

Double-Edged Imitation

Theories and Practices of
Pastiche in Literature

Sanna Nyqvist

University of Helsinki 2010

© Sanna Nyqvist 2010
ISBN 978-952-92-6970-9

Nord Print Oy
Helsinki 2010

Acknowledgements

Among the great pleasures of bringing a project like this to completion is the opportunity to declare my gratitude to the many people who have made it possible and, moreover, enjoyable and instructive.

My supervisor, Professor H.K. Riikonen has accorded me generous academic freedom, as well as unfailing support whenever I have needed it. His belief in the merits of this book has been a source of inspiration and motivation. Professor Steven Connor and Professor Suzanne Keen were as thorough and careful pre-examiners as I could wish for and I am very grateful for their suggestions and advice.

I have been privileged to conduct my work for four years in the Finnish Graduate School of Literary Studies under the directorship of Professor Bo Pettersson. He and the Graduate School's Post-Doctoral Researcher Harri Veivo not only offered insightful and careful comments on my papers, but equally importantly created a friendly and encouraging atmosphere in the Graduate School seminars. I thank my fellow post-graduate students – Dr. Juuso Aarnio, Dr. Ulrika Gustafsson, Dr. Mari Hatavara, Dr. Saija Isomaa, Mikko Kallionsivu, Toni Lahtinen, Hanna Meretoja, Dr. Outi Oja, Dr. Merja Polvinen, Dr. Riikka Rossi, Dr. Hanna Ruutu, Juho-Antti Tuhkanen and Jussi Willman – for their feedback and collegial support. The rush to meet the seminar deadline was always amply compensated by the discussions in the seminar itself, and afterwards over a glass of wine.

I am especially grateful for the friendship and advice of Dr. Merja Polvinen, a brilliant scholar and wonderful friend, who has carefully read and commented on the manuscript at its different stages of development. The mornings spent playing badminton with her have offered physical and intellectual exercise in equal measure. I now have the pleasure of working with Merja in the *Styles of Mimesis* project, directed by Professor Pirjo Lyytikäinen. I thank Pirjo for her sage advice and support, and my project colleagues Dr. Saija Isomaa and Dr. Riikka Rossi for sharing valuable

ideas and experiences. Also a member of the *Styles of Mimesis* project, Docent Sari Kivistö commented on the manuscript at the crucial finishing stages. Her high standard of professionalism is an example to which I aspire.

Colleagues and academic staff in Comparative Literature have also contributed to this project in important ways. I thank Professor Heta Pyrhönen for encouragement at the early stages of my university career. The seminars of Docent Kuisma Korhonen were inspiring and challenged me to look at things from new angles. Dr. Eva Maria Korsisaari was one of my first teachers at the university and is now a dear friend and colleague. Her beautifully hand-written comments circling the pages of my manuscript were always a pleasure to read and, moreover, taught me a lot about methodology. Fellow post-graduates Laura Lindstedt, Martti-Tapio Kuuskoski and Dr. Pajari Räsänen have been crucial to the intellectual atmosphere in our department. Over the last three years, I have had the privilege of sharing the office with Sami Sjöberg, whose humour and compassion have brightened my days. Many of my ideas have been tested and developed in conversation with him over and through the bookshelf that divides the office into two separate dens.

Docent Roderick McConchie revised the manuscript with meticulous attention; however, I remain responsible for any remaining errors. I have had the pleasure and honour to present my work in numerous seminars both home and abroad and would like to thank the organisers for the opportunity and other participants for their comments and ideas.

Special thanks are due to my dear friends, whose intelligence, humour and cookery have considerably helped along the way. Thank you Suvi Ervamaa, Tomi Kokkonen, Aino Rajala, Johanna Sinkkonen and Janne Tompuri. I have also significantly benefited from the collegial support and friendship of Kaisa Kaakinen and Leena Kaakinen. I owe a great deal to Timo Pankakoski, an unfailing friend and fellow post-graduate, whose intellect and example I hold in the highest esteem. Discussions with him, as well as the opportunity to read his work-in-progress on the concept of

struggle in German political theory have had a great influence on me, which I am happy and grateful to acknowledge. Dr. Dara Connolly's constant belief in my project and capabilities has been invaluable. He has never failed to provide informative and enlightening answers to my queries, whatever their subject. This is all the more remarkable since his field of professional expertise, power systems engineering, is rather distant from mine.

I thank my parents, Lars and Pirkko Nyqvist, for their enduring patience and support, as well as for an early education in the art of argumentation. Their habit of reading stories to me and my siblings ignited in me the love of literature early on. Dr. Jyrki Hakapää is not only a frighteningly sharp-sighted proof-reader, but also the most sensible and caring companion one could wish for during the ordeal known as the doctoral thesis. My admiration for him is boundless.

My work has been financially supported by Emil Aaltosen säätiö, the Finnish Concordia Fund, Alfred Kordelinin rahasto and the University of Helsinki, which I am grateful to acknowledge. The final revisions have been made while I have been working in the *Styles of Mimesis* project (122854), funded by the Finnish Academy. A much earlier version of chapters 1.2 and 1.3, entitled "Jäljittelyn jäljillä: pastissin käsitteen historiaa," was published in the journal *Tiede & Edistys* (3/2004), and the section on D.M. Thomas's novel *Charlotte* in chapter 3.3 is based on my article "Perverse Pastiche: Identity and Authorship in D.M. Thomas's *Charlotte*," published in *Narrative and Identity: Theoretical Approaches and Critical Analyses* (Trier: WVT, 2008), edited by Birgit Neumann, Ansgar Nünning and Bo Pettersson.

Helsinki, 14th February 2010
Sanna Nyqvist

Contents

Acknowledgements

Contents

A Note on Translations

INTRODUCTION	1
PART I: HISTORY	18
1.1 The Prehistory of Pastiche	20
<i>The Tradition of Imitation</i>	20
<i>Copyright Laws and Modern Authorship</i>	26
1.2 Theories of Pastiche from 1699 to the Present	34
<i>Etymology and Early Definitions</i>	34
<i>The Beginnings of Literary Pastiche</i>	48
<i>Pastiche in the Nineteenth Century: Criticism and School Exercise</i>	56
<i>Pastiche in Vogue: The Beginning of the Twentieth Century</i>	64
<i>Approaches to Pastiche from the 1960s Onwards: History, Influence, Mystification, Reading</i>	79
<i>Structuralist Views on Pastiche</i>	88
1.3 Postmodernism and Beyond	103
<i>The Postmodern Re-Invention of Pastiche</i>	103
<i>Epistemology and Emotion</i>	120
<i>Conclusion to Part One</i>	124
PART II: CONCEPT	129
2.1 Two Kinds of Pastiche	129
<i>A Terminological Solution</i>	134
<i>Compilation Pastiche</i>	136
<i>Compilation Pastiche in Critical Analyses</i>	144
<i>Stylistic Pastiche</i>	152
<i>Examples of Stylistic Pastiche</i>	163
2.2 Conceptual Cousins and Sister Arts	174
<i>Related Literary Practices</i>	174
<i>Pastiche in Other Arts</i>	196
2.3 Aspects of Double-Edgedness	205
<i>The Pastiche Contract</i>	205
<i>Pastiches of a Particular Work, Period or Genre</i>	214
<i>The Impossibility of Repetition</i>	221
<i>Double Signature</i>	228
<i>Shadows of Originality</i>	236
<i>Pastiche as a Test Laboratory</i>	245

PART III: PRACTICE	252
3.1 Style as Vision: The Pastiches by Marcel Proust	256
<i>The Two Pasticheurs: Proust and Reboux</i>	256
<i>Style, Vision, Memory: The Goncourt Pastiche of Le Temps retrouvé</i>	263
<i>Pastiche and Metaphor</i>	268
<i>The Indeterminate Space of Pastiche</i>	273
3.2 The Apocryphal Adventures of Sherlock Holmes	277
<i>Corrective and Complementary Pastiches</i>	281
<i>Deceptive Appearances: The Seven-Per-Cent Solution</i> <i>by Nicholas Meyer</i>	284
<i>Reichenbach Revisited: The Last Sherlock Holmes Story</i> <i>by Michael Dibdin</i>	290
<i>Anxiety of Authenticity: The Exploits of Sherlock Holmes</i> <i>by Doyle and Carr</i>	293
3.3 Transgressive Pastiche in A.S. Byatt's <i>Possession</i> and D.M. Thomas's <i>Charlotte</i>	304
<i>The Neo-Victorian Novel: Textual Mysteries</i>	305
<i>Poetics of Retelling: A.S. Byatt's Possession: A Romance</i>	308
<i>Conjurers of Dead Spirits</i>	313
<i>Pastiche as Transgression</i>	321
<i>Perverse Pastiche: D.M. Thomas's Charlotte</i>	327
<i>Sex, Lies and Audiotape</i>	332
<i>Incestuous Pastiche</i>	336
CONCLUSION: THE FATES AND FUTURES OF PASTICHE	341
APPENDIX: ON THE MEANINGS OF THE TERM 'PASTICHE' AND ITS VARIANTS IN DIFFERENT EUROPEAN LANGUAGES	347
WORKS CITED	355
INDEX	375

A note on translations

Unless noted otherwise, translations from sources are my own. I am indebted to many colleagues and friends for assistance on translations and hope to have credited each of them in footnotes, but I naturally remain responsible for any remaining errors.

Introduction

In *Les Caractères* (1688-94), a satirical account of the morals of the seventeenth century, Jean de La Bruyère offers a witty analysis of the complications involved in the encounter between two acquaintances. He describes a common enough situation: you meet someone in the street or at a party and, as you approach them, you start to wonder whether they will recognise you, whether you should greet them first or wait until the other one recognises you, whether you should merely pass by or stop for a little conversation. Deciding upon the right course of action involves a quick examination of your previous relationship to the person and a balancing of your own feelings with those you anticipate the other person has towards you. In La Bruyère's time, the rigid social hierarchy and formulaic interaction added to the awkwardness of the situation. When commenting on such aspects of social life in *Les Caractères*, La Bruyère usually offers a sharp, ironic, matter-of-fact analysis (whether in the form of an anecdote, imagined dialogue or a maxim), but in this particular case, he exceptionally turns to another great commentator on manners and morals, Michel de Montaigne, whose *Essais* (1580-95) were, in La Bruyère's time as now, praised for their insightful analysis of human nature. "I hate a man whom I cannot accost or salute before he bows to me, without debasing myself in his eyes, or sharing in the good opinion he has of himself," La Bruyère writes, and continues: "Montaigne would say: 'I will have elbow-room: I will be courteous and affable according to my fancy, without fear or remorse. I cannot strive against my inclination nor go contrary to my disposition, which leads me to address myself to everyone whom I meet.'"¹ These sentences evoke the freethinking, affable castellan

¹ "Je n'aime pas un homme que je ne puis ny aborder le premier, ny saluer avant qu'il me saluë, sans mavillir à ses yeux & sans tremper dans la bonne opinion qu'il a de luy même. Montagne [sic] diroit: *je veux avoir mes coudées franches, & estre courtois & affable à mon point, sans remords ny consequence. Je ne puis du tout estriver contre mon penchant, ny aller au rebours de mon naturel, qui m'emmeine vers celuy que je trouve à ma rencontre*" (*Les Caractères* 188, emphasis original).

who does not shy away from declaring his opinion and sharing the fruits of his introspection. The words, however, are only a prologue to an exhaustive pondering of the matter in one breathtakingly long, periphrastic sentence:

Quand il m'est égal, & qu'il ne m'est point ennemy, j'anticipe son bon accueil, je le questionne sur sa disposition & santé, je luy fais offre de mes offices sans tant marchander sur le plus ou sur le moins, ne estre, comme disent aucuns, sur le qui vive: ce'uy-là me déplaist, qui par la connoissance que j'ay de ses coûtumes & façons d'agir me tire de cette liberté & franchise: comment me ressouvenir tout á propos & d'aussi loin que je vois cet homme, d'emprunter une contenance grave & importante, & qui l'avertisse que je crois le valoir bien & au delà; & pour ce de me ramentevoir de mes bonnes qualitez & conditions, & des siennes mauvaises, puis en faire la comparaison: c'est trop de travail pour moy, & ne suis du tout capable de si roide & si subite attention; & quand bien elle m'auroit succedé une première fois, je ne laisserois de flechir & me démentir à une seconde tache: je ne puis me forcer & contraindre pour quelconque à estre fier. (Les Caractères 188-89, emphasis original)

If such a person is my equal and not my enemy, I anticipate his courtesy; I ask him about his temper and health, I offer him my services without any haggling, and am not always on my guard, as some people say. That man displeases me who by my knowledge of his habits and behaviour deprives me of such liberty and freedom. How should I remember, as soon as I see him afar off, to put on a grave and important look, and to let him know that I think I am as good as he, and better? To do this I must call to my mind all my good qualities and points, and his bad ones, so as to compare them together. This is too much trouble for me, and I am not at all capable of showing such an abrupt and sudden presence of mind; even if I had been successful at first, I am sure I should give way and lose my head a second time, for I cannot put any restraint on myself nor assume a certain haughtiness for any man. (*Characters* 71-72)

In short, Montaigne dislikes presumptions. Or rather, that is what La Bruyère makes him say, since the passage is not a quotation from anything Montaigne actually wrote, although it could be: such rambling and repetitive trains of thought occur often in Montaigne's essays, and the topic – the intricacies of social life –

is one to which he constantly returns.² The conditional of La Bruyère's reporting clause, "Montaigne would say," suggests that what we have here is a question of make-believe: if Montaigne were thinking about this, he would say thus. Lest any reader remain uncertain as to the imitative status of the text, La Bruyère has even furnished the passage with an explicatory note: "Imité de Montagne [sic]."³ He clearly wishes to emphasise that the adoption of Montaigne's style should be regarded neither as accidental influence nor as a sign of lack of originality. Furthermore, the imitation is set aside from the rest of the text by its italic font and old-fashioned orthography (e.g., *estre* instead of *être*, a detail many later editions have not retained).⁴ All these features contribute to highlight the passage as imitation and as separate from La Bruyère's own text.

