

EVA KUSHNER

LITERARY STUDIES, CULTURAL STUDIES: THE CASE FOR A CEASE-FIRE

Admittedly, my title dramatizes the tension which has been observed for some time between literary and cultural studies. A state of tension is not necessarily negative; but it does signal a need for attention. In our case, it requires that special thought be given to the present and future orientation of Comparative Literature studies, since the outcome may have profound repercussions upon our field of endeavour, both from an intellectual and a professional viewpoint.

One may legitimately wonder whether the very obvious recent growth of cultural studies is not mostly a U. S. phenomenon. It is well known that, periodically, intellectual fashions will change in such a way that people who are not habitual observers of every new trend may feel either guilty or disadvantaged. Whether the impulse comes from Paris, Yale, Chapel Hill or Birmingham, it quickly becomes institutionalized. Publications and academic programs try to incorporate the new tendency, often «throwing out the baby with the bath water». Is the current appeal of cultural studies that kind of phenomenon? Also, is it radically new? Leaving mostly aside the institutional aspect of the question let us analyse the corresponding intellectual rationale, as a set of alternatives. It is all too easy to be on the defensive (and therefore in a position of weakness) against what destabilizes us. Let us, instead, attempt to design a dialogue.

The Humanities, in recent years, have appeared to be constantly legitimating themselves, and seeking their optimal path, which makes them seem fragile and drives them to extremes in their endeavour to inscribe themselves among the most necessary areas of human knowledge and activity. In comparison, the popularity of cultural studies can be seen —among other things— as an example of successful self-legitimation.

Semiotically and psychologically we are used to grasping situations in terms of opposites. Here is an example. For many years literary theory has been represented as the opposite of literary history, in a manner which of course emphasizes the failings of traditional, positivistic literary history, and rarely takes into account the fact that literary history has been abundantly renewing itself in response to the theoretical and methodological questioning it had encountered. But theory too has changed; and one of the elements of that change has been precisely the fact that it has broadened its role vis-à-vis literary studies from its initial critical stance vis-à-vis literary history to the rôle of *theoria*, theorizing in a much more philosophical sense about literature within culture; and thus theory itself has become far more conscious of its own historicity, of the diversity and dispersion of the phenomena to be studied and of their access to signification; more conscious, therefore, of the need to accept the provisional, the fragmentary, the

incomplete for reasons which are themselves theoretical. Thus the opposition between «history» and «theory» is seen in perspective as a kind of necessary accident in the humanities search for self-understanding; in the process, it became clear, especially as structuralism gave way to poststructuralism, that what theoreticians had criticized was not just a mode of reconstruction of the past, but all construction referring back to some kind of foundational vision (for example, scholars engaged in Renaissance studies saw the extent to which the very concept of Renaissance has been a construct, and realized that at the very least it had to be recognized as such; which in turn became a basis for rethinking, rewriting, rereading what can now be less dogmatically termed the Early Modern period with a view to perceiving the voices and the forces that the dominant construct had not made audible and visible).

Thus, not only has the history/theory opposition been breaking down, but it appears that overcoming it has been the fruit of new thinking about literature itself and therefore, necessarily, literature in relation to culture (whether or not in terms of a specificity of literature within culture). I therefore see the advent of the new opposition, that between literary and cultural studies, as a result of the breaking down of the earlier opposition, but also very much as an opportunity for improving the self-definition of Comparative Literature studies.

Is the opposition between literary and cultural studies truly a new one? It seems to me on the contrary that it has been on our horizon for a very long time, but has only recently been thrown into the arena of burning issues, and represented as a bottom-line choice so that where there were two different, complementary mentalities (complementary among groups but surely also within the thought and research of single individuals), attitudes have hardened, and hard choices are demanded between a concept of literature defined by specifically aesthetic criteria, and a literary discourse seen as part of the social discourse at large, regardless of formal criteria and inseparably from the entire set of socio-cultural phenomena including mass phenomena. Furthermore, that opposition masks another, profoundly anchored in postmodernity: that between a perceived or voluntary élitism and a broad welcoming of all that enters into a culture, or into culture in general.

For Comparative Literature there are, therefore, many issues involved, of which some are clearly institutional and have serious short-term consequences in institutional and curricular terms, especially in the Humanities if a choice is imposed between a strict definition of literature, and a broadly cultural approach; and some are more philosophical in the sense that they invite us to a prior examination of concepts before we draw any institutional and pedagogical consequences.

