

BOOK REVIEWS



RESEÑAS

Engler, Balz, and Renate Haas, eds. 2000: *European English Studies: Contributions towards the History of a Discipline*. Published for The European Society for the Study of English (ESSE) by The English Association. Pp. II, 388.

Rüdiger Ahrens
Universität Würzburg

1. INTRODUCTION

As the subtitle of this book suggests, it does not pretend to present a comprehensive history of English Studies as an academic discipline from its outset to the present day. In view of the great variety of English Studies in Europe it modestly aspires to confront the reader with some sketches of its development without giving a full account of coverage in all European countries. The European Society for the Study of English, which came into being under the acronym ESSE in 1990, was somewhat influential because, as the two editors state in their preface to this volume, the idea of such a project was born at the Glasgow Conference of ESSE in 1995 when a first tentative version of it was read to an attentive audience. At the conference which followed in Debrecen two years later, this project evolved into a seminar which was the actual foundation stone of the volume under scrutiny. Although enormous efforts were made by the two editors, the volume presents only an intermediate stage en route to a more comprehensive historical outline of our discipline.

But why has such an undertaking only been ventured upon now after approximately a century and a half of continuous development of English Studies in European countries? No precise answer is given by the editors. Is it because such a time-span invites the professionals working within this discipline to look back with pride because of its achievements or with terror because of the crisis it has run into? Or has the point been reached when people start looking out for new orientations because they are leaving the firm ground they have been standing on so far? These assumptions cannot easily be answered, but two things have clearly contributed to the fostering of such an enterprise: firstly, ESSE has provided an organisational frame for representatives and authors who are inclined to reflect on the history of English studies in their individual countries; secondly, the overwhelming growth of English Studies in the last century requires some meticulous considerations to seek for new orientations when universities in general are under pressure from society at large.

ATLANTIS
Vol. XXIV Núm. 1 (Jun. 2002): 247-52.
ISSN 0210-6124

2. THE SCOPE OF THE UNDERTAKING

When considering the overall title of the book the reader must ask himself several questions which are only partly dealt with in the included essays. The two editors offer a conceptional frame to the national surveys by individual contributors. In his introductory essay on "Writing the European History of English Studies", Balz Engler from Basel University not only delineates the abstract implications of English as an academic discipline, but also hints at the institutional difficulties and methodological consequences which were entailed by its process of establishment within a traditional university system. The fifteen national surveys written by individual authors, which form the heart of the volume, sway from west to east in their geographical stratification, i.e. they start in Portugal and come to an end in Bulgaria. As for the omission of Switzerland one might succumb to Balz Engler's introductory statement about the country having "no national history of the discipline" (ii). One may, however, ask for the reasons of this lack beyond the linguistic split which rules in that country. Also Belgium, Hungary and Greece are not given any special attention although they are represented on the ESSE Board. The same holds true for the Baltic countries (Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania) as well as for the Scandinavian countries, Sweden and Finland, and for eastern Europe (Russia, Ukraine, Belorussia). So the title of the book raises the question as to what Europe as a geographical entity implies and how far east it is supposed to stretch without hurting any geopolitical feelings.

In his introductory essay Balz Engler touches on the point of geographical restraints (7), when in an era of globalization English is becoming the *lingua franca* of communication systems, of aviation and computer industry as well as of youth and policy cultures, entertainment and clothing industries. Also there are hardly any borderlines these days between the use of English as a mother tongue or as a foreign language, and linguistic registers do not always offer a clear-cut way of dealing with overlapping within the different Englishes. In his final essay on "Englishness and English Studies", Balz Engler discusses the relationship between language and nationhood. When he emphasises that "English nationhood is special" (p. 337), one feels his reservations about the definitions of the English nation that fluctuate between a regional location and a global commitment. This universal aspect is tied to "the historical memory of the Empire" (338) being effectively balanced, as we all know from our views of the English countryside, by a strong adherence to the location.

In a geographical sense the editors admit omissions concerning the development of English Studies in Britain and Germany, although the section on "European Case Studies" (293-334) does discuss some German particularities of the university curriculum in the field of English studies.

The essay by Renate Haas deals with the influence of the 1848 revolution which marked "the decisive turning-point in 19th century German history" (294) and which launched a new general consciousness of literary and cultural studies in German universities. These changes were due to the strong impact inaugurated by the university reform of Wilhelm von Humboldt, who required freedom of research and teaching as the fundamental academic principle. The methodological turn was caused by the so-called *Vormärz* understanding of German Studies, which raised the

consciousness of the social relevance and the political role of a national philology. This took place in the context of the linguistic revolution initiated by Jacob Grimm who was widely acclaimed for his *Deutsche* (i.e. Germanic) *Grammatik* of 1819. The coverage of this philological method included west-Germanic dialectal forms of language under which Old English was considered to be just part of the German Studies programme. Because of the considerable influence of French following the Norman Conquest in 1066, Middle English was integrated into the Romance Philology programme so that "no division of independent English Studies was needed" (305). Another strong influence was exerted by Victor Aimé-Huber (1800-1869), first Professor of Modern Languages in Rostock and Marburg before moving to Berlin in 1843. Renate Haas's enlightening monograph in 1990 is worth studying in this concern. By combining economics, history and theology with English Studies, Aimé-Huber gained the reputation of being the father of what we now call "area studies". All these mainstream developments postponed the achievement of full academic status by English Studies in German universities until the end of the 19th century. The first Chair of English Studies in Germany was held by Alois Brandl, a Tyrolian by birth, who exerted a strong influence at the universities of Göttingen, Strasbourg and Berlin until his death in 1940. This was mainly due to his sympathy with Nazi Germany and his right-wing leanings. Renate Haas's contribution to the book would certainly have been more valuable if she had carried these developments in Germany up to the present day. It is to be hoped that she will find time and strength to share her profound knowledge in this field with us in the near future.

3. THE CONCEPTUALIZATION OF ENGLISH STUDIES

As Balz Engler points out in his above-mentioned reflections on Englishness and its consideration of English Studies, academic preoccupation with English literature was invented outside England principally in Scotland, India and Germany. The leaders of the Scottish Enlightenment, above all Hugh Blair, in the 18th century not only elaborated a system of rhetoric and encouraged a taste for *belles lettres*, but also developed a method of teaching canonical authors (Shakespeare, Milton, Swift) as classics of English literature. The emphasis on correct English assisted in developing a hierarchical notion of English literary forms (339-ff.). A similar mechanism facilitated the introduction of English in India in order to teach the natives moral norms, and to correct the negative impressions the behaviour of the colonial masters had evoked. In Germany, however, the need for English literature, above all for reading Shakespeare in the original, arose from the practical need for teachers of English in secondary education. There, English was substituted for the classical languages, because German political leaders had acknowledged Britain's powerful position in trade and in imperial politics, a position which the unified Germany increasingly looked upon with jealousy and ambition. All these developments do not account for England's tardiness in establishing an English programme in her universities. Oxford introduced such a programme in 1893, Cambridge followed suit in 1917. But the foundation of Schools of English as schools of nationhood came in the aftermath of the Great War, and was instigated by the Newbolt Report in 1921. The Regius Chair in Rhetoric and Belles Lettres at Edinburgh was founded in 1762 (to all intents and purposes a Chair in English

Studies). It had nothing to do with English nationalism, and was intended to improve the communication skills of the professional classes in Scotland.

Terry Eagleton, the materialist thinker and Marxist theorist of literary criticism in Oxford, digs deeper in his essay "The Rise of English", when he explains the Romantic concept of human creativity as the foundation of a form of idealist and escapist reaction to the Industrial Revolution (1996: 19-ff). For him, the alienation of art from social life reinforced by the aesthetic movement in the second half of the 19th century created an ideological need for the teaching of literature, which thus became a substitute for the loss of religion and morality. Eagleton quotes from the inaugural lecture of George Gordon, early Professor of English literature at Oxford, who commented that "England is sick, and ... English literature must save it. The Churches (as I understand) having failed, and social remedies being slow, English literature has now a triple function: still, I suppose, to delight and to instruct, but also, and above all, to save our souls and heal the State" (1996: 23). English Studies became, as Eagleton puts it some pages later, "a way of providing a cheapish 'liberal' education for those beyond the charmed circles of public school and Oxbridge" (1996: 27). But literature became useful also for the education of women and for those from the "lower ranks" who became school-masters. Eventually in the era of high imperialism, as the example of India shows, English literature proved to be an instrument to teach moral standards and a receptive sensitivity to the natives. By a curious chain of argument, these objectives entailed asserting the racist supremacy of the Germanic tribes in northern Europe, whose best representatives settled in England, and thereafter established constitutional liberty in that country, and took upon themselves the burden of imposing her culture on the native people in the empire united under her flag. In the book under review Renate Haas sums up parameters and patterns in the development of English Studies in Europe to find all these conceptualisations alive on the Continent. They helped to establish Chairs of English in the second half of the 19th century, because the pervasive Humboldtian reform of university education included teachers training in its programme. The need for teachers, as she confirms (363), is caused by the rising numbers of foreign language students, which in these days amount to more than 18 million in the case of English in the ten main European countries.

4. ORGANIZATIONAL PARAMETERS OF ENGLISH STUDIES

It would be a highly daunting task and would transgress the scope of a review, to enter into a discussion of all the survey articles, which contain a plethora of information on the developments of English Studies in the European national states. Interestingly enough, however, there is a common denominator. First and foremost, the preoccupation with language and linguistic aspects of English as a foreign or standard language dominated the beginnings of all university courses. This is certainly caused by the status of English as a foreign language or privileged in some way, which compels students to acquire the linguistic competences of speaking and writing it through the application of cognitive theories. In Scandinavian countries, for example, attention was drawn to teaching and learning methodologies at a comparatively early stage. Also central European and south-eastern European countries such as Poland, Czechia or Romania and Bulgaria turned to linguistic analysis, often on a contrastive or comparative basis, in order to provide the

necessary knowledge to acquire the language. In Germany, the diachronic method dominated the classroom for a long time, because the philological way to understand Old and Middle English texts was considered to be the main target of academic studies. This avoidance of compliance with the necessities of the day found many imitators in other countries such as Portugal and the Netherlands, which for a long time resisted the need for modern language learning.

France also offers a special case, because even today learning English is regarded in this country as a necessary evil, which can be circumvented only by the study of English civilisation. For political reasons and rivalries Spain avoided any contact with English language and literature until recently, and allowed a syllabus for English Studies within its academic education only after the Second World War. In the second half of the last century, these Spanish resentments slowly disappeared.

As Tomás Monterrey from the University of La Laguna in the Tenerife Island convincingly makes clear, English literature, even Shakespeare's works, long remained virtually unknown to Spanish writers and intellectuals. It was only early in the 1950s that syllabuses of English Philology were officially sanctioned by the Spanish Minister of Education for the Universities of Salamanca and Complutense of Madrid (37) and in 1961 that Esteban Pujals became the first chair holder of English language and literature at the Complutense. But Spanish universities also took a shortcut to American Studies, because the US kept a tight control over the country after the Second World War. This influence was also noticeable in 1976 when the Spanish Association for Anglo-American Studies AEDEAN (Asociación Española de Estudios Anglo-Norteamericanos) was founded in Seville. This association together with assistance from the American Embassy and the British Council strongly helped to consolidate English studies beyond the Pyrenees.

Jorgen Erik Nielsen's statement on the recent development in Denmark can be confirmed as the present state of affairs in many countries:

The old philological and historical approach to linguistic studies has almost disappeared, has given way to modern grammar and new linguistic approaches; American and post-colonial literatures are areas of study like British literature; history and civics, which have always been paid more attention to in the study of English than in German or French [programmes], are today regarded as branches on a par with language and literature. (138)

It is also common practice in many European countries that their old degrees are being replaced by the Anglo-American degrees of B.A. and M.A. in order to comply with the Bologna Agreement of June 1999, i.e. to create a common academic market within the European Union. Although there is a stunning amount of diversity in English programmes, the common features should not be overlooked. In order to become more aware of these diversities, which enliven the European scene of English studies, and in order to make these more transparent so that we can create more unifying factors for research and teaching, Balz Engler sums up the intention of this very laudable book: "What we need is an international history of English studies" (345).

REFERENCES

Eagleton, Terry 1996: "The Rise of English". *Literary Theory. An Introduction*.
Oxford: Blackwell. 17-53.

Op. Cit.: Uma Revista de Estudos Anglo-Americanos/ A Journal of Angloamerican Studies. N° 3, 2000. (Associação Portuguesa de Estudos Anglo-Americanos).

M^a Isabel Balteiro Fernández¹
Universidad de Santiago

With the arrival of the new millenium, the short life of *Op. Cit.: Uma Revista de Estudos Anglo-Americanos/ A Journal of Angloamerican Studies*, whose third volume has been recently published, calls for a review. *Op. Cit.*, as the journal of the Associação Portuguesa de Estudos Anglo-Americanos (APEAA), is now one of the main references for scholars concerned with Anglo-American studies in Portugal. It answers the needs of the members of the Association, who, after years of publishing a journal on a somewhat irregular basis, decided that the twenty-year-old Association should publish it annually. They aimed to produce a periodical of international standard that would be a place for debate and work in Anglo-American studies in Portugal, encompassing the ample range of fields and interests of the Association's members.

As regards its contents, *Op. Cit. 3* is structured in six sections: editorial, articles, translations, review(s), dissertation abstracts, and notes on contributors.

The journal opens with the editor's words (9-11), in which Carlos Azevedo not only suggests problems in consensus among the members of the Association but also includes a special plea to all members to send work for future issues. This alarming call for contributions may be the final consequence of both the fluctuating character and the topic-restriction of some of the issues. Thus, with the topic-free *Op. Cit. 1*, also entitled *Oceans*, their aims were successfully achieved as its comprehensive character welcomed varied works that contributed to the different fields of Anglo-American studies. Both the second and third volumes, however, were topic-restricted and focused on Modernism and Postmodernism, and on Translation, respectively. Then, it seems that their intention of returning to topic-openness, or topic-freedom, for the fourth volume will be the right way to proceed in order to cover the interests and fields of the varied membership.

The editorial is followed by five articles of different lengths (from 6 pages, the shortest, to 19, the longest) that offer an interesting glimpse of translation, specially of the role of translation in foreign language teaching and the teaching of translation

¹ This research has been funded by the Galician Ministry of Education, Secretaría Xeral de Investigación, PGIDT01PXI20401PR. This grant is hereby gratefully acknowledged.

itself. Though the weight of the articles is on the teaching of translation, the first two deviate in some ways from this.

The first article, entitled "A Reação contra o Modernismo: A Poesia Italiana Moderna *versus* A Poética Traductológica Anglo-Americana" by Lawrence Venuti (13-19), discusses the trends followed by English and American translators of Italian poetry during the 40s and 50s, making reference to the readers' reception. The first English translations of Italian poetry which began relatively late, in the 40s, are said to have been highly influenced by the reaction against Modernism that both the British and American literatures were experiencing at that time. Thus, for the last fifty years, English translations kept the structure of the Italian poetry quite faithfully, though there were obviously some variations imposed by the target language. The result of this tendency is that texts communicate not only the message of the original but also meanings that are only possible in the target language and culture to which the new text is addressed. Mandelbaum's translations of Ungaretti's poetry, for example, imitated the Italian syntax and division of verses as well as looked for word equivalences but he also re-wrote the style, posing Ungaretti's work in the Anglo-American poetic tradition, far from Italian Modernism. This new and ornamented version has clearly addressed to American readers who were familiar with the British and American poetic traditions. So, Mandelbaum was acting against a Modernism cultivated in the Italian poetic tradition. For this reason, nowadays, Mandelbaum's work is, in Venuti's opinion, considered asymmetric, though it was previously seen as the reconciliation of the differences between the Italian and the American, the academic and the literary worlds. Towards the end of the article, Venuti suggests that the success of a translation depends on the style and movement chosen, a difficult task when translating into English as there are, according to Venuti, as many styles as there are foreign traditions.