This passage is the first known example of pastiche in literature,⁵ by virtue of its inclusion in Jean-François Marmontel's liter-

² See essays 13 and 42 in volume one, and essay 17 in volume two of *Essais* where Montaigne discusses meeting ceremonies, inequality among men and presumption respectively. Montaigne in particular criticises the sin of pride, which undoubtedly inspired La Bruyère to imitate Montaigne in this context.

³ "In imitation of Montaigne." This note has been removed (apparently as superfluous) from many editions, for instance, from Henri van Laun's English translation that I am using here. Some early editions, for example, the Michaillet edition of 1699, have put the pastiche passage in quotation marks, a feature which has been retained in many later editions, e.g., the 1951 Pléiade edition and Laun's English translation. As signals of exact citation, the quotation marks are in interesting contradiction with the indicators of imitation.

⁴ The first edition of *Les Caractères* was published in 1688 as an appendix to La Bruyère's translation of *The Characters* by Theophrastus. Intended as a "modern" version of Theophrastus's character sketches, it was also influenced by Montaigne's essays. The pastiche of Montaigne's style was added to the fifth edition, published in 1690, which is the edition I am using here. Subsequent re-editions have changed the orthography and presentation of the passage. For an analysis of the changes made to the 1690 version, see Bilous, "Récrire l'intertexte." The popularity of *Les Caractères* gave rise to a number of imitations and pastiches, to the (admittedly rather hypocritical) dismay of La Bruyère (Aron, *Histoire* 63-64).

⁵ Firstness is always a dubious quality. As I will elaborate in chapter 1.1, there are reasons to regard pastiche as a particularly modern practice, if by "modern" we mean the gradual process of individualisation at all levels of culture and society that began in the seventeenth century. It is, of course, possible to identify instances of particularly personalised imitation in pre-seventeenth-century litera-

ary encyclopedia *Éléments de littérature* (1787) which was crucial to the establishment of the term pastiche in literary studies, first in French and later in other European languages. La Bruyère did not use that term himself – it was introduced into French roughly at the time when he wrote *Les Caractères* – but the characteristics of his imitation of Montaigne correspond to the emerging conception of pastiche as the deliberate imitation of the style of a particular author. In just three sentences, La Bruyère manages to capture something immediately recognisable in Montaigne's style: the rhetoric of repetition and contrast that testifies to the speaker's ability to look at the issue at hand from different perspectives and the honest and straightforward attitude which makes the speaker appear as the equal of his readers. As one of the first distinctly individualistic writers in the European literary history, Montaigne is an apt object of imitation in a pastiche which highlights personal stylistic features.

The meticulousness of the imitation in this passage from *Les Caractères* inevitably raises the question of why go through all this trouble, especially if it would have been possible to refer to Montaigne indirectly – tell rather than show what he would think of the situation. Montaigne is clearly evoked here as an authority in the matter of social relations, but the fact that the evocation is carried out in the imitation of his characteristic literary style also extends the appeal to his authority as a great, exemplary writer. Montaigne is referred to, not only because his conception of fairness supports La Bruyère's views, but also as a writer whose works have considerably shaped the mindsets of generations of writers and readers. It is possible to see the pastiche as La Bruyère's acknowledgement of his indebtedness to and affinity with Montaigne, whose *Essais* were one of the sources of inspiration for La Bruyère's analyses of the manners and mores of his time. However, the difference between his own sharp, authoritative writing and Montaigne's personal, chatty style makes it difficult to regard the pastiche merely as homage. Earlier in *Les Carac-*

ture, but if one chooses to discuss them as pastiches, one should be aware of the possibly anachronistic implications of that terminological choice.

tères, La Bruyère had criticised people who decorate their message with unnecessary flourishes and digressions. If you want to point out the fact that it is raining, you should simply say “It rains” (176-77). Everything else is superfluous. Juxtaposed to such matter-of-fact aesthetics, the circumlocutory style of Montaigne is inevitably rendered somewhat ludicrous, and therefore the pastiche has been interpreted as mockery of Montaigne. In *Éléments de littérature*, Marmontel writes:

Voilà certainement bien le langage de Montaigne, mais diffus, et tournant sans cesse autour de la même pensée. [. . .] Montaigne cause quelquefois nonchalamment et longuement: c’est ce que la Bruyère en a copié, le défaut. (3: 89)

Here we have unquestionably Montaigne’s language, but diffuse and endlessly circling around the same idea. [. . .] At times, Montaigne’s discourse is casual and long-winded: that is what La Bruyère imitated, the flaw. (Qtd. in Genette, *Palimpsests* 99)

The pastiche is thus characterised by a fundamental ambiguity. On the one hand, it makes appeal to a moral and literary authority who is evoked to support the views of the pasticheur. On the other hand, this appeal is rendered suspect by the deliberate stylistic contrast that gives the style of the author being imitated an air of the ridiculous. While Marmontel took a rather negative view of such treatment of a canonical writer, later commentators have interpreted the pastiche more positively as a piece of creative criticism. As in this case, pastiche is often a conflation of homage and criticism, which is one of the aspects that lend it its characteristic edgy doubleness.⁶

⁶ This doubleness as well as the temporal distance from the time of its publication poses a challenge to the interpretation of La Bruyère’s pastiche. In *Palimpsestes*, which includes one of the most influential accounts of literary pastiche in the twentieth century, Gérard Genette claims that he cannot see any satire in this passage, which he regards as a faithful pastiche of the style of Montaigne (130). In my opinion, he misses the point somewhat: although the pastiche does not distort or ridicule the stylistic traits of Montaigne’s writing (indeed, it is easy to find examples of such labyrinthine sentences in his works), its presentation in the context of a stylistically different work creates a contrast that makes Montaigne’s style appear somewhat ludicrous. In *The Politics of Pastiche from Proust to French Film*,

This conception of pastiche and its functions will seem somewhat unfamiliar in the context of postmodern cultural theory, where the term is associated with the ways in which contemporary culture recycles the past. Fredric Jameson's seminal 1984 essay "Postmodernism, or the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism," which introduces it as a "cultural dominant," has made pastiche become one of the keywords of postmodernism. Often grouped with other "postmodern effects" – such as irony, parody, cliché, hybrid, mimicry, simulacrum and so forth – it is associated with a sense of cultural condition rather than with actual practices. Thus postmodern pastiche is not usually understood as the reworking of an identified source text, pertaining instead to a larger cultural tendency to recycle elements from the past in altered contexts (McGowan 22).

Like Jameson, many other critics have seen this tendency as a deplorable one. On this view, postmodern pastiche means the radical limitation of expressive possibilities. Artists, filmmakers, authors, copywriters and others in the cultural field turn to the past instead of searching for contemporary means and styles to represent the present moment in its full, deep historicity. Postmodern pastiche is consequently associated with the conservative forces in cultural politics that shy away from urgent contemporary issues – such as the challenges of the new global economy and multiculturalism – or offer flaccid, nostalgic solutions to them. A contrastive view regards pastiche as a positive and critical force in contemporary culture because of its ability to invoke and reinterpret the past in ways which offer new perspectives on the contemporary condition. For example, according to Ihab Hassan, pastiche

enrich[es] *re*-presentation. In this view image or replica may be as valid as its model [. . .], may even bring an '*augment d'être*.' This makes for a

James F. Austin assesses the quality of La Bruyère's rendering of Montaigne's style and finds it unconvincing (100). It is difficult to measure the success of a pastiche (especially when it is a three-sentence rendering of the style of a massive three-volume work), but for those who would like to engage in close comparative analysis, I recommend Montaigne's "De la presumption" (essay 17 of vol. 2) as a point of comparison.

different concept of tradition, one in which continuity and discontinuity, high and low culture, mingle not to imitate but to expand the past in the present. In that plural present, all styles are dialectically available in an interplay between Now and the Not Now, the Same and the Other. (170-71, emphases original)

Along with other previously undervalued forms, pastiche has been legitimised in postmodernism in the name of plurality which challenges those values and boundaries that have previously restrained cultural production.

These preliminary examples, the seventeenth-century Montaigne pastiche and the brief overview of some of the main lines of the postmodern debate on pastiche, illustrate the scope of enquiry that opens up when one turns one's attention to pastiche. This study arose from the need to understand the continuities and discontinuities between the various practices and conceptions of pastiche. More specifically, I became interested in what I perceived as a problematic discrepancy between the ambitious claims of postmodern theory and the predominantly French tradition of pastiche writing and criticism, where stylistic imitations of the kind composed by La Bruyère are common and where critics long before postmodernism have considered various aspects of this peculiar imitative practice. In order to understand how these two conceptions – the inclusive cultural “dominant” and the specialist term denoting a particular imitative practice – came about, it seemed to me necessary to trace the vagaries of the concept of pastiche from its origin to postmodernism and beyond. While pastiche, in particular its postmodern variant, has been called a “terminological minefield” (J. B. Foster 109), I do not think that we ought to abandon the concept or ignore its potential to illuminate cultural practices in the face of the existing critical complications, some of which are merely the result of unnecessary confusions or prejudices.

The history of pastiche, like the history of many other critical concepts, is not a teleological process tending towards completion. The changing aesthetic and ideological paradigms have adopted the term for their own purposes, making the history of

the concept discontinuous and fragmentary, but also multilayered: the same features or ideas are re-invoked in different contexts, often without knowledge of or reference to the earlier discussions. Examining the ways in which the concept has been used over the course of the centuries will not only clarify the present terminological and theoretical confusions, but also offer a background for what I hope will be a more balanced conception of pastiche, a conception rooted in the history of the term as well as relevant to the practices that go by that name.

In this study, the practices under scrutiny are those of literary pastiche. Literature is sometimes seen as the art form in which the uses and traditions of pastiche are the strongest.⁷ Only in literature and music has pastiche acquired what could be termed generic status: in other words, it is used to refer to a relatively distinct set of practices, a usage shared by authors/composers, audience and critics alike. In contrast to music, where *pasticcio* refers to a historical form of opera,⁸ pastiche in literature has not been confined to one genre and period only, but has remained a living practice in prose, poetry and drama, at times less popular, at times (like today) more so.

This medium-specific perspective differs from the postmodern conception of pastiche as a cultural phenomenon in a general sense, extending from art to architecture, film to literature, advertisements to industrial design. While I believe that comparative perspectives can be valuable in the study of pastiche, they are in practice often rendered problematic by virtue of their tendency to ignore the historical differences between the arts and to disregard the possibilities and constraints of their various media.⁹ In so far

⁷ See the appendix to the present work; Dyer, *Pastiche* 51-52; Hoesterey, *Pastiche* 80.

⁸ The original Italian form of the term has been retained in music. For details about the musical *pasticcio*, see p. 35.

