

## Book Reviews

*Toronto Workers Respond to Industrial Capitalism, 1867-1892.* By Gregory Kealey. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1980. Pp. xviii, 433. Cloth \$27.50; Paper \$12.50.

This is a very good and very valuable book. I wish it had existed when I was writing my history of Canadian labour organizations, 1812-1902.

Part one sets the stage, provides the framework, for the whole: Toronto and the National Policy, and Toronto's industrial revolution. It was to the transformation wrought by industrialism and the National Policy that Toronto workers "responded," as Professor Kealey describes and analyzes in the twelve chapters that follow.

First, we have four examples of how specific groups of workers tackled the change from craft to industry: the shoemakers, the coopers, the metal-trades workers and the printers. The shoemakers managed to maintain their organization, through a series of unions; the coopers failed. The metal-trades workers, or at least the moulders, succeeded in preserving their all-important control of the shop-floor. The printers, in this period, did even better. Both moulders and printers fought some epic battles against foremen worthy of their steel.

These are good chapters, though I am a little surprised that the one on the coopers, with the sub-title, "the struggle for shorter hours," has in fact so little on that subject. On the other hand, the chapter on the metal-trades workers, with the sub-title, "and shop-floor control," has considerable material on producers' co-operatives, not only in foundries but also in printing, cigar-making and baking. Rather oddly, it does not mention the fact that the Iron Molders' International Union became so enamoured of co-operatives that in July 1868 it changed its name to Iron Molders' International Co-operative and Protective Union.

Chapter Seven, "The Orange Order in Toronto: Religious Riot and the Working Class," provides what is (for me) a highly novel and most interesting view of that organization. I am not wholly convinced that the part it played in working class activities was either quite as important or quite as positive as Professor Kealey suggests (though he does, of course, point out its negative, divisive role). Incidentally, I am surprised that he finds it "surprising" that the Order's loyalty to the Crown was conditional on the Crown's

upholding the Protestant religion and constitutional rights. The Order, after all, harked back to the Revolution settlement of 1688-89, which, as a result of bitter experience under James II, explicitly provided that henceforth the monarch must be a Protestant, and that any attempt to repeat James' violations of certain constitutional rights would be unlawful. The monarch to whom the Orangemen were fiercely loyal had to be a Protestant and constitutional monarch.

Chapter Eight is a comprehensive and thorough treatment of the Toronto working class's first entry into politics: the nine hours movement and its results and aftermath, more particularly the ties between the workers' leaders and the Conservative party, and, later, the Liberal party under Blake and Mowat. Both alliances yielded substantial results.

Chapter Nine, "The National Policy and the Toronto Working Class," analyzes the relations of the Toronto workers and their organizations and leaders, with the Conservative party in the inception and implementation of the National Policy.

Chapter Ten opens a new phase in the response to industrial capitalism: the Knights of Labor. Too little has been written hitherto about the work of this remarkable organization in Canada. Beginning in Hamilton in 1875, it organized some four hundred Local Assemblies in every part of the country except Newfoundland, Prince Edward Island and Saskatchewan. It organized workers of every kind: men and women, black and white, skilled and unskilled. It brought into the labour movement a host of new and far-reaching ideas. Throughout the quarter-century from 1867 to 1892 it played a leading, and seminal, part in the Toronto Trades and Labor Council and the Trades and Labor Congress of Canada. Professor Kealey has made a thorough study of the Knights' history in Toronto, and in this and later chapters has condensed it with great skill and perspicacity.

Having borne a large part in the defeat of an anti-labour candidate for mayor in 1882, in 1883 the Trades and Labour Council made the epoch-making decision to nominate independent labour candidates for the two Toronto seats in the provincial legislature. They were really Conservative-Labour and Liberal-Labour. (The latter was not opposed by the Liberals, and came near being elected.) None the less, both were actively supported by leading labour men who had previously worked for one or the other of the two old parties. Professor Kealey says, with perhaps a touch of wishful thinking, that "The 1883 electoral experience constituted stage one of a labour upsurge that was building towards the most tangible and significant political challenge in the late-nineteenth century."

After the 1883 defeat, the Trades and Labor Council went back to its old method of political action, lobbying both parties. At first, the unions had looked askance at the Knights of Labor, and tried to keep them out of the Trades and Labor Council. But this soon changed, and one result was that Liberal-leaning Knights came to supersede Conservative-leaning unionists as

leaders of the Council's political activities. They were largely responsible for the election of the pro-labour W.H. Howland as mayor in 1885.