American scholars working in Comparative Literature are very attentive to this conceptual aspect, but are also faced with audiences which demand quick curricular and institutional implementation. In basic terms, the question arises whether, in American Universities, literary studies programs are being superseded by cultural studies programs. The Canadian situation is slightly different: in Canada there are few programs and Departments of Comparative Literature as such, which have by and large developed orientations independent of the American situation; yet undeniably the pressure is mounting, exemplified by the long lists of works on cultural theory and its applications periodically issued by academic presses. Even supposing the problem were only a storm in the American teapot, it would be incumbent on Comparative Literature scholars in other countries to reflect upon it, not by way of submission to some kind of perceived hegemony, but by way of recognition of the fact that so much sifting of international intellectual trends has occurred in the U. S. in the past few decades.

Any generalisation about tendencies in such a vast and diverse country runs the risk of being arbitrary and superficial. We may, however, rely on a document stemming

from the American Comparative Literature Association, which reflects a discussion applicable to literary studies in general, «A Report to the A.C.L.A.: Comparative Literature at the Turn of the Century» (Bernheimer et al., 1993). The document should be seen in its context, that of the periodic reporting on standards undertaken by the Association. Earlier reports (1965 and 1976) portray Comparative Literature in the U.S.A. as it has been made familiar through the teaching and research of the faculty members now in place; the present report points to a profound destabilization of the discipline. From my own perspective there is nothing negative about being epistemologically destabilized; it is an opportunity to rethink the current paradigms and the nature of our openness: has Comparative Literature been merely open-ended? or capable of generating truly open systems? The two previous reports, to which the current report reacts, had been founded on a concept of comparative literary studies reinforcing «an identification of nation states as imagined communities with national languages as their natural bases» (Bernheimer, 1993, 1); and giving an élite image of the discipline, that included work on texts in original languages (but often a set of dominant languages, with the languages of more remote cultures communicated only in translation). The earlier reports also expressed diffidence towards interdisciplinarity and even towards theory, both of which have been challenging the specificity or, as the authors of these reports would express it, the purity of comparative literary studies. It is not surprising that the authors of the newest report have proceeded to a radical examination of actually existing practices across the board. This is in itself a significant shift, because the very concept of standards regulating a discipline, which implies normativity, has given way to the observance of actual practices. In summary, the result of the inquiry is that «the space of comparison today involves comparisons between artistic productions usually studied by different disciplines; between Western cultural traditions, both high and popular, and those of non-Western cultures; between the pre-and post-contact cultural productions of colonized peoples; between gender constructions defined as feminine and those defined as masculine; or between sexual orientations defined as straight and those defined as gay; between racial and ethnic modes of signifying; between hermeneutic articulations of meaning and materialist analyses of its modes of production and circulation; and much more.» (Bernheimer, 2). Implicit in this survey of actual interests is the current broadening of the concept of literature, and the questioning of its specificity; but also an entire range of phenomena felt throughout the Humanities in general: the increasingly insistent presence of non-European literatures and cultures, the violent accusations of Eurocentricity, the impact of other humanities and social science disciplines upon literary theory, the interaction but also the mutual questioning between élite and popular culture; the lively jolt dealt to the literary system by feminist and post-colonial readings and the enormous diversification brought about by the variety of ethnic cultural groupings active within, without or in the margins of the deceptively uncomplicated bodies that used to be national literatures; not to mention the questioning of the identity of the literary text itself and of its hermeneutic destiny.

This already familiar list can help us characterize and perhaps even explain the atmosphere of crisis in which literary studies have lived for some decades. It undoubtedly presents a compelling epistemological challenge. The 1993 A.C.L.A. report makes a radical statement concerning its impact on graduate studies: «Literary phenomena are no longer the exclusive focus of our discipline. Rather, literary texts are now being approached as one discursive practice among many others in a complex, shifting, and often contradictory field of cultural production.» (Bernheimer et al., 1993, 3). One consequence of this state of affairs, wherever and whenever it may prevail, is that the study of «high literary discourse» is no longer seen as a separate discipline, and dealing with other «discursive practices» along with literature is no longer regarded as an inter-