⁹ Moreover, since the study of pastiche often requires a certain amount of knowledge of the traditions of the art form in question as well as considerable sensitivity to its practices, I have chosen to concentrate on literature, the field I am most familiar with. See also Dyer (*Pastiche* 93) for a comment on the competence required in the study of pastiches.

as pastiche is associated with the imitation or appropriation of style, it is inevitably challenged by the lack of a universal conception of style that could encompass the expressive differences of the various arts (see Ross 232-33). Despite my focus on one art form, I hope and believe that the present work will also be useful to readers interested in other arts, who can use their own expertise to draw parallels between the various art forms and cultural practices.

The title of this study, *Double-Edged Imitation*, refers to what I see as the most characteristic feature of pastiche as a literary practice. Literary pastiche is a form of imitation that cuts both ways: while it resurrects an earlier style, it also tends to question the status and value of that style. As La Bruyère's Montaigne pastiche illustrates, the evocation of the style of another writer may be interpreted as both homage *and* criticism. Similarly, when a pastiche imitates not an individual style but the characteristic style of another period, that period is often evoked for complex reasons involving both admiration and critical commentary. By disconnecting a style from its context, pastiche even calls into question the received notion of authorship based on the problematic conflation of originality, stylistic unity and authority.¹⁰ At the same time, however, pastiche is an example of how the present literature system – the ways of producing, circulating, reading and evaluating literature – depends on a notion of strong authorship and the ability to attribute styles to individual writers. Neither tendency can be identified as dominant; hence the particular and unavoidable ambiguity of the pastiche.

Duality and doubleness are often associated with parody (e.g., Hutcheon, *A Theory of Parody* 32-34), with which pastiche shares a number of characteristics, but from which it differs, among other things, by virtue of its close affinity with the source text, the style of which it reproduces in detail. In parody, as in pastiche, the duality results from the paradoxical adherence to and differentiation

¹⁰ A polemical but illustrative account of this conflation can be found in Foucault's article "Qu'est-ce qu'un auteur."

from an existing model. In some respects this tension is relevant in all literature and art. As Jonathan Culler writes:

Literature is a paradoxical institution because to create literature is to write according to existing formulas – to produce something that looks like a sonnet or that follows the conventions of the novel – but it is also to flout those conventions, to go beyond them. Literature is an institution that lives by exposing and criticizing its own limits, by testing what will happen if one writes differently. (40)

Pastiche is one particular way in which writers invent boundaries in order to think and write differently¹¹ and, even if they sincerely try to remain as faithful to the source style as they can, they will inevitably create differences that will put the imitation into an ambiguous relationship with its model.

The double-edgedness of pastiche can extend beyond literary questions. For instance, the confluence of the opposing modes of homage and criticism does not fully explain the ambiguity of the pastiche of *Les Caractères*. It is obvious that the gist of the text lies in the critique of the kind of pretentiousness that makes people compare themselves to others and impose social hierarchies on the basis of various merits and virtues. Both La Bruyère and Montaigne (as La Bruyère interprets him) are in favour of equality and straightforwardness in social interactions. Yet this attitude seems to be in a curious contradiction with its textual expression: does not the juxtaposition of the two different styles set up precisely the kind of hierarchical comparison and evaluation as is expressly criticised in the text? By contrasting his own concise style with the verbosity of Montaigne, La Bruyère in fact stages a situation where his style will be seen as the superior one. The presentation undercuts the moral message in a way that draws attention to a larger issue at stake in *Les Caractères*, namely the discord between what people or things truly are and what they appear to be. According to Jean Alter, who has analysed the relation between power and literature in late seventeenth-century France, La

¹¹ Hence it is not surprising that the writers of the Oulipo group were interested in pastiche (see Bénabou; Bisenius-Penin).

Bruyère's "portraits, stories, group tableaux, essays [. . .] evoke personalities defined by the absence of a true personality, fashions and games as role models, discrete idioms and meaningless formulas, and all manner of deceit by which real power corrupts the social system without disturbing its surface order" (307). Morally and textually ambiguous, the pastiche performs the contradiction at the heart of La Bruyère's account of the manners and mores of his time.¹²

The double-edgedness of pastiche also extends to its reception, which is often characterised by puzzlement. Unlike parody, in which the characteristic "parodic" tone (however difficult that is to define) gives us an idea of how to interpret the work, in pastiche such indicators of the motivation or purpose of the imitation are often few or more uncertain than in parody, and they are always to some extent counteracted by the irreducible ambiguity of this literary form. Reading a pastiche can be an estranging experience, although paradoxically based on a sense of familiarity: in order to become aware that we are reading a pastiche, we need to recognise the imitative quality of the text. In an ideal case, the reader of a pastiche shares enough of the pasticheur's cultural background to be able to reflect the imitation against her own experience or preconception of the style being imitated. Although the effect of pastiche has been compared to the Freudian notion of the Uncanny (e.g., Jameson, "Postmodernism" 70), in my view it lacks the sinister undertones of that awkward feeling. I am thus more inclined to sympathise with Richard Dyer's conception, according to which pastiche creates in its audience a feeling of familiarity which opens a way to knowledge about the way in which expressions, images and cultural forms are historically constructed (*Pastiche* 178-79). Thus one aspect of the doubleness of pastiche is that it brings together emotions and knowledge which our culture often strives to keep apart or set in opposition to each other.

The full extent of the double-edgedness of pastiche becomes apparent only when we look at actual examples of pastiches in

¹² The performative aspects of pastiche have only recently attracted some attention. See esp. Austin (90-118).

their contexts. Although “theories” and “practices” are separated in the subtitle as well as in the structure of this work, the distinction is intended as a heuristic one: in fact, theories and practices exist necessarily and unavoidably in interaction. Hence I will draw from many kinds of literary pastiche – prose and poetry, literary fiction and entertainment, contemporary literature and historical examples – to illustrate the multifacetedness of this strangely redundant and slyly creative form.

A few terminological notes are in order before I turn to an overview of the substance of this study. As the example of La Bruyère illustrates, I take the term pastiche to mean the acknowledged imitation of a recognisable style (usually the style of another writer, but not necessarily: pastiche can imitate generic and period styles too). Pastiche is thus primarily concerned with stylistic matters, but not in a narrowly linguistic sense: La Bruyère has not only imitated Montaigne’s language but also the emotions and ideas it gives expression to. My choice of the term *source text* (or *source*) also calls for a brief comment here. Although not particularly familiar in literary studies, it is commonly used in translation studies to designate the translated text as distinct from the translation, the target text. I would like to retain the ideas of transformation and movement from one context to another inherent in this distinction, although in the case of pastiche the source text is less easily pointed out than in translation.¹³ Pastiche imitates a style, but that style does not exist in the abstract: it belongs to a text, a discourse, a corpus of texts. The singular term – source text – thus usually covers a number of texts, such as the oeuvre of a writer or the textual material from which arises a conception of a period style. Although I occasionally use the term *original*, that term is too biased towards the so-called romantic conception of the value of art to be entirely satisfactory. Other possibilities such as *model* or *target* have their problems too: model implies straightforward copying, while target suggests that the activity of pastiche is directed at the text being imitated. In practice, pasticheurs often

¹³ For a brief discussion of the source-target theory and its implications in the field of translation, see Chesterman (8).

use the source text for other purposes: imitation becomes a means rather than a target as such. *Intertext* may be misleading since pastiches can have other intertexts in addition to the source text, and the terms introduced by Gérard Genette, *hypertext* and *hypotext*, would imply the adoption of his views on pastiche and other forms of what he calls “hypertextuality” (see p. 96).

Part one of this study is devoted to the history of the concept of pastiche, beginning with what I call its “prehistory,” the context in which it first emerged as a term of art criticism and later as a literary critical term.¹⁴ The history of pastiche is not well known: the existing studies are often brief and cite the same sources, usually Wido Hempel’s article “Parodie, Travestie und Pastiche: zur Geschichte von Wort und Sache” which was published in 1965. Many influential sources of pastiche criticism have been forgotten or lost, most importantly the inaugural definition by Roger de Piles, which has until now been cited inaccurately from second-hand sources. The lack of recorded history has led some critics to give special prominence to the etymology of the term (*pasticcio*, a pie of mixed ingredients) as a source of the term’s meaning. However, these attempts are, in my view, slightly misguided: the etymological origin, while important to the emergence of the term, does not offer a shortcut to its meaning today.¹⁵ Although my survey of the uses of “pastiche” in academic discourse from the end of the seventeenth century to the present is not meant to be exhaustive, it is nevertheless the most detailed account of the matter so far.

In this task, I have been inspired by the approaches of conceptual history (*Begriffsgeschichte*) which draws attention to how concepts are created, how they are given new meanings and how these meanings and the ways of using the concept become the fo-

¹⁴ Although the word *concept* is sometimes used to refer to a set of theoretical assumptions, and the word *term* to designate the linguistic expression of the concept, I do not follow this distinction. In this study, the words *concept* and *term* are used interchangeably.

¹⁵ Witness also the difficulties involved in trying to relate concepts such as parody and satire to their etymologies: for parody, see Rose, *Parody: Ancient, Modern, Postmodern* (6-19); for satire, see Ullman, and Rooy (esp. 1-29).

cus of a debate (see, e.g., Bödeker). This means taking into consideration the different ways concepts have been used in various contexts and genres. Although my investigation for the most part remains within the boundaries of what can loosely (and in part anachronistically) be defined as literary criticism, I take other uses into consideration as well, which can be seen in the generic plurality of the texts examined in part one. Rather than trying to find the immutable essence of pastiche in these various sources, I will look at ways in which its meaning has been constructed and transformed in the critical debates over the centuries.

A history of the concept of pastiche would need to be complemented by a study of the literary form: how and to what ends has pastiche been used in literature? So far we only have studies of pastiche in French literature, the most comprehensive of which are Paul Aron's recent *Histoire du pastiche* (2008) and the annotated bibliography of nineteenth- and twentieth-century pastiches and parodies compiled by Aron and Jacques Espagnon (2009).¹⁶ Pastiche is often embedded in other works, as is the case with La Bruyère's Montaigne pastiche, or, if published independently, their circulation might be limited, which makes such historical enquiries challenging. Moreover, since they often imitate works that are in vogue in their own time or comment on topical affairs, they readily fall into oblivion. If the source text is no longer read and known, the pastiche loses much of its point or may even become incomprehensible. While an extensive enquiry into the history of pastiche as a literary form lies beyond the scope of this work, the examples of pastiche literature discussed in the critical works considered in part one will serve to illustrate some of the historical changes in the uses of pastiche in literature.

One of my main observations in charting the history of the concept of pastiche pertains to a gap between the French tradition of pastiche criticism, which developed in interaction with the literary practices of imitation, and the influential contemporary Anglophone criticism. In the appendix, "On the Meaning of 'Pastiche'"

¹⁶ For useful bibliographies on French pastiches and literary critical works discussing pastiche, see *Pastiches, collages et autres réécritures* (232-48).

and Its Variants in Different European Languages,” I suggest that the breach extends beyond orientational differences to those of semantics and illustrate how the uses of pastiche in other European languages differ from the uses of the term in English. Indeed, it seems to me that the different aspects taken into consideration in the two academic cultures derive in a fundamental way from the differences in how the meaning of the word has been understood in the respective languages.

Part two discusses the theoretical distinction between the two notions of pastiche, which I term stylistic pastiche and compilation pastiche. Moving on to look more carefully into the conditions of stylistic pastiche, which I see as the more useful and the more tenable of the two, I identify stylistic specificity and explicitness of imitation as its primary distinctive elements. These distinguish it from many other intertextual practices, although various forms of imitation and appropriation often overlap, as I point out in chapter 2.2, where pastiche is discussed in the context of related terms, most notably parody, with which it is often associated. The last chapter of this part is devoted to the closer analysis of the ways in which the double-edgedness of pastiche is manifested. I shall look at the phenomenon in relation to the concepts of repetition and originality and conclude by pointing out how pastiche can, owing to its inevitable duality, function as a test laboratory in which (or with which) writers can test the limits of fiction.

The discussions in part two draw from two areas of literary study in particular. I side with the kind of literary study that emphasises the role of rewritings and investigates the ways in which ideas, myths, stories and, in the case of pastiche, styles are communicated and distributed in a culture. Since such activity cannot be investigated from a narrowly textual perspective, I have taken into account the ways in which pastiches are published, marketed and received.¹⁷ As to the double-edgedness of pastiche, my analysis has been informed by the poststructuralist suspicion

¹⁷ Since the reception of pastiches, in particular their emotional impact on the audience, has been usefully studied by Richard Dyer in *Pastiche*, I shall spend less time on it.

of origin and the critical analyses of the hierarchical relationship between origin and repetition. In my view, pastiche shows this relationship to be dialectical rather than hierarchical, since pastiche in some respects creates the origin it purportedly imitates.