This spurred the workers to have a second try at direct labour political action, this time both provincially and federally. In the provincial election of 1886 the labour candidates polled about a quarter of the votes in the two Toronto seats. In the Dominion election of 1887 the Liberals did not oppose the labour candidates, and they polled, respectively, 47 and 35 per cent of the votes. This was still disappointing: partyism was dying hard, and the Conservatives strove strenuously to keep their old working class support. "The struggle towards a class identity which transcended party, sect, and ethnicity had not totally triumphed," says Professor Kealey, "but positive steps had been taken. Moreover, it had become clear that a militant labour base could prevent trade-union leaders from the easy partyism of the earlier period . . . Nevertheless, were the militant base to weaken, partyism still had much to offer."

The last chapter (apart from a final "Summary") is: "Radicalism and the Fight for the Street Railway." The radicalism was Single tax and socialism; the fight for municipal ownership was lost.

The book has twenty-six tables in the main text and another thirty-one in appendices; ten pages of illustrations (including some excellent cartoons); six pages of short biographies of Toronto labour leaders of the period; sixty-nine pages of notes; and thirteen of bibliography: altogether, a rich and indispensable mine for future labour historians, and a fascinating and amply documented story of a critical period, in a critical place, in Canada's labour history.

There is a surprising number of misprints (only one of them serious), and some rather curious locutions, such as "O'Donoghue resolved, seconded by . . . ," where my generation at least would have expected "moved" (the "resolving" being done by the body which passed the motion). These, however, are crumpled rose-leaves.

Ottawa

Eugene Forsey

---

*The Roots of Disunity: A Look at Canadian Political Culture.* By David Bell and Lorne Tepperman. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1979. Pp. 262.

This book begins with an invitation to "imagine how a visitor from outer space might describe how Canadians vote," which at first glance seems as promising an approach to the subject as any. After the last federal election, many Conservatives at least might well believe that only a visitor from outer space *could* adequately describe it. Disappointingly, however, what the authors have in mind is merely the mechanics of voting (putting ballots in

metal boxes) which makes the exercise a good deal easier if less interesting. The point they are making is that "politics makes sense only if we know the political culture"—a truism of political science to which one is tempted to add: "and sometimes not even then."

Nevertheless, the authors are surely on safe ground when they assert that it is to the political culture (defined as "What Canadians feel, think, and do politically") that we must turn in order to understand the disunity which is so marked a feature of Canadian politics. This may not explain very much, but it does serve to focus attention upon historically based differences in attitude, outlook and way of life which reinforce provincial loyalties in Canada no less than more obvious factors such as wealth, geography and language. It also provides the authors with a useful and easily understood framework around which to organize their material, which is important in a volume which is presumably intended primarily for first-year university students in political science or Canadian studies courses.

The content consists mainly of a comprehensive and up-to-date survey of virtually everything which has been published on the subject of Canadian political culture, or which might have a theoretical bearing on it. This is no small task. The sheer bulk of such writing is most impressive, as the numerous and varied footnotes attest. (There is no bibliography, but the footnotes provide a useful guide to available sources.) Surveys of this kind are often done badly but this one, on the whole, is done very well. The summaries and discussions of the works of numerous authors, from Marx and Mannheim to such contemporary writers as Gabriel Almond and Sidney Verba, Louis Hartz and S.M. Lipset, are admirably clear and concise, as far as they go. The interminable debate over Gad Horowitz's application of Hartz's 'fragment' theory to Canada is reduced to its bare essentials, as is John Porter's critique of the 'mosaic' concept in a chapter which offers a capsule review of the "English'-Canadian Identity Puzzle" upon which so much ink has been so fruitlessly spilt. Likewise, the topics of French Canada, Regionalism and Ideology are dealt with in exemplary brief reviews of the literature.

The trouble with books of this kind, however, is that by covering so much material so lightly they are bound to be somewhat superficial. Even good brief expositions of other writers' complex arguments will sometimes have the effect of reducing them to near-banalities. In the present case, for example, a reader encountering the Hartz-Horowitz thesis for the first time might well be left wondering why anybody would want to devote more than five minutes to such airy speculations.

In substance, what this book seems above all to demonstrate is that differences among Canadians are real, important, deep-seated and probably permanent. Such differences, in fact, are largely the stuff of which Canada is made, and, for good or ill, what mainly distinguishes it from other countries. The challenge of Canadian politics, one might therefore conclude, is to con-

tinue to find the means by which our differences may be accommodated. Curiously, the authors do not draw this conclusion at all, even though it would seem to follow logically. Instead, they end their book with a conventional Ottawa-style plea for more "national unity" (though exactly how Canadians could be more unified than they are, in view of their multifarious differences, remains a mystery).