Ezra Pound's words "translate what I MEAN to write" or "don't bother about the WORDS, translate the MEANING" (22) are the starting point of Gualther Cunha's article (*Op. Cit.* 3: 21-34). These ideas are already present in the title, "Don't Translate What I Wrote, Translate What I Mean to Write": A Intencionalidade no Discurso Poético e a sua Relevância para a Tradução", and are discussed throughout. Cunha not only deals with the relevance of the author's intentionality in translation but also demands a theoretical status for it. Moreover, he rejects those twentieth century trends which deny the importance of the author, saying that claiming the author's death implies also the disappearance of the text itself. Against those tendencies, he argues that the poet's emotional tone, cognitive dimension, and moral attitude must be paid special attention by the translator. In addition to this, he sets out to show how intentionality works in poetic discourse and also how interpretation works in relation to intentionality. These two ways of looking at discourse are, according to Cunha, essential for the translation of poetry.

Unlike the former, the last three articles concentrate on (the improvement of the) teaching and/or learning of translation. Thus, the third article, "The Practicum in Translator Training Programs" by Javier Ortiz García (35-44), tries to promote a three phase 'practicum' or training for translation services, arguing against the *theoretical* training that students receive at translation schools. In view of all this, Ortiz establishes ten objectives for the so-called 'practicum', in which the student is expected to become familiarized with the role of the translator in the office, his tools

and equipment, the types and quality of translations, revision, proof-reading, etc. Moreover, he shows that good knowledge of some of these cannot be achieved at workshops or "in-house" 'practicums'. Finally, Ortiz defends an ideal three-phase practicum in which the student will be, firstly, an observer (by being introduced to the work environment), secondly, a translator's assistant (learning and performing auxiliary translations under supervision), and thirdly, an apprentice-translator (translating texts and dealing with all aspects involved in translation). Though the article is carefully built-up, it still remains to be proved whether the time established and even the way of training a future translator is the most appropriate.

The fourth essay, "Towards Bridging The Gap: Direct-Textual and Translational Methods in the Teaching of Agricultural ESP Texts" by M. Angeles Ruiz Moneva (45-64), considers the hitherto opposing methods: the grammar-translation method and the direct method, arguing for a combination of both. The paper focuses on so-called English for Special Purposes (agricultural) classrooms, maintaining that some methods are more useful or suitable for certain students. It also shows that a combination of textual and translation methods can help students to develop their own strategies in order to deal with meaning and the rhetorical structures of specialized texts. It defends translation as the only means of clarifying the main concepts, ideas and terminology in scientific and technical language. An example of the steps to follow in an ESP (English for Special Purposes) classroom is also included: from warming-up exercises to translation of the text, the final step.

The fifth and last article entitled "Using a Translation Corpus to Teach English to Native Speakers of Portuguese" by Ana Frankenberg-Garcia (65-78), focuses on the errors that Portuguese students produce when using prepositions, specially those employed in the complementation of certain English verbs and adjectives. In addition to this, it provides the reader with a good example of the usefulness of translation corpora in producing second language teaching materials for monolingual classes.

As can be inferred from the titles of the articles, though the journal is devoted to Anglo-American studies, it welcomes material in both English and Portuguese. This feature has its pros and cons: on the one hand, it may increase the number of potential contributors that may feel more comfortable writing in one of the two languages; on the other hand, it may also discourage (some) potential readers who cannot read Portuguese.

But in this short issue of *Op. Cit.*, consisting of only 109 pages, there is also place for Translations (79-84). Thus, Marvell and Shakespeare's poems are translated into Portuguese by Paula Sampaio and Jorge M. Bastos da Silva, respectively.

In the Reviews section, *Op. Cit.* 3 includes only M. Gomes da Torre's review of Venuti's book entitled *The Scandals of Translation. Towards an Ethics of Difference*, published in London by Routledge in 1998. The review (87-90) is well argued, portraying not only the main points made in the work but also some evaluative comments. Gomes da Torre also explains how the book is influenced by Venuti's previous works. In general, he does justice not only to Venuti's book but also to his reputation among translators and translation theorists.

Perhaps one of the most welcome parts of the journal is the Dissertation Abstracts section (91-106), specially for its novelty and/or atypical character. It includes abstracts of both Doctoral Dissertations and M.A. Dissertations, belonging to different fields of Anglo-American studies, all of them published in 1998 and 1999. The problem with this is that it only includes those abstracts submitted by members of the association, not the totality of dissertations defended or published in Portugal in those years. This may come as a disappointment to those who expected to find out about the latest tendencies and interests of Portuguese researchers in Anglo-American studies. Another unsatisfactory feature is that abstracts appear in both Portuguese and English, which I find unnecessary. English would be enough, as Portuguese readers who may be interested in Anglo-American studies will also know English. It looks as if they were trying to justify the length of the journal. Moreover, titles of dissertations should be kept in the language of the original, that is, that in which they were first written and which also corresponds to the language of the dissertation.

As for the last part, Notes on Contributors (107-109), some of the above criticisms are also applicable here. Thus, further divisions by language, English or Portuguese, but containing the same information, seem unnecessary. However, the section is pertinent for its informative character specially in a journal like this with relatively few contributors.

I would finally like to comment on the style of the journal, as some matters concerning its format are not entirely successful. Thus, there is a sheet marking the reviews section which gives the impression that the issue is separated into two main parts: a general one and another devoted to reviews. This, however, does not seem to be the case if its contents are taken into account. The section devoted to articles should also be marked, specially if we consider that they form the main body of the journal. Translations should also be separated from articles. And finally, both dissertation abstracts and notes on contributors should be independently presented, separate from the reviews section. In addition to this, there seems to be lack of uniformity within the articles themselves. Thus, while some have abstracts, others do not. Moreover, contents may be divided into sections or the running text displayed without further divisions.

To conclude, in spite of all the criticisms noted above, the journal deserves attention, not only because it is a way of keeping the field of Anglo-American studies alive but also because it provides researchers and scholars outside Portugal with an opportunity to find out the interests and trends followed by English Departments of the Portuguese Universities. Finally, I would not like to end this review without expressing my hope that the journal gains the respect and attention it deserves, specially if it continues to publish such well-argued and interesting articles.

Fennell, Barbara A. 2001: *A History of English. A Sociolinguistic Approach* (Blackwell Textbooks in Linguistics, 17). Oxford: Blackwell [284 + xiv páginas; ISBN: 0-631-20072-X (hardback), 0-631-20073-8 (paperback)].

Juan Camilo Conde Silvestre
Universidad de Murcia

A pesar de un título tan específico, *A History of English. A Sociolinguistic Approach* es un manual introductorio a la historia de la lengua inglesa, en la línea de otros que han aparecido en el mercado durante los últimos años (Blake 1996; Smith 1996, 1999; Görlach 1997; Knowles 1997), siguiendo la estela de textos clásicos, como los firmados por Thomas Pyles y John Algeo (1964), Albert C. Baugh y Thomas Cable (1951), Barbara Strang (1970), Celia M. Millward (1989) o, en nuestro país, Francisco Fernández (1986). En este sentido, el volumen adopta la tradicional división de capítulos por periodos y en cada uno de ellos incluye las discusiones sobre fonología, morfología, sintaxis y léxico usuales en este tipo de textos introductorios.¹ Estos apartados se completan con otros de contenido u orientación sociolingüística, los cuales, desde mi punto de vista, no responden al fructífero desarrollo alcanzado durante las dos últimas décadas por las conexiones de esta disciplina con la lingüística histórica y con la historia de la lengua inglesa. Por otro lado, tampoco queda claro para el lector qué se entiende por sociolingüística en un libro de estas características. La primera referencia a este enfoque no aparece hasta la página 44, en el capítulo dedicado a las lenguas indoeuropeas y germánicas, como extensión de una breve sección dedicada a los métodos tradicionales de la lingüística histórica: comparatista, neogramático y estructuralista. Podrían haberse utilizado secciones anteriores de la introducción, como la dedicada a los niveles y las unidades de análisis ("Linguistic preliminaries", 9-10), o la que trata sobre el cambio lingüístico ("Language change", 3-7), para delimitar con claridad esta importante cuestión metodológica, pero esta clarificación se deja para páginas posteriores, donde se ofrece una definición generalista de esta disciplina: "sociolinguistics ... focuses on the nature of language as a social phenomenon and the correlation between social and demographic features and the use of linguistic tokens, and the way in which language functions in society" (44). De este modo, sin que el lector sepa con certeza qué se entiende por sociolingüística en los límites del volumen, pasa a encontrarse, después de las secciones habituales de cada capítulo, con un apartado que, bajo el título "Sociolinguistic focus", recoge aspectos tan diversos como, entre otros, el contacto lingüístico, el desarrollo de actitudes

¹ 1. Introduction (1-14); 2. The Pre-history of English (15-54); 3. Old English (55-93); 4. Middle English (94-134); 5. Early Modern English (135-166); 6. Present-Day English (167-207); 7. English in the United States (208-240); 8. World-Wide English (241-269); Bibliography (270-279); Index (280-284).

lingüísticas, cuestiones sociopolíticas relacionadas con la expansión mundial del inglés y la propia correlación entre factores sociales y elementos lingüísticos que ha caracterizado los avances recientes de la sociolingüística histórica.

Por ejemplo, en el capítulo segundo, "The Pre-history of English" (15-54), se discute el método comparatista, la reconstrucción del Indoeuropeo y los distintos grupos de lenguas que conforman esta familia y se describen algunos de los procesos fonológicos propuestos para explicar el desgajamiento de las lenguas germánicas desde este ámbito lingüístico más general: leyes de Grimm y Verner, *second consonant shift*, etc. Como colofón, se dedican unas páginas (49-53) al "enfoque sociolingüístico" y, sin reconocer las dificultades de esta empresa en los estadios primitivos de la historia de las lenguas, se alude a algunos aspectos del contacto entre lenguas, a las teorías estructuralistas del sustrato, el adstrato y el superestrato y a los estudios dedicados a la búsqueda de los primeros asentamientos de los indoeuropeos, en relación con las propuestas migracionistas tradicionales. Al final de esta sección, con todo, se apuntan tesis más novedosas, como la desarrollada por Colin Renfrew (1987) en el sentido de que el movimiento de población que pudo haber originado la distribución de las distintas lenguas indoeuropeas debió haberse dado a lo largo de distancias relativamente cortas, dependiendo, no sólo de factores militares o de la conquista por otros pueblos —como entendía la perspectiva migracionista—, sino especialmente de cambios demográficos, tecnológicos o socio-económicos. Esta oportuna matización no impide que a lo largo de todo el capítulo aparezcan afirmaciones excesivamente contundentes sobre las proto-lenguas reconstruidas y sobre una época histórica tan difusa, las cuales deberían usarse con cuidado, poniendo de manifiesto su relatividad. Así ocurre, por ejemplo, cuando se reconoce a los indoeuropeos como "the ancestors of English" (13), se alude a la difusión de "spoken varieties of Indoeuropean" (49) en conexión con "a series of migrations across Europe and Africa" (51), o se habla sin ambages de "speakers of Indoeuropean dialects" (50).

Semejantes cualidades presenta el capítulo tercero, dedicado a "Old English" (55-93). Tras un breve repaso de aspectos históricos y culturales, se revisan de forma sucinta y superficial determinadas cuestiones seleccionadas sobre la fonología y la morfosintaxis del inglés antiguo. El enfoque sociolingüístico con que culminan estas páginas es una exploración de los contactos entre el latín, las lenguas celtas y escandinavas y el inglés antiguo, y su reflejo en los préstamos léxicos y semánticos que aparecieron en la lengua inglesa en este periodo. La autora sigue de cerca la exposición que sobre este tema hiciera Dick Leith en *A Social History of English* (1983: 7-26), aunque moderniza su propuesta con teorías más recientes sobre el contacto lingüístico y sus consecuencias, ofreciendo al lector un útil resumen de la escala de imbricación lingüística que postulan Thomason y Kaufman (1991).² Sin embargo, no alude a otras propuestas que exploran de forma adecuada la difícil conexión entre ciertos usos lingüísticos y determinados aspectos socio-políticos de

² A pesar de la importancia de esta obra para el desarrollo de este capítulo, alternan en el libro las referencias a su publicación, que aparecen indistintamente como 1988 y 1991. Por otro lado, en la bibliografía final, sólo se recoge la primera, correspondiente a la edición de tapas duras, de manera que el lector, desorientado, puede pensar que falta alguna referencia en esta sección. De hecho, no se incluye en la bibliografía un trabajo de David Graddol publicado en 1987 y mencionado en la página 266, o el libro de David Crystal publicado ese mismo año (1987) citado en la página 7.

la Inglaterra anglosajona, como los trabajos que cuestionan la uniformidad de las cuatro variedades dialectales reconocidas tradicionalmente en este periodo e infieren la existencia de múltiples variedades diatópicas y diastráticas (Toon 1992a; Hogg 1998, entre otros), o los que exploran la distribución de ciertos rasgos en relación con los centros de poder político y religiosos de Wessex y Mercia (Toon 1983; 1992b). La estructura del capítulo dedicado a "Middle English" (94-134) es similar. A un breve repaso del marco histórico y cultural sucede la revisión de algunos aspectos fonológicos y morfosintácticos que caracterizan a esta variedad histórica. En líneas generales, la sección dedicada al enfoque sociolingüístico" (116-134) está más centrada que las de capítulos anteriores, posiblemente porque entre los siglos XII y XIV está mejor atestiguado el desarrollo de actitudes lingüísticas en relación con la coexistencia del francés normando y del inglés, de acuerdo con ciertos esquemas sociales, profesionales, etc., o porque a partir del XV se extiende la denominada *ideología de la estandarización*, con lo que esto supone para las conexiones entre usos lingüísticos y factores demográficos, sociales, políticos y actitudinales. En cualquier caso, el recorrido por estas cuestiones sigue muy de cerca la exposición que hicieron Baugh y Cable en *A History of the English Language* (1951: 107-157) y no se ven enriquecidas por propuestas más recientes que han matizado y mejorado esta perspectiva, como, entre otras, las del propio Leith (1983: 26-30), Burnley (1992), Turville-Petre (1995) o, en nuestro país, Iglesias Rábade (1991). Este mismo apartado mejora cuando se discute la definición del inglés medio como variedad criolla o se ejemplifica el análisis sociolingüístico de estadios históricos de la lengua inglesa mediante la exposición de los trabajos desarrollados por James Milroy sobre la pérdida de /h/ inicial en inglés. En el primer caso se exponen de manera coherente los distintos argumentos a favor o en contra de la criollización en inglés medio, negándose finalmente esta hipótesis, al reconocer que la simplificación morfológica y la interferencia estructural de francés e inglés no supuso en ningún caso la sustitución de un sistema lingüístico por otro, ni el abandono del inglés por parte de sus hablantes. El segundo muestra al lector por primera vez un caso práctico de explicación sociolingüística de un fenómeno específico de la historia del inglés; la autora resume con claridad las explicaciones de James Milroy (1983; 1992: 137-145) sobre la difusión regional y textual de la pérdida de /h/ inicial, su vinculación con importantes centros comerciales en el periodo medio tardío y su consiguiente transformación en un rasgo prestigioso, lo cual contrasta con su valoración actual como vulgarismo, desde que en el siglo XVIII se extendiese la influencia de la ortografía estandarizada sobre la pronunciación. La observación de estos cambios en la valoración del mismo fenómeno lingüístico debería ayudar al lector a concluir que estos no son, en sí mismos, mejores ni peores, sino que distintas circunstancias demográficas, socio-políticas o económicas hacen que los hablantes les confieran el prestigio o el desprestigio que, muchas veces, afectan al cambio lingüístico.