disciplinary pursuit but precisely as part of «cultural studies». If we broaden our perspective to culture as a whole we are not crossing borders but rejoining an already existing dynamic. (I am still leaving aside the question whether this intellectual reconfiguration demands a reorganization of curricula and institutional structures). In literature, as well as other arts and humanities disciplines, we are called upon, not to abandon precise techniques of specifically rhetorical analysis or of prosody, (or formal devices in arts other than literature), but to take into account the ideological, cultural and institutional contexts in which these forms signify. The overall emphasis, then, is on the production of meaning. And, inevitably, all the fundamental questions occur at once: in a literary text, who is speaking to whom, and in whose name? Is there such a thing as a literary text, and if yes, what makes it so? Logically this places on the agenda the question of the canon; «Comparative literature should be actively engaged in the comparative study of canon formation and in reconceiving the canon.» (Bernheimer et al, 4). This exigency harbours three components: the examination of what enters the canon, but also of what determines the canon itself, and how; and last but not least of the manner in which non-traditional readings (for example the feminist or the postcolonial) of canonical texts contribute to expanding the canon.

Hence a call for Comparative Literature to play an active role in «furthering the multicultural recontextualization of Anglo-American and European perspectives» (Bernheimer et al., 4). Minimally, this means broadening the linguistic and cultural scope of the usual Comparative literature offerings, not because it might be politically correct, but because it accomplishes better the international and intercultural vocation of the discipline. It is only at this point that the 1993 report notes «some» affinity with cultural studies, pointing out at the same time that cultural studies have tended to be monolingual, and have concentrated on issues in specific contemporary popular cultures. My own stance is that Comparative Literature should continue to problematize the literature of the world inclusively, that is, by combining the resources of historical and theoretical thinking upon the symbolic universe.

In a carefully thought out response, Peter Brooks of Yale University first of all welcomes the openness of the A.C.L.A. report to broader interpretive contexts, especially in the face of what had perhaps been too narrow a commitment to «rhetorical reading of the deconstructive variety». But he strongly objects to the apologetic tone with which the report treats the teaching of literature, as a discursive practice among others favoured only by an aging mandarin caste. He criticizes the report for recommending changes of which in fact many have already occurred. But, most importantly, he points out that all the programmatic wishes expressed by the report and its imperatives do not amount to a theoretical framework, but rather to a roster of preferred activities underpinned by an undeclared ethical principle, rather than by an endeavour to renew the coherence of a field of knowledge which might still be called poetics. Literary studies are still about literature, and the teaching of them, about apprenticeship of a constituted body of knowledge... to be viewed self-critically, which is where the role of theory comes in. With respect to life together in institutions of higher education, Brooks feels that Comparative Literature and cultural studies should mutually be interlocutors, not entities poised to devour each other. Finally, to take a stand on literary studies centering upon the study of literature is not to shun multiculturalism, but to affirm that literature can indeed be a ground upon which the dialogue of cultures takes place. In other words, let cultural relativism not become cultural dogmatism!

In a very recent MLA presidential forum Henry Louis Gates warned of the danger of a new imperialism that can implicitly be imposed in the name of cultural difference: «A salient difficulty raised by the variety of uses to which the term [multiculturalism] has been put is that multiculturalism itself has certain imperial tendencies. Its bounda-

ries have not been easy to establish. We are told it is concerned with representations of difference—but whose differences? which differences? Almost all differences in which we take an interest express themselves in cultural ways; many, perhaps most, are exhausted by their cultural manifestations.» (Gates, 6). Cultural identities remain content with their self-expression, which leads to «cultural diversity» and cultivation of distance, rather than to encourage study of difference per se. For that reason, cultural «externalism» is not as good an ally as it appears at first of gender or sexual identity. Sexual difference is a difference within, says Gates. «Othering starts in the home». (Gates, 7.) Some of the content alliances claimed by cultural studies, according to Gates, do not work well. Politically he advocates a pluralism in which cultural differences are recognized, critically discussed but mutually studied and understood so that identities are «in dialogue» rather than to be considered impenetrable, absolute, and so potentially hostile. (Gates, 11.)

But commonalities and differences among cultural assumptions have long been studied as possible bases for thoughts on the universal and the particular; literary scholars are in fact constantly warned to deflect situations in which a culture attempts to impose its own assumptions upon some or all others. Difference has, in many ways, been triumphant and is indeed a link with the spirit of cultural studies.