University of Western Ontario

S.J.R. Noel

---

*Prodigal Sons: A Study in Authorship and Authority.* By David Wyatt. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1980. pp. xix, 172. \$12.95.

Biographical criticism, the relating of an author's life to his work, was once a mainstay of the psychoanalytic study of literature, but it has fallen out of favor in the past decade or so, perhaps beginning with Norman Holland's influential discussion of the "three ways of psychoanalytic criticism" in *Psychoanalysis and Shakespeare* (1966). According to Holland, the only truly accessible "mind" of the three apparently available to analysis—the author's, the character's, and the reader's—is that of the reader. Much important literary theory and criticism has arisen from this theoretical base, and the study of the relation between reader and text continues unabated. David Wyatt now proposes, without taking on Holland and his disciples directly, to revive psychoanalytically informed biographical criticism in a new form: what he calls the study of careers.

Of course biographical criticism has been more generally suspect at least since Wimsatt and Beardsley's "The Intentional Fallacy" (1946), and Wyatt (wisely, I think) does not attempt to engage in that theoretical debate. Rather, he presents his findings as a form of knowledge which simply differs from other kinds of literary knowledge. Using the Prodigal Son parable as paradigm, he searches in seven authors for "a decisive turn in a career, the moment when an author makes his accommodation with authority and ceases wrestling with his role as a son" (xv). The basis is psychoanalytic theory in another paradigm, that of the Oedipus complex, specifically in the inevitable rebellion, in some form, of son against father. But Wyatt applies both paradigms—the Christian and the Freudian—flexibly to a diverse group of authors, and rarely creates the impression that he is reducing all of them to a single pattern.

Certainly, some of his arguments may seem over-ingenious, as when, in discussing Henry James, he finds the assumption of authority to take place in the revision by James of his "children" in the New York Edition of his works. Yet the presentation of evidence of James's troubled relationship to his father, and to fatherhood, is impeccable, and Wyatt's analysis of Christopher Newman's apparent lack of motivation in *The American* as

stemming from James's own inability to face marriage seems wholly convincing. Equally convincing is Wyatt's analysis of Yeats's two stages of assumption of authority, first as the spiritual father of the anti-Oedipal Synge, and then as middle-aged father of his own child. The chapter on Hemingway takes a different tack, following Freud's essay on "The 'Uncanny,'" and tracing the author's development from the creator of Nick Adams, who can face neither sex and birth (from the "uncanny" place, the womb) nor death, to the creator of Robert Jordan, who accepts love in the present, refusing to put an end to uncertainty by taking his own life. There are also brilliant discussions of *The Sun Also Rises* and *A Farewell to Arms*, which limitations of space prevent me from summarizing.

But the most significantly biographical of the essays is that on Faulkner, which, though drawing upon John T. Irwin's psychoanalytic study, corrects Irwin's findings in the direction of chronological rather than synchronic analysis. Here, as in all the essays, Wyatt's bias (using that term without pejorative implications) in favor of resolution leads him to stop at a certain point in Faulkner's career—when the sense of failure to avenge his father and great-grandfather is replaced fictionally (in "An Odor of Verbena") by the willed choice *not* to take revenge. The remaining chapters, on James Agee, Robert Penn Warren, and Robertson Davies, all fit the paradigms to the authors according to their individuality. Of the three, I find that on Davies most interesting, because it explores the differences between Freud's and Jung's theories of interpretation, and convincingly disputes the labeling of that novelist as simply a "Jungian."

Altogether, *Prodigal Sons* is a brilliant and humane work of criticism, lucid, free of jargon, complex in its ideas, and to a degree refreshingly personal. Wyatt understands the principles of Freudian theory, but does not impose them on the texts; the book is not heavily theoretical, and yet it should inspire much theoretical debate, particularly on the relation of an author's life to the meaning of his writings. My only serious doubts have to do with Wyatt's use of certain key Freudian terms. I have noticed recently that Freud's concept of the "Family Romance" is being used by writers in the humanities to designate the relationships within a family, whereas Freud meant by it specifically a child's fantasy that his *real* parents are some other, more exalted beings than those of his household. Wyatt never defines the term, which he uses primarily in discussing Yeats's relationship to Synge and Lady Gregory; and it seems to me that if Yeats did involve Synge in a "Family Romance," it was an inverted one, and this perhaps should have been noted.