Part three of this study is devoted to more detailed analyses of three different cases of pastiche. They represent the most common forms of literary pastiche: anthology pastiche, continuation pastiche and embedded pastiche. Marcel Proust, whom I analyse in the first chapter of this section, is a good example of a writer for whom pastiche was not merely a one-off digression, but a form to which he returned at various stages of his writing career. He regarded pastiche as a synthesis of the style and worldview of the author being imitated and juxtaposed it with the analytical practice of literary criticism. In addition, he also likened pastiche to metaphorical transfer whereby new connections are established between previously separate contexts. The latter aspect, which has not been very much commented on, will prove important for my analysis of Proust's pastiches of Henri de Régnier, Hippolyte Taine and the Goncourt brothers.

The analyses of the Sherlock Holmes pastiches by Michael Dibdin, Nicholas Meyer and the duo Adrian Conan Doyle and John Dickson Carr in chapter 3.2 question the idea that issues of authorship and imitation are different in popular literature from literary fiction and shed new light on the notion of detective fiction as a particularly "bookish" genre. All three examples highlight the awkward situation of writing in the shadow of an influential model. The *corrective pastiches* of Dibdin and Meyer set out to replace and invalidate their intertexts, while the *complementary pastiches* of Doyle and Carr continue the original series in an apparently straightforward manner.

In the last chapter, I shall turn to one of the most prominent forms of pastiche in contemporary literature, the revival of Victorian styles in British fiction. In the two novels I analyse, A.S. Byatt's *Possession* and D.M. Thomas's *Charlotte*, the pastiches of Victorian literature are used for multiple purposes. Pastiche is a literary form in which the Victorian past can be heard and experienced,

but it is also a way to evoke political and ideological issues, such as the limitations imposed upon creative women. In both novels, a Victorian narrative is juxtaposed with a contemporary one, and by creating contrasts and continuities between the two narrative levels, the novels establish a set of connecting metaphors or analogies which reflect on the nature of pastiche as a double-edged literary form.

While these three sets of examples show the uses of pastiche in different contexts, their point is not merely illustrative: through them I demonstrate how in literary works pastiche is used in ways that sometimes give a more thorough or nuanced picture of the potential (and limitations) of this literary form than theoretically oriented criticism has been able to do.

The main objectives of my study can be summarised as follows. I shall contextualise pastiche first by setting it in the historical context where the term emerged and developed, and, second, by analysing the pastiche fictions in the contexts in which they were produced in order to better understand the concerns which they address or which they raise. From this perspective, pastiche appears to be a much more adaptable literary phenomenon than it is usually credited for. In arguing for certain conceptual clarifications, my aim is to show that pastiche can be a useful concept in discussing a particular form of stylistic imitation. While not very common, this literary form can nevertheless offer valuable insights into the ingrained ways of thinking about originality and literary value, as well as fostering critical thinking beyond the impasses of rigid evaluations and towards a more nuanced understanding of the ambiguities or paradoxes on which literature as a form of expression and cultural institution is based.

PART I: HISTORY

An interesting complication characterising the critical discussion on pastiche pertains to the history of the concept. Some critics have suggested that pastiche is a recent addition in the critical vocabulary, others claim that it hails from late modernism or that its origin lies in an apocryphal seventeenth-century source.¹ Its origin has been traced variously to parody, forgery and the ancient cento.² All these mutually incompatible conceptions are founded in some kind of understanding of where the term comes from and what it means but, in the absence of a more detailed study of the history of the concept, it has been difficult to assess their significance and reliability. The existing histories of the concept are concise and mostly based on second-hand sources; moreover, they do not shed light on the context in which the term emerged.³

This background, which I shall explore in the first chapter, is however fundamental to the understanding of the early definitions and uses of the concept. Even if the scarcity of sources available leaves a number of issues in the realm of speculation,⁴ it is possi-

¹ E.g., in *Defective Inspectors*, Simon Kemp suggests that “[t]he entry of *pastiche* into critical vocabulary is a comparatively recent event” and mentions Genette’s *Palimpsestes* as one of the first serious attempts to define it (18, emphasis original). Fredric Jameson derives the term from Thomas Mann (see chapter 1.3), and Ingeborg Hoesterey draws a blank when attempting to trace the origin of the first known definition of pastiche (*Pastiche* 4-5).

² E.g., Daniel Compère claims that pastiche derives from parody (“Je suis l’Autre” 99); Margaret Rose discusses what she sees as the erroneous association of pastiche with forgery (“Post-Modern Pastiche” 31), and Ingeborg Hoesterey treats it as a modern form of cento (*Pastiche passim*). For a definition of cento, see p. 116.

³ Wido Hempel’s account from the 1960s is still a useful source (esp. 167-76). Another, slightly updated but not altogether reliable history can be found in Hoesterey’s *Pastiche* (1-15). If the history of the concept has remained a somewhat unexplored ground, the history of pastiche as a literary phenomenon has by contrast attracted more attention. See, e.g., *Histoire du pastiche* by Paul Aron.

⁴ An interesting and important area of further study would be the transition of the term pastiche from Italian to French.

ble to identify some of the main currents of thought and developments in the material and institutional frameworks that shaped the emerging concept of pastiche in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. An investigation of these conditions will help to illustrate two essential points: that pastiche is a *modern* phenomenon which differs in crucial respects from the older practices of imitation of past masters, and that its emergence coincides with the construction of modern authorship. However, the heritage of neoclassical imitation also shaped ideas of pastiche up until the early twentieth century. By beginning my investigation into the history of the concept pastiche with its background in chapter 1.1, I wish to emphasise the contradictory impulses governing the emergence of this term.

The marginal status of pastiche means that critics have often commented on it in passing, as a digression from another topic. This explains the heterogeneity of sources and perspectives discussed in chapters 1.2 and 1.3, where I trace the career of pastiche as a critical concept. Its history is characterised by discontinuities and repetitions, as critics have not always been aware of the work of others. The same ideas and insights recur in the discussion, each time discovered anew. It is nevertheless possible to discern a number of periods of heightened interest in the concept or important shifts in its meaning. In the eighteenth century the concept emerged in the context of art criticism from which it was adopted into literary discourse. In the following century pastiche became to be seen as a form of literary criticism, a notion further developed by early twentieth-century writers, who also draw attention to the affinities between pastiche and parody. In the latter half of the twentieth century structuralists paid attention to the textual means in which pastiche establishes its relationship to the source text, and postmodern theory reintroduced the term to designate what was perceived as an important tendency in contemporary culture.

1.1 The Prehistory of Pastiche

The Tradition of Imitation

Imitation of other writers and other styles has as long a history as literature itself. It has been one of the main tenets of Western literature since antiquity, although the motives, targets and functions of imitation have been interpreted and evaluated differently at different times. The Latin term *imitatio* and its cognates have been and are widely used as translations for the complex Greek term *mimesis*, which touches upon the basics of art and representation: the rendering of reality with the means and structures particular to each art. Yet the term imitation has also come to mean more specifically the emulation of an earlier work, or the “method of translating looser than paraphrase, in which modern examples and illustrations are used for ancient, or domestick for foreign,” as Dr. Johnson defines it in *A Dictionary of the English Language*. This sense of the term was coupled with the Aristotelian idea of behavioural mimesis, or the natural capacity of humans to learn by observing and imitating others (Aristotle 1448b5-8; Halliwell 293n). Hence the pedagogical value ascribed to imitation from early on: in *Ars poetica*, Horace advised aspiring Roman poets to study Greek models day and night (lines 268-69), and Longinus, or the anonymous author of *On the Sublime*, advocated “zealous imitation of the great prose writers and poets of the past” (XIII, 2) as a way to acquire greatness of style.

The advice of Horace and Longinus was paramount to the institutionalisation of what I shall call *traditional* or *classical imitation*, namely, the practice of taking earlier, established literary works as models of literary creation. The importance of imitation is evident in the way in which ancient and, in consequence, much of later European literature, builds upon imitation and variation. Imitation had a crucial role in the transmission of literary culture. It contributed to the emergence, preservation and development of generic conventions, and was one of the principal means for evaluating and interpreting texts. Writing in the 13th century, St

Bonaventure distinguished between four different ways of making a book:

Sometimes a man writes others' words, adding nothing and changing nothing; and he is simply called a scribe [*scriptor*]. Sometimes a man writes others' words, putting together passages which are not his own; and he is called a compiler [*compilator*]. Sometimes a man writes both others' words and his own, but with the others' words in prime place and his own added only for purposes of clarification; and he is called not an author but a commentator [*commentator*]. Sometimes a man writes both his own words and others', but with his own in prime place and others' added only for purposes of confirmation; and he should be called an author [*auctor*]. (Qtd. in Burrow 31)

In this system, all literary production is based on the reworking of existing works. Another example of medieval poetics, the so-called *rota Virgilii* (the wheel of Virgil) illustrates the extension and types of dependence on earlier literature. The *rota Virgilii* offered a classification of genres based on a system of correspondences in which Virgil's three main works (*Aeneid*, *Georgics* and *Bucolics*) serve as examples of the three registers of style (grand, middle, plain) and their characteristic elements. These divisions were established as the parameters for literary invention.⁵ New innovations were carefully fitted into the existing classical system and, if possible, related to suitable ancient or ecclesiastical models. The *rota Virgilii* illustrates the constancy of literary topics and values in medieval poetics in that the world described in literature and the styles and means in which it was rendered were, to a great extent, conceived of as perpetual and unchanging.

The imperative of imitation was reformulated by neoclassicists like Nicolas Boileau and Alexander Pope, who returned to the Aristotelian conception of art as the imitation of nature, by which they meant not nature as it appears to the senses, but nature purged and rearranged to correspond to the ideal of nature which was considered to be the true (*vrai*) one. Thus art was to be essentially illusionist. Imitation was selective and guided by moral and aesthetic criteria which were drawn from or attributed to an-

⁵ For the importance of *rota Virgilii* for Medieval poetics, see Mehtonen (106-11).

cient *auctores*. This neoclassical maxim was famously formulated by Pope in *An Essay on Criticism*: “Learn hence for ancient rules a just esteem;/To copy Nature is to copy them” (249). Although the neoclassical *artes poeticae* stressed decorum and moderation, it is significant that neoclassical authors also favoured satire and parody, imitative forms which deliberately transgress the limits of good style. Indeed, the ideal of imitation, as authoritatively as it was asserted, was constantly under debate. The famous quarrel of the Ancients and the Moderns in France (from the 1680s onwards) centred on the question of whether writers should continue revering ancient models or should recognise the independence of their own time from the classical tradition and try to initiate new literary forms (such as fairy tales published by the leading Modern, Charles Perrault). This debate reflects a division of imitation at the heart of the classical paradigm. Horace had already warned aspiring young writers against “slavish imitation” (lines 133-34), which was contrasted to imitation proper or the kind of imitation in which the borrowed material was treated creatively (see, e.g., Leclerc 223). Servile imitation was not criticised only because of its unproductive dependence on previous works but also because it encouraged bad characteristics in the imitator, as Abbé Du Bos, one of the earliest commentators on pastiche, pointed out: “A servile imitator will naturally fall short of his model, because he adds his own faults to those of the person he imitates” (*Critical Reflections* 2: 46).⁶

The degrees of imitation are reflected in neoclassical terminology and even beyond, given the persistence of neoclassical influence in French culture. Alongside *imitation* other terms used were

contrefaçon (imitation; also forgery, illegal copy; sometimes parody)

copie (copy; sometimes the result of “servile imitation”)

fausseté (imitation, esp. in the derogatory sense of Plato’s *Republic*; dissimulation)

⁶ “L’imitateur servile doit demeurer au-dessous de son modele, parce qu’il joint ses propres défauts aux défauts de celui qu’il imite.” (*Reflexions critiques* 2: 63)

singerie (from *singer*, 'to ape': bad imitation; caricature; satirical imitation)

vraisemblance (verisimilitude; imitation which aspired to the ideal truth, *le vrai*) (cf. *Le Grand Robert*).

Diderot and d'Alembert's *Encyclopédie* distinguishes between the key terms as follows: "One imitates what one respects, copies if one is sterile, parodies (*contrefaire*) for fun. One imitates the writings, copies paintings and parodies persons. One imitates by prettifying, one copies in a servile manner, one parodies by changing" (4: 133).⁷ In neoclassicism, degrees of imitation thus ranged from Platonic bad copies and servile imitation to correspondence with ideal truth. These notions, as well as the distinction between servile and creative imitation, form an important context for the early definitions of pastiche in the eighteenth century, as I will point out in chapter 1.2.