Donde más se echan en falta las referencias a trabajos que, como los de James Milroy, exploran sistemáticamente la correlación entre fenómenos lingüísticos y factores sociales (clase social, profesión, red social, género, edad, etc.), es en el capítulo dedicado a "Early Modern English" (135-66). Sin duda, éste ha sido el periodo más favorecido por la perspectiva sociolingüística y, en este sentido, merece una mención especial el desarrollo en Helsinki del proyecto de investigación "Sociolinguistics and language history", en conexión con la compilación y difusión

de corpus diacrónicos generales o específicos de la lengua inglesa. Otros proyectos semejantes han generado, junto a éste, una serie de publicaciones que exploran sistemáticamente aspectos de la morfología, la sintaxis o incluso la pragmática del inglés moderno a la luz de la metodología variacionista (Kytö 1993; Nevalainen 1999; Nevalainen y Raumolin-Brunberg 1994; 1996; Raumolin-Brunberg y Nevalainen 1997, entre otros; véanse también Tieken-Boon van Ostade 1988; Cheshire 1993; Trudgill 1997, etc.). A pesar de la ausencia de estos y otros autores entre las referencias del capítulo, y de que ciertos aspectos de la morfosintaxis del inglés moderno —como la extensión de *-(e)s* en perjuicio de *-(e)th* en la tercera persona singular del presente— se expliquen sin conexión con los factores sociales mencionados, la sección dedicada al enfoque sociolingüístico recoge otros procesos clave que han recibido este tipo de tratamiento. Concretamente, el *Great Vowel Shift* se interpreta, siguiendo otra vez la propuesta de Dick Leith (1983: 145-149), en relación con la estratificación social existente en Londres durante la época Tudor. Por otro lado, en el nivel de análisis pragmático, se estudia el uso de títulos, fórmulas de tratamiento o el recurso a las formas *th-* (*thou, thee, thy/thine*) o *y-* (*ye, you, your/yours*) del pronombre singular de segunda persona en conexión con el establecimiento de relaciones de poder o solidaridad entre los hablantes, o con el uso de estrategias de cortesía, adoptando el modelo de análisis desarrollado por Brown y Gilman (1989). Por último, la noción de estándar se ve claramente matizada por la adopción de una perspectiva sociolingüística que lleva a la autora a evitar una aproximación que atienda exclusivamente al desarrollo de la variedad estandarizada, y, al contrario, le permite reconocer que el origen y desarrollo histórico de las variedades no estándar es también digno de estudio como una parte crucial del sistema lingüístico inglés.

En los párrafos precedentes se ha calificado al repaso que se hace de la fonología y la morfosintaxis de los periodos antiguo, medio y moderno, como una revisión sucinta y, en ocasiones, superficial. Justificaré en los siguientes las razones de esta apreciación. En primer lugar, proliferan explicaciones simplificadas y descontextualizadas de difícil comprensión para quienes accedan a la historia de la lengua inglesa exclusivamente a través de este manual. Por ejemplo, al tratar sobre la fonología del inglés antiguo, se dice que sus consonantes "were very similar to those of Modern English" (60), sin especificar los términos en que se establece la relación, y con respecto a la morfología verbal se indica "modern transitive-intransitive pairs derive from the mutation of old intransitive forms to transitives: *lie/lay, sit/set*" (62): un galimatías si no se han explicado previamente los rudimentos del *i-umlaut* en las lenguas germánicas y el carácter derivativo de sus verbos débiles, como es el caso. En el capítulo dedicado al inglés medio se alude por primera vez al uso de ciertos conectores en la historia de la lengua inglesa señalando que "*that* developed during this period, although *fle* survived until the thirteenth century" (102), sin especificar la función (conector de cláusulas de relativo) a que se está refiriendo la autora. Como último ejemplo sirva esta afirmación sobre la procedencia de las construcciones progresivas en inglés medio "from an *-ande* construction, or it may result from the fusion of the verb and the present participle as adjective and the verb + *on* + the gerund" (105). La ausencia de un desarrollo apropiado de esta breve explicación dificulta, desde mi punto de vista, su comprensión para quien no sea experto en historia de la lengua inglesa o conozca previamente el proceso que se trata. Hay otros motivos para tachar de superficial el tratamiento de algunas

cuestiones lingüísticas en los capítulos dedicados a estos tres periodos. Entre ellos destaca la penuria de detalle en la descripción de algunos procesos. Así, el estudio de los cambios fonológicos entre el inglés antiguo y medio (98-101) se reduce a un mero listado de ejemplos. En cuanto a la morfosintaxis de este mismo periodo, no se mencionan procesos fundamentales, como, por ejemplo, la extensión y nivelación analógicas que acompañaron a la simplificación y pérdida de las declinaciones del inglés antiguo, cuya explicación queda reducida al efecto fonológico determinado por la ausencia de acento en las sílabas finales. También es endeble la sección dedicada a la sintaxis del periodo "moderno temprano" al no tratarse con la suficiente profundidad procesos sintácticos que resultan fundamentales para entender la conformación del actual, tales como el surgimiento del auxiliar *do*, el establecimiento de los verbos modales y defectivos, o el afianzamiento de las construcciones progresivas. Finalmente, estos capítulos se ven empañados por la aparición de errores, algunos de poca entidad, como la mención del poema anglosajón *Juliana* en masculino —*Julian*— (83), o la transcripción del apellido de la eminente lingüista Jean Aitchison como "Aitcheson" (159). Otras veces se trata de errores más serios, que afectan a la veracidad de algunas afirmaciones y dificultan la comprensión de textos y procesos lingüísticos. Por ejemplo, se adscribe el breve texto anglosajón *The Wife's Lament* al corpus literario escrito en inglés medio (116), se traduce de manera equivocada la voz *lede* ["people"] en el prólogo del *Cursor Mundi* —"For the love of Inglis lede"—, como "language" (119), o se conecta de forma errónea el origen de la terminación adverbial *-ly* con la pérdida en inglés medio de la vocal <-e> final que distinguía adverbios y adjetivos en el periodo antiguo, señalando que esta pérdida se compensa mediante "the addition of the suffix *-lic* instead" (103), cuando este sufijo se empleaba en inglés antiguo en la derivación de adjetivos. Resulta también jocosa la afirmación de que en el Renacimiento aparecen en la lengua inglesa voces "which are quite common, even indispensable today", ejemplificando esta propuesta con palabras tan usuales como *agile*, *prodigious*, *apostrophe*, *dextrously* o *frugal* (147).

El tratamiento de la dimensión sociolingüística y la propia consistencia de la exposición mejoran en los tres últimos capítulos. En el dedicado a "Present-day English" (167-207) aumenta el peso de los aspectos sociales y políticos y sus efectos sobre la lengua inglesa actual, en menoscabo de la revisión de características lingüísticas concretas; aunque se dedican secciones específicas al léxico, en conexión con el colonialismo y el desarrollo científico y tecnológico actual, y a cambios recientes en la morfosintaxis del inglés. Se echa en falta, con todo, alguna referencia a las relaciones entre estos rasgos morfosintácticos y las propuestas prescriptivistas desarrolladas en los siglos XVIII y XIX. Por otro lado, la adopción de una perspectiva sociolingüística favorece el tratamiento en estas páginas de las variedades del inglés que no alcanzaron el rango de estándar y, así, junto a una somera descripción del RP, se detallan, siguiendo a Trudgill (1990), las características de otros dialectos rurales y urbanos y se ilustran los procesos de formación de normas suprarregionales mediante la descripción del *Estuary English*. En esta misma línea, se atiende, desde una perspectiva sociohistórica, a la expansión e imposición del inglés en Escocia, Irlanda y Gales en perjuicio de las lenguas celtas o del Scots, y se detalla la situación de multilingüismo que, como consecuencia de la inmigración, existe actualmente en las Islas Británicas, apuntándose la necesidad de

proteger y velar por el mantenimiento de la riqueza cultural que supone esta coexistencia de lenguas.

La atención a la diversidad lingüística es también palpable en el capítulo dedicado al inglés en los Estados Unidos (208-40). Tras una oportuna y completa revisión de los primeros asentamientos, se ofrece un repaso de la expansión del inglés por el territorio norteamericano, acompañado de una breve referencia a la distribución de la /r/ postvocálica en las variedades de Nueva Inglaterra, como consecuencia lingüística de este proceso. Esta información se completa con un análisis de distintas propuestas sobre las divisiones dialectales en el inglés americano y, como en el capítulo anterior, la explicación del surgimiento de procesos fonológicos suprarregionales, como el *Northern Cities Vowel Rotation* o el *Southern Vowel Shift*. Finalmente, se describen variedades lingüísticas menos prestigiosas, como el inglés afroamericano (*African-American Vernacular English*), y se atiende a la pujanza reciente del español y a su contribución al desarrollo de nuevas variedades que resisten su nivelación con el estándar americano. La misma perspectiva predomina en el capítulo dedicado a la expansión mundial del inglés (241-69), donde se revisan los factores históricos y sociopolíticos que acompañaron a este proceso, prestándose atención a las condiciones específicas de Canadá, el Caribe, Australia, Nueva Zelanda, África del Sur o el Sureste Asiático. Aunque no se incluyan las características del inglés en estos territorios —por falta de espacio—, la autora no rehuye el tratamiento de cuestiones controvertidas, como el papel simbólico del inglés sudafricano en relación con el movimiento anti-apartheid, la función de esta misma lengua como instrumento de control en la India, y los problemas más recientes que afectan a la planificación lingüística en África Occidental o en las antiguas colonias británicas del Pacífico. Además, se atiende con buen criterio y sensibilidad a las distintas posiciones en los debates actuales sobre el papel del inglés en el mundo actual: por un lado, se verifica su extensión como medio de comunicación internacional en relación con el poder político y militar de los Estados Unidos y, en general, con el progreso socio-económico y técnico de los países anglófonos en el pasado siglo; por otro, se apunta al riesgo cierto que esta expansión supone para la homogeneización de la cultura mundial y el peligro de asimilación de poblaciones diversas a un modelo político y cultural basado en el patrón anglo-norteamericano, con la amenaza subsiguiente para lenguas y culturas minoritarias. Las contradicciones de este doble papel del inglés en el mundo actual se ven reflejadas en una aseveración paradójica, bien utilizada por la autora: "If English is to be seen as a killer language, communicative technology must be interpreted as one of its major weapons" (267). En general, estos tres capítulos están mejor desarrollados que los anteriores, posiblemente porque abundan en ellos los datos de historia de la lengua externa, los cuales son más fácilmente asimilables a la perspectiva sociolingüística y no requieren explicaciones adicionales que desborden una expresión sintética y comprimida. Con todo, siguen apareciendo afirmaciones que, a fuerza de simplificar, resultan absurdas —"on the grammatical level there are a number of variants within RP" (188)— o contradictorias con la perspectiva sociolingüística; así, se asume que en ciertas zonas de Escocia, Irlanda o Gales, donde las lenguas celtas están en peligro de extinción, "it will be the speakers and the desire to keep the language alive as a first language that hold the key" (197) — como si la presión de la lengua dominante, su extensión por motivos técnicos, políticos o incluso como un factor que favorece el progreso social, pudieran ser

vencidas exclusivamente por la resolución de un hablante rural, que sólo ve inconvenientes en mantener su lengua materna y transmitirla a sus descendientes.

En resumen, dejando a un lado una descripción ciertamente pobre de las características del inglés en los periodos antiguo, medio y moderno, este manual presenta altibajos en el tratamiento sociolingüístico de diversos aspectos de la historia de esta lengua. Podría atribuirse esta desigualdad a un esfuerzo de síntesis pedagógica por parte de la autora. En este sentido, aunque se echa de menos un prefacio indicando los objetivos de la obra y la audiencia a la que está dirigida, la propia organización de contenidos, las referencias bibliográficas al final de cada capítulo o el estilo discursivo empleado en las explicaciones, hacen pensar en un público de estudiantes de los primeros cursos universitarios. Esto puede haber llevado a Barbara Fennell a seleccionar ciertos aspectos en virtud de sus sencillez, obviando así el establecimiento de una correlación sistemática entre fenómenos lingüísticos y sociales en los periodos medio y moderno, los cuales requerirían de aclaraciones paralelas sobre aspectos fundamentales del método de investigación sociolingüística. Con todo, la justificación del tratamiento asistemático del enfoque sociolingüístico en aras de la organización pedagógica se contradice con la ausencia generalizada de este mismo sentido pedagógico en diversas secciones del libro. Sirva como muestra el tratamiento de algunas cuestiones fonéticas y fonológicas y la ausencia de sistematicidad en la notación utilizada.

En la introducción, por ejemplo, se dedica un apartado a describir los fonemas vocálicos del inglés contemporáneo, sin mencionar las diferencias de longitud entre algunos de ellos, ni su situación específica en el trapecio que convencionalmente representa la cavidad bucal; simplemente se ofrece el símbolo fonético (sin marcas de longitud) y algunos ejemplos: "/ê/, hit, illness; /a/, father, lah-dee-dah" (12). Esta representación en forma de trapecio aparece más adelante, en las páginas que se dedican en el capítulo sexto al RP (187), pero tampoco se consigue en este caso informar claramente al lector sobre las características de sus vocales, pues el trapecio no tiene límites diáfanos, situándose en la página como si estuviera flotando, sin incorporar información sobre la posición de los órganos fonadores en la emisión de cada vocal, ni sobre su apertura. La ausencia de especificidad fonética en la descripción de las vocales del inglés contemporáneo contrasta con un exceso de celo en la representación de los fonemas vocálicos del inglés antiguo, entre los que se distinguen —sin una base clara para ello— las vocales breves abiertas /E/ y /O/, frente a las largas cerradas /e:/ y /o:/, y todas se sitúan claramente en un trapecio vocálico donde, por ejemplo, las vocales /u:/ e /i:/ están en posición más elevada que /Ë/ e /ê/, situadas más hacia el centro. Cabe preguntarse de dónde ha obtenido la autora información fonética tan específica para situar los fonemas vocálicos empleados hace más de mil años con tanta exactitud en la cavidad bucal. Además, el exceso de exhaustividad choca con la afirmación contradictoria en sí misma de que "we cannot be sure of the exact quality and quantity [of vowels] in OE, we know that there are 14 vowel sounds, plus schwa and four diphthongs" (62). En comparación con el celo desarrollado en la descripción del sistema vocálico del inglés antiguo, resulta sorprendente que no se aluda a algunas diferencias establecidas en el inglés medio, como la postulada entre la vocal anterior, larga, media y cerrada /e:/ y la abierta /E:/. Inicialmente, Fennell no tiene en cuenta esta distinción, no plantea su origen distintivo en inglés antiguo —el cual se ofrece como

/e:/ y /E/ para una única vocal cerrada /e:/ en inglés medio—, ni su importancia para el desarrollo posterior del *Great Vowel Shift*, cuando ME /e:/ > EModE /i:/, y ME /E:/ > EModE /e:/ > /i:/ o /eê/ (98-99). Contrasta esta falta de atención inicial a las vocales mencionadas, con su aparición más adelante en un cuadro resumen de cambios fonológicos entre el inglés antiguo y medio (100). De nuevo surgen incoherencias terminológicas y de transcripción fonética cuando se explica el *Great Vowel Shift* en el capítulo siguiente.³ En este caso, se reconoce la existencia de la vocal media abierta /E:/ en inglés medio, pero, al contrario de lo que ocurría antes, esta vocal no aparece entre las incluidas en un cuadro resumen de la página 159, donde se asigna a *beet* y *beat* la misma pronunciación medieval /e:/. Hay otros muchos casos de descuido pedagógico en el libro, entre los cuales cabe mencionar el cuadro resumen de las series de alternancia vocálica en los verbos fuertes del inglés antiguo (69), las cuales quedan oscurecidas cuando se ejemplifica el presente con formas contractas cuya vocal radical se ve afectada por palatalización en relación con la del infinitivo; así, para el verbo *ceosan* (clase II) se indica que las vocales del presente son <eo> o <u>, y se da como ejemplo la forma contracta *ciest*, donde no aparece ninguna de las dos; igualmente para *faran* (clase VI) se señala la vocal <a> como esperable en el paradigma de presente, pero el ejemplo muestra, sin ninguna explicación, la forma contracta y palatalizada *færfɪ* (69). Por otro lado, cuando se dan ejemplos de la conjugación verbal en inglés medio, se incluyen formas de presente y pretérito de los verbos *singen* y *drinken*, pero parece dejarse aparente libertad al lector para adivinar cuándo se está ejemplificando un tiempo u otro, al no darse ninguna indicación sobre esta distinción (103).

En definitiva, *A History of English. A Sociolinguistic Approach* es un manual introductorio que no cumple los requisitos de un libro de texto de estas características, ni los objetivos que se exponen en su título. Presenta un tratamiento simplificado y empobrecido de la historia de la lengua inglesa, carece de sentido pedagógico en la exposición y —con algunas excepciones en los capítulos seis, siete y ocho—, no está a la altura de los avances recientes en las relaciones entre la sociolingüística y la historia de la lengua inglesa.