Similarly, Wyatt never makes it clear how he is using the term "primal scene," but in most of the contexts in which it occurs (though not in all) it is difficult to relate to Freud's meaning, that of a child witnessing (or fantasizing) his parents in sexual intercourse. Finally, part of the discussion of the "uncanny" in Robertson Davies distorts Freud, who was *not* speaking of



the effect of watching Offenbach's opera, *Tales of Hoffmann*, but of a particular story by Hoffman, and whose discussion of what Wyatt calls "the elements . . . which continue to produce an uncanny effect" (147) has nothing to do with what Wyatt proceeds to summarize. It is a pity that an author who wears his Freudian knowledge so lightly and so well should make slips of this kind, and that the readers employed by Johns Hopkins University Press should have left them uncorrected, to mar what is otherwise an excellent book.

Simon Fraser University

Michael Steig

*Dreams of Adventure, Deeds of Empire.* By Martin Green. New York: Basic Books, 1979. 429 pp.

In the prefatory notes to his *Dreams of Adventure, Deeds of Empire*, Martin Green offers his readers a floor plan for what he concedes is a "fairly massive structure" (xi). Even with this well-intentioned gesture, however, readers will occasionally be either lost or confused or both. Given the nature of the book—an examination of the adventure story as "the generic counterpart in literature to empire in politics" (37)—some difficulty is understandable. Such an examination requires a bringing together of literature, history, and political theory in a way that is always tricky for writer and reader alike. Green, who looks at almost three hundred years of adventure fiction, is not always able to manage the ambitious project he has set for himself. Starting with Defoe, he moves on to Scott, Fenimore Cooper, Tolstoy, Twain, Kipling, Conrad, and—at the end—Doris Lessing and V.S. Naipaul. The line of adventure he is tracing is not always clear; neither is its geographical context. Most problematic is Green's maddening eclecticism; among those recruited to help define the concepts of his argument are Immanuel Wallerstein, Lévi-Strauss, Robert Scholes, Claudio Guillen, Edmund Leach, Tenn A. van Dijk, and Norman O. Brown. The list goes on, and the reader, in short, is forced to reconcile structural anthropology, structuralist criticism in literature, folklore, transformational grammar, the "modern world system" theory (Wallerstein here) and more, all of which are altered just slightly to fit something Green perceives as a method.

Stripped of its distracting theoretical paraphernalia, Green's book is an interesting study of the way excitement about empire was reinforced in literature and the way that this literature is related to "serious" literature (or what Green, by way of Guillen, refers to as "literature-as-a-system") and to society. People interested in Green's subject have long awaited just such a work, envisaging it as possible synthesis of all that has already been said about literature and empire. For this reason, whatever the shortcomings of

Green's book, it should and will be read. Other works in the area are sufficiently limited in number to recite in one breath: Susanne Howe's *Novels of Empire*, Alan Sandison's *The Wheel of Empire*, G.D. Killam's *Africa in English Fiction*, Benita Parry's *Delusions and Discoveries*, Allen J. Greenberger's *The British Image of India*, Jonah Raskin's *The Mythology of Imperialism*, and Jeffrey Meyers' *Fiction and the Colonial Experience*. Oddly enough, with the exception of Meyers' book, which is curiously cited for the information that two thousand miles separated the English frontier from Russia in 1846, no reference to these works is made in either the text or the bibliography. The omission would be less obvious and less important, perhaps, were Green not trying so hard to argue a place for the adventure story and its historical importance. Since others have dealt with the adventure story as an imaginative influence on the development of imperialist thought, it is difficult to imagine Green's effort without theirs.

The most controversial feature of *Dreams of Adventure, Deeds of Empire* is surely Green's professed aim to reach "beyond the limits of scholarship, to provide a platform for a new approach to English literature as a subject of study" (339-340). Not only does Green want the adventure novel to be taught in schools and colleges, but he wants it to be "at the center of the curriculum" (342). Jane Austen should be replaced with Scott, Green maintains, and only specialists in the history of the novel should be required to study Austen, George Eliot, the Brontës and other writers of what Green refers to as the "domestic novel." This whole-sale jettisoning of the study of much of English literature is urged, rather naively, in the name of civilization. Green believes that the adventure novel will explain to the immigrants of England how they came to be and will, in addition, bring the immigrants into closer contact with the native-born English. Certainly the adventure story provides readers with a critical view of the imperial imagination and habit of mind, but it does not "explain how England came to acquire an empire" (xiv) as clearly as Green suggests. Surely, unless the power of the imperial pen is rare indeed, no programme like Green's will significantly alter race relations in England.