Thus in traditional imitation the focus was on the generic aspects of the model. The aim was not to write like Homer but to write in the finest epic style of which Homer was thought to be the best example or to imitate the epic conventions established in Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. As Gérard Genette explains, "[t]he poetic consciousness of neoclassicism, practically as soon as it perceived a given stylistic feature, interpreted and converted it – and thereby absorbed it – into a timeless generic character"⁸ (*Palimpsests* 90). Style in neoclassicism was usually understood as a matter of selection from a pre-existing stock of models corresponding to a genre, while in the aesthetics of romanticism it came to be associated with the particular expression of the individual genius (Compagnon 201; Rogers 373). The emphasis on genre and general stylistic features, as well as on the universal quality and truth-

⁷ "On *imite* par estime, on *copie* par stérilité, on *contrefait* par amusement. On *imite* les écrits, on *copie* les tableaux, on *contrefait* les personnes. On *imite* en embellissant, on *copie* servilement; on *contrefait* en changeant." I am grateful to Dr. Dara Connolly and Aino Rajala for advice and assistance with the translations from French to English.

⁸ "Dans la conscience poétique du classicisme, tout trait stylistique individuel est, pour ainsi dire aussitôt que perçu, interprété et converti, et par là résorbé, en caractéristique générique intemporelle" (*Palimpsests* 117-18).

fulness attainable in or through them marks a significant difference in orientation between classical imitation and modern pastiche. In pastiche, the focus is on the particular, the individual style of the author or the characteristic traits of the school, which are rendered in detail (Leclerc 133). While traditional imitation concentrates on what is exemplary in the source text, pastiche focuses on the particular, including quirks, mannerisms, and breaches in style – in short, those features which would be termed “mistakes” or “faults” in neoclassical vocabulary. Pastiche operates at the material level of language while classical imitation often aspires to the ideal manifested in the constancy and value of the ancients. Moreover, while in classical imitation the imitator takes ancient authors or, more generally, canonised writers as models, the target of pastiche may be any text or style provided that it can be recognised in imitation by the readers; thus its targets also include works of contemporary literature. Appealing to the tradition of ancient authors conveys authority to subsequent writers and elevates their status and, although a similar effect is sought after in pastiches, the authority is always simultaneously under suspicion: as a rewriting, pastiche derives its meaning in the first instance from its connection to the source text, but by imitating its particular style pastiche detracts from its literary value insofar as individuality of style is thought to be a key component of literary value.

However, the two types of imitation – classical imitation and pastiche – have a great deal in common. In fact, the earliest notions of pastiche arose from a neoclassical context interspersed with new ideas about individual expression and new commercial concerns. The neoclassical aesthetic underwent not a radical or sudden but an extended and gradual re-evaluation during the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries (see Rastier 264-68). The distinction between pastiche and classical imitation sketched above was not evident from the beginning but became established by and by. Neither is there a clear change in the practice of imitation, since earlier literature abounds with examples which could retrospectively – and anachronistically – be called pastiches. Sev-

eral critics, for instance, Remy de Gourmont, Wido Hempel and Alexander Kudelin, have used the term to describe works that precede the term's time of emergence. As Paul Aron reminds us in *Du pastiche, de la parodie et de quelques notions connexes*, the techniques pastiche employs were not new; what was new, was the ways and ends to which these imitative and transformative techniques were used (45). In order to become a distinctive practice, pastiche had to spread across the whole of literary culture and this dissemination took time. Various sectors of the literary culture develop at different pace: for instance, literature teaching is seldom found in the avant-garde of new developments, and by virtue of its influence it can for instance help to hold back the tastes of the reading audience in face of innovative new forms. The ability of educational systems to incorporate selectively newer ideas into older ones is apparent for instance in the endurance and development of imitation exercises in French schools, a topic to which I shall return in chapter 1.2.

Although I have sought to emphasise here the relative differences in the orientations of the two kinds of imitation, pastiche shares the negative evaluation ascribed to imitation in modern aesthetics. In *The Aesthetics of Mimesis*, Stephen Halliwell remarks on the change in the meaning of imitation in modern times:

Where once, in a neoclassical intellectual setting, 'imitation' could, in the hands of the most subtle writers, possess a suppleness of meaning and resonance that it 'borrowed,' so to speak, from the philosophical weight of tradition that lay behind ancient mimeticism, the standard modern significance of imitation tends almost inevitably to imply, often with pejorative force, a limited exercise in copying, superficial replication, or counterfeiting of an externally 'given' model. (14)

Pastiche too has been seen as a problematic practice in a time which increasingly values innovation and originality. While classical imitation stressed tradition and heritage, the new aesthetic of originality sought to obscure origins and filiations, hence making a heavily intertextual practice like pastiche appear trivial.

Copyright Laws and Modern Authorship

The eighteenth century, which saw the establishment of pastiche as a term of art, was also a time when the social, legal and aesthetic conditions of authorship were subject to considerable changes. The eighteenth century witnessed the emergence of the professional author⁹ who negotiated his living not only with patrons but also – and increasingly – with publishers and printers. Books became profitable merchandise and subject to state regulations, at first in the form of royal printing privileges, then in the form of statutes and laws which gradually reinforced the authors' rights to their works. Writers formed unions, such as the precursor of today's *Société des auteurs et compositeurs dramatiques* (SACD) initiated by Beaumarchais in 1777, to defend the status of authors against printers and theatre companies benefiting from their work (Gautier 18-19; Leclerc 229). The growing reading audience became more aware of the author's role. Anonymous publishing was still the norm but, as John Mullan has pointed out in his study of anonymity in the English literary history, the authorship of anonymous works was common knowledge in literary circles, and, if the work was well received, the edition following the anonymous first publication often bore the author's name. Especially among the middle classes, the "stigma of print" (Bennett 29, 52) disappeared. It was no longer considered shameful for writers to sell their printing rights and accept royalties from the market sales.

I shall concentrate here on three aspects of this emerging modern authorship which I see as an important context for pastiche. These are the material circumstances of stylistic imitation, the emergence of copyright laws and the new emphasis on originality as the most important artistic quality. A crucial material precondition for modern authorship was the establishment of the printing press in the mid-fifteenth century and the ensuing evolu-

⁹ Bennett observes that the development of a new conception of the author is reflected in the English language: the eighteenth century witnessed a proliferation of terms denoting different aspects of authorship (7). French, by contrast, never developed a similarly extensive vocabulary of authorship.

tion of the literary culture (Leclerc 215-19). The emergence of print culture also paved the way for the emergence of pastiche. Print culture meant the regularisation of the style and form of the work which had been subject to corruption and change in the hands of copyists. Since literary works could be distributed in identical copies for the first time, the whole idea of the identity of the work began to change as questions of meaning and intention became relevant in a new way. Andrew Bennett points out that “the uniformity of the printed book [. . .] led to a desire to express one’s personality, one’s self, to represent oneself as a unique individual” (45). This development provided new opportunities for imitation. In manuscript culture, careful imitation of style would have been subject to the randomness of the version at hand, and in any case, the audience of such imitation would have been severely limited. Although printed literary books long remained the privilege of the wealthy, the new technology enabled a wider and more equal distribution of literature. This led to a saturation of the literary culture, which is a necessary precondition of pastiche. According to Roland Mortier, literary culture in France was sufficiently widespread by the Enlightenment for pastiche to appear (217). The widespread distribution of identical (or near-identical) copies of a text created a context in which the subtle imitation of a recognisable style could be perceived as an independent and meaningful practice.

Printing technology made literature into a commodity and raised the question of whether the author or the printer would benefit from the printing of books. The relative ease of printing books made it possible for owners of presses to profit from successful works by reprinting them. Piracy was a major issue in the eighteenth century, and the undefined status of translations, extended and revised editions of earlier works, and other works using pre-existent material caused problems for printers and authors trying to negotiate in this relatively unregulated market environment (see Febvre and Martin 342-43; Saunders 45). While the scarcity of regulation had a positive effect on the distribution of literary culture, the pressure to govern and limit the production of

books eventually grew stronger. The emerging copyright laws were not, as is sometimes thought, a direct consequence of the emerging aesthetic of originality. The development of copyright legislation in fact preceded romantic ideas of authorship and developed semi-independently from them, as David Saunders repeatedly stresses in his study *Authorship and Copyright*. The fact that copyright legislation developed in different ways in different countries indicates that they were formed under specific ideological and material pressures. For instance, the moral rights of the author became the central concern of *le droit d'auteur* in France, while Anglo-American copyright law centred on the right to print copies. While the two systems have since grown closer, the difference is still visible in the very terms used to denote the protection of intellectual property.¹⁰

The French system of authors' rights is of particular interest as regards pastiche, because it emphasises their moral rights and because it developed at the same time as the idea of pastiche. French legislation was influenced by Enlightenment thinkers such as Denis Diderot, who is also one of the early critics interested in pastiche (see chapter 1.2). Responding to the debate concerning the dissolution of the royal printing monopoly, Enlightenment thinkers began to consider intellectual achievements as something which could be owned (Hesse 114-15). The royal edicts of 1777 and 1778 recognised the author's right to his text for the first time in Western legal history by granting rights of reproduction to both authors and printers (Saunders 83; see also Hesse 111-13). In 1793 these were followed by a law concerning the property rights of authors. This law assigned authors the exclusive right to sell and profit from their works, and imposed financial penalties on the manufacturers and sellers of *contrefaçons* or illegal copies (Bertrand 27-28). This law, which marks the establishment of modern authors' rights, proved a particularly lucid statement on the matter since it remained in use for almost 170 years (Gautier 19-20). Its application in courts shaped the notion of the rights of authors in

¹⁰ See André Bertrand for a concise refutation of the commonly held belief that a fundamental difference exists between the two systems (41-42).

France and abroad, in particular because the French legal system had a considerable effect on the Berne Convention (1886), the first international treaty acknowledging the authors' rights.¹¹

Several aspects of the French legal system resonate with the basic assumptions governing the practice of pastiche. The French system concentrates on the *droit moral*, or the moral right of the author to his or her work. The work is seen as an extension of the author's person and equally deserving of protection. One aspect of the *droit moral* is the right of attribution (*droit de paternité*) which protects the connection between the author and the work by prohibiting the erasure of the author's name in connection to the work, whether it be a question of republication, translation or partial usage. (Of course, since the writer has the right to publish anonymously or pseudonymously, the protection of the name might in practice mean protection of the absence of a name.) Another crucial aspect of *droit moral* pertains to the unity of the work, since the right of integrity (*droit au respect de l'œuvre*) essentially prohibits any changes to the work not authorised by the author (Gautier 149). In legal understanding, a work is characterised primarily by its form of expression; in other words, what is protected is not the ideas but the style and form in which they are expressed, although the distinction between the two is often subtle (Bertrand 162ff; Haarmann 96-99). As a literary practice, pastiche seems to disrespect all these principles: it is often falsely attributed to both the author being imitated and the pasticheur, it might incorporate elements or even long extracts from the original and it usurps the style of the original. Indeed, as will be seen in chapter 1.2, the earliest definitions of pastiche allowed for its deceptive use to the extent that in some cases it remains unclear how to distinguish pastiche from forgery. Although pastiche is nowadays easily distinguished from deliberate deception, one of its functions pertains to

¹¹ The international legislation was advocated, for instance, by an authors' movement led by Victor Hugo. The moral rights of authors were made explicit in the convention in a provision added in 1928.

the investigation of the limits of authorship and authors' rights as defined in legal practice.¹²

The modern French Code de la propriété intellectuelle explicitly makes allowance to pastiche as a practice that does not infringe the rights of the author being imitated. The law states that the author of the original cannot prohibit the publication of pastiches, parodies or caricatures based on his or her work (L122-5). The fact that these three practices are explicitly mentioned has elicited criticism from Pierre-Yves Gautier, a professor of law and a specialist in intellectual property law (239-40). He notes that while each practice has traditionally been assigned to a particular art – pastiche to literature, parody to music, caricature to visual arts – the terms can be easily confused and in his opinion should be abolished. As a provisional solution, Gautier classifies all three as parodies and proceeds to give two sets of criteria for such work. First, it should be clearly distinguishable from the original and devoid of appropriationist intent, such as the wish to benefit from the success of another author's work. Second, while it seeks to ridicule the author being imitated, it should not denigrate him or her. In France, pastiche is thus not only defined in artistic practices and critical discourse but also by legal discourse. Its express recognition in French intellectual property law is, however, an exception which reflects the special status of pastiche in French culture. For instance, the UK Copyright, Designs and Patent Act 1988 grants, in much less precise terms, the right to create and publish adaptations of existing works (Section 76), but it also reserves to the holders of copyright the right to object to "derogatory treatment" of their work in adaptations (Section 80). *Gowers*

¹² See, for instance, the discussion of pastiche under the title of *Questions de littérature légale* (Nodier), or the frequent thematisation of legal aspects in pastiche fictions: Reboux and Muller divorce a writer's creative ideas from his style in their rewriting of Maupassant's "La Parure" in the styles of Dickens, Edmond de Goncourt, Zola and Alphonse Daudet; Patrick Rambaud has published his Duras pastiches under the pseudonym "Marguerite Duraille," which not only twists the author's name – her signature – but also adds a comment on her oeuvre (*duraille* means difficult or mean); Peter Ackroyd's *Chatterton* deconstructs the division between creation and forgery – just to give some examples from twentieth century fiction.

