

others all but unknown (one is available only online on the BNF site); they include *Le guerrier philosophe*, *Angola*, *Thérèse philosophe*, and André de Mirabeaux's *La morale des sens*. Perhaps it is a shame that *Les confessions du comte de **** and *Les malheurs de l'inconstance* did not get a chance to round out what might appear too schematic an opposition of mind and heart.

Kavanagh often foregoes the most obvious examples, especially in art, preferring to find the telling trait in simpler or seemingly less characteristic works. It is thus in the nature of things that some comparisons may seem strained or in any event less persuasive than others. The intriguing originality of the discussion of Rousseau lies not in the summary of Rousseau's political thought but in comparison and partial contrast with Boucher (Rousseau preferred engravings to paintings). And basing an argument about Laclos's "anthropology of pleasure" less on *Les liaisons dangereuses* than on *Des femmes et de leur éducation* is a neat turn, more firmly cementing the Rousselian connection while tracking transition. Du Bos's thesis about the importance of subjective pleasure in art is called on as background to a chapter on the paradoxes of Boucher's ambiguous reputation. Somewhat disconcerting is a comparison of his "illustration" of a tale by La Fontaine with more suggestive ones by Eisen and Fragonard—disconcerting in that the Boucher is *not* an illustration but a full-fledged canvas (67 x 55 cm), which, besides entailing rich pigments and fluid brushstrokes, is inherently incommensurate with in-12° black-and-white line engraving that measures perhaps 12 x 8. And, of course, Boucher did many landscapes in his early career—such as *La forêt* (1740), *Le moulin* (1751)—that might now strike some as "untypical" of his style. Even so—and anyone might have other quibbles—the voice is magisterial, the conduct is both firm and subtle, and the course is held. Kavanagh's notes cover the technical points but do not do much to steer the reader to complementary readings that might be helpful for the development of particular lines of thought, for example, for Epicureanism specifically, Natania Meeker's *Voluptuous Philosophy: Literary Materialism in the French Enlightenment* (2006). Peter Cryle's two books, *Geometry in the Boudoir: Configurations of French Erotic Narrative* (1994) and *The Telling of the Act: Sexuality as Narrative in Eighteenth- and Nineteenth-Century France* (2001), as well as Michel Delon's *Le savoir-vivre libertin* (2000), also come to mind.

Duke University (NC)

Philip Stewart

LAPOINTE, MARTINE-EMMANUELLE, et LAURENT DEMANZE, éd. *Figures de l'héritier dans le roman contemporain*. Montréal: PU de Montréal, 2009. ISBN 978-2-7606-2203-6. Pp. 158. \$12 Can.

The editors of this special issue of *Études françaises* argue for the importance of notions of *filiation* in a number of contemporary writers, pointing out the significance in their works of the *héritiers*, not in the model of nineteenth-century inheritors of fortunes, but rather characters whose presence raises issues of family relationships and intergenerational transference. Contemporary writers reveal themselves to be less interested in *lieux de mémoire* as they are with reconstructions by the subject of a fragmentary and fugitive narrative in which the subject reframes him/herself by internally assimilating the community of his/her ancestors. This perspective is broadly and perceptively assessed in an important essay,

“Le silence des pères au principe du ‘récit de filiation’” by Dominique Viart, who coined the term *récit de filiation* in 1996 and who has addressed other aspects of this question in other venues. He argues for a significant mutation in French literature between 1975 and 1984 during which texts focused more intently on realities beyond themselves, including the subject and his attempt to cope with issues of filiation, heritage, and flawed transmission. In this contribution he reflects on how some of these narratives marked by paternal silence can be viewed as attempts to reestablish frayed communal bonds. Although his is the final essay in the dossier, it might profitably be read first, to be followed by Laurent Demanze’s article investigating how the valuation of autonomy in modern and post-modern culture has led to the creation of characters who choose fragments of their inherited past to establish their identity. In these narratives, family memory is selectively appropriated and assumed individually rather than collectively.

These two essays, broad in their reach, reflect on such writers as Pierre Michon, Annie Ernaux, Sylvie Germain, Jean Rouaud, Gérard Macé, Pierre Bergounioux, Michel Séonnet, Leïla Sebbar, Martine Sonnet, and Virginie Linhart, while the remaining articles focus on individual authors. Élisabeth Nardout-Lafarge addresses the links between past and present, the disappearance of traces, and the attempt to liquidate heritage in Richard Millet’s *La gloire des Pythre*. Her discussion is equally attentive to the question of intertextual legacies and particularly to the Faulknerian resonances of the novel. Mathilde Barraband analyzes the narratives of Christian Prigent, particularly *Demain je meurs*. Prigent’s writing melds fiction with autobiographical content, extending the reflection to a broader family configuration that includes father, mother, but also grandmother. Avoiding a linear, unidirectional representation of individual human stories, Prigent explores the need to denounce the father as a means of achieving identity. Martine-Emmanuelle Lapointe treats Réjean Ducharme’s *Va savoir* as a “récit de recyclage” in which the reconstruction of a house becomes part of the reconstruction of a family heritage. The novel emerges as a reflection on “les économies de l’héritage” that can help to explain the narrator’s relationship to both past and future.

At a time when young writers in Quebec associated with *La barre du jour* and *Les herbes rouges* were forcefully rejecting their ancestors, Victor-Lévy Beaulieu was insisting on reclaiming legacies, although of his own choosing and on his own terms. Michel Biron reflects on this peculiar stance that underlies a series of books Beaulieu wrote on literary giants, in particular those on Melville and Joyce, in which Beaulieu projects himself into the life of Melville, especially his drive to write in spite of failure, and becomes equally absorbed by Joyce who emerges as the author whose linguistic creativity most fascinates him. Biron’s insight is that the most revealing pages in Beaulieu’s literary essays are those in which he denounces the faults and failures of these writers only to identify more closely with them. The volume provides insights into a noteworthy development in contemporary writing in France and Quebec.

University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign

Émile J. Talbot

LARROUX, GUY, et YVES REBOUL, éd. *Pierre Bergounioux*. Toulouse: PU du Mirail, 2009. ISBN 978-2-8107-0066-0. Pp. 196. 22 €.

By all accounts, Bergounioux, who began publishing in 1984, has until recently been more heard about and respected than actually read. As little as ten years