Yet another source of irritation is Green's writing. One stumbles almost immediately over a passage like the following: "The English accent begins to have a tawdry sound, like tattered lace" (xii). The use of the generic "man" is taken to near-absurd extremes in a remark about the seriousness of the adventure novel vis-à-vis that of the domestic novel: "Defoe and Scott were of course serious men, and if Jane Austen and George Eliot were more so (which I would dispute anyway) this is clearly not a matter of more or less" (341). One last example should give some indication of the frustratingly perverse logic that readers are compelled to make sense of: "I have argued in another essay," says Green, ". . . that English literature is characterized by a marked preference for quotation, allusion and cliché. I cite Virginia Woolf and Grahame Greene as particularly notable among novelists for . . . this



device . . . It now seems to me that they learned this art . . . from Kipling. If so, this unacknowledged debt is a neat example of the general ingratitude of modern English literature; they have claimed Conrad as father while owing more to Kipling—for this seems to me a very significant debt, establishing the important terms of reference for all criticism." (397n) Finding one's way through that sort of reasoning for any length of time is difficult indeed.

The limitations of Green's book are only too plain. Nonetheless, there are random bits and pieces that redeem, in part, the ill-considered and eccentric whole. These are to be found in, for example, the discussion of Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe* as prototypical adventure tale, the account of Swift's hostility to Defoe, the comments on Samuel Smiles' *Self-Help*, the passage on Henry Stanley, and various remarks on the nineteenth-century cult of manliness and machinery. Most interesting is his identification of and effort to tackle some of the more puzzling aspects of adventure literature. How does one reconcile the adventure novel's explicit support of imperial values in economics, religion, and philosophy with its all-too-frequent silence about the empire itself? How does one account for the seeming contradiction between the adventure's merchant hero, who is antipathetic to militarism and appears to represent the world of commerce and technology, and the adventure's soldier hero, who is antipathetic to commerce and technology, and the adventure's soldier hero, who is antipathetic to commerce and appears to represent the world of traditional aristocratic landowning and military culture? Green's suggestion that the problems be seen as a reflection of shifting class alliances between merchant and aristocrat, although not clearly developed, has a very convincing ring.

Martin Green obviously does not inspire confidence, but even so his book is inviting. Readers who tread cautiously and have a high frustration threshold may well be satisfied with its sparing rewards.

St. Mary's University

Wendy R. Katz

---

*Reading Clarissa: The Struggles of Interpretation.* By William Beatty Warner. New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1979. Pp. xiii, 274. \$19.50 U.S., cloth.

*Clarissa's* most discerning readers over the past decade have been the converted, a group of scholars and critics sympathetic to Richardson's designs in forging an imaginative identification between his audience and his exemplary heroine. Inevitably, any fresh interpretation of the novel must rival the patient, loving attention given it in Mark Kinkead-Weekes' classic *Samuel Richardson: Dramatic Novelist* and the complementary studies of its craft by Elizabeth Brophy and Margaret Doody. Warner's *Reading Clarissa* provides

a provocative alternative to what he labels the "humanist sublime" (219-20) in Richardsonian criticism. He does so by aligning himself as reader with a masculinist pleasure principle. He plays the Sadean sceptic, eager to reclaim the "body" of Clarissa's "text" for Lovelace. Warner's most impressive contribution to our understanding of *Clarissa* is his detailed and utterly convincing account of the singular attention accorded the novel by its first readers, together with an analysis of Richardson's attempts to control "misreadings" through his extensive revisions of subsequent editions. This alone makes *Reading Clarissa* an important book for eighteenth-century specialists. The interpretation of the fiction itself is controversial, guaranteed to reanimate the debate over its meaning; but it disturbs because Warner intentionally polarizes for sensational effect the responses of men and women to sexual power, and more particularly, to rape.

Warner offers cogent, often dazzling, rhetorical readings of the history of critical response to *Clarissa*. The struggle to gain "interpretive mastery" (171) over the novel involved the energies of many of Richardson's contemporaries, who read it in three long installments. The fiction gained for several the status of scripture, as indeed it does for Clarissa and Belford within the text. Warner argues that Clarissa's book became a powerful object of desire for Joseph Spence and Lady Bradshaigh. Their reactions diverged sharply. Spence refused in 1744 to "violate" the "unspotted virgin purity" (152) of his handwritten copy with suggested alterations, while "Belfour" (Bradshaigh's pen name) pleaded eloquently with the author for Lovelace's reformation and marriage. As Warner demonstrates, each interpretation tried to "tame or discredit debate" in order to enforce a "closure of meaning" (171) on *Clarissa*. Richardson, nominally the editor of his heroine's correspondence, both encouraged these fierce debates over the propriety of her behavior and the justice of her death and simultaneously used his extensive correspondence and additions to the book to engage in a partisan, rearguard vindication of his secular saint. Warner is especially astute in exploring Richardson's psychological need to revenge himself on the rake who rapes his adored creation, just as he is in explaining Spence's (and Belford's) panegyrics about text and protagonist as an indication of the voyeur's guilt at his implication in Clarissa's violation. The research of Eaves and Kimpel and Kinkead-Weekes has made such a study possible, but the critical ingenuity which is Warner's particular strength is here utilized to full effect.