Review of Intellectual Property, commissioned by the Chancellor of the Exchequer and directed by Andrew Gowers, recommended several changes to the UK legislation in 2006, including the creation of “an exception to copyright for the purpose of caricature, parody or pastiche by 2008” (65). The writers of the review justified this addition by pointing out that

an exception to enable parody can create value. Weird Al Yankovic has received 25 gold and platinum albums, four gold-certified home videos and two GRAMMYs® [sic] by parodying other songs, but he had to ask permission from rights holders. Furthermore, many works which are considered to have high value could be considered parodies, for example Tom Stoppard's *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead*. (65)

At present, the exception remains to be implemented. In the USA, parodies and related works are generally treated under the notion of “fair use” as defined in Section 107 of the Copyright Law of the United States; however, since the text of the US law does not explicitly recognise the status of parodies, adaptations and suchlike, the question of whether they merit the protection granted to independent creations has been judged case by case in the courts.¹³

In its focus on the moral rights of the author, the French copyright law corresponded to the evolving conception of originality as the mark of distinction and value in art. The conception of originality is based on a notion of the linear, cumulative development of art, in relation to which an original work appears as something new – “a perfect stranger [. . .] from a foreign land,” as Edward Young described it in *Conjectures on Original Composition* (1759). An original is not merely a new version of an existing work – an imitation of a classic, for instance – but a unique creation based on the imagination of the individual artist or writer. In romanticism, one of the customary analogies of the original writer was God, the origin and creator of the world, omnipresent and

¹³ See Chatman's “Parody and Style” (27-28) and McCutcheon's “The New Defence of Parody and Satire Under Australian Copyright Law” (168-78) for examples of such cases. I wish to thank Samuli Miettinen, LL.M, for useful comments on copyright matters.

solely in charge of the fates of its inhabitants. Divine omnipotence provided the model for artistic genius, as can be observed in Victor Hugo's preface to *Cromwell* (1827), a key text of French romanticism: "Like God, the true poet is present in every part of his work at once. Genius resembles the die which stamps the king's effigy on copper and golden coins alike"¹⁴ (388). The monetary metaphor is perhaps even more apt than Hugo intended: originality had become the desired effect in part because it was a highly marketable value in modern capitalist society. Yet while the metaphor celebrates the vital connection between the author and his or her work, it also reveals one point of contradiction in the romantic theory: genius is compared to the mechanical activity of stamping coins, which deprives individuality its spontaneous, exceptional quality.

Despite its inherent contradictions, the notion of the original author has to a great extent dominated in Western aesthetics from romanticism onwards. Even the famous "death of the author" debate, inaugurated by Michel Foucault and Roland Barthes in the 1960s, failed to overthrow the popular conception of the original author as the source and guarantee of his or her works. In fact, as Séan Burke points out, the debate served to point out the tremendous importance of a notion of authorship to modern Western culture (xvi). Moreover, critical responses to the writings of Foucault and Barthes have pointed out that the "Romantic author is, in a sense, a fiction of subsequent critical reception, a fantasy, a back-formation or 'retrojection' produced through a partial reading of Romantic poetics since in fact Romantic thinking around authorship is precisely constituted in and by conflict, paradox, instability" (Bennett 71). Rather than regarding the author as a repressive authority and an obstacle to the free flow and distribution of texts as Foucault and Barthes did, it is perhaps most helpful to regard the author today, as Alain Brunn suggests, as an "indefinite term which refers to different realities and dissimilar prac-

¹⁴ "Comme Dieu, le vrai poète est présent partout à la fois dans son œuvre. Le génie ressemble au balancier qui imprime l'effigie royale aux pièces de cuivre comme aux écus d'or" ("Préface" 92).

tices, and which also proposes, indirectly but inevitably, a certain definition of what literature ought to be and how it should be treated"¹⁵ (13). As we shall see, the emergence and later phases of the term pastiche are ineluctably tied to the contradictory but nevertheless powerful notion of the original author whose individual manner is both the unifying feature of his or her work and a guarantee of his or her authorship.

¹⁵ “[. . .] un terme flou, qui renvoie à des réalités diverses, à des pratiques dissemblables, et qui pose aussi indirectement mais inévitablement une certaine définition de ce que doit être la littérature, et de la façon dont il convient d’en traiter.”

1.2. Theories of Pastiche from 1699 to the Present

Etymology and Early Definitions

Like so many good things, the term pastiche has its origins in Italian cuisine. *Pasticcio*¹⁶ means a pie filled with various ingredients, usually beef or mutton, vegetables, pasta and spices. According to a traditional recipe recorded in the nineteenth century, the chopped ingredients and macaroni are layered in a buttered pan, covered with pastry and baked in an oven (Artusi 306-07); another common variant of *pasticcio* is a closed pie. The eclectic quality of the filling presumably suggested an affinity with works of art which combined elements from various sources.¹⁷ Battaglia's *Grande dizionario della lingua italiana* cites the mock-heroic poem *La Gigantea* (written in 1547 and published in 1566)¹⁸ and the writings of the critic Francesco Scipione Maffei (1675-1755) as the first occurrences of *pasticcio* in the context of art. In addition to its culinary sense, *pasticcio* also denoted a mess or muddle, negative sense which has persisted to date. It may have contributed to the application of the term in art since eclectic derivative works were considered less valuable than originals or "good" imitations.

From a metaphor based on structural similarity the term evolved into a specialist concept which was used to classify and in many cases to evaluate works of art, probably during the seven-

¹⁶ From the Latin *pasticus* < *pasta*, 'paste'.

¹⁷ Other interpretations have been offered too: Jean-François Jeandillou writes that the idea of heterogeneity in pastiche does not apply to the imitative work but to its ambiguous relationship to the model: "en tant que simulacra artificiellement compose de scories, de fragments démarqués, il se situe au plus près de l'œuvre souche, tout en lui restant extérieur" (*Esthétique* 131). ("[A]s a simulacrum assembled from dross and copied fragments, [pastiche] positions itself as closely as possible to the source work, while remaining outside it.")

¹⁸ The poem, which includes a reference to "nit-picking pedants" who make (or bake) pastiches out of Petrarchs ("fanno in pasticci il Petrarcea"), is often attributed to Girolamo Amelonghi or Benedetto Arrighi. For details, see Zandré, *Cultural Non-Conformity in Early Modern Florence* (87-89, 102). I am grateful to Janne Koskinen and Aino Kostianen for assistance with Italian sources.

teenth and eighteenth centuries. This trajectory was not a straightforward one. In its Italian form, the term was – and still is – applied to a type of popular opera performed between 1650s and 1800. These musical *pasticci* typically consisted of favourite arias welded together with a new libretto. According to Curtis Price in *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, the musical term *pasticcio* came into general use around the year 1730 (213). The musical *pasticci* did not suffer from low reputation since renowned composers such as Vivaldi, Handel, Gluck, Mozart and Haydn rearranged their works into *pasticci* or contributed to composite operas which borrowed materials from many existing works (213-14). One example of this operatic practice is Handel's *Elpidia* (1725) which consists of a libretto by Zeno and arias drawn from contemporary operas by Vinci and Orlandini. Handel himself contributed only the secco recitative and possibly the duets. Price concludes that “the result is stylistically removed from Handel, but it is not less dramatic or coherent than many of his own operas; and [. . .] the pasticcios allowed Handel to test the *gallant* tastes of the fickle London audience more radically than he dared to do in his own operas” (215).¹⁹ Like so many other musical terms, *pasticcio* retained its Italian form, due to the influence that this superpower of music had in the development of that art form and its institutions throughout Europe in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. However, in visual arts and literature the concept was mainly applied and developed by French critics and writers. It was in the French form ‘pastiche’ that the term became rooted in the vocabulary of the arts and spread because of the significant cultural influence of France to other European languages. I offer a general overview of its distribution in some European languages in the appendix to this study.

Le Grand Robert quotes the year 1677 as the first appearance of the term *pastiche* in French, occurring in a treatise by the art critic Roger de Piles, entitled in the dictionary, and in many other sources, “Conn. des Tabl., III.” Piles’s formulation of pastiches as

¹⁹ For more details about Handel's *pasticci*, see Reinhard Strohm's article in *Essays on Handel and Italian Opera* (1985).

“neither originals, nor copies” became the veritable ur-definition in French, either quoted or incorporated without a source reference into most dictionary entries on pastiche. In *Pastiche: Cultural Memory in Art, Film, Literature*, Ingeborg Hoesterey embarks on a scholarly “sleuthing operation” in order to track down this reference, discovering, after many dead-ends, that it is apocryphal (4-6). None of Piles’s works corresponds to the publication year or the abbreviated title, and Hoesterey’s most palpable source candidate, *Conversations sur la Connaissance de la Peinture* from 1677 does not mention pastiche at all.²⁰ Hoesterey concludes:

Our desire to trace the statement that could establish the discourse tradition of [pastiche] [. . .] inadvertently revealed what poststructuralists have been maintaining all along: that there is not one origin (Derrida) but a forest of origins; that discursive conventions come about through displacements and transformations, through successive rules of use [. . .]. (5)

It would indeed be tempting to think that the concept of pastiche, which undermines the notion of originality, has no traceable origin of its own. However, this is not the case, at least not in the sense suggested by Hoesterey. Further archival investigation produced the origin that had eluded Hoesterey’s attention: by comparing bibliographical information and consulting different editions of Piles’s published works I was able to locate the oft-quoted passage in *Abregé de la vie des Peintres* (first edition 1699), a scholarly work which outlines parameters for evaluating art works and introduces the canonical painters and schools of European art from antiquity to the seventeenth century.²¹ In this treatise, Piles summarises and modifies the neoclassicist principles of his era, but what makes the work particularly interesting as the source of

²⁰ *Conversations sur la Connaissance de la Peinture* is also cited as the source of the quotation in Aron’s *Histoire du pastiche* (7), but Aron appears to rely on second-hand sources since no exact reference is given.

²¹ Piles (1635-1709) was a painter, critic, and diplomat, whose travels took him around Europe between 1662 and 1692. He assisted many renowned collectors and collected a considerable library of art books and prints himself. *Abregé de la vie des Peintres* was written during Piles’s imprisonment in the Netherlands in the 1690s. (“Abregé de la vie de M. de Piles,” no pagination; Puttfarcken x-xii.)

the first known discussion of pastiche is its practical orientation: the book was written from the point of view of a curator to other curators and collectors, its aim being to aid them in the evaluation and correct attribution of paintings. Thus pastiche emerges as an art term in a context which dynamically combines neoclassicist conceptions with the demands of the evolving modern art market in which individuality was emerging as an appreciated value.

Abregé de la vie des Peintres includes a section called “De la Connoissance des Tableaux,”²² the third part of which – hence “Conn. des Tabl., III” – is dedicated to the distinction between originals and copies or, more particularly, to the classification of three kinds of copy according to their degrees of faithfulness to the original. At the end of the section, Piles turns to pastiche, which he sees as a related but nevertheless distinct practice.²³

Il me reste encore à dire quelque chose sur les Tableaux, qui ne sont ni Originaux, ni Copies, lesquels on appelle Pastiches, de l’Italien, *Pastici*, qui veut dire, Pâtez: car comme les choses différentes qui assaisonnent un Pâté ne sont mêlées ensemble que pour faire sentir un seul goût, de même toutes les imitations qui composent un pastiche ne tendent qu’à faire paroître une vérité. (102)

I still have something to say about those paintings which are neither originals nor copies and which are called pastiches after the Italian term for pies, *Pastici*; for just as the different things that season a pie

²² “On the Knowledge of Pictures” (*Art of Painting* 66).