REFERENCIAS BIBLIOGRÁFICAS

- Baugh, Albert C. y Thomas Cable 1951: *A History of the English Language*. London: Routledge.
- Blake, Norman F. 1996: *A History of the English Language*. London: MacMillan.
- Brown, Roger y Albert Gilman 1989: "Politeness Theory and Shakespeare's Four Major Tragedies". *Language in Society* 18: 159-212.
- Burnley, 1992: "Lexis and Semantics". *The Cambridge History of the English Language. Vol. 2: 1066-1473*. Ed. N. Blake. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 409-99.

³ La propia ubicación de la explicación del *Great Vowel Shift* al final del capítulo, en la sección dedicada al enfoque sociolingüístico, puede ser adecuada desde esta perspectiva, pero perjudica al tratamiento de otros cambios fonéticos tratados anteriormente que quedan descontextualizados, cuando se ha de hacer referencia inevitable a ciertos procesos fonéticos que no se han mencionado todavía.

- Cheshire, Jenny 1993: "Standardization of the English Irregular Verbs". *Towards a Standard English 1600-1800*. Eds. D. Stein *et al.*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Fernández, Francisco 1986: *Historia de la lengua inglesa*. Madrid: Gredos.
- Görlach, Manfred 1997: *The Linguistic History of English. An Introduction*. London: Macmillan.
- Hogg, Richard 1998: "On the Ideological Boundaries of Old English Dialects". *Advances in English Historical Linguistics*. Ed. J. Fisiak, *et al.*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 107-18.
- Iglesias Rábade, Luis 1992: *El uso del inglés y francés en la Inglaterra normanda y plantagenet (1066-1399)*. Santiago: Universidade de Santiago de Compostela, Servicio de Publicacións.
- Knowles, Gerry 1997: *A Cultural History of the English Language*. London: Arnold.
- Kytö, Merja 1993: "Third Person Present Singular Verbal Inflection in Early British and American English". *Language Variation and Change* 5: 113-39.
- Leith, Dick 1983: *A Social History of English*. London: Routledge.
- Millward, Celia M. 1989: *A Biography of the English Language*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Milroy, James 1983: "On the Sociolinguistic History of /h/-dropping in English". *Current Topics in English Historical Linguistics*. Eds. M. Davenport, *et al.* Sheffield: University of Sheffield Press. 173-91.
- 1992: *Linguistic Variation and Change*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Nevalainen, Terttu 1999: "Making the best use of 'bad' data: Evidence for Sociolinguistic Variation in Early Modern English". *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 4 C: 499-533.
- y Helena Raumolin-Brunberg 1994: "Its strength and the beauty of it: The Standardization of the Third Person Neuter Possessive in Early Modern English". *Towards a Standard English 1600-1800*. Eds. D. Stein, *et al.*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 171-216.
- y Helena Raumolin-Brunberg, eds. 1996: *Sociolinguistics and Language History. Studies Based on the Corpus of Early English Correspondence*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Pyles, Thomas y John Algeo 1964: *The Origins and Development of the English Language*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich.
- Raumolin-Brunberg, Helena y Terttu Nevalainen 1997: "Like Father (Un)like Son: A Sociolinguistic Approach to the Language of the Cely Family". *Studies in Middle English Linguistics*. Ed. J. Fisiak. Berlin/New York: Moutin de Gruyter. 489-511.
- Renfrew, Colin 1987: *Archaeology and Language. The Puzzle of Indoeuropean Origins*. London: Jonathan Cape.
- Smith, Jeremy 1996: *An Historical Study of English. Function, Form and Change*. London: Routledge.
- 1999: *Essentials of Early English*. London: Routledge.
- Strang, Barbara M.H. 1970: *A History of English*. London: Methuen.

- Thomason, Sarah y Terence Kaufman 1991: *Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Tieken-Boon van Ostade 1988: *Do in 18th Century English. A Sociohistorical Linguistic Approach*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Toon, Thomas 1983: *The Politics of Early Old English Sound Changes*. New York: Academic Press.
- 1992a: "Old English Dialects". *The Cambridge History of the English Language. Vol 1: The Beginnings to 1066*. Ed. R.M. Hogg. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 409-51.
- 1992b: "The Social and Political Contexts of Language Change in Anglo-Saxon England". *English in Its Social Contexts. Essays in Historical Sociolinguistics*. Eds. T.W. Machan y Charles T. Scott. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 28-46.
- Trudgill, Peter 1990: *The Dialects of England*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- 1997: "Third Person Singular Zero: African-American English, East Anglian Dialects and Spanish Persecution in the Low Countries". *Folia Linguistica Historica* 18: 139-148.
- Turville-Petre, Thorlac 1995: *England the Nation. Language, Literature and National Identity, 1290-1340*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Manzanas, Ana M^a and Jesús Benito 1999: *Narratives of Resistance: Literature and Ethnicity in the United States and the Caribbean*. Cuenca: Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha. 337 pp.

Mar Gallego Durán
Universidad de Huelva

The volume *Narratives of Resistance: Literature and Ethnicity in the United States and the Caribbean* edited by Manzanas and Benito is undoubtedly an important contribution to the growing field of ethnic studies in Spain, with such valuable predecessors as Aitor Ibarrola's *Fiction and Ethnicity in North America* (1995) and Olga Barrios and Bernard Bell's *Contemporary Literature in the African Diaspora* (1997). This publication resulted partly from a 1997 international conference organized by the Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha dedicated to the topic of ethnicity and literature, but other materials were later incorporated that enhanced the scope of the book. As a whole, the book sets out, as the editors explain, "to invite readers to further their rethinking of American and Caribbean literatures" (16), and this objective is clearly fulfilled and even surpassed by the extremely interesting and thought-provoking content of the twenty-three articles that compose the work.

This collection of articles is a direct heir to Paul Lauter's comparatist perspective in his seminal work *The Heath Anthology of American Literature* (1994) in a number of ways: firstly, because it responds to the redefinition of the American literary canon by placing canonical and non-canonical authors side by side; secondly, due to its deep investment in an effort "to reconnect literature and its study with the society and culture of which it is fundamentally a part" (Lauter xxxiii); third and very importantly, thanks to its representation of the wide variety of cultures that constitute the rich contemporary tapestry of American literature. Springing from diverse theoretical perspectives, it comes as no surprise that postcolonial and feminist approaches figure prominently, although not exclusively, in this work, as they adapt particularly well to the objectives of the collection. All these articles propound an enlightening discussion of the proposed authors and texts which intends to illuminate the different strategies instrumental in performing a twofold task: on one hand, the opposition and resistance to mainstream impositions and, on the other, the forging of alternative models for a new sense of representation of the ethnic self. In this sense, all the authors selected in the collection engage in a process of deconstruction of the traditional boundaries between the concepts of center and margins by consciously subverting their hierarchical order and by proposing fresh insights into the integrative and dialogic nature of literary texts. The volume offers

ATLANTIS
Vol. XXIV Núm. 1 (Jun. 2002): 269-75.
ISSN 0210-6124

thus a very updated rendering of problematic but very productive issues such as race and ethnicity constructs, silence and absence, cultural diversity, gender equality, racial discrimination, the rewritings of (hi)story, folk elements, linguistic subversion, to name a few. So a well-informed and contemporary range of concerns pervades the present volume.

Hence the two crucial ideas of resistance to the imposed tradition and creation of suitable alternatives serve the purpose of connecting the articles to one another and confers unity to the book as a whole. This sense of unity is also achieved by the circular structure given to the volume, which is preceded and concluded by one piece by Alfred Arteaga and a theoretical article by each of the editors. Then, the subsequent chapters focus on specific text(s) or author(s) that reveal and problematize the varied ways and manifold implications that arise from the analysis of the topics of resistance and creation in the selected areas and literatures under consideration in the volume, mainly Arab American, Latino, Asian American, Caribbean, Jewish American, and Native American.

As a theoretical framework, the two pieces by Alfred Arteaga "X Antecanto: The Xicano Sign" and "Poetics of Resistance" set the mood for the rest of the collection by bringing to the fore the hybrid sign X as a convenient metaphor for the entire volume. As Arteaga observes, "it is our mark, our cross, our X, our sign of never ceasing being born at the point of two arrows colliding, X" (25). It is precisely at the core of the hybrid self and the hybrid literature it produces where we can locate what Arteaga terms "a poetics of resistance" (334), which informs the different readings proposed by the articles in the collection. In one way or another, each of the articles tackles the issue of shaping that poetics of resistance in order to resist oppression and subjugation and to promote survival and celebration instead.

The critical stance of the collection is complemented by the two articles the editors author in the volume. Manzanás' call in "Ethnicity, *Mestizaje* and Writing" seems to find its most suitable response in Benito's conclusive essay. In Manzanás' piece the key terms of ethnicity and *mestizaje* are contextualized within the literary terrain. She discusses the impact of the making of American society according to certain factors such as race, gender and class, which obviously furthered the so-called "fear of creolization and hybridization" (28). She also analyzes the changing meanings of "race" and "ethnicity" throughout history in order to prove their social and cultural constructedness, despite the persistent presence of racial discrimination. These ideas lead her to assert the usefulness of the written word to both alienate the master discourse and to articulate a *mestiza* literature. As a complement to Manzanás' view the article by Benito, "The Poetics and Politics of Resistance", theorizes on the need of resistance from a historical standpoint. Starting from the origins of the colonial paradigm, Benito is able to offer a succinct yet illuminating journey into the relevance of the ideological and linguistic forces that shaped Western hegemony and its enforcement of voluntary submission, together with the different responses to it. Without forgetting any of the leading theorists of both colonial and postcolonial perspectives—Gramsci, Foucault, Braithwaite, Said, Césaire, Stuart Hall, Bhabha—, his impressive account aims at demonstrating the powerful influence of subversive hybridity and mimicry in literature as a privileged site for resistance.

Following the theoretical guidelines articulated by Arteaga, Manzanos and Benito, the opening essay "Arab American Poets: the Politics of Exclusion" by Nabil Alawi addresses the marginal position occupied by Arab American poets even within the multicultural trend in contemporary literary studies. Rethinking basic difficulties in the integration of Arab American literature in university syllabi, Alawi provides some crucial clues to understand the literary universe specifically depicted by Arab American poets accounting for their dilemma of assimilation and their nomadic quality. In so doing, the critic clearly links political and cultural issues as the main cause for their continuous exclusion. He relentlessly problematizes the relationships among such concepts, claiming for a rightful place for these poets in contemporary anthologies of American literature.

The three subsequent articles center on Asian American literature. Eulalia Piñero Gil's "Raising Voices, Writing Ethnicities: Asian American Poets and the (Re)construction of History" revises the traditional way of writing history and asserts the need to "reconstruct the immigrant memory of Asian Americans in the United States" (57). As Asian American poets have been unjustly ignored up to quite recently, Piñero argues for the central role of their poetic works in order to embrace their bicultural heritage and a sense of counterhistory. She examines the diverse ways in which Mei-mei Berssenbrugge, Nelly Wong, Lawson Fusao Inada and John Yau achieve their purposes by fusing their personal stories with reimagining the historical past of their community. Writing poetry becomes for these writers an act of survival but also an act of resistance, enabling them to recover their past and their ethnic inheritance. Also focused on Asian American literature is Begoña Simal's "Chinese American Ethnogenesis: From Jade and Lotus Flowers to Chinatown, Cowboys, Bananas, and Monkeys". It provides a fresh interpretation of the double nature of ethnicity as a cultural construct following the Derridean principle of erasure. Within the framework of the different schools of thought on ethnicity, Simal refuses any essentialist understanding while denouncing everyday discriminatory practices. She then revises the very concept of Asian American literature by exposing the many gaps found in the earliest anthologies, especially its gender politics which excluded women writers. Finally, she chooses the work by acknowledged authors Maxine Hong Kingston, Amy Tan and David Henry Hwang to dismantle any preconceptions or stereotypes about Asian American writing, while proposing an alternative theory symbolized by the Monkey figure whereby ethnic subjects are marked by instability and undecidability. Lucía Mora's "La fuerza de lo femenino: entre la herencia cultural y la conciencia americana en *The Hundred Secret Senses* de Amy Tan" contributes to further destabilize the monolithic conception of Asian American literature by taking Tan's novel as a paradigm of the coalescence of ethnicity and gender. Myth and realism fuse in Kwan, the protagonist, who is able to transcend stereotypical representations in order to find her own sense of self, although Mora loses the opportunity to present a clearer opposition between Kwan and her sister Olivia.

The next section of seven articles is devoted to Caribbean literature analyzed from different perspectives, either general or based on specific authors and works. Paula Burnett's "'Where Else to Row, But Backward?' Addressing Caribbean Futures through Revisions of the Past" sets the bases for the rest of the section by brilliantly probing into the meanings of history, myth and resistance in the work of Naipaul,

Walcott, and Wilson Harris and three younger Guyanese writers: Pauline Melville, David Dabydeen and Fred D'Aguiar. By means of their "obsessive revisiting of the region's past" (92), Burnett captivates readers by tracing the diverse strategies employed by these authors in order to overcome that traumatic past in their fight for survival and for a better future. Juan A. Suárez in "Modernism, Caribbeanism, and Cultural Critique in Zora Neale Hurston's *Tell My Horse* (1938)" focuses on that paradigmatic work by Hurston to stress its discursive potentiality as a modernist anthropological landmark. Suárez' engaging reassessment of Hurston's work stresses its pan-African awareness and its defiance of conventional mimetic modes, which in fact questions received notions and hierarchies and emphasizes what Suárez calls "the arbitrariness and contingency of all cultural forms" (124), including folk practices. Therefore, these folk elements become reliable sources of resistance against totalizing narratives like classic ethnography.

Ileana Sanz' article entitled "Fiction Rewrites Caribbean History" also points in the direction of a necessary rethinking of the traditional meanings assigned to Caribbean history. Sanz aptly explores the intimate relationship between history and literature throughout time in order to overcome the contradictions between official and real history. She then centers on the work of three Caribbean women writers, Lorna Goodison, Honor Ford-Smith and Grace Nichols, and specifically on their fictional reconstruction of a historical figure: Nanny, a maroon woman who was a leader of rebel slaves. Sanz' stimulating account of the way these authors' fiction rewrites history helps to regard them as "contemporary griots" (141) that provide an alternative history of resistance. Fernando Galván makes a similar point in his suggestive article "Postmodern Views of the Caribbean", where he reexamines Antonio Benitez Rojo's theories as particularly suited to the Caribbean context. Galván contends with lucidity that Benitez Rojo's vision of the Caribbean as an island that repeats itself and its connection to Chaos paradigms can be successfully applied to other works not mentioned by Benitez Rojo, concretely Caryl Phillips' most recent novels.

The two following articles are devoted to Derek Walcott's poetics as an illustration of resistance. Keith Whitlock's "The Poetics of Derek Walcott as a Narrative of Resistance" pinpoints the attacks Walcott has been subject to on account of his alleged mixed ancestry and multiculturalism. The article starts with Nayantara Saghal's words that very appropriately remind the reader of the Eurocentric bias inherent to the postcolonial approach. It then proceeds to exemplify the way in which Walcott has excelled in appropriating a mixture of cultures as a means of resistance, but devotes too little space to providing more telling examples. Antonio Ballesteros' "The Chains of Literary History: Derek Walcott and Intertextuality" seems to stress rather the opposite feature of Walcott's poetics, namely self-division. However, as the article unfolds, its valuable comments and close reading of Walcott's poems insist on the importance of intertextuality in the discursive universe of the poet as a strategy that confirms resistance by opening up new venues for creation. Finally and also on the topic of poetry, Christine Harris revisits Louise Bennett's work in "A Tongue of Heritage: Creole and the Expression of Ethnic Identity in the Poetry of Louise Bennett". Harris' argument takes issue with Bennett's use of Creole as a means to resist standard English and its power structures. As Saghal would do in Ballesteros' account, Harris disproves of Edward

Kamau Braithwaite's concept of "Nation Language" and its distinction from Creole as "somewhat pedantic" (180). In her penetrating analysis of Bennett's poetry she underlines the way Bennett is able to validate her woman's voice and her Afro-caribbean identity by bridging the gap between the oral and literary traditions.