It is, however, the same ingenuity that seduces Warner to play, quite literally, the devil's advocate in his own interpretation of the novel. He champions Lovelace's "comic" view of its action, rejecting as sober, mundane, and characteristically "female" (meaning effeminate) any view of *Clarissa* as a tragedy whose course is determined by the rape. While he knows the rape to be a "violent and reflexive striking out so as to level Clarissa," (49) Warner evidently shares Lovelace's uneasy conviction that homage can lead to "impotence" (45)—a state of affairs associated in this book with the enervating

effects of humanism on the reader. The analogies between Lovelace as rapist and the reader Warner postulates invading the text, and subjecting it to his own willed meaning, are made baldly explicit:

The rape is also to be a moment of knowing—the moment when Clarissa will be undressed, seen, penetrated, and known. These are activities which engage every reader, like Lovelace, who wishes to gain authority for his interpretation. He “lays bare” the text, “sees” its significance, “penetrates” to its real meaning, and thus “knows” it. (50)

Warner's identification with Lovelace reaches at moments to imagining the rake's mocking laughter at the outraged responses of those Richardsonian readers who are “tethered” to a “set of moral imperatives.” (54, 29) Clarissa, in this reading, is levelled indeed. She is a self-centered, sentimental heroine. Warner presents her letters as a series of feminine stratagems and poses that culminate in the self-magnification of the text *Clarissa*. What is lost in this reductive process is any full sense of her humanity. We learn that the control of Clarissa's “body” is the book's central concern for she believes her hymen to be “her crucial anatomical structure.” (50) The mystique of rape, here confounded with real sexual knowledge, is read with truly Lovelacean delusion as the “moment of greatest intimacy.” (212) Warner cannot afford to confront the complexity of humiliation, rage, and guilt aroused in Clarissa by her violation. To do so would necessitate acknowledging the complicitous shame Stanley Cavell has shown to be a fundamental part of our response to violence in tragedy. Taking his cue from de Sade, Warner insists that we read *Clarissa* for the “pleasure of seeing virtue crushed.” (258) Even if we suspend our scepticism about this position—and reflecting, for example, on Cordelia's death in *King Lear* makes such a view untenable—Warner's attitude towards rape must provoke protest.

The heroine of Cleland's *Fanny Hill*, the comic paean to eroticism published a year after *Clarissa*, differentiates clearly between sexual pleasure and acts of aggression which take a sexual form. Like Clarissa, Fanny Hill is raped while in a state of “lifeless insensibility.” (Signet edition, 80) Her psychological insights into rape are worth recording. Fanny's hymen is not at all in question, nor does she share Clarissa's ethical integrity (“our vices and our virtues depend too much on our circumstances”), but she is thoroughly humiliated and shamed by Mr. H's invasion of her private space. Fanny denounces this rape as a kind of necrophilia. Her language exposes the hollow posturings of Lovelacean rhetoric: “I found him buried in me, whilst I lay passive and innocent of the least sensations of pleasure: a death-cold corpse could scarce have had less life in it . . . [He] satisfied his passion on a mere lifeless, spiritless body dead to all purposes of joy since, taking none, it ought to be supposed incapable of giving any.” (80-2) Since *Fanny Hill* is subtitled the “Memoirs of a Woman of Pleasure” and further explicitly parodies the

morality of Richardson's *Pamela*, Fanny's concurrence with Clarissa's sense of victimization carries considerable weight. Rape remains a masculinist outrage in both *Fanny Hill* and *Clarissa*, an act destructive of both pleasure and intimacy in its exercise of sexual domination. *Reading Clarissa* sheds new light on Richardson's novel because of its contentious antagonism towards its heroine's claim to tragic stature, but Warner's interpretive bias is finally one with which few readers are likely to be comfortable.

Erindale College, University of Toronto

H. Jennifer Brady

---

*Defoe and Fictional Time.* By Paul K. Alkon. Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 1979. Pp. 276. \$17.50.