²³ I am quoting from the second edition (1715), which has been “reviewed and corrected by the author,” as it is the one I have had easiest access to. I have also acquainted myself with a copy of the first edition (1699) in the Bodleian Library and the differences in the pastiche passage are slight. In addition to these two editions, there is a later one dated 1767, but it does not include the passage on pastiches. The part containing the passage on pastiche has also been published separately (*L’Idée du peintre parfait, pour servir de règle aux jugemens que l’on doit porter sur les ouvrages des peintres*, Londres 1707). To my knowledge, the first and second editions and *L’Idée du peintre parfait* are the only editions that contain the pastiche section. The English translation, *The Art of Painting* (1706), was made from the first French edition.

are mixed together to produce a single flavour, likewise the imitations which comprise a pastiche seek only to produce a single truth.²⁴

This is the source definition of pastiche that has been quoted over and over again in dictionaries and critical treatises, and it is easy to see why it would be appealing to later commentators, presenting pastiche through comparisons in a manner which is both concise and evocative. Yet precisely these qualities render the passage problematic, especially if it is considered in isolation from its wider context. For instance, the double negation “ni Originaux, ni Copies” leaves open the question of how pastiche relates to these two categories: is it somewhere between them or completely outside their scale? According to Pierre Laurette, it designates the indeterminate space (*l'espace incertain*) of pastiche, analogous to the *je ne sais quoi* feeling of classical aesthetics (115). While pastiche is characterised by a degree of ill-definable ambiguity, one can find partial answers to the question in the continuation of the passage which has not been available to commentators on Piles's definition.²⁵ In this passage, Piles goes on to explain the relationship between the pasticheur and his model:

Un Peintre qui veut tromper de cette sorte, doit avoir dans l'esprit la maniere & les principes du Maître dont il veut donner l'idée, afin d'y réduire son Ouvrage, soit qu'il y fasse entrer quelque endroit d'un Tableau que ce Maître aura déjà fait, soit que l'Invention étant de luy, il imite avec legereté, non seulement les Touches, mais encore le Goût du Dessen, & celuy du Coloris. Il arrive très souvent que le Peintre, qui se propose de contrefaire la maniere d'un autre Peintre, ayant toujours en vuë d'imiter ceux qui sont plus habiles que luy, fait de meil-

²⁴ For clarity's sake, I will use my own English translations. In the 1706 English translation the passage is rendered as follows: “It remains for me to say something of those Pictures that are neither Original nor Copies, which the *Italians* call *Pastici*, from *Paste*, because, as the several things that Season a Pasty, are reduc'd to one Tast, so Counterfeits that compose a *Pastici* tend only to effect one Truth” (*The Art of Painting* 74). The anonymous translation is presumably by John Savage (see the bibliographical details of *The Art of Painting* provided in the Integrated Catalogue of the British Library).

²⁵ For instance, Laurette refers only to the short definition (113), probably borrowed from a secondary source, although no source information is given. Likewise, Hempel refers to Piles through a dictionary quotation (167).

leurs Tableaux de cette sorte, que s'il produisoit de son propre fond. [. . .] Il y a de ces Pastiches qui sont faits avec tant d'adresse, que les yeux même les plus éclairés y sont surpris au premier coup d'œil. Mais après avoir examiné la chose de plus près, ils démêlent aussi-tôt le Coloris d'avec le Coloris, & le Pinceau d'avec le Pinceau. (102-03)

A painter who wishes to deceive in this manner has to have in his spirit (*esprit*) the manner and the principles of the master whose sense (*l'idée*) he wishes to convey, in order to reduce the master's oeuvre in the imitation. Whether he is going to introduce some aspect of a painting that the master has already done, or whether he is inventing by himself, he imitates delicately not only the touches but also the taste of the drawing and that of the colouring. It often happens that the painter who aims to imitate (*contrefaire*) the manner of another painter, and whose aim has always been to imitate those who are more skilful than him, makes better paintings in this way than he would have made by himself. [. . .] Some of these pastiches are composed so skilfully that even the most enlightened eyes have been surprised at first. After having examined the matter more closely, however, they can soon distinguish one colouring from another and one brush from another.²⁶

It is possible to distinguish in this passage a partial answer to the question of the status of pastiches as “ni Originaux, ni Copies.” As in originals, invention in pastiches need not be dependent of the models: the pasticheur is at liberty to invent a topic to which he applies the manner²⁷ of another painter. As to copies, the cru-

²⁶ “A Painter that wou'd deceive in this way, ought to have, in his Mind, the Manner and Principles of the Master, of whom he wou'd give an Idea, whether he takes any part of a Picture which that Master has made and puts it in his own Work, or whether the Invention is his own, and he imitates lightly, not only his Touches, but even his *Goût* of Design and Colouring. It often happens that these Painters who propose the Counterfeiting another's manner, aiming to imitate such as are more Skilful than themselves, they make better Pictures of this kind, than if they were to do something of their own. [. . .] There are some of his [David Teniers] *Pastici* made with so much cunning, that the Eyes of the most judicious are surpriz'd by them at first sight, but after having examined them nearer, they soon distinguish the One's Colouring, and the One's Pencil, from the Other's” (*The Art of Painting* 74-75).

²⁷ In the art discourse of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, *manière* had two basic meanings: it could either refer (neutrally) to the characteristic style of the artist or it could designate negatively the “tics” and individual traits of the artist. In *Conversations sur la connaissance de la peinture*, Piles compares *manière* to the

cial difference seems to be that whereas a copy imitates only *one work* (97-99), pastiche imitates elements from *different works of the same author*. Thus, while a copy can be judged in comparison to its model, the evaluation of a pastiche is less straightforward since it involves the juxtaposition of the characteristic manner of the artist being imitated with that of the pasticheur, whose own manner is traceable in the invention and selection as well as the execution of the imitation. Hence the duality of pastiche which Piles condenses in the famous double negation of his definition.

According to Piles, the pasticheur's aim is to render the sense or idea (*l'idée*) of another artist by imitating selected elements of his works. This conception of pastiche seems to relate to the neo-classical practice of selective imitation, in which the artist chooses to depict only those elements which correspond to the ideal conception of the object (see previous chapter). Thus when Piles sees truth (*vérité*) as the intended effect of pastiche, he is probably thinking of something akin to an idealised synthesis of the manner of the imitated painter.²⁸ If a pasticheur succeeds in attaining this effect, the resulting imitation is capable of deceiving the viewers who will not recognise it as a pastiche but take it as a previously unknown painting by that artist. Although Piles's description of pastiche resembles the modern conception of forgery, he did not speak of deception in negative terms, deception or illusion for him being (as for other neoclassicists) the desired effect of art and

style and writing of an author without any obvious negative undertones (*Conversations* n. pag.; Michel 153-55).

²⁸ Wido Hempel, who in "Parodie, Travestie und Pastiche" (167) quotes Piles's definition from Brunot's *Histoire de la langue française*, cannot see how derivative pastiches could attain to truth. Consequently, he suggests that there is a mistake in the word order of the original definition. Brunot's quotation is taken from the first edition of *Abregé de la vie des Peintres*, where the definition goes as follows: "parce que de même que les choses différentes qui assaisonnent un Pâté, se réduisent à un seul Goût; ainsi les faussetés qui composent un *Pastiche*, ne tendent qu'à faire une vérité[.]" In Hempel's view, Piles must have meant conversely that the truths (*vérités*) which pastiche imitates must amount only to falsity (*fausseté*). As I mentioned in chapter 1.1, however, *fausseté* is one of the near-equivalents of *imitation* in neoclassical discourse and hence there need be no contradiction in Piles's definition. This appears to be the likeliest interpretation since in the second edition of *Abregé de la vie des Peintres* the word *faussetés* has been replaced by *imitations*.

the measure of the quality of the work (see Puttfarken 47). Art's aim was to create an illusion of nature, or, in the case of pastiche, an illusion of the style of another artist.

Piles's example of a pasticheur capable of deceiving in this way is David Teniers the Younger (1610-90), "who has deceiv'd, and ever will deceive the Curious, who are not prepossesst of his dexterity in transforming himself into [Jacopo] *Bassano* and *Paolo Veronese*"²⁹ (*Art of Painting* 75). In some cases the verisimilitude of pastiche to its model can be so striking that even experts find it difficult to distinguish "the One's Pencil, from the Other's." Even in the best of pastiches the pasticheur's own traits break the illusion, however. Piles notes that Teniers's drawing is not equal to its model in spirituality and proper characterisation of objects; nor does his colouring have "the vigour and sweetness"³⁰ of Bassano (*Art of Painting* 75). It appears that in Piles's view pastiches can maintain the illusion only temporarily, and when found out, they invariably fall below their models in artistic quality, as a detailed examination will reveal (*Abregé* 104).

The reception of pastiche thus appears to have two aspects: first, delightful deception and the related admiration of skill, then critical analysis, in which the defects of the pasticheur are found out. Even if pastiches turn out to be disappointing as art works, their reception seems to offer two kinds of pleasure: the emotive pleasure of illusion and interest, and the analysing pleasure of distinguishing the pastiche from its models. The relation between pastiche and the analysis of art is further strengthened by Piles's conception of the affinity between the pasticheur and the targeted painter: in order to "deceive" successfully, the pasticheur ought to have internalised the manner and principles of the painter whom he is imitating (*Abregé* 102). Such thorough familiarity with the painter is also one of the necessary qualities of the art expert, who must be able to penetrate the artist's soul (*Esprit*) in order to gain

²⁹ "[. . .] qui a trompé, & qui trompe encore tous les jours les Curieux, non prévenus sur l'habilité qu'il avoit à se transformer en Bassan, & en Paul Véronese" (*Abregé* 103).

³⁰ "[. . .] ni la vigueur, ni la suavité" (*Abregé* 104).

proper knowledge (*connaissance*) of his works (96). In the case of both the expert and the pasticheur, mastery of the technical aspects of painting is not enough: knowledge of artworks and artists necessitates emotional involvement, an affective response to the works one wishes to become acquainted with. It is possible to perceive an emerging conception of the pasticheur as a critic-artist in Piles's work, someone who combines the analytic faculty with the creative. As we shall see, this aspect is characteristic of the twentieth-century literary pastiches analysed in part III, and it has surfaced as a focal point of interest in recent pastiche criticism, although without explicit reference to the early conceptions of pastiche where this idea was first explored.

Although Piles's account has been lost to later commentators of pastiche until now, it was very influential in its own time. *Abregé de la vie des Peintres* was translated into English (1706), German (1710), and Dutch (1725), and the distribution of several copies of the French original in libraries all over Europe suggests that the work was widely read in the eighteenth century. The entry on "pastici" (sic) in the influential German encyclopedia *Grosses vollständiges Universal-Lexicon* (1740) is an almost a word-for-word translation of the passage on pastiche in Piles's work, and many other reference works recycle or echo Piles. Piles's only example, the pastiches of David Teniers, remained an important point of reference in subsequent accounts of pastiche.

While Piles admired Teniers's skill in deceptive imitation, the historian and cleric Abbé Du Bos³¹ took a more critical view in *Reflexions critiques sur la poesie et sur la peinture* (originally published in 1719):

Mais Teniers, lorsqu'il a voulu peindre l'histoire, est demeuré au-dessous du médiocre. On reconnoît d'abord les pastiches qu'il a faits en très-grand nombre, à la bassesse comme à la stupidité des airs de tête des principaux personnages de ces tableaux. On appelle communément des *pastiches* les tableaux, que fait un Peintre imposteur, en imitant le main, la maniere de composer & le coloris d'un autre Peintre, sous le nom duquel il veut produire son propre ouvrage. (70-71)

³¹ Jean-Babtiste Dubos (1670-1742).

But when he [Teniers] attempted history-painting, his success was even inferior to that of indifferent painters. His *pasticci*, whereof he has drawn a vast number, are immediately known by the mean and stupid air of the heads of the principal personages. We commonly give the name of *pasticci* to pictures drawn by an impostor, who imitates the hand and manner of composing and coloring of another painter, under whose name he has a mind to expose his work to the public. (*Critical Reflections* 51-52)

If there is no room left for illusion and its dismantling in careful analysis, pastiches seem to lose their interest for art lovers and experts. The fact that Du Bos passes the topic over in a few sentences clearly indicates that in his view pastiches are not worth further consideration. Again, pastiche is defined in terms which relate it to forgery, but Du Bos's formulation does not make it clear whether pastiches were passed on as works of those imitated or whether they were exhibited under the title "À la manière de..." Whichever is the case, in Du Bos's view there is no danger of mistaking pastiches for their models: even the works of Teniers, who was generally regarded as a skilful imitator, are immediately recognised as derivative.