The next set of three articles undertake the task of mapping out strategies of resistance and creation in Latino writing, and especially in Latina writers. "Feminism on Stage: The Subversive Plays of Fornes, Moraga and Prida" by Barbara Oziebło inaugurates the section with an engaging analysis of the carnivalesque connotations embedded in these three authors' theatrical production. Bakhtin's theories prove very useful for Oziebło to present consistent evidence of the way in which these women authors consciously "subvert the theatrical experience from within" (188), both in content and structure. Influenced by the women's movement and Luis Valdez's "Teatro Campesino", the three of them manage to place women and women's concerns center-stage breaking the sanctioned theatrical norms and revealing a truly subversive intentionality. Another presentation of the same topic is that propitiated by Matías Barchino's "Identidad cultural e identidad en la autobiografía de Esmeralda Santiago, *When I Was Puerto Rican/ Cuando era puertorriqueña*". In this case, Barchino makes use of Santiago's two versions of her autobiography, in English and Spanish, to chart the ambiguity of a double self and the relevance of language to create and define identity. Santiago's self-reflexive act of double definition once more emphasizes hybridity, but perhaps Barchino fails short of providing clues into the resisting act this duplicity may entail. Much more pointed is Juan Antonio Perles Rochel's reading in "The Politics of Identity in Ana Castillo's *Sapogonia*". This perceptive analysis of Castillo's work attributes to a gender reason the scant critical attention paid to the novel and claims its feminist agenda. Perles throws light on the strategies deployed by Castillo to render the reader's identification difficult as a previous step in her deliberate deconstruction of normative definitions of both masculinity and femininity. Hence the author problematizes identity constructions warning the reader "to distrust any master narrative, eurocentric or Chicano nationalist, of identity search" (216), as Perles conveniently concludes.

The following cluster of articles interrogates the meanings ascribed to Jewishness and their relation to gender and search for identity in Jewish American literature. This is the alleged purpose of Luisa Juárez's "Is there a Jewish American Woman Writer? The Jewish American Narrative and the Mysteries of Canon Formation", where Juárez effectively dismantles the sexist bias underlying the traditional Jewish American canon and calls for a serious reevaluation of the role played by Jewish women writers in a wider definition of Jewishness. However, she could have offered a more detailed study of these women's works and what they entail for the formation of a more inclusive canon. In "'The Devil Wore a Skirt': The Ideology of the Anticommunist Witch-hunts in Tema Nason's *Ethel*", Juan Ignacio Guijarro takes the reader back to the claustrophobic decade of the fifties, and concretely to the so-called "Rosenberg case" and its fictional renderings. By focusing on a supposedly minor work, Tema Nason's *Ethel*, Guijarro underlines Nason's refusal to place the historical figure of Ethel in a marginal position. Guijarro's highly interesting and informative account of Nason's revisionist and oppositional perspective allows him to delve into the process of demonization and

otherness this figure underwent, especially due to her lack of adaptation to the concept of normative femininity of the fifties. Stanislav Kolar also returns to the past in his "Function of Recollections in Jewish-American Literature", although from a different standpoint. Claiming the essential role of recollections in Jewish American writing as a vehicle to search for identity, Kolar draws an interesting comparison between the use of the past in the immigrant generation and those born in America. Although he definitively makes his point asserting that "memory can be understood as a way of resistance to the forces leading to assimilation" (256), his analysis could have been enriched by discussing similarities and differences in depth.

Finally, the last three chapters evolve around the topic of canon formation, writing as resistance and hybridization processes in Native American literature from three different perspectives: firstly, Esther Álvarez's "Native American Women Speak: Autobiographies, Identities, and the (Author/ized) Ethnic Self" deals with the problematic issue of the politics of canon formation in female autobiographies and its relation to identity construction. Álvarez provides an intelligent analysis of the changes in these women's autobiographies that facilitate the construction of positive Native American models. Moreover, Álvarez argues, their privileged liminal status allows them to frankly reconceptualize themselves and the world surrounding them. Then, M^a Esther Martínez in "El complejo destino de la condición del indio en *Love Medicine*, de Louise Erdrich" scrutinizes the concept of writing as resistance in Erdrich's emblematic novel. Erdrich presents characters who continuously negotiate between two seemingly opposite codes—Western and Native American—as an intrinsic characteristic of their marginal position. Martínez affirms Erdrich's investment in tradition as crucial to the survival and well-being of the entire tribe. Opposing this view, Aitor Ibarrola's "The Red and the Dark: Sherman Alexie's Indebtedness and Expansion of Black Racial Consciousness in *Reservation Blues*" emphasizes hybridization as a means to achieve a coherent sense of self and community. Ibarrola's rigorous and attractive account derives its strength from his accurate knowledge of the innovative devices Alexie avails himself of, mainly stemming from Native American and African American influences. He consistently and conveniently defends thus hybridization as an effective and useful instrument for resistance and creation.

All in all, the volume discussed here means a significant contribution and welcome addition to the growing field of ethnic studies in Spain but also abroad, due to its multilayered approach to very contemporary and controversial issues which will surely pave the way for future research and investigation into the nature of culturally constructed ethnic identities. Its lucid and captivating articles provide an impressive wide range of topics and motifs which will make this book a compulsory reference for those interested in multicultural literary endeavors.

REFERENCES

- Barrios, Olga and Bernard Bell, eds. 1997: *Contemporary Literature in the African Diaspora*. León: Celarayn.

-
- Ibarrola, Aitor, ed. 1995: *Fiction and Ethnicity in NorthAmerica*. Bilbao: Uncilla Press.
- Lauter, Paul, ed. 1994: *The Heath Anthology of American Literature*. 2nd ed. Lexington: D. C. Heath and Company.

Fischer, Olga and Max Nänny, eds. 2001: *The Motivated Sign. Iconicity in Language and Literature 2*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. Pp. xiv + 387.

Daniel García Velasco
Universidad de Oviedo

El volumen objeto de esta reseña contiene un total de diecisiete artículos presentados en el *Second International Symposium on Iconicity in Language and Literature* celebrado en Amsterdam en el año 1999. *The Motivated Sign* continúa el camino abierto por su volumen predecesor, *Form Miming Meaning* (Benjamins 1999), editado por los mismos autores, que a su vez recoge una selección de artículos del primer simposio sobre la iconicidad de Zurich en 1997.

Como señalan los editores, el objetivo de ambas conferencias y, en consecuencia, de los dos volúmenes de ellas derivados, es "to present case studies of how iconicity *works* on all levels of language ... in literary texts and in all kinds of verbal discourse" (1).

El concepto de iconicidad, aunque se remonta al trabajo del semiólogo C. S. Peirce publicado en la primera mitad del siglo pasado, ha recibido gran atención en los últimos años principalmente en los estudios lingüísticos de orientación funcionalista. En pocas palabras, la iconicidad introduce como hipótesis de trabajo la idea de que la forma o estructura lingüística viene motivada o de algún modo refleja el significado que codifica; la iconicidad supone así un rechazo al famoso principio de la arbitrariedad del signo de Saussure (de ahí el título del volumen). Los autores creen que el hecho de que la lingüística tradicionalmente haya desestimado el papel relevante de este concepto se debe principalmente a una errónea caracterización del mismo. Para Fischer y Nänny (1999), existen dos tipos fundamentales de iconicidad: *imagic* y *diagrammatic*. La primera de ellas supone una relación directa entre el significante y el significado, como ocurre, por ejemplo, en el caso de las onomatopeyas. Sin embargo, en la iconicidad diagramática existe una relación más abstracta en forma de conexión icónica entre las relaciones de los elementos que constituyen el significante y las relaciones de los elementos que componen el significado. Así, en el famoso ejemplo de Julio César *veni, vidi, vici*, el orden sintáctico de la expresión se corresponde icónicamente con la relación de orden temporal entre los eventos denotados. Según Fischer y Nänny (1999: xxi), es este tipo de iconicidad diagramática el que desarrolla un papel fundamental en el lenguaje, tanto en el nivel estructural como en el semántico.

Pero sin duda, el punto donde el concepto de iconicidad resulta más atractivo reside en la posibilidad de que suponga una refutación total o parcial de la hipótesis de la autonomía de la gramática defendida por la lingüística formal liderada por

ATLANTIS
Vol. XXIV Núm. 1 (Jun. 2002): 277-82.
ISSN 0210-6124

Noam Chomsky. Si la estructura lingüística y las reglas que rigen el funcionamiento del sistema gramatical vienen motivadas por el significado que expresan, no parece pertinente su estudio independiente de factores extragramaticales tal como se lleva a cabo en la corriente generativista. Por el contrario, los chomskyanos mantienen la excepcionalidad de la facultad del lenguaje en el conjunto de nuestros sistemas cognitivos, de tal modo que no es posible reducir sus principios constitutivos básicos a reglas y mecanismos propios de otros sistemas. Esta cuestión es sin duda un aspecto de intenso debate en la lingüística contemporánea (véase por ejemplo Croft (1995) y Newmeyer (1992)), y la iconicidad en este sentido viene siendo el argumento preferido por parte de aquéllos que se posicionan contra el paradigma chomskiano.

Es necesario señalar, no obstante, que del libro se desprende una fundamental diferencia entre la manifestación de la iconicidad en la literatura y en la lengua. La obra literaria, como fenómeno de creación artística más o menos consciente, manifiesta aspectos icónicos de un modo evidente, puesto que, como demuestran algunos artículos (Anderson, Müller, Ljunberg), los autores utilizan este recurso de forma intencionada a fin de producir diferentes efectos expresivos o estilísticos.

Tal situación no se da en el lenguaje, puesto que la supuesta relevancia de la iconicidad en la formación de los principios gramaticales obviamente no responde a una intención consciente por parte de los miembros de una comunidad lingüística. A mi juicio, esta diferencia resulta fundamental porque nos sitúa en dos escenarios diferentes: la iconicidad en el texto literario es un hecho esperable (y quizá por ello menos interesante), mientras que la iconicidad como principio motivador de la estructura gramatical es aún una cuestión de debate sujeta a comprobación/refutación empírica. Con estas premisas en mente, pasaré a continuación a comentar en más detalle los contenidos de esta obra.

El libro se organiza en cinco secciones: I. General, II. Sounds and beyond, III. Visual iconicity: typography and the use of images, IV. Iconicity in grammatical structures and V. Iconicity in textual structures.

La primera sección contiene tres artículos de orientación teórica, y, en este sentido, actúan como introducción o marco para el resto de contribuciones de orientación más práctica. Nöth, en *Semiotic Foundations of Iconicity in Language and Literature*, revisa las distinciones de iconicidad propuestas por Peirce, que constituyen ejemplos de lo que el autor denomina "exophoric iconicity". A continuación introduce un nuevo tipo de iconicidad, "endophoric iconicity", que se podría considerar intralingüística, ya que consiste en la repetición verbal o en la simetría dentro del lenguaje o discurso. Aunque otros autores (ej. Müller, Ljunberg, etc.) se hacen eco de esta distinción, a mi modo de ver no queda suficientemente ejemplificada, con lo que no se observa su verdadera relevancia.

White ofrece un estudio sobre la técnica narrativa denominada *mise en abyme*, consistente en la incrustación de una historia dentro del cuerpo de la obra principal, con claras alusiones o semejanzas a ésta última. La técnica, en este sentido, es un proceso icónico por su propia naturaleza que cumple una variedad de funciones estilísticas en su relación con la historia principal. White ofrece un detallado y documentado estudio del *mise en abyme* en la tradición de crítica literaria y de su

manifestación en obras como *El juicio* de Kafka y *La Montaña Mágica* de Thomas Mann.

El tercer artículo de la sección introductoria del volumen ofrece una visión cognitiva de la evolución del lenguaje. El ejemplo en que se apoya el autor, Herlofsky, es la búsqueda de una motivación icónica para los principios sintácticos de *Binding* propuestos en el modelo generativista de Chomsky. El autor sugiere un escenario de la evolución del lenguaje en el que la complejidad sintáctica de las lenguas deriva de modo gradual de una cultura prelingüística de naturaleza mimética y no simbólica. En este sentido observa un paralelismo entre los tres principios de *Binding* y las asociaciones referenciales de iconos, índices y símbolos respectivamente. La hipótesis del autor es que los principios de asociación referencial son anteriores a los principios sintácticos de *Binding*, lo cual justifica la teoría de la evolución del lenguaje propuesta.

La sección segunda arranca con un interesante artículo sobre el valor simbólico de la combinación consonántica *gl-* al inicio de palabra en el inglés. Al igual que en el artículo anterior, Sadowski presenta un panorama del origen del lenguaje en el que se asume una transición de una etapa comunicativa basada en signos emotivos, a través de otra basada en signos icónicos, a una final con mayor carga de signos arbitrarios. Quizás en contra de la filosofía general del libro, la propuesta de Sadowski parece así sugerir que el peso de la iconicidad en las lenguas es bastante menor de lo que algunos mantienen.

Dos artículos más cierran esta sección: Norman trata de probar la existencia de rasgos fonéticos y morfológicos similares en muchas lenguas en la denominación de las plantas cucurbitáceas, sugiriendo la existencia de una relación semiótica entre el referente y la forma. Igualmente, la evocación metafórica de estas plantas como símbolos de vida y muerte en muchas culturas es para el autor el resultado de la fisiología de las cucurbitáceas y de la percepción humana de las mismas. Finalmente, el estudio de Anderson muestra el uso consciente de recursos sintácticos y fonéticos de motivación icónica en poemas medievales ingleses.

La sección tercera del volumen, dedicada a la manifestación visual de la iconicidad, recoge artículos que estudian aspectos que quizá han recibido escasa atención en la crítica literaria. Este es el caso de los artículos de Henry y Nänny; el primero de ellos mantiene la hipótesis de que los signos de puntuación de elipsis (puntos suspensivos, guiones, asteriscos, etc.) constituyen un sistema semántico propio, que la autora justifica con un estudio detallado de su uso desde los manuscritos medievales. Nänny, por su parte, muestra como la línea tiene un claro potencial icónico en la obra literaria, en cuanto que el incremento o reducción gradual de su longitud puede servir como reflejo de nociones tales como longitud, distancia, duración o sus opuestos contracción, pequeñez, estrechez, etc. El autor examina la manifestación de estos rasgos principalmente en poetas ingleses de los siglos XVII y XVIII, demostrando la relevancia de la iconicidad como figura estilística, lo que se observa asimismo en los dos siguientes artículos de esta sección: el estudio sobre la iconicidad en el mensaje publicitario (Goh) y en la literatura inglesa del siglo XVII (Innocenti).

La sección cuarta, *Iconicity in grammatical structures*, comienza con el estudio de Conradie sobre los genitivos en inglés. El autor introduce un Modelo de Evento,

de clara reminiscencia al *Canonical Event Model* de Langacker, que icónicamente parece motivar el orden sintáctico SVO de muchas lenguas. Para el autor el uso del genitivo sajón resulta de la influencia del mencionado Modelo de Evento, en cuanto que se observa una precedencia lineal del causante o poseedor sobre el NP poseído o efectuado. La evolución del inglés de orden SOV a SVO motiva el uso de la construcción con la preposición *of* con el objeto de la actividad en último término del sintagma nominal.

Fischer ofrece un estudio de la posición del adjetivo en inglés antiguo desde una perspectiva icónica. Al contrario que en inglés moderno, el inglés antiguo permitía situar los adjetivos en posición pre- y postnominal. En las lenguas romances, que, como el inglés antiguo, admiten ambas posibilidades, se advierten diferencias de significado según la posición que ocupe el adjetivo. La misma situación, según la autora, se da en inglés antiguo, donde los adjetivos postnominales actúan como una especie de predicados secundarios. Por el contrario, los adjetivos que preceden al nombre, típicamente de la declinación débil, forman una especie de compuesto o unidad conceptual con el nombre que modifican y presentan más rasgos de naturaleza nominal. Según la autora, este efecto se deriva en gran medida de la posición de los adjetivos, ya que el hecho de que un adjetivo aparezca antes del núcleo nominal invita a considerarlo como una parte íntimamente asociada al mismo.

Jansen y Lentz estudian la expresión de eventos simultáneos en textos de carácter instruccional como es el caso de las recetas culinarias. La imposibilidad física de producir dos cláusulas a un mismo tiempo impide una codificación totalmente icónica de la simultaneidad. Los autores exploran las opciones expresivas posibles, en concreto, el uso de participios de presente incrustados en la cláusula principal, lo que sugiere simultaneidad entre ambos eventos, a la vez que, icónicamente, implica la menor importancia del evento que expresa dada su menor longitud y su menor complejidad morfológica.