Professor Alkon's study of Defoe is of major importance; it represents a considerable advance in the criticism of his fiction and will have to be taken into account by future commentators on Defoe. It is excellent in four ways. Firstly, it adopts a critical approach which is informed and highly observant and which, by challenging received views about Defoe's episodic style and about his concern with verisimilitude, demonstrates the range of his narrative skills. Secondly, as a result of concentrating upon Defoe's themes about time and upon his affective interest in the reader's awareness of reading-time, it is able to discriminate between the novels and to propose that they constitute significantly distinct achievements. Thirdly, this study's success in detailing Defoe's careful deployment of tempo and of tensions between temporal and spatial form leads inevitably to the conclusion that Defoe energetically embodied and creatively realized moral ideas in his fiction. And, fourthly, by revealing how such critical concepts as narrative frequency testify to Defoe's wish to make the reader's response a part of the structure of his fiction, this study maintains in a fresh and compelling way that Defoe made a real contribution to the novel and literary tradition.

The major premise of Alkon's critical approach is that the final shape of memories which is elicited by a text should be viewed as one of its formal attributes (p. 11). This premise reflects his sympathy for the current movement of critical attention away from textual patterns towards the reading experience. Despite his dislike of traditional formalism, however, Alkon does not value the reading process more highly than the imaginative recall which accompanies the end of reading. Rather, he desires to be balanced by relating the temporal appeal of the reading process to the spatial imagination which the sense of ending arouses. Nevertheless, his commitment to the phenomenology of reading causes him to examine Defoe's fiction for the way in which 'conscious recollection of previous parts of the text' (p. 12) is obligatory and establishes a cumulative awareness in the reader which entails

that the moment of reading is necessarily relative to earlier ones and which means that the reader's memories are continuously reshaped, expanded, and defined.

The first step in his thesis that Defoe was more interested in conveying meaning than in enhancing verisimilitude is taken when Alkon surveys the setting and chronology of the novels. Hence, by contrasting the precise and accurate details of the pirate flags and crosses in *The King of the Pirates* with the vaguer but more suggestive application of the same properties in *Captain Singleton*, Alkon maintains that Defoe implicitly invites readers to judge Singleton and to recognize that he has no responsible sense of time nor of the practical and spiritual significance of his sea-going (p. 33). Alkon also properly argues that the lack of specific details of calendar-time in *Captain Singleton* manifests that temporal ambivalence whereby Defoe exploits the topical interest of piracy in 1720 while drawing upon a story which belongs to the turn of the century. As a result of Alkon's survey it becomes clear that in any given narration Defoe conflates different narrative times so that history, while it retains its validity and exemplary truth, is yet 'detemporalized.' The point is that, although he set his stories in the past, Defoe could create the illusion, by avoiding particular dates, that his characters are contemporary with the reader. In Alkon's eyes, Defoe's ability to place his characters in historical time and in the timeless realm of the imagination renders his anachronisms intentional (p. 41). As a consequence of this emphasis on chronology, Alkon is able to indicate an ambivalence in Defoe's employment of setting. For example, he convincingly shows that *Roxana* is set in the courts of Charles II and George I (p. 57). In effect, Alkon affirms that inconsistencies in chronology and setting were instrumental to Defoe's wish to present both close and distant perspectives on his characters and to balance sympathy and judgment. Alkon further reduces the significance of verisimilitude for Defoe criticism in his demonstration that, by minimizing temporal details and favouring references to 'biological time,' Defoe establishes general, symbolic meaning without being obtrusively emblematic. He suggests that, when Defoe's characters talk about the span of their lives, their temporal references are primarily statements about their use of time which invite the reader to compare their temporal and spiritual growth. Thus Alkon emphasizes that an understanding of the development of Defoe's characters involves much more than an appreciation of chronology and setting.

The next step of Alkon's thesis is the proposition that Defoe's stress on reading-time makes redundant the generic issue of whether his narratives are history or fiction. Moreover, by insisting that Defoe's most characteristic devices invite the reader to look back and to consider what has been read with what is being read, Alkon discounts the supposed generic uniformity of the novels; he denies that they are equally offered as imitations of authentic autobiographies. For Alkon, Defoe's sense of reading-time causes him to

engage the reader with literary memories which induce the latter to think about eternity rather than to notice verisimilitude or generic patterns (p. 94). In his account of *Colonel Jack*, Alkon clearly exemplifies the notion that narrative events gain significance to the degree that they are reorganized in the reader's memory. He shows conclusively that the story concerns the evolution of Jack's memory towards its proper spiritual role, that the narrative becomes a spiritual exercise which is integral to Jack's repentance, and that the retrospective viewpoint is the medium for the reader's spiritual perspective.

