

no one would argue that Roland is a complex character, he is constructed to appear to be a naïve character in Schiller's sense, allowing Charles to manifest auroral aspects of the sentimental. Given the general validity of the argument, such a difference may be valid and therefore confirm Schiller's intuition. Any beginning, as Edward Said points out, is "a necessary fiction" whether it be "an intransitive, 'pure' beginning" or "a transitive, problem- or project-directed beginning" (*Beginnings: Intention and Method* [New York: Columbia UP, 1985] 50). Roland, like Schiller's notion of the naïve, falls into the latter category. The strength of Haidu's argument would imply, in fact, that he was already constructed so by whoever felt the necessity of the Baligant episode, suggesting that the class Roland represented was not entirely naïve, but required such a construction. Such an implication folds back curiously upon Benjamin's assertion, and also gives increased power to Haidu's argument.

The brevity of this review can hardly do much more than gesture toward the profound significance of Haidu's project. Its carefully thought use of both semiotics and Marxism as they are brought to bear upon this seminal medieval text marks it as brilliant achievement in literary history. Furthermore, the evident passion with which it has been nurtured for over two decades makes the text *actuel* in ways that few studies have been capable of doing by reinserting it into a history that is at once its own and ours. (E.D. BLODGETT, UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA)

\*MARÍA ROSA MENOCA. *Shards of Love: Exile and the Origins of the Lyric*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1994. 295 + xv pp. \$49.95 hardcover, \$ 18.95 paper.

This is an eloquent indictment of Alfonso the Wise, Petrarch, Nebrija, Bartolomé de las Casas, Bembo, Curtius, de Rougemont, and philology, and a passionate defense of Dante, Columbus, Luis de Torres, Ibn Arabi, Llull, Spitzer, Auerbach, and comparative literature. Indeed, the medieval world around the Mediterranean, its view of itself and our attempts to understand it, divide thus: in one camp, the inventors and defenders of History as a great coherent, orderly, causal, evolutionary, diachronic, grammatically codified and hegemonically totalizing narrative from which has been exiled and erased anything that could not otherwise be cleaned up and smoothed over; in the other camp, the exiled practitioners of Memory, living and writing in the "productive chaos" (19) and "great muddle" (76) of cacophonous, mongrel, eclectic, hybrid, polyglot and polymorphic cultures. Columbus serves as the coincidental paradigm of such a culture, as *Shards of Love* was originally scheduled to appear in 1992: he spoke, among other languages, Castilian (codified by Nebrija in 1492) and Latin but took along as an Arabic interpreter Luis de Torres, a Jew with an Andalusian accent, who was to translate his dealings with the Taíno on Cuba. The Taíno chief, his

language and his encounter with Columbus are gone from history because Las Casas wrote them out of History, as History and philology and literary criticism have written Muslims and Jews (expelled from Spain on August 2, 1492) out of the Western tradition.

A less anecdotal paradigm of those for whom the "universe ... sang" (19) in a myriad of accents, in irregular vernaculars and bad grammar, are the poets of (love) songs, exiles from History for whom Memory is "tellable only in the near incoherence of the lyric" (13). Menocal's discussion of the *muwashshahat* (24-32) is but one instance of her wide-ranging, memorialistic and recuperative digging into the "memorial structures of the literary universe" (21).

If "the search for a way out of ... totalizing History" (16); if "the reveling in pluralities; the refusals to cultivate the great tradition; the writing of literature in the crass dialects...; the embrace of the popular and ungrammatical...; [the admittance of] the noises of the rabble ... as real literature" (37); and if "construct[ing] an authentic self from cultural fragments" (50) are all the marks of the postmodern condition, then the Middle Ages must be called postmodern, a time of exile spent far away from the orthodoxies of modern medieval and later writers, philologists and critics.

And whither are unorthodox philologists and critics exiled? The "legacy of ... exilic ... philology has been in comparative literature, conspicuously created by the exiled community ... hopelessly idiosyncratic and inherently lyrical in its structures" (137).

Does Menocal overstate her case, or reduce it to too simple a dichotomy? Neither criticism would detract from her erudite analyses and spirited synopses. To stimulate our reflection on literature and the profession, she obviously felt that effective rhetorical devices were called for. And "limiting" her study to the origins of the love lyric in no way precludes, indeed encourages our thinking about other exiled genres. Nor should the profound unity between "la femme et l'oeuvre" escape our attention: an exile from Cuba herself, her critical stance is memorialistic, her book unconventional (even materially: Part IV, "Readings and Sources" [191-269], contains essay-length "footnotes"), and her memory a bridge between medieval and modern (Carpentier, García Márquez, Paz, Guillén *et al.*) postmodernism. (HANS R. RUNTE, DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY)

\*ROBERTO GONZALEZ ECHEVARRIA. *Celestina's Brood: Continuities of the Baroque in Spanish and Latin American Literature*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1993. 281 + xi pp. \$ 17.95.

Roberto González Echevarría has been one of the most perceptive and influential critics in North America over the last few decades. His studies of his Cuban compatriots Alejo Carpentier (*The Pilgrim at Home*) and Severo Sarduy (*La ruta de Severo Sarduy*), plus the general study, *Myth and Archive: a Theory of Latin*