Finalmente, en si cabe el artículo menos interesante de esta sección cuarta, Lecercle trata de demostrar la iconicidad emotiva reflejada en el ritmo de las expresiones y en fenómenos tales como las dislocaciones o rupturas sintácticas de diferente naturaleza. Su punto de partida es una expresión francesa de carácter amenazador recogida de modo casual. Con este reducido corpus, es difícil poder demostrar la existencia de relaciones sistemáticas entre un fenómeno sintáctico y un contenido expresivo, algo que sin duda hubiese sido deseable para sustentar la tesis propuesta.

La sección quinta y última del volumen recoge tres artículos de naturaleza textual, que se aproximan al fenómeno de la iconicidad desde una perspectiva más amplia. Müller y Ljunberg tratan el uso de recursos icónicos en William Shakespeare y Margaret Atwood respectivamente, mientras que Wolf se centra en descripciones paisajísticas en la ficción inglesa. El artículo de Ljunberg, el más interesante de los tres desde mi punto de vista, es una clara muestra de lo expresado anteriormente: el uso consciente de técnicas literarias de motivación icónica en la disposición visual de poemas como *Pastoral Elegy*, a modo de mariposa en metáfora de metamorfosis y renacimiento o *This is a photograph of me*, en el que la

disposición de las líneas, como señalaba Nänny en su artículo, actúa como un importante recurso estilístico.

En resumidas cuentas, los artículos recogidos en este volumen exploran el concepto de iconicidad desde ángulos muy diversos, lo que confiere a la obra un doble valor positivo y negativo al tiempo. Por una parte, dado el nivel de especialización que va adquiriendo el área de la Filología Inglesa en los últimos tiempos, resultaría difícil encontrar investigadores en cuyo campo de estudio y producción científica caiga tanto el valor simbólico de las plantas cucurbitáceas como la motivación funcional de los principios de *Binding*. Sin embargo, tal diversidad puede ser entendida positivamente, en cuanto que justificaría "the pervasiveness, great variety, richness and subtlety of verbal iconicity" (13) que defienden los editores.

En cualquier caso, si bien el papel "consciente" de la iconicidad como fuerza motivadora de diferentes técnicas narrativas y figuras estilísticas parece quedar suficientemente refrendado en los artículos a tal efecto, su vertiente motivadora de la estructura lingüística presenta más dudas. Si asumimos que la iconicidad surge a partir de una base fisiológica-perceptiva común en el ser humano, su manifestación lingüística debería ser universal. Esto es lo que afirma Fischer de modo rotundo: "iconic structures are by their very nature not language specific, and therefore, the same rule would apply whether the language is Old English or Modern English, Italian or Greek" (273), pero el artículo de Sadowski rechaza la posibilidad de que la carga icónica de la combinación consonántica *g/-* tenga un carácter universal. Es más, admite claramente la existencia de restricciones específicas al sistema gramatical de cada lengua (83), lo que podría apoyar la tesis de que al menos algunos aspectos gramaticales son de naturaleza autónoma.

Quizá el trabajo más atractivo en este sentido es el artículo de Herflosky, en cuanto que ofrece una motivación funcional (icónica) para un principio formal. Sin embargo, la existencia de esta correlación no supone en sí una refutación de la hipótesis de la autonomía, pues el principio sintáctico generativista permanece intacto. Consecuentemente, sería posible afirmar que el artículo de Herfloski sirve para apoyar la estrategia metodológica formalista basada en el estudio independiente del sistema gramatical.

En suma, no creo que de este volumen se pueda extraer la relevancia de la iconicidad a fin de refutar la tesis de la autonomía de la gramática. Justo es decir, sin embargo, que muy probablemente no fuese ese su objetivo, ya que, como señalé anteriormente, el interés de la obra radica para sus editores en la presentación de aplicaciones prácticas del fenómeno. Lo que si es cierto es que Fischer y Nänny han recogido un conjunto de artículos que, aunque presentando diferentes niveles de calidad, prueban indudablemente el interés del concepto de iconicidad tanto para el académico interesado en la crítica literaria como para quien prefiera investigar en la estructura y organización del lenguaje humano. Espero, en consecuencia, que esta reseña "motive" al lector a acercarse a esta obra en la que sin duda encontrará propuestas que susciten su interés.

OBRAS CITADAS

- Croft, William 1995: "Autonomy and Functionalist Linguistics". *Language* 71: 490-532.
- Fischer, Olga y Max Nänny 1999: "Introduction: Iconicity as a Creative Force in Language Use". *Form Miming Meaning. Iconicity in Language and Literature*. Eds. M. Nänny y O. Fischer. Amsterdam: Benjamins. xv-xxxvi.
- Newmeyer, F.J. 1992: "Iconicity and Generative Grammar". *Language* 68: 756-96.

Prieto Pablos, Juan Antonio, María José Mora, Manuel J. Gómez-Lara and Rafael Portillo, eds. 2000: *Thomas Shadwell: Epsom Wells*. Sevilla: Secretariado de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Sevilla. LXX + 177 pages.¹

Santiago González
Universidad de Oviedo

This is the second volume of a series started by *The Virtuoso* (Prieto Pablos, Juan Antonio; María José Mora, Manuel J. Gómez-Lara and Rafael Portillo 1997), and let us hope that new titles will be incorporated in the collection at a shorter pace, as this University of Seville initiative is really interesting and, I think, important for the promotion of Restoration studies in Spain.

The editors have selected an author —Thomas Shadwell (1642?-1692)—² and a period in the history of English theatre (1660-1700) that has been much neglected in literary historiography and is still considered as second rate in several academic circles. But I for one think it is an age that needs a thorough revision with modern eyes and methodologies as the Restoration had a group of playwrights and writers that calls for more attention. The relations between the scene and the innovative operatic musical layouts by Purcell and then, later, by Haendel, are still matter for some research, as one may find (with relative ease) materials on Drummond and Dryden, but modern scholarship on the period 1660-1700 is comparatively scarce.

The edition is well structured and it aims at a motley audience, although undergraduates are the most likely commercial target. But postgraduate students and scholars with an interest in Restoration theatre will also benefit from both the annotation of the text and the introductory study. This has some 41 pages (pages xvii to lxviii are the introduction proper, then pages lxix-lxx contain a list of further reading materials directly related to the play). The book may be structured in six parts: Shadwell's life and times (pages xvii-xxvi), contemporary comedy and the play itself (pages xxvi-xliii), the play and 17th century hygienic vogues and customs (pages xliii-lii), *Epsom Wells* in detail: with a study of characters, players, allusions and the London stage in the 1670s (pages lii-lxiii), the fate of this play and its later success (pages lxiii-lxiv) —a section that could have been embedded in the previous one—, and finally, what is labelled as "The Text" (pages lxiv-lxviii), a section where the editors give information about their early textual sources, together with academic

¹ The author wishes to thank the reviewers of earlier versions of this note.

² On page xvii of this edition the authors refer to John Ross's 1995 edition of *Bury Fair*, and they also share the opinion that Shadwell was born in 1641. The question is not absolutely settled.

editions of later periods. It is particularly remarkable that, apparently, *Epsom Wells* fell into oblivion for over a century (no edition seems to have been published in Britain in between 1720 and 1927). Also, the editors state on pages lxvi-lxvii what their practice has been: a collation of all extant texts, with special attention to the three quarto editions (Q1 1673, Q2 1676, Q3 1693 —just after Shadwell's death—), the 1693 variorum edition, and the last 18th century quarto (1704). On top of this, Shadwell's *Dramatick Works* (1720), with John Shadwell's preface, is the last of the old prints used in the preparation of this edition.

This Seville edition is also exhaustive from the point of view of textual and scholarly edition, and the authors (page lxvi) correctly criticise previous readings by other academics. What I find more debatable though is the mixed nature of their text. On page lxvi we read that:

The present edition is based on the collation of all extant texts, although only the quartos and, occasionally, D [the 1720 version in *Dramatick Works*] are mentioned in the footnotes. It was thought that, where the collation offered a number of alternatives, those options provided by the quartos should be preferred over the later editions, and Q1 over Q2-4. However, in most cases, there was coincidence between Q1 and at least one of the other quartos, and the choice was greatly facilitated.

If several options may be taken, the editors have duly stated their own in an appropriate note. The textual format has been partially modernised (page lxvi), although "restricted to a minimum". A sample plate would have been most welcome. It is indeed true that on page lxxiii we have the title page of the 1672/3 comedy as "acted at the Duke's theatre", but the information about textual disposition, stage directions, etc., that one sample may have provided, is missing but for the descriptions of pages lxvi-lxvii. Modernisation, the authors say, has not affected "style, grammar and vocabulary", but it has affected —we infer, as that is stated— "spelling or typography, punctuation and scene headings".

Spelling and typography are quite different things... Typographical changes, at least for the sake of modern printers, are pragmatically convenient... Spelling modernisations are something different. Generally speaking they only affect our reading, but occasionally they make a world of a difference. I have not had access to the 17th century editions, but in this *Epsom Wells* I can think of several examples where spelling modernisation, may have done away with an intentional pun, an ambiguous effect, or just some minor information concerning the pronunciation of one particular item three centuries ago. Modernising punctuation (see pages lxvii-lxviii) is a good example: what the editors say about "commas, especially those that appear between the subject and the verb" implies that if the 1673 text used the comma as a stage direction or an elocutionary expression of an intonational pattern to guide the reader as to what the actor might have performed, then, that has been changed and accommodated to contemporary interpretation. All this is indeed accessory to the discussion of what a text should be, but from my point of view, it is just the carrying over of a traditional editorial practice for which the only justification is the staunch reluctance of many editors to draw a line with a much revered (but not necessarily petrified) philological past.

Let me illustrate this point with what is still common practice in the case of Chaucer (and many 16th and 17th century works). Most primary textual sources in the case of Chaucer spell the letters thorn, yogh and eth. The only really important MS that uses "th" is the Ellesmere manuscript. And there are over 50 good manuscript sources, of, let us say, *The Canterbury Tales*. However the academic editions of Chaucer—the Riverside Chaucer (1987), to mention the standard one—do silently modernise the spelling, after a fashion started by Caxton in the late 15th century (and resuscitated by Skeat in the 1890's). This makes students approach Chaucer in a much more familiar way, as they are not required to acquire specific (and difficult) skills, and hence the illusion that Chaucer's text is "almost modern English". Shadwell's English may also appear modern in its typography, even in its partially modernised spelling: but it is not. It is English from the 1670's, as its syntax, morphology, and very especially its lexicon and expressions, prove. I do not really see any special advantage in modernising a part of the textual appearance and directions: what I tend to argue for is either to leave things as they are, because the textual forms that have come down to us are the true witness of a certain age and of a certain author, or to facilitate things thoroughly. In the first case, specialised technical knowledge is required; in the second—one may retort—knowledge is also required, but its nature is of a general character, and hence the scope of the audience is much wider while it still keeps a specific (academic or university) audience in the bull's eye.

In the end the text we have in this edition (as in all editions, really) is an editorial creation. This text of *Epsom Wells*, as it stands in this 2000 book was really never printed nor staged: it is an academic artefact. Most editions of classical works tend to be academic artefacts, even such "true texts" as electronic facsimile ones. As a consequence readers do not really have in mind what the 1673 readers read, nor what the 1672 theatre-goers watched. Instead, what the Seville editors offer us is their careful interpretation of *Epsom Wells*, their own version of how the play should read (or be read?), and hence they follow the great tradition of scholarly publishing: manipulating texts to facilitate their understanding by the "less gifted"... but also to make students feel more comfortable when approaching a late 17th century play, and hence this *aggiornamento*, though quite unacceptable for a different sort of more demanding audience, is appropriate for the sort of audience that I think this edition seems to be aimed at.

What I consider as a major achievement in this book is its introductory study, which far surpasses its point of departure and will be of great use to anyone seeking information on theatrical ways during the late seventeenth century. What the Seville group has achieved is to concentrate as much useful and researched information about the early Restoration comedy as possible in some 15.000 words. The introductory study is clear, very well (and traditionally) structured, and it offers the reader if not exactly "God's plenty" as Alexander Pope might have put it, what comes closest to it. Juan Antonio Prieto Pablos, María José Mora, Manuel J. Gómez-Lara and Rafael Portillo have set an example that can and should be followed by other publications in the field. Their edition has no apparent errata (there are seemingly just a couple), and this is further proof of their evident care for the comedy and for Shadwell.

The edition ends by offering a group of historical appendices (Songs and variegated news from the fashionable spas) that set a context for the hilarious cacophony of discourse that is Shadwell's *Epsom Wells*. But far beyond that, the editors bring in a prodigious knowledge of stage practices and conventions and provide the opening of a needed window onto a wide variety of reading practices that academics, students and undergraduates apply to English Restoration Drama. With the Seville *Epsom Wells* the editors do not just offer, "loudly the triumphs of that day they boast" (5), but they "contribute to our delight" (5), don't they?

REFERENCES

- Benson, Larry ed. 1987: *The Riverside Chaucer*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Prieto Pablos, Juan Antonio; María José Mora, Manuel J. Gómez-Lara and Rafael Portillo eds 1997: *Thomas Shadwell: The Virtuoso*. Sevilla: Secretariado de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Sevilla.
- Ross, John C. ed. 1995: *Thomas Shadwell: Bury Fair*. New York: Garland.
- Skeat, W. W. 1894-1897: *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*. 6 volumes. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lauter, Paul and Ann Fitzgerald, eds. 2001: *Literature, Class, and Culture: An Anthology*. New York: Longman. 746 pp.

Lauter, Paul and Ann Fitzgerald, eds. 2001: *Instructor's Manual*. Prepared by Paul Lauter and Ann Fitzgerald to accompany *Literature, Class, and Culture: An Anthology*. New York: Longman. 225 pp.

Ana Manzananas Calvo
Universidad de Salamanca

As Paul Lauter points out in "American Proletarianism", his chapter in Emory Elliott's *The Columbia History of the American Novel* (1991), Proletarianism "has, in the cultural discourse of the United States, come to be associated with a 'foreign' way of speaking, historically that of the Soviet or Soviet-identified leftists.... In its more barbarous manifestations, this set of connections has led to the view that 'proletarian' and 'American' are mutually contradictory terms" (1991a: 331). The absence of class differences is, we may recall, at the heart of Crèvecoeur's *Letters from an American Farmer*, when he maps a space of equality in the new land: "Here are no aristocratical families, no courts, no kings, no bishops, no ecclesiastical dominion, no invisible power giving to a few a very visible one, no great manufacturers employing thousands, no great refinements of luxury. The rich and the poor are not so far removed from each other as they are in Europe" (1998: 854). The absences and omissions which underlie Crèvecoeur's optimism are also the subtext of more contemporary formulations of Americanness such as John Kowenhoven's article "What's 'American' About America", where he explains the gridiron pattern which characterizes American cities as "a blueprint for a future society in which men would live each in his own domain, free and equal, each man's domain clearly divided from his neighbor's" (1954: 18). It is clear that, as Lauter has pointed out, "The United States in its origins specifically rejected the idea of privilege rooted in birth, race (and national origin), gender, and class" (1991b: 49). Hence the difficulty of editing an anthology of literature and culture with class, such an "old-world" concept, as the major axis of the project. Most Americans, as Paul Lauter and Ann Fitzgerald write in their clarifying introduction to *Literature, Class, and Culture*, "have been taught to disbelieve in class" (2001: 1). As the editors explain, out of the famous trio, gender, race, and class, the latter has been the least explored, addressed or taught in university syllabi, for surely, "to raise the specter of class" so carefully dispelled in classic pieces of American literature, "engenders class conflict—surely un-American" (2001: 2). But class, as Lauter and Fitzgerald remind us, is all around us, from the "first-class" to the "economy" class on a plane, from ghettos to exclusive suburbia. Class, we may all have experienced, has a distinctive face and speaks with a distinctive accent, eats at specific places and

ATLANTIS
Vol. XXIV Núm. 1 (Jun. 2002): 287-92.
ISSN 0210-6124

dresses in a certain way. But Lauter and Fitzgerald are very careful not to essentialize the term, but rather to examine it as "a set of relationships that change over time and in different historical circumstances" (2001: 4-5). Class, moreover, cannot be understood without reference to identity categories such as race, gender, nationality or sexual orientation (2001: 8). From the presumably egalitarian society of Crèvecoeur's *Letters* class—together with race and gender—has come to play a fundamental role in how marginality has been constructed and maintained (Lauter 1991b: 49). Marginality can be understood in a variety of interconnected ways: economic and social marginality usually go hand in hand with linguistic, literary and cultural marginality. Like gender and race, class, therefore, has inflected the ways we look at the world and the perspective from which we understand and write literature.

