary, we still can and should oppose the forces that defeated Winston Smith. In fact, the impact of the novel does not come from the writer's pessimism about human nature: it derives from its power to warn against totalitarianism as something that is unnatural and inhuman, contrary to human nature. The frightening alienation totalitarianism creates between man and woman is one of the most powerful manifestations of these unnatural, inhuman forces.

Regardless of the disagreements about Orwell's strategy, most readers of Orwell will probably agree that Daphne Patai's thesis and its execution make *The Orwell Mystique* one of the best informed and most tightly argued works that have emerged from the profusion of Orwell scholarship in 1984. Patai's intimate knowledge of all aspects of Orwell's work should earn the respect of even the most dedicated Orwellian. In fact, even in 'debunking' the edifice of the Orwell mystique, she works intramurally,

consistently relying on the foundation of Orwell's moral-political terminology. The depth of her insight and the perceptive application of the feminist perspective to Orwell's own political and aesthetic thought make this a most provocative study. And even if Orwell himself would have defied an interpretation of his work in terms of "male ideology", (just as he would have rejected any other manifestation of the Procustean bed of ideology), *The Orwell Mystique* is a work that should offer enlightenment to all shades of opinion along the Orwell spectrum.

Seneca College, Toronto *Erika Gottlieb*

Where Nature Ends: Literary Responses to the Designification of Landscape. **By Susan E. Lorsch. London and Toronto: Associated University Presses, 1983. Pp. 175.**

There are two underlying premises in *Where Nature Ends,* the first historical, the second New Critical. As Susan E. Lorsch points out in the introductory chapter, "Theoretical Framework," by the mid-19th century, as a result of the new scientific thinking of such as Lyell and Darwin, writers were beginning to think of nature not as either benevolent or hostile to man, but as simply other, blank, neither providing nor reflecting human or religious meaning of any kind. The initial shock of perceiving the natural world in this way gradually, over time, for certain writers, abated until, in the 20th century, we find that the British literary tradition now includes, as a strong thread, acceptance of the idea that humanity exists in an absolutely meaningless universe. The second, New Critical, premise in this book is that literary form matches, embodies, content.

These premises prompted Lorsch to ask a question. What literary techniques, particularly diction but also characterization, narrative focus, and structure, do writers develop in order faithfully to render their conception of designified nature? Certain options, those of removing landscape entirely from the literary work, or of relegating it to mere background, or of reading its meanings as projections from the human mind, are dismissed from this study as not coming to grips with the central technical problem. That problem, from the writer's point of view, is how to incorporate landscape as important to human life in the poetry or prose, and yet to indicate its actual non-significance, and this in words that almost necessarily carry symbolic freight.

Clearly, there can be no one answer to such a question. And Lorsch avoids certain theoretical temptations that could accompany it. She points out that the authors whose works she studies—Arnold, Swinburne, Hardy, Conrad, and Viriginia Woolf—did not present only one view of nature in their whole *oeuvre.* Nor does she attempt to specify what influence one author might have had on a later one. Further, she does not "judge," finding this or that technique to be superior to another, but

rather sees each as embodying that writer's intentions at that time. *Where Nature Ends* is essentially descriptive: its strength lies in Lorsch's precise and persuasive analyses.

Yet there is an historical drift in this book, one that carries an important implication about the interaction of the history of ideas with literary technique. Lorsch begins her study with Matthew Arnold, whose "work reveals a beginning awareness of the theoretical difficulties of using symbol and metaphor in referring to and evoking an unmeaning landscape, but only a hesitant recognition of the technical implications of this philosophy of nature . . . . " (p. 26) She ends her extended analyses with Woolf's *The Waves*, in which she "in addition to using theme as the other four artists do, uses diction (like Swinburne and Arnold) and structure (like Hardy and Conrad) to forge a novel that perfectly embodies, reflects, and almost solves the problems posed for literary art by the designification of nature." (p. 27) From the periphery of a writer's consciousness to centre stage in a later author's fictional world: this progression of an idea from cautious recognition to acceptance as an integral part of the way a writer perceives the world has been shown to carry with it shifts in literary technique that accurately mirror the importance of the idea to the writer. The implication for the literary critic and historian is that many technically innovative, often puzzling, modern works might well be read as sufficient embodiments of ideas that have for some time been gathering force.