It is in order further to depreciate the importance of episodic realism that Alkon passes on to maintain that the character's retrospective viewpoints are subordinated to the reader's memory by narrative strategies. He proposes that the reader is invited to consolidate narrated events in a way that imitates encounters with unfolding experience rather than with narrator's memories (p. 115). Referring to Moll's seduction, he describes illuminatingly how narrated moments are superimposed upon one another in the reader's experience, how the sense of reading-time exercises the reader's mind beyond Moll's ideas, and how Defoe characteristically puts narrative sequence before plot sequence to heighten the reader's awareness. To Alkon, these narrative techniques possess some of the advantages of rereading during the first-reading: the departure from chronological sequence permits the reader memories of the narrative future (p. 121)! Alkon explains brilliantly that retrospective allusions which amalgamate memories of previous scenes with narration of subsequent episodes constitute a stylistic feature which emphasizes moral meaning. He argues that the repetition of scenes furthers the memory of moral implications and that in retrospect such scenes have incremental effects that are more powerful than those a single scene or series of scenes could have. Alkon convincingly exemplifies this cumulative method of narration and the way in which the reader's viewpoint is freed from the narrative point of view by examining the different accounts that Crusoe gives of his establishment on the island. He demonstrates that Defoe repeats the episode to create a more nearly complete picture of events in the reader's memory than exists in any one of the versions which Crusoe presents (p. 157). From his examination Alkon concludes that the different versions, besides giving an impression of how time flowed for Crusoe on the island, invite the reader to consider the importance of writing for the discovery of providential design.

The verisimilitude that Alkon does recognize in Defoe's fiction he clearly subordinates to the novelist's sense of tempo. His remarks about *A Journal of the Plague Year*, which he regards as the best example of Defoe's control over the reader's subjective sense of time and over the pacing of narrative, makes this clear. He contrasts *The Storm* in which Defoe adopts a historical and rational perspective on the simultaneity of events and matches event to narration in a one-to-one ratio to the *Journal* which has no determinate generic form or narrative structure. Indeed, the *Journal's* dominant stylistic



feature which subordinates generic considerations is the illusion of the narrator's speaking voice which, through its intrusiveness, slows reading-time for emphasis. Alkon's point is that the speaking voice makes the subjective experience of reading-time conform to the slow rhythms and pace of conversation. After showing from a comparison of *Roxana* and *Robinson Crusoe* that Defoe was alert to the different effects he could achieve by inviting his readers to imagine sound, Alkon returns to the *Journal* to indicate how the narrator's words have to be given imagined accents and intonation and how this aural imagination slows the narrative pace. His fine remarks about Defoe's variation of narrative frequency and his comments on the way in which the imagination reacts to incomplete anecdotes and must generalize those single episodes which stand for classes of events also contribute to explain the efficacy with which Defoe slows the tempo in the *Journal*. As a result, his conclusion that the *Journal* is about mental duration and that its represented time seems to move slowly because its reading-time does (p. 230) is profound.

In his chapter on the implications of his study, Alkon interestingly suggests that Richardson and Fielding, like Defoe, universalize their narratives and move away from verisimilitude because of their attitudes towards time. He is particularly stimulating about how Defoe can serve as a precedent for a mythical interpretation of time in Fielding (p. 239). But, in calling for a more thorough critical understanding of time, Alkon concedes that his insights are not based on an adequate theory of tempo and he acknowledges that he cannot discriminate as precisely as he would like between ordinary traits of Defoe's prose and those which control the variation of pace. Certain of the stylistic features that reflect tempo, he is moved to call for a grammar of these features which will explain their function and priority. Although he considers himself to be outlining tasks for critical theory, his conclusion that Defoe's concern with the moral aspects of time and with experiments in tempo makes him a writer of both traditional and contemporary importance is a significant critical achievement in itself.

In summary, Alkon's study is remarkable for its theoretical ideas and critical insights. Although he draws attention to the inadequacy of the theory of reading-time and to the precariousness of some of his interpretations, these concessions do not weaken his argument or polemical intentions. His challenge to formal criticism and to the literary history of the novel is lucid and bracing. Naturally, his emphasis leads him to overlook some critical difficulties: he tends to blur differences between character and narrator and between narrator and implied author; he ignores Defoe's social projecting; and his attitude towards judgment leads him to underestimate the effect of biblical and political allusion which often demands local and immediate judgment. But these omissions are insignificant beside his sense of how criticism of Defoe and the novel should advance: his awareness of how to rectify the traditional undervaluation of Defoe's narrative skills is inspiring.