Literature, Class, and Culture is precisely a fascinating example of the multiple inflections and interconnections among these three concepts. In "American Proletarianism" Lauter called for "rearticulated narratives" which could restore historical and literary omissions, and that is what the present anthology offers. The making of an anthology, as Richard Poirier and L. Vance point out in their preface to *American Literature* (1970), is an act of historicizing literature: "All anthologies are acts of criticism, of deciding that certain things deserve space that would have been given by other editors to something else" (1970: v). To "anthologize", then, is to engage into the difficult task of articulating literary history/histories, as the changing views of what we understand by American literature, from the "selective" tradition of *The American Tradition in Literature* (1957) and *The Norton Anthology of American Literature* (1969) to the successive editions of the ground breaking and inclusive *Heath Anthology of American Literature* (3rd edition 1998) clearly illustrate. We may recall that until the publication of *The Harper American Literature* (1987), with Donald McQuade as general editor, American Literature was supposed to start with Captain Smith, William Bradford or John Winthrop. The limitations of this perspective are clear in McQuade's words: "such beginnings ignore a great deal of compelling literature written in and about America long before the first settlements at either Roanoke Island or Plymouth Plantation" (1987: xxv). As opposed to these earlier attempts at historicizing American literature from an Anglo-Saxon perspective, *The Harper* appears as an inclusive and integrated project, as the general editor states: "No collection of American literature can be complete unless it includes a wide range of distinct voices, including those of women, blacks, Asian-Americans, Mexican-Americans, and Native Americans" (1987: xxvii). Some of these pioneering aspects of the *Harper* will be further explored and illustrated in *The Heath Anthology of American Literature*. Like *The Heath*, *Literature, Class, and Culture* is an exercise of literary integration which rejects either/or positions; it also shows that it is possible to augment and widen the range of texts we teach in American literature syllabi. But "augmentation" does not simply imply juxtaposing or listing names, but rather exploring the interconnections among the different texts, as well as the ways texts respond to one another. *Literature, Class, and Culture* makes it easier for students and readers to explore what we can call, using Mary Louise Pratt's term, "contact zones" (1992: 6) in American literature, that is, the exchanges and dialogues between different cultural and literary traditions.

Dialogue or exchange is perhaps the key word in the collection and the series itself, as Mikhail Bakhtin's quote suggests: "If an answer does not give rise to a new question from itself, it falls out of the dialogue". The collection illustrates a democratic approach to literature and culture which puts together texts by over ninety writers including classic figures of literature, i.e. Melville, Faulkner, Willa Cather or Edith Wharton, with lesser known names such as Rebecca Harding Davis, Carlos Bulosan, Tillie Olsen or Junot Díaz, together with musicians and song writers such as Janis Joplin or Bruce Springsteen, Billy Joel or Bob Dylan, as well as thinkers or intellectuals as varied as Andrew Carnegie, Matthew Arnold, Raymond Williams or Mao Tse-tung. Each text is preceded by a very useful headnote, concise, lively and to the point, which provides a biographical outline, briefly explains the reception of the piece, and offers possible interconnections with other works. The editors not only include expressions of working-class experience by writers such as Tillie Olsen or Helena Viramontes, but also of upper-class life by Edith Wharton. Similarly, the writers anthologized may have a working class background, but can also be part of the different versions of American middle class, and have developed what the editors, quoting from Tillie Olsen, call the "trespass vision", "the ability to cross boundaries of class and gender to see deeply into lives so unlike one's own" (2001: 471). This "trespass vision" appears in Rebecca Harding Davis' "Life in the Iron Mills", as well as in Faulkner's "Barn Burning". The fact that writers coming from such different backgrounds have developed this ability, offers further possibilities for comparing texts. Stories such as "Barn Burning" illustrate, moreover, how class conflicts are at the core of the writings of classic writers who are frequently studied for many other reasons and from many other perspectives.

The dialogue, therefore, is established among a vast array of writers and a variety of genres, from poetry to stories, novel excerpts, essays, speeches, and songs. To give just an example, Rebecca Harding Davis' visions of Dante's *Inferno* in "Life in the Iron Mills" —with the total absence of hope, the stifling of all forms of (creative) expression, as well as the description of "a great gulf never to be passed" between the rich and the poor—, contrasts sharply with the optimistic vision of social mobility and the natural progression to success chronicled in Andrew Carnegie's *The Gospel of Wealth*, the text that follows Harding Davis in the collection. This juxtaposition highlights the contrast between the descriptions of stark poverty, the cold, the fetid air, the starvation in Harding Davis's piece, and the idealized vision of poverty Carnegie conveys in *The Gospel of Wealth*: "You know how people moan about poverty as being a great evil, and it seems to be accepted that if people had only plenty of money and were rich, they would be happy and more useful, and get more of life.... As a rule, there is more genuine satisfaction, a truer life, and more obtained from life in the humble cottages of the poor than in the palaces of the rich" (2001: 497). Harding Davis seems to have a vision of poverty more akin to Edwin Markham in his poem "The Man with the Hoe"; she also offers a critique of social paternalism and hypocrisy similar to that presented by Joe Hill — agitator, organizer and song-writer— in "The Preacher and the Slave".

Lauter and Fitzgerald have divided *Literature, Class, and Culture* into four parts. The first section of the volume, "Bread, Land, and Station: Work and Class", deals with the way work shapes and is shaped by class. The second section, "Clothes Make the Woman: The Social Dimensions of Class", illustrates the ways in which

class inflects and interacts with relationships between people. "'Between the Workers and the Owners': Class Conflict", the third section, offers literary examples of class conflict between the poor-weak and the wealthy-powerful. Section four, "Classic or classy: Art and Class", looks at the different ways writers express the interactions (or lack of them) between art and class. Yet the editors offer another itinerary, and also organize contents by genre: "Poems", "Stories", "Novel Excerpts", "Essays", "Autobiographies", "Speech", and "Songs". In this way, *Literature, Class, and Culture* offers a literary dialogue which transgresses generic boundaries and invites the reader to be the one to decide what (if any) boundaries apply.

As a supplement to *Literature, Class, and Culture* the editors offer a very useful pedagogical tool, an *Instructor's Manual*. Whether in the hands of instructors or students, manuals are of extreme help, especially when dealing with texts (and their contexts) which are not usually available in anthologies and rarely included in university syllabi. Unavoidably, manuals are going to reflect the vision of literature and literary history which the anthologies they supplement have fleshed out in the selection of texts. Lauter and Fitzgerald have elaborated a manual which recalls the approach to literature and teaching implicit both in *The Heath Anthology of American Literature* and its instructor's guide edited by John Alberti. The different aspects covered in Alberti's edition of *Instructor's Guide for The Heath Anthology of American Literature* (1994), "Classroom Issues and Strategies", "Major Themes, Historical Perspectives, and Personal Issues", "Significant Form, Style, or Artistic Connections", and "Questions for Reading and Discussion/Approaches to Writing", have been simplified in the manual accompanying *Literature, Class, and Culture* into discussion questions, exercises and assignments, and a bibliography for further study. Beyond these rubrics, however, both manuals share important assumptions about literature and pedagogy: the literature class is a cultural forum which does not reject the formalist techniques of close reading, but rather widens their applicability, as John Alberti explained in the preface to the manual (1994: xviii). Another major similarity is the vision of marginality and how it affects literary and artistic creation. In *Guide for Instructors: Teaching with The Norton Anthology of American Literature* (1998), Bruce Michelson and Marjorie Pryse seem to go back to the notion of literature as an isolated edifice or an ivory tower, and try to essentialize marginality as a common feature of all writers: "Within the Euro-American tradition, writers such as Hawthorne, Thoreau, Whitman, and Clemens show us that even in the nineteenth-century 'American Renaissance' being a writer was a marginalized condition for an American white man. In America, anyone can feel like an outsider —this in mind, a collective sense of exclusion may provide a tradition that includes us all" (1998: 22). As opposed to these essentialist visions of marginality, both *The Heath Anthology* and *Literature, Class, and Culture*, with their respective manuals, do away with a monolithic vision of literature and literary creation to explore their permeable borders. *Literature, Class, and Culture* historicizes "difference", be it spelled out in terms of race, class or gender, and emphasizes the conditions which have constructed and maintained marginality. In this way, both projects, anthology and instructor's manual contribute to articulating integrated accounts of different literary traditions.

The possibilities of dialogues and exchanges between the different traditions, the supposedly canonic and the non canonic, the established and the marginal, the literary and the non-literary are one of the fascinating aspects of the collection and the *Instructor's Manual*; so is the daring comparative approach which underlies the collection, and which in many ways materializes the comparativist model Lauter advocates in *Canons and Contexts* (1991: 48). The juxtaposition of texts, therefore, is more than a question of putting works together; it activates a process which requires the reader's participation. *Literature, Class, and Culture* situates the reader in the process of creating the literary and ideological connections between and among texts, and in so doing, the reader is immersed in the act of creating integrated and comparativist visions of literary histories.

WORKS CITED

- Alberti, John, ed. 1994: *Instructor's Guide for The Heath Anthology of American Literature*. Lexington: D.C. Heath and Company.
- Crèvecoeur, J. Hector St. John 1998: *Letters from an American Farmer. The Heath Anthology of American Literature*. Ed. Paul Lauter. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Co.
- Kowenhoven, John 1954: *What's 'American' about America. Taller de estudios norteamericanos*. León: Secretariado de Publicaciones, 1996.
- Lauter, Paul 1991a: "American Proletarianism". *The Columbia History of the American Novel*. Ed. Emory Elliott. New York: Columbia University Press. 331-56.
- Lauter, Paul 1991b: *Canons and Contexts*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lauter, Paul and Ann Fitzgerald, eds. 2001: *Literature, Class, and Culture: An Anthology*. New York: Longman.
- Lauter, Paul, and Ann Fitzgerald, eds. 2001: *Instructor's Manual*. Prepared by Paul Lauter and Ann Fitzgerald to accompany *Literature, Class, and Culture: An Anthology*. New York: Longman.
- McQuade, D. 1987: *The Harper American Literature*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Michelson, Bruce, and Marjorie Pryse, eds. 1998: *Teaching with The Norton Anthology of American Literature*. 5th. edition. New York: Norton.
- Poirier, Richard, and L. Vance, eds. 1970: *American Literature*. Boston: Little, Brown and Co.
- Pratt, Mary Louise 1992. *Imperial Eyes*. London: Routledge.

Moulton, Ian Frederick 2000: *Before Pornography. Erotic Writing in Early Modern England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Pp. xiii – 268.

María O'Neill
Universidad de Lleida

I have attempted to elucidate the complexity of erotic representation in a particular time and place, exploring the ways in that early modern erotic writing was engaged in discourses not only of gender but also of national identity. I have also endeavoured to raise broader questions about the history of erotic writing and of erotic representation more generally—a history that remains largely unwritten and which I am convinced is more complex and multivalent than traditional certainties about the nature of pornography and its social role would suggest. (220 -21)

With this closing statement, Ian Frederick Moulton summarises the main contributions this study of erotic discourse makes to both Renaissance studies in particular and cultural studies in general. As the title indicates, the main focus is erotic writing in the era before the term "pornography" gained currency or before it came to be burdened with the moralistic and subjective connotations that skew our view, and condition our interpretation of any discourse even remotely associated with the term. However, as any scholar of the early modern period is well aware, writers of the time were not boxed in by specialisms: the period was typified by eclecticism and the themes that engaged the passions of the intellectuals and "articulate citizens", to borrow A.B. Ferguson's (1965) nomenclature, were closely meshed together.

Pressing social, linguistic and cultural issues were addressed in terms of propriety in clothing, mannerisms and finance as Elsky (1989); Halpern (1991) and Bailey (1991), among others, have demonstrated. Erotic writing in the early modern English period must also be included in the repertory which expresses and measures the importance of these issues. It is in this way that Moulton, building on feminist theory and queer studies investigates the role this type of discourse played in articulating and exteriorising worries about masculinity and the construction of national identity. At the same time, he takes erotic writing as a gauge to reflect the changing social conditions which forced these issues to centre stage in the first place.

The author's ambitions go beyond the historically specific and attempt to place erotic writing in a context which invites contemplation on the present acceptance of the term "pornography". His efforts to constantly relate historical reality to current

ATLANTIS
Vol. XXIV Núm. 1 (Jun. 2002): 293-97.
ISSN 0210-6124

conventionalisms invite the reader to reflect on this genre and recognise that neither in the early modern English period nor now, can it be dismissed as marginal, titillating, trivial or single-faceted. The term "pornography" is a misnomer as the author goes to great pains to stress in the introductory chapter, one which is crucial to the understanding of the whole enterprise and deserves careful reading. The appropriateness of the term, either critically or generically is examined, questioned and dismissed because "pornography", as Moulton argues and convincingly demonstrates, is a historical phenomenon which must be examined in light of this historical specificity.

The book is divided into two parts. The first deals with what might be called native English erotic writing and examines how in the early modern period it skirts the bugbear (one of the many) which lurked in the nooks and crannies of the Renaissance consciousness—in this case, the threat of effeminacy and its relation to the construction of national identity. The second part turns its eyes to what was perceived as the Continental threat, centring on the figure of Pietro Aretino, a writer who was controversial in his time but is little known today.

Three aspects of erotic writing are selected as parameters by which to identify and measure changes in those issues which dominated the social and cultural scenarios of sixteenth and seventeenth-century England. It played a crucial role, Moulton argues, in the construction and negotiation of gender identity, national identity and authorial power. An in-depth study of both manuscript and printed material, its content, distribution and circulation helps to upset commonplace ideas on the perception of male and female sexuality, and the blurred zone where they overlap. The notion of effeminate weakness which clung to the arts is dealt with in some detail as it is a central issue in writing of an erotic nature. Indeed, the whole borrowing controversy, the so-called inkhorn debate has not yet been studied in terms of the explicitly erotic and the discussion here suggests that this could prove to be a rich vein of research.

The second area where the material can contribute to knowledge of the period in fundamental ways was a consequence of this imperilled masculinity and reverts to the perennial question of nationalism which, in one way or another, informs most Renaissance writing of a linguistic, literary or social nature. Although, as the writer acknowledges, to refer to nationalism in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries is anachronistic, the notion of Englishness is present in most of the debates of the period. Much of the vehemence of both the inkhorn and spelling reform controversies stems from an underlying and powerful sense of Englishness, and how to preserve and safeguard it from possible foreign corruption.

As regards authorial power, Moulton interprets erotic writing as constituting a strategic weapon by which authors could achieve a number of disparate objectives in the social, political and literary fields: self-definition and self-emancipation in the first place and striking a blow for nationalism as an off-shoot.

The chapters on English erotic writing are replete with a variety of dishes which can only whet the intellectual appetite as they provide material which, apart from its lively and humorous quality, holds two additional merits. It demonstrates the potential and, as yet unexplored wealth of source material, the surface of which has only been scratched but which deserves further research and secondly, provides

new perspectives on gender identity in early modern England. By drawing heavily on manuscript material, primarily from commonplace books, the author affords new perspectives on such issues as misogyny, lesbianism, homosexuality and female initiative. The myth of female passivity, to take one example, has rarely been questioned, when it was raised at all, but the material Moulton presents challenges inherited presumptions. Additional aspects of manuscript material such as audience, authorship, consumption, circulation and censorship are of general interest as well as being specifically pertinent to erotic writing.