University of New Brunswick *A.C. Morrell*

The Smaller Infinity: The Jungian Self in the Novels of Robertson Davies. **By Patricia Monk. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1982. $27.50.**

Robertson Davies' interest in the theories of Freud and Jung has long been known—he is proud of having read and reread all Freud's and Jung's collected works—so it is a matter for satisfaction that a scholar as capable as Dr. Monk should have given us in this study a detailed and graceful account of the influence of Jung on Davies' novels. Robertson Davies is our most important writer—important in the sense that for more than forty years he has concerned himself with such questions as the importance of art for our society, the necessity to divest ourselves of restrictive religious codes, the definition of a Canadian identity vis-à-vis the pressures of English colonialism and, in this century, U.S. cultural imperalism—and for that reason detailed studies such as this one are to be welcomed. *The Smaller Infinity* began as a Ph.D. thesis but, unlike most such theses, Dr. Monk's reworked version is hedged about by the same kind of protective irony that Davies, and even Jung himself, adopt about Jungian theory; she begins her book with a disarming quotation from Jung: "We

must always bear in mind that, despite the most beautiful coincidence between the facts and our ideas, our explanatory principles are none the less only points of view."

Monk's first chapter demonstrates sensitively and persuasively how Davies began as a Freudian and how and why he gradually moved away from Freud to Jung. Freud's reduction of human weaknesses to a sexual etiology seemed too facile to Davies and not to fit the complexities of human behaviour. More importantly, Davies, always the moralist, always keenly aware of the subtly nuanced relationship of good and evil, came to distrust Freud's claim that religion was essentially an illusion. Jung with his espousal of folklore and magic, his belief in the value of literature and archetypes, his sympathetic response to religion ('Our religions and political ideologies are methods of salvation. . .'), his theory of individuation, proved more congenial to Davies than Freud's reductive train of thought, as he came to regard it.

Dr. Monk's second chapter struck me as the only weak one in the book. I was not persuaded by her argument, poorly documented, that Davies' *Shakespeare's Boy Actors* is a Jungian statement of "an encounter with the idea of the persona" and I was even less convinced by Monk's argument that Samuel Marchbanks, Davies' "creation of a second self", was a step Davies "had to take in dealing with the problem of identity". This is to confuse Jung's concept of the persona, a psychological concept, with the literary concept of the persona mask. And I am not convinced that in creating Marchbanks "Davies is not putting on a mask by creating a persona but stripping away his acquired persona."

Monk's third chapter, on the Salterton trilogy, is much better and her analysis of *A Mixture of Frailities* is especially illuminating as she documents Monica Gall's Jungian journey from a state of alienation to individuation, a journey presided over by Giles (animus), Mrs. Gall (sybil), and Domdaniel (magus). It is significant that the Jungian shadow is only hinted at in the Salterton trilogy, but this is to be expected since the trilogy is essentially a comedy of manners where the devil plays his role off stage. In the Deptford trilogy the shadow is given a central role as Davies moves from manners to morality.

In three separate chapters devoted to each of the novels of the Deptford trilogy Dr. Monk demonstrates convincingly the extent to which Davies draws upon Jung to develop and reinforce his aesthetic aims. Central to *Fifth Business* is the Jungian shadow here personified in Liesl Vitzliputzli, sexual partner to Dunstan, Magnus Eisengrim, Faustina and, perhaps, David Staunton. *Fifth Business*, like Blake's *The Marriage of Heaven and Hell*, demands a radical rethinking about traditional norms of good and evil. In Davies' scheme of things the *felix culpa* comes to embrace both Liesl's sexual promiscuity and Mary Dempster's copulation with the tramp in the gravel pit. Monk's remarks on the fifth business mandala conclude a chapter that admirably combines research and insight.

In her chapters on *The Manticore* and *World of Wonders* Monk shows how Davies moves beyond Jungian theory—despite the fact that *The Manticore* is the most Jungian of his novels—to embrace a Magian view of reality. Dr. Heller leads David Staunton as far as she can in the essential task of rehabilitation and individuation, but only Liesl can introduce him to his ancestors in the cave of the bears. But we need not be surprised at Davies' seeming repudiation of Jung in *The Manticore*; the bear episode acts as a bridge into the third novel of the trilogy where Dr. Monk quite rightly argues that the controlling archetype is that of the journey and the hero developed within the mode of romance which Liesl explicitly links with Spengler's Magian theory as expressed in his *Der untergang des Abendlandes*. From the vantage viewpoint of the trilogy's close it is possible to see that Davies defines human identity in terms of three myths—the Jungian myth, the Spenglerian myth and the hero myth. Magnus Eisengrim who is described in terms of these three myths is, as Dr. Monk well says, the magician who creates the illusions that deceive and enlighten us while we recognize that behind Eisengrim is the master illusionist, Robertson Davies himself.

Finally, it should be said that Dr. Monk has written a book that is refreshingly free from the jargon that too often disfigures reworked Ph.D. theses, and books that draw upon psychology and psychiatry. Because of the scholarship and clarity of exposition here demonstrated by Dr. Monk, let us hope that she will turn her attention to Davies' drama which, regrettably, has not been studied in this fine book.

University of Guelph *Eugene Benson*