As a discipline, cultural studies have for a long time, under the influence of thinkers such as Raymond Williams, had an intellectual and institutional identity, notably in Great Britain. For Williams literary texts are among other things objects of sociological and sociocritical study. After all, Williams was a student of Leavis', whose stress on specifically literary values, which are those of an entire community, was notorious. Stressing the importance of both the text and «life» in culture, Williams, however, rejected Leavis' cultural élitism. Thus «culturalism», of which Williams is only one representative among several others, identifies high and popular culture as two existing realities within culture. Williams' own choice is to place higher value on working-class cultural achievements. In doing so he in no way deterritorializes literature, which provides him with an inexhaustible *réservoir* of common experience. As he sets out to analyze the impact of mass media institutions, he does not do so in terms of a competition between traditional and non-traditional means of communication; but rather in terms of a quest for a «properly democratic communications system» (Milner, 1994, 41).

But decades have elapsed and some authors of cultural studies books have adopted a more aggressive way of describing the situation. «The field of cultural studies is experiencing [...] an unprecedented international boom. It remains to be seen how long this boom will last and what impact it will have on the intellectual life. Certainly, within the fragmented institutional configuration of the academic left, cultural studies holds special intellectual promise because it explicitly attempts to cut across diverse social and political interests and address many of the struggles within the current scene.» (Nelson, 1.)

Thus far, the favourable ambience, supported by numerous centres, programs, textbooks, has indeed proved popular and gainfully so, since institutions tend to quickly zero in on the expected successes. The intellectual promise, however, has to be demonstrated in different terms, such as those we have been attempting to conceptualize. The editors of *Cultural Studies* also present a list of major categories of current work in cultural studies, a list all the more disquieting since they also admit that there is no limit to what could be added to it in the future: «[...] The history of cultural studies, gender and sexuality, nationhood and national identity, colonialism and postcolonialism, race and ethnicity, popular culture and its audiences, science and ecology, identity politics, pedagogy, the politics of aesthetics, cultural institutions, the politics of disciplinarity, discourse and textuality, history, and global culture in a postmodern age. But cultural studies can only partially and uneasily be identified by such domains of interest, since

no list can constrain the topics cultural studies may address in the future.» (Nelson, 1.) Thus conceived, cultural studies would simply coincide with vast sectors of the humanities and of the social sciences, but only from a certain perspective, that of an ambition combining forces with postmodernism to feed its appetite for transgressiveness. In this spirit, cultural studies are decidedly and consciously moving away from literary studies: the expression «politics of aesthetics» relativizes in advance any unifying principle that would define literature. They are also going in the direction of «dissemination» favoured by Derrida, which emphasizes uniqueness and therefore incomparability, defying the universal/particular dialectic so familiar to literary scholars.

One of the new wave of cultural studies textbooks bears the challenging title *Crusoe's Footprints*. (1990). This comes from an episode in which Robinson is afraid when he sees on the shore a footprint of which for two years he will not know whether it is his or that of some frightening or hostile creature; an episode which Michel de Certeau has used to symbolize the destabilization of the conquering bourgeois. The footprint becomes the symbol of the other, of others, including Friday whose language Robinson will never learn, and who will remain other. «Crusoe's solipsism can be read as the parable of all forms of imperialism and political divisiveness that have divided people through history into masters and servants, the dominant and the dominated.» (Brantlinger, 3.) Following the «whole life» concept drawn from Raymond Williams, Brantlinger gives cultural studies the widest possible extension. Their final objective rejoins the lesson Crusoe was unable to learn —that «in order to understand ourselves, the discourses of “the other” — of all the others —is [sic] that which we most urgently need to hear». (Brantlinger, 3). But he also admits that the program of cultural studies is neither unified nor set, but rather presents itself as a heterogeneous set of tendencies, problematics, questions, which also means that it brings in a variety of theories and methodologies: Marxism, feminisms, deconstruction, psychoanalysis, ethnography, etc... Brantlinger looks back to 1968 inasmuch as the sixties movement had put into question the epistemology of all the human sciences in a way one can easily see as continued by the cultural studies movement; the young, Habermas reminds us, are particularly sensitive to the untruth of preceding legitimations. (Brantlinger, 5).

