



PROJECT MUSE®

---

Dramaturgies de l'ombre: actes du colloque organisé Å  
Paris IV et Paris VII, 27 au 30 mars 2002 (review)

Henry Phillips

French Studies: A Quarterly Review, Volume 60, Number 3, July 2006,  
pp. 422-424 (Review)

Published by Oxford University Press



➔ For additional information about this article  
<https://muse.jhu.edu/article/208216>

subjects include Aristotle in the thirteenth century, Erasmus, Molière's *Dom Juan* (a good essay by Olivier Bloch), La Fontaine, Leo Strauss's handling of Spinoza, Sartre's *La Nausée*, the *nouveau roman*, and, in Jean Emelina's entertaining contribution, the embarrassment caused to seventeenth-century scholarship by the rude bits of the bible. There are excursions to ancient Rome, eighteenth-century Basque country, Genovesi's Rome and Franco's Spain. The editor's Introduction and Conclusion strive to bind all this together, sometimes at the cost of overgeneralization: although he says, for instance, that censorship has always aimed to deny the very existence of the works it targets, the perverse attractions of the censored text must always have been as apparent to censors as to their victims and opponents; and, to consider only the example of the French Enlightenment, Domenech's home territory and the centre of the collection, something more complex than attempted obliteration characterized censorship towards the end of the Ancien Régime, with its ever more convoluted system of *privileges*, *permissions* and semi-official nods and winks.

Several of the best essays consider the 'art of writing'. Marie-Paule de Weerd-Pilorge argues against ahistorical notions of self-censorship in discussing Saint-Simon's *Mémoires*; Paule Adamy comes to see the Goncourts' *Journal* as a semi-literary space accommodating material that could not be published in plays and novels; and Huguette Krief, using a broad notion of self-censorship, examines the rhetorical and emotional shifts in Mme du Deffand's letters to Horace Walpole, who found her style too effusive and novelistic. 'En comparaison de vous' she concedes, 'je ne suis qu'une caillette, une diseuse de lieux communs' (the *caillette*, as urban readers of *FS* may have forgotten, is the abomasum or rennet-bag, the fourth stomach of ruminants). Yet the remark itself, like many others in the correspondence, is as eloquent as it is poignant ('Vous m'avez rendue poussière; je vous le pardonne, n'en parlons plus'), and her self-restraint and self-abasement appear at once painfully sincere and a triumph of epistolary art. I also enjoyed Jean-Marie Seillan's reading of abbé Bethléem's *Romans à lire et romans à proscrire* (first edition 1905, eleventh revised edition 1932). Bethléem called *Le Temps retrouvé* 'particulièrement répugnant', elaborated a singular typology of readers (distinctions must be drawn between 'petites jeunes filles', 'jeunes filles déjà grandes' and 'grandes jeunes filles'), and, in a peculiar display of verbal repetition compulsion, railed against René Maran, author of the Goncourt prize-winning *Batouala*: 'Issu de parents noirs, il est noir lui-même [no surprises there, but already some indication of where Bethléem's trauma may lie], et son roman, roman nègre, est consacré aux noirs'. Seillan is doubtless right to warn the scholar against the superficial pleasures of the *bétisier*, but it seems like poetic justice to take the censor's comments out of context in order to disparage them.

NICHOLAS HARRISON  
KING'S COLLEGE LONDON

doi:10.1093/fs/knl074

*Dramaturgies de l'ombre: actes du colloque organisé à Paris IV et Paris VII, 27 au 30 mars 2002.* Sous la direction de FRANÇOISE LAVOCAT et FRANÇOIS LECERCLE. Presses universitaires de Rennes, 2005. 538 pp. Pb €25.00.

'Place à l'ombre' are the reported words of the *buissier* at the Comédie-française trying to get the actor playing the ghost in Voltaire's *Sémiramis* through the