The contents of these collections reveal that prose and poetry of an erotic nature rubbed shoulders quite naturally with other items of a devotional, literary or medicinal nature. Frontiers between the popular and the canonical are transgressed as acrostics, bawdy doggerel, epigrams, ballads and riddles are found interspersed between poems by such canonical figures as Donne and Marlowe. The material cited from these collections, therefore, offers an alternate and perhaps more faithful reflection of the place of erotic representation in Tudor and Stuart society since they were exempt from censorship, circulated in free exchange and, provide some evidence of a female readership, if not indeed, authorship. The last question is never satisfactorily resolved due to the ambiguity of the texts themselves, on the one hand and the sheer dearth of conclusive evidence which accounts for Moulton's prudent reluctance to draw precipitate and hasty conclusions.

This issue is taken up and developed in the next chapter where the debate on poetry, its effeminising effect and consequences for national security is addressed. As the author points out, the whole question of effeminacy is complex and contradictory insofar as sexual activity, on the one hand, asserts male domination but on the other, excessive indulgence in the sensual undermines manhood. Poetry, theatre, gambling, drinking and other profligate activities which were thought to sap the strength of English manhood were the targets for polemicists such as Philip Stubbs and Stephen Gosson who are quoted extensively. As opposed to the antitheatricalists, for whom poetry should reinforce the patriarchal, Protestant status quo, Moulton cites Sidney and Spenser as defenders of the sensual and the erotic and analyses both *In Defence of Poetry* and extracts from the first book of *The Faerie Queen* in this light.

The extent to which erotic writing was considered under a nationalist prism can be gauged from the fact that both political satire and ribald verse were lumped together in the same category censored by the Bishop's Order of 1599. Marlowe is taken as a test case to exemplify this. His poetry, which emphasises the failure of male orgasm and men's subjection to women fell under the censor's hammer. One of the most interesting facts which comes to light in the analysis of Marlowe's poetry, supported by numerous anonymous pieces is, as was seen in the analysis of the commonplace books, a substantial modification of the myth of female passivity as the vagina begins to be depicted as protagonist, as an active, autonomous and potentially destructive element threatening male sexuality.

After this wide ranging review of the implications within and consequences of English erotic writing, the second part of the book embarks on an extensive review of the Italian menace. Roger Ascham is cited as the first to boldly point the finger at Italy as the source of the vilification and corruption of English manhood and his

relentless diatribe against all things Italian —dress, morals (or lack of them) and language certainly acted as a dynamo for the debate. Beset and besotted by the Italian hydra, English manhood was felt to be prey to the venomous poison spewed from a double source: Machiavelli and Aretino. It is curious that the perceived sources of this menace were known mostly by hearsay in Renaissance England: their notoriety had preceded their texts. As with Machiavelli whose *Il Principio* was not translated into English until the beginning of the seventeenth century, so too with Aretino —only a fraction of his output was actually known at first hand or in translation.

The prolonged and detailed account of Aretino's life and works serves as a preface to explaining the profound influence Moulton claims he exerted, even indirectly on the work of Thomas Nashe and Ben Jonson. It is also justified insofar as, as Moulton quite rightly assumes, this author is an unknown quantity for most readers, in great part, because of the obscurity into which his work fell after having been placed on the Index and banned by the Catholic Church. Although much attention is devoted to Aretino's works, especially *Sonnetti luxurosi* it is this controversial poet's figure and what it represented in terms of authorial autonomy and power to his English contemporaries that is the focus of the following chapters. The simultaneous rebuttal and attraction of Aretino lay in the political and authorial power he came to wield by way of his use of erotic writing as a satiric weapon, a means of maintaining his independence and distancing himself from specific sources of power which were liable to wax and wane. It was his use of the sexual as a weapon for social satire, as a *modus operandi* by which to climb the social ladder and score out for the author a position which would not only confer on him social prestige and recognition, but also give him a role in shaping policy that made him attractive to English writers. However, although the adjective "aretine" was used to attribute English erotic writing to Italian sources, as Moulton points out, and has already more than sufficiently demonstrated in the previous chapters, the tradition also sprang from autochthonous roots and its attribution to foreign sources responded to specific historical conditions which transposed blame from native to foreign causes.

Nashe was branded with the then ignominious title of the "English Aretino", the epithet arising mainly from his *Choice of Valentines*, a work which was perceived as questioning masculine gender identity and raising (yet again) the threat of female autonomy. Jonson's appropriation of the aretine model differs slightly from that of Nashe's and its political and social consequences is the theme of the penultimate chapter. It is pointed out that Jonson attempts to disassociate eroticism from effeminacy and replant it in an entirely masculine context. Moreover, he attempted to assimilate an aretine-type discourse into native English satire. It is argued that with Jonson, a new, unprecedented type of erotic discourse emerged; one which allowed the author to distance himself from the threat of effeminacy.

The conclusions which the author reaches is (not surprisingly) that sexuality is not a compartmentalised space separate from any other area of institutionalised life. The further back in time one reels the tape, the truer this truism becomes. Sexuality is the marrow of life and informs every atom of our understanding of the world and, as such, justifies serious study. As a discourse type which defies simple classification it can open up hitherto ignored perspectives or those traditionally

relegated to the periphery. This precisely is one of the important achievements of *Before Pornography*: it raises more questions than it answers and is consistently sensitive to the difference in mental constructs between then and now.

Finally, justice would not be done to this study of eroticism if the mention were not made of the author's own prose style which is engaging and highly readable. His concentration on the texts themselves rather than abstract theory is one of the book's main attributes. The novel reading he provides of canonical texts, together with insightful readings of a variegated assortment of previously unpublished pieces which range from the vaguely obscene to the highly entertaining make *Before Pornography* both a serious academic study and an enjoyable read. Moulton's contextualisation of the texts and the nuggets of additional information he scatters along the path reproduce the eclecticism of Renaissance writing and help lead the reader out of the Forest of Error. As the author himself states in true Renaissance fashion, this is a book which points in many directions and towards many an untrodden path—the rest is up to the reader.

WORKS CITED

- Bailey, Richard W. 1992: *Images of English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Elsky, Martin. 1989: *Authorising Words. Speech, Writing and Print in the English Renaissance*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Ferguson, A.B. 1965: *The Articulate Citizen and the English Renaissance*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press.
- Halpern, Richard. 1991: *The Poetics of Primitive Accumulation*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Defoe, Daniel 2000: *Robinson Crusoe*. Edición de Fernando Galván. Trad. Fernando Galván y José Santiago Fernández Vázquez. Madrid: Cátedra.

Carmen Toledano Buendía
Universidad de La Laguna

De todas las obras escritas por Daniel Defoe, la más conocida es sin duda *Robinson Crusoe*, no tanto por haber sido considerada por la crítica la mejor desde un punto de vista literario, sino por haber supuesto la creación de un mito universal. De alguna manera cabe afirmar que Robinson Crusoe ha perdido su nacionalidad, su origen inglés, para convertirse en un héroe universal que encaja culturalmente en todas la literaturas del mundo: la historia del naufragio en una isla desierta, lejos de la civilización, que tiene que luchar contra las fuerzas de la naturaleza —usando la razón y con la ayuda de Dios— para sobrevivir e imponer el orden del mundo moderno.

Independientemente del contenido moralista y mercantilista que muchos críticos atribuyen a la obra, *Robinson Crusoe* cumple los requisitos indispensables para su universalización. Por otro lado, su pronta incorporación a distintas literaturas y su adaptación para otros públicos diferentes de aquellos que en su día se supone fueron lectores potenciales del original es debida a la posibilidad que ofrece de realizar distintas lecturas. Y a ello debe también su éxito, sobre todo como literatura de masas. Es la simplificación y consiguiente conversión de la novela en una historia de aventuras y el valor imaginativo de la situación —un naufragio, una isla desierta, la soledad, la supervivencia— lo que ha provocado tal cantidad y variedad de reescrituras e interpretaciones desde Campe a Tournier. Sin embargo, esta misma circunstancia se ha vuelto en su contra ya que ha condicionado su recepción e interpretación como una novela de aventuras, situándola al margen de la literatura "más seria" para adultos y privándola de su justa y merecida consideración. Esta posición periférica ha influido a su vez en la calidad de las traducciones publicadas: no debemos olvidar que el menor prestigio tanto de la literatura juvenil como de consumo ha permitido en muchas ocasiones comportamientos poco éticos por parte de editores que acudían a argucias empresariales para escatimar costes publicando traducciones ya hechas o contratando traductores poco profesionales, lo cual, a su vez, ha redundado en la baja calidad media de las traducciones.

El amplio éxito del que disfrutó *Robinson Crusoe* en Inglaterra fue inmediato y sorprendente: aparecieron seis ediciones de la primera parte, *The Life and Strange Surprising Adventures of Robinson Crusoe, of York, Mariner* en 1719, el mismo año de su publicación, aparte de las ediciones piratas y condensadas que incluían tanto la segunda parte, *The Farther Adventures of Robinson Crusoe*, como la tercera parte de la

ATLANTIS
Vol. XXIV Núm. 1 (Jun. 2002): 299-302.
ISSN 0210-6124

novela, *Serious Reflections during the Life and Surprising Adventures of Robinson Crusoe: with his Vision of the Angelick World* (1720) (59). Este éxito promovió no sólo la lectura y traducción de la obra en toda Europa, sino también, como ya apuntábamos, la aparición de numerosas adaptaciones e imitaciones. De hecho, podríamos afirmar con toda certeza que es una de las obras más adaptada y versionada de la historia de la literatura, sobre todo destinada a un público infantil y juvenil. No debemos olvidar que la conversión de obras para adultos en lecturas infantiles era una de las principales fuentes de creación sobre todo en períodos en los que no existía una literatura específica para niños. Y *Robinson Crusoe* es uno de los principales ejemplos. Aunque formalmente no cumpla los requisitos necesarios para considerarla una lectura infantil, sí ofrece posibilidades para convertirse en ello. Aparte de las lecturas didácticas y moralizantes que se pueden hacer de la obra y que se consideraban muy adecuadas para los jóvenes, el personaje de Robinson y el ambiente en el que se desenvuelve se acerca a un modelo de héroe que bien podría ser admirado por los niños: el hombre solitario que naufraga en una isla y se fabrica todo con gran habilidad. Las primeras adaptaciones infantiles y juveniles se realizaron pocos años después de la publicación de la obra original, y desde entonces hasta la actualidad se ha venido versionando "para todos los públicos". En resumen, Galván apunta que hacia 1900 existían 200 ediciones inglesas, incluyendo versiones condensadas, 110 traducciones, 115 revisiones y adaptaciones y 267 imitaciones (59-60).

Aunque España no es ajena a este «fulgurante y arrollador» éxito, la recepción de la novela de Defoe fue bastante más tardía que en otros países europeos ya que no se tradujo al castellano hasta 1835, momento a partir del cual no ha cesado de editarse y reeditarse. Además, la incorporación de la novela se verá influida por una peculiar inversión ya que el lector español tiene antes acceso a diversas adaptaciones y versiones que a la obra original. Esto es, España traduce primero las adaptaciones realizadas a partir de la obra que la propia novela. De todas ellas, la primera en recibirse y más conocida es la traducción llevada a cabo por D. Tomás de Iriarte de la adaptación que realiza el pedagogo alemán J. Campe, *Robinson der Jünger* (1779-1780), con el título de *El nuevo Robinsón, Historia Moral reducida a diálogos*, publicada por primera vez en 1789. El hecho de que disfrutara de gran éxito lo demuestran las numerosas ediciones que salieron a la luz (1800, 1804, 1806, 1809, 1817, 1823, 1825, 1829, 1832, 1833, 1841, 1843, etc.). Esta inversión determinará de manera definitiva la consideración de *Robinson Crusoe* como literatura infantil y juvenil. La primera traducción de la novela original de Defoe no apareció, como ya mencionamos, hasta 1826, más de un siglo después de su publicación, y lo hizo con una versión condensada realizada a partir de un texto francés y destinada a un público juvenil. Nueve años más tarde, en 1835, aparecerá la primera traducción completa de las dos primeras partes, aunque también se trataba en este caso de una traducción indirecta realizada a partir del francés destinada a un público joven. La primera traducción directa, esto es, realizada partiendo de un texto inglés, no se publicará hasta finales del siglo XIX. Ya durante el siglo XX se multiplicarán las ediciones que encontramos publicadas de la novela, y aunque la gran mayoría son ya traducciones directas abandonándose el filtro francés, también es cierto que éstas manipulan, de una manera u otra, el original en forma o contenido. En resumen, podemos afirmar que de manera paradójica la recepción de la obra de Defoe en España ha aglutinado éxito y desatención.

La editorial Cátedra a finales del pasado año ha sacado a la luz la que quizá tenga el honor de ser la última traducción española de *Robinson Crusoe* del siglo. Ésta aparece incluida en la colección "Letras Universales" y acompañada de grandes obras de la literatura de todos los tiempos. Entre los títulos publicados debemos destacar *Tom Jones* de Henry Fielding y de *Pamela* de Samuel Richardson no sólo porque su edición, al igual que en el caso de *Robinson Crusoe*, ha corrido a cargo del profesor Fernando Galván, sino también porque junto con la novela de Defoe quedarían perfectamente representados los principales exponentes del surgimiento de la novela inglesa del XVIII. Cuestiones de esta índole resultan muy significativas ya que nos proporcionan información no sólo sobre el tipo de lector al que va dirigido el texto, sino también sobre la consideración y valoración estéticas y literarias que se le presupone a la obra.

Fernando Galván y José Santiago Fernández nos presentan una traducción de la primera parte de las tres que componen las aventuras de nuestro héroe, realizada a partir de la reconstrucción de la primera edición de la obra que vio la luz en 1719. Se trata, por tanto, de una traducción directa del inglés. Es también un texto fiel al original, ya que éste no ha sido sometido a ningún tipo de modificación ni en el contenido ni en la forma. Abandonan así los traductores una práctica, que como ya mencionamos ha sido norma habitual en la mayoría de las traducciones precedentes de *Robinson Crusoe*, en las que el texto se sometía a modificaciones cuantitativas, o bien condensándolo, o bien simplemente eliminando aquellos fragmentos considerados superfluos para el desarrollo de la acción. Nos encontramos, pues, ante una traducción íntegra. Por otro lado, tampoco se ha alterado la macroestructura del texto, lo cual era también una práctica común de los traductores y/o editores con el fin de facilitar su lectura, especialmente a través de la división de la novela en capítulos o la incorporación de resúmenes o síntesis introductorias. El texto que aquí se nos ofrece aparece sin interrupciones ni divisiones, respetándose así su forma original. Todas estas modificaciones las encontramos incluso en traducciones tan prestigiosas como las realizadas por Carlos Pujol o Julio Cortázar.

Con respecto a los paratextos, al igual que en el caso de las ediciones de *Tom Jones* y de *Pamela*, la novela aparece introducida por un extenso y detallado estudio crítico en el que Galván proporciona al lector detalles sobre el contexto sociocultural y político en el que Daniel Defoe vivió y desarrolló su obra, así como información sobre las diversas lecturas e interpretaciones críticas de *Robinson Crusoe*. Es reseñable, como también ha sido habitual en sus ediciones anteriores, la bibliografía que acompaña el ensayo y que guía los pasos del lector interesado en profundizar en algún aspecto de la obra. La traducción aparece arropada por un gran número de notas a pie de página en las que los traductores nos ofrecen definiciones de términos especializados de navegación, explicaciones geográficas, referencias culturales, históricas o bíblicas e información referente a la equivalencia de monedas o medidas anglosajonas que, de no explicitarse, dificultarían la percepción del sentido en el lector español. Todos estos datos proporcionan al lector contemporáneo un marco de referencia que le permiten ubicar la obra en las coordenadas lingüísticas, históricas y culturales de su época y apreciar la riqueza literaria de la misma. Todo ello es además posible gracias a la utilización de una expresión elegante y precisa, que encuentra el equilibrio a la hora de transferir la naturalidad del estilo periodístico de Defoe y, por otro lado, la sofisticación que supone la especialización léxica que utiliza el autor para dar realismo a la trama.

En resumen, esta traducción consigue sacudirse la presión del público infantil y sacarla de las redes del lector de literatura de consumo, factores que privaron a la novela de su justa y merecida consideración y permitieron la realización de traducciones poco rigurosas. Esta última traducción del siglo recupera para el lector español un clásico de la literatura inglesa y le reconoce el estatus literario y estético que esta novela de Defoe merece y que ha estado reducido a círculos intelectuales.