Brantlinger in fact is just as balanced as Peter Brooks. For example, he does not contest the pedagogical ideal of the liberal arts, while at the same time wishing to end their impotence; and he refrains from declaring that literature is dead. On the contrary, he advocates a more sustained presence of aesthetics but he wants it more devoted to serving historical and cultural representation; and here of course we encounter the question of aesthetic freedom, a freedom which in any case would appear quite consistent with the ethical objectives contemplated by Brantlinger.

After sampling representative statements concerning the pros and cons of cultural studies, a brief sampling among attitudes of literary scholars whose work has been implicitly oriented towards cultural studies might provide us with a useful complement. A book of essays by the Québec scholar André Brochu, entitled *La visée critique* (1968), consists of a combination of critical and autobiographical essays, reminiscent of the now familiar osmosis among the genres, and of the openness of autobiography to all the struggles of modern subjectivity. Particularly striking was a 1984 essay, «Littérature Québec», into the far too incomplete educational conquests of the Quiet Revolution, the pedagogical schemes still all too dependent on those of France, not to mention theoretical frameworks also of French origin. In conclusion Brochu notes the feminization of the audience of literary studies, the precarious situation of those studies and their internal tensions reflecting those of a divided society still unhappy with its institutions of higher learning and still uncertain of its status as a francophone country. He also notes the power and strength of the Québec's system of higher education, even if it lives

«on a volcano». As the author enumerates its cultural achievements and points out their social relevance one cannot help being reminded of the challenge of cultural studies within the anglophone system of higher education. This example only serves to deepen our dilemma: literary studies need elbow room within higher education, they aspire in their own way to serve society; yet they will not serve it as well if they are restrained from retaining their specifically literary emphases.

The question continues to arise whether and to what extent there is a coincidence between adhering to the notion of literary specificity, and de facto opting in favour of «élitism». Is the conjunction of these two elements a necessary one? (And does the fact of asking this question, which might be thought to expect an integrative response, make one immediately suspect of a comparatist vision based on some unavowed metafiction? I hope not). I hope that literary phenomena can continue to inhabit the entire spectrum that goes from the popular to the highly sophisticated. There is a difference between seeking criteria of literariness and affirming that in order to be literary a text must exhibit them all: literary texts can be of interest to cultural studies for reasons other than form, but form is not automatically excluded from their considerations; after all, it is the readership which ultimately sanctions literary identity; so that between the two extremes that would be the existence and non-existence of literariness we might conceive of a third option in which the literary emerges within the whole culture as a response to it, and harbours no promise of absolute literariness, always remaining an open and unstable category. This option also comes closest to the nature of the process of canonization: the most coveted status carries within itself the greatest threat of obsolescence.

Our quest would always remain exploratory, favouring frontiers over acquired territories, and look out for points of emergence of the literary within the cultural. In that perspective the literary differential is seen as process. We can think, for example, of folktales becoming literature for children and adults; or of the gradual entry of science fiction into the literary orbit. While speech act theory would continue to emphasize the closeness between literary and ordinary communication, a theoretician such as Northrop Frye stressed that what enters the literary system should be studied, not in terms of its socio-cultural origins, but in its relation to the literary system itself.

In our search for effective compatibilities, two additional points could be made. First, the fact that the osmosis between the literary and the cultural is in fact already well incorporated in literary studies; the challenge imposed by cultural studies is to make it necessary to revisit the nature of that osmosis as new horizons of expectation, rooted in culture, create new aesthetic demands. The second, more philosophical point, is that the current collapse of disciplinary boundaries should not lead us to renounce searching for an optimum status for literary studies, but on the contrary, to see the convergence of all human sciences, in their struggle for intelligibility.

One fundamental difference between literary and cultural studies which has not often been discussed is the focus of the latter upon the present, as part of their ethical and indeed political engagement. Literary studies, although their centre of gravity has also been shifting towards the XXth century, continue to claim responsibility for the understanding of the entire literary system from the most remote past. Implicitly or explicitly literary history has often brought grist to the cultural studies mill by showing the emergence of specific literary genres, forms, conventions within culture. The first volume of the recent *History of Criticism* published by the Cambridge University Press concerns criticism in Ancient Greece and Rome. This, at the outset, means that it regards as established not only the literary specificity of a number of Greek and Roman works, and the set of genres among which they are allocated; but also that it takes for granted, with respect to Antiquity, the existence of a critical practice, and of a body of criticism having theoretical implications. The ritual and oral origins of poetry are not