spectators seated on the stage. Well, the ghost certainly gets his place in this impressively large volume comprising twenty-nine essays ranging in period from antiquity to the twentieth century, and dealing with authors as diverse as Euripides, Shakespeare, Jean de la Taille, Calderón, Voltaire, Ibsen, Genet and Bond (this list is indicative rather than exhaustive). It will already be apparent that the ghost is called upon to illustrate many different facets of theatre, indeed to illustrate the 'spectral' powers of theatre itself (E. Hénin), especially where the stage resuscitates or reincarnates the past, sometimes for the specific purposes of nationalist politics in Poland (D. Chauvin) or 'panthéonisation' in France (N. Rizzoni). Indeed, Genet's desired proximity for theatre is a cemetery (M. Dancourt). Good signposts to the volume's direction as a whole are contained in the two essays that begin it. F. Legangneux explores the taxonomic questions arising from the different categories of shades in ancient theatre, and F. Lecercle provides a compelling compendium concerning the ways in which ghosts are troubling presences on stage. Issues relating to dramaturgy and staging are subsequently much in evidence. What role does the ghost play in the plot? To what degree is it a character or a dramatic instrument? How do you stage or perform what is essentially immaterial? In this context, intriguing questions of costume are raised by P. Kapitaniak in the context of Elizabethan theatre. L. Naudeix addresses aspects of staging in opera in terms of traps and the physical irruption of the ghost through the stage floor. H. Védérine discusses how nineteenth-century France negotiated the staging of the ghost in *Hamlet*. How the living on the stage are to be distinguished from the dead is further discussed by P. Vasseur-Legangneux, and the role of actual ghostly presence is brilliantly explored at the level of rhetoric by O. Millet in terms of prosopopeia. Among the most interesting essays of this collection are those that bring together the appearance of the ghost and the generation of meaning. The ghost may possess a moral significance in representing unresolved guilt on the part of living characters or an ineradicable 'souillure' on the surface of life incarnated in the 'bodily' presence of the ghost, or embody a 'vanitas mundi' (D. Dalla Valle). In other words, the ghost, as in the case of Banquo, acts as a 'trouble-fête' (F. Lecercle). This is most telling in other discussions of Shakespeare and, as one might expect, the ghost of Hamlet's father again looms large. The nineteenth century in particular, through staging, through the particular instances of translations into German or alterations to the French text, understood the ghost as a means of exteriorizing internal troubles and exploring the realm of the imagination within the individual psyche (B. Franco). Hence, the role of the ghost at the level of character converges with the ghost as interrogating the art of theatre, as raising the uncertainty of the frontier between reality and illusion. The ghost becomes, moreover, a powerful poetic symbol in the case of Paul Claudel's 'Ombre double', as analysed in the essays of M. Dubar and D. Millet-Gérard, both of whom raise the influence of Japanese theatre on the playwright. One form of theatre where one might not expect to see ghosts to the point of outright rejection is naturalism. According to J. Pailler, however, the psychological effect of belief in ghosts exercised on simple souls allows for a critique of the Christian supernatural. On the other hand, ghosts do not need to make an appearance on the stage to have an effect, as they can be incorporated as textual entities in dialogue, constituting disturbing unseen presences. Such is the interpretation C. Treilhou-Balaude gives to Ibsen and A. Eissen to Eugène

O'Neill's *Mourning becomes Electra*. I have not sought to mention every contributor by name for a collection which offers a thought-provoking comparatist perspective on the discourse of theatre itself. Inevitably, some repetition was bound to occur. Equally, few readers will wish to read this volume in one go. For those primarily interested in theatre studies who wish, and should, dip in to it, there is, as the saying goes, something for everyone.

HENRY PHILLIPS

UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER

doi:10.1093/fs/ksn1104

*Heroism and Passion in Literature: Studies in Honour of Moya Longstaffe*. Edited by GRAHAM GARGETT. (Internationale Forschungen zur Allgemeinen und Vergleichenden Litteraturwissenschaft, 77). Amsterdam — New York, Rodopi, 2004. xii + 282 pp. Pb \$80.00; €64.00.

Moya Longstaffe's estimable body of work is suitably honoured in this volume, which develops the strands with which she linked Corneille, Stendhal and Claudel in *Metamorphoses of Passion and the Heroic* (1999). In the first section, the waning of heroism, and its deviations, in the late seventeenth century are well covered. With his customary mastery, H. T. Barnwell explores Racine's ambiguous use of heroic language and ambivalence towards a 'Roman' concept of heroism in *Bérénice*, and Angela Ryan draws on an impressive range of theoretical perspectives to compare the Racinian Phèdre, within her 'constrained heroic space', with her Euripidean counterpart. John Campbell tracks the shifting view of (heroic) ambition in *La Princesse de Clèves*, Robert McBride the subterfuges and self-deceptions of Molière's comic heroes, and Marité Oubrier presents a biographical evaluation of La Fontaine, debating whether he deliberately positioned himself as 'anti-hero or reluctant hero'. Concurrently with these now canonical figures' questioning of conventional heroism, the increasingly marginalized Huguenot community had a particularly acute need to consider of what stuff heroes were made. An excellent essay by Jane McKee analyses the expression of beleaguered spiritual heroism, mediated through biblical allegory, in Laurence Drelincourt's *Sonnets chrétiens*, where self-reliance and trust in the Creator are not irreconcilable values. The sole eighteenth-century focus is in Graham Gargett's persuasive identification of a new real-life model for Voltaire's 'Ingénu', exploring the 'transformation of heroic noble savage into civilized heroic Frenchman'. For the following century there is Brian Keith-Smith on Wagner in Paris, John McCann on Baudelaire, Anne Judge and Solange Lamothe, in one of relatively few essays to foreground passion, on Stendhal's style, a fascinating note by Henri Godin on the film versions of Maupassant's *Bel-Ami*, and Elizabeth Lillie's fine account of Renan's evolving concept of the intellectual hero and the duty of the 'aristocrat of the mind' to enlighten and guide the masses. A meta-discourse on the heroic figure of the writer as prophet and mediator, present in Baudelaire and Renan, reappears in the final section in Aimé Césaire's vision of the poet as 'heroic creator of a new myth' expertly reviewed by Angela Chambers and in Stanley Black's deft analysis of Juan Goytisola's metafiction. Less ambitious figures feature in essays by John Gillespie, Gerard M. Macklin and Pól Ó Dochartaigh on, respectively, Camus's flawed heroes, Beckett's