denied; but a literary evolution, including a critical dimension, is shown to follow from them: «Criticism as an instinctive audience reaction to the performance of poetry is as old as song. Literary theory begins to emerge in Archaic Greece in the self-reference of oral bards and early literate poets and as part of the conceptualization of ideas which marked the birth of Greek philosophy.» (Kennedy, p. IX.) Poetry, especially dramatic poetry, is part of popular festivities; it is closely allied with religious myth, music, philosophy; as it gradually evolves into a specific phenomenon, its self-awareness also increases; and as change occurs —e.g. the decline of the epic— it begins to see itself historically.

The response that could be made to this example is that from the cultural studies viewpoint it is not the existence of literature which is at issue —it is unlikely that anyone would challenge Jakobson's distinction between marked and unmarked discourse— but that of its separateness within culture, and of the norms which would give it a privileged status. The example of the double destiny of myth constitutes an excellent argument for literary specificity. Myth, which is «applied narrative [...] describes a meaningful and important reality that applies to the aggregate, going beyond the individual». (Nagy, 3.)

Initially, myth is set apart because its religious or social function; but the setting apart of it, with its musical and verbal consequences, creates a formal structure which will endure and repeatedly gain new signification, to be culturally reinvested again and again, often far beyond the borders of the culture of origin. Without formalization, however, this survival could not occur.

The late Paul Zumthor devoted much thought to the abyss which separates the present-day scholar from the understanding of bygone cultures. His own theory, and praxis, consisted in seeking contact with the medieval world through the network of verbal signs it bequeathed to us, precisely in the material aspect of its textuality.

To the 25th anniversary issue of *New Literary History* Zumthor contributed a study of the early modern travel narrative, an immensely diverse corpus which cannot initially be said to be unified by anything except its diffuse narrativity, its fascination with space which is the meeting ground with the Other, and only gradually the desire for verifiable truth about that Other. The texts are literary only in the sense of open discourse. Gradually, the desire for episodes to illustrate moralities will give way to scientific curiosity as well as personal self-expression. Narrativity, however, remains the foundation of writings of different times, places and cultures; it challenges description (what was there when we came-geography —as opposed to what happened from our arrival— history); it attests and sanctions every claim to possession; it confronts the reader with the choice between real and imaginary. For these and many other reasons, the travel narrative constitutes an excellent example of the complementarity of literary and cultural studies.

Zumthor may not have written it in so many words, but he certainly presupposed in all his work —philological, historical, theoretical, cultural and fictional— three propositions on which we would have happily agreed. 1. Humanity is still the one collective basis of the human sciences. 2. The human sciences have exploded and splintered, not unlike the cultures of the world. 3. Follow your project, literary *or* cultural. Chances are it will usefully complement the aggregate of scholarship.

EVA KUSHNER
UNIVERSIDAD DE TORONTO

WORKS CITED

- Charles BERNHEIMER, CHAIR, et al., «A Report to the A.C.L.A.: Comparative Literature at the Turn of the Century», 1994.
- Patrick BRANTLINGER, *Crusoe's Footprints. Cultural Studies in Britain and America* (New York: Routledge, 1990).
- André BROCHU, *La visée critique* (Montreal: Boréal, 1988).
- Peter BROOKS, «Must we apologize?», 1994, in press, 15 p.
- Henry Louis GATES, 1993 Presidential Forum address, *Profession 93* (New York: M.L.A., 1994).
- George A. KENNEDY, «Preface», *The Cambridge History of Criticism, vol. I; Classical Criticism* (Cambridge University Press, 1989, IX-XV).
- Andrew MILNER, *Contemporary Cultural Theory: an Introduction* (London: UCL Press, 1994).
- Gregory NAGY, «Early Greek views of poets and poetry», *The Cambridge History of literary Criticism, Vol. I: Classical Criticism*, ed. George A. Kennedy (Cambridge University Press, 1989); 1-77.
- Cary NELSON, PAULA A. TREICHLER, Lawrence GROSSBERG, eds., *Cultural Studies* (London and New York: Routledge, 1992):
- Paul ZUMTHOR, «The medieval travel narrative», *New Literary History, 25th Anniversary issue, Vol. 25, autumn 1994, n.º 4*, 809-24.