Antoine-Joseph Dezalliers d'Argenville, a disciple of Piles, drew heavily on his teacher's work in *Abrégé de la vie des plus fameux peintres I-III*, published between 1745 and 1752.³² Dezalliers d'Argenville defines pastiches as "paintings done after the taste of another"³³ (xxxix) and, despite his straightforward condemnation of the imitation of another painter's manner as an inimical artistic strategy (xx-xxi), he describes pastiche in neutral terms:

Cette imitation bien suivie trompe en effet beaucoup de curieux; le moyen de s'en garantir est de s'attacher à la touche, à la couleur, au pinceau, & sur-tout à la finesse de la pensée du véritable auteur. Les

³² Antoine-Joseph Dezalliers d'Argenville (1680-1765), a notable collector, art expert and Counsellor of the King. In addition to *Abrégé de la vie des plus fameux peintres*, he also published a treatise on the theory of horticulture. I thank Dr. Johanna Vakkari for drawing my attention to the works of Dezalliers d'Argenville, whose account of pastiche has not been noted in previous histories of the concept.

³³ "[. . .] des tableaux faits dans le goût d'un autre[.]"

sujets de ces tableaux sont ordinairement simples, de plus composés décéleraient tout-d'un-coup la tromperie. (xxxix-xl)

This consistent imitation in fact deceives many experts; the way to succeed in it is to follow the touch, the colour, the brushstrokes and especially the subtlety of thought of the author being imitated. The topics of these paintings are usually simple, as more advanced ones would reveal the hoax.

In his concise biographies of famous artists, Dezalliers d'Argenville offers a couple of lively anecdotes about how pasticheurs have initially deceived buyers or experts but revealed their authorship once the trick had been pulled off:

On m'apporta un jour un tableau du Poussin à vendre; le prix modique qu'on demandoit me fit soupçonner quelque supercherie; je fis voir le tableau à de bons connoisseurs, à des gens même du métier, tous le réputèrent original: peu satisfait de ces jugemens, j'allai voir Boullongne [sic], je lui parla du tableau, il me dit qu'il le connoissoit & me demanda si je le trouvois beau: il m'avoua ensuite qu'il est l'auteur. (2: 375; see also 2: 78)

One day I was brought a painting by Poussin, which was for sale. Its low price made me suspect some kind of trickery (*supercherie*); I took it to recognised experts to see, even professionals, and all declared it an original; unsatisfied with this result, I went to see Boullongne and described the painting to him. He said to me that he knew it and asked if I thought it was beautiful; afterwards he revealed to me that he himself was the painter [*l'auteur*].

In contrast to the lowly imitation practised by less talented painters, pastiche appears in Dezalliers d'Argenville's treatise as a jocular form of proving one's sovereign mastery of the style of another. Thus, unlike Piles, Dezalliers d'Argenville does not stress the ultimate inferiority of pastiche to the original.

Piles's discussion of pastiche in *Abregé de la vie des Peintres* also proved a valuable source for the entry on pastiche in the great Enlightenment project, the *Encyclopédie* (1751-72) of Diderot and d'Alembert. The article concerning pastiche was composed by

Louis de Jaucourt,³⁴ who might also have known Abbé Du Bos's *Reflexions critiques sur la poesie et sur la peinture*, since he takes a similarly critical approach to pastiche. In his description of pastiche, Jaucourt stresses the integrity of great works of art against imitations. A pastiche is, he writes

tableau peint dans la maniere d'un grand artiste, & qu'on expose sous son nom. Les *pastiches*, en italien *pastici*, sont certains tableaux qu'on ne peut appeller ni *originaux*, ni *copies*, mais qui sont faits dans le goût, dans la maniere d'un autre peintre, avec un tel art que les plus habiles y sont quelquefois trompés. Mais d'abord il est certain que les faussaires en Peinture contrefont plus aisément les ouvrages qui ne *demandent* pas beaucoup d'invention, qu'ils ne peuvent contrefaire les ouvrages où toute l'imagination de l'artiste a eu lieu de se déployer. Les faiseurs de *pastiches* ne sauroient contrefaire l'ordonnance, ni le coloris, ni l'expression des grands maîtres. On imite la main d'un autre, mais on n'imite pas de même, pour parler ainsi, son esprit, & l'on n'apprend point à penser comme un autre, ainsi qu'on peut apprendre à prononcer comme lui.

Il faudroit avoir un génie presque égal à celui du peintre qu'on veut contrefaire, pour réussir à faire prendre notre ouvrage pour être de ce peintre. On ne sauroit donc contrefaire le génie des grands hommes, mais on réussit quelquefois à contrefaire leur main, c'est-à-dire leur maniere de coucher la couleur, & de tirer les traits, les airs de tête qu'ils répétoient, & ce qui pouvoit être de vicieux dans leur pratique. Il est plus facile d'imiter les défauts des hommes que leurs perfections. (155-56, emphases original)

painting painted in the manner of a great artist and exhibited under his name. The *pastiches*, in Italian *pastici*, are paintings which can be called neither *originals* nor *copies*, but which have been made according to the taste and in the manner of another painter with such skill that experts can sometimes be mistaken. But it is certain that in painting imitators most easily emulate those works which do not *require* much invention; for they cannot imitate works in which the imagination of the artist has had free rein. The makers of *pastiches* can hardly imitate the arrangement, colouring or expression of the great masters. One can imitate the hand of another but not, so to speak, his spirit, and one cannot

³⁴ The philosopher and scientist Louis de Jaucourt (1704-79) contributed almost 18,000 articles (of the total 72,000), earning the sobriquet "the slave of the *Encyclopédie*."

learn how to think like another at all, although one can learn how to speak like him.

He must possess talent almost equal to that of the painter whom he wants to imitate in order to make us believe that the work in question is by that painter. One cannot thus imitate the talent of great men but one does occasionally manage to imitate their hand, that is, their way of applying the colour and drawing the lines, the expressions that they habitually use, and any defects they may have. It is easier to imitate the faults of men than their perfections.

In Jaucourt's analysis, pastiches are doubly inferior to good originals: either they are imitations of mediocre works or, if the target is a masterwork, pastiche can only attain to its weaknesses. Unlike Piles, who stressed the spiritual affinity between a pasticheur and his target, Jaucourt strictly separates the technical level of painting (the hand) from the spiritual (genius, spirit), confining pastiche to the former. In his view, pastiche would not be able to "convey a sense" of the imitated painter, since the pasticheur cannot render that which is most valuable in art, its spiritual content deriving from the individual artist. Jaucourt's criticism of pastiche nevertheless implies a justification for this parasitic practice. For if pastiche imitates the faults of the original, it can have a critical function. Jaucourt does not actively take up this aspect, but as we shall see, it will make pastiche more acceptable to later writers with a classicist bias and, by the twentieth century, criticism will have come to be perceived as one of the main functions of pastiche.

Although this account of pastiche concentrates on its defects, Jaucourt's tone becomes more appreciative when he turns to discuss particular examples. For instance, Luca Giordano is "one of the great makers of *pastiches*" who successfully imitated Guido Reni; Nicholas Le Loir imitated Poussin so well that "it is difficult to distinguish the copy from the original," and Bon Boullogne imitated the manner of Guido Reni amazingly well (156, emphasis original).³⁵ Yet Jaucourt expresses surprise at seeing tal-

³⁵ "Jordane le Napolitain [Luca Giordano] [. . .] étoit, après Teniers, un des grands faiseurs de *pastiches* [. . .]." "Le Loir (Nicolas) copioit si bien à force d'étude les paysages du Poussin, qu'il est difficile de distinguer la copie d'avec original."

ented painters waste their skills in pastiche and collectors wasting their money in buying them (156). His examples interestingly reveal that although he adopts Piles's "ni Originaux, ni Copies" formulation, he treats pastiches in practice as copies of originals. The subtle difference in their approaches is apparent in their discussion of Andrea del Sarto's copy of the the portrait of Leo X painted by Raphael and Giulio Romano:³⁶ Piles gives it as an example of a good copy (*Abregé* 99-102), but Jaucourt discusses it as a pastiche (156). Piles is the subtler analyst of the two, while Jaucourt exerts his authority in evaluating derivative works.

It is noteworthy that the early descriptions of pastiche do not mention the term style, speaking instead of manner, hand and taste, or analysing what I have called here the technical aspects of painting (composition, colouring, drawing, and so forth). The term style came to be used in relation to visual arts in the course of the eighteenth century (Michel 158-59; *OED* s.v. 'style'), when the emphasis of evaluation was shifting from the appropriate representation of separable elements to the overall effect of the art work as the expression of an individual artist; the latter view is often encapsulated in the metaphor of the work of art as an organism or an organic whole. The old aesthetics of division informs the way in which Piles, Du Bos and Jaucourt discuss the presentation of people's heads or animals in isolation from their contexts. In literature, to which I shall turn presently, style was already an established term by the time the term pastiche came to be applied to literary works. Twentieth-century and contemporary definitions of pastiche in visual arts and literature tend to speak of the imitation of style, although manner is mentioned as an alternative term.

From today's perspective, the definitions of these early critics – Piles, Du Bos, Dezalliers d'Argenville and Jaucourt – appear to make pastiche synonymous with forgery but, as I have pointed out, in their time deception had not the predominantly negative meaning it has today. The distinction between deception as a function of art and deception as in fraud was not clear, as the two meanings of the verb *contrefaire* ('to forge', 'to imitate') attest. For-

³⁶ The example originates from Vasari.

geries in the modern sense (works with false claims of authenticity) began to proliferate in the eighteenth century, first as the term *pastiche* emerged in art discourse (Randall 528). Both terms were means of classifying literature in relation to what could be called 'authenticity effects' (Ruthven 74), or the means by which the works are situated and evaluated when innovation and originality are gradually being established as key aesthetic values.

The writings of Piles, Du Bos and Jaucourt were widely distributed beyond France, and it was probably through them that the term *pastiche* was adopted by other European languages.³⁷ Thus *pastiche* became an established art term in the writings of scholars and critics whose academic pursuits shaped their approach to the term and to the phenomenon it was taken to designate. It did not spring directly from artistic practices, but its culinary etymology and its association with popular opera (*pasticcio*) attest to varied origins. After the inaugural writings of Piles, Du Bos and Jaucourt in the context of painting, the term *pastiche* was soon applied to another art form, literature, which has since come to be seen as the privileged field of *pastiche*.

The Beginnings of Literary Pastiche

The first known reference to literary pastiches in French occurs in Denis Diderot's *Salon de 1767*³⁸ as an afterthought following

³⁷ All dictionaries I have consulted give the French term as the primary etymological source for the national variant. English makes a distinction between the hodgepodge sense of the term (*pasticcio*), derived from Italian, and the sense of direct imitation, derived from French (Partridge s.v. 'paste'; see also *OED* s.v. 'pasticcio', 'pastiche'). For the meanings and dissemination of the term *pastiche* in various European languages, see appendix.

³⁸ During Diderot's lifetime *Salon de 1767* was circulated in manuscript form, apart from a couple of extracts published in the periodical *Correspondance littéraire*. The full version of the text was first printed in the posthumous *Œuvres de Diderot* (vols. 14-15), edited by Naigeon in 1798. For the publication history of *Salon de 1767*, see "Note" by Annette Lorenceau in Diderot's *Œuvres complètes* (16: 34-44).

Diderot's discussion of Francesco-Giuseppe Casanova's³⁹ paintings in the exhibition of the Académie Royale de Peinture et de Sculpture. Not impressed by the battle paintings Casanova became famous for, Diderot focuses his attention instead on the genre pieces exhibited in the style of the Flemish painter Philips Wouwermans,⁴⁰ commending their exquisite quality:

J'ai dit que c'étaient deux petits Wauvermans, et cela est vrai pour les sujets, la manière, la couleur et l'effet. J'en croyais le technique perdu. Casanove le retrouverait. Il y a des connaisseurs d'un goût difficile qui prétendent que ce faire est faux, sans aucun modèle approché dans la nature. Je ne saurais le nier, car je ne me rappelle pas d'avoir jamais rien vu de ressemblant à cette magie; mais elle est si douce, si harmonieuse, si durable, si vigoureuse que je regarde, admire et me tais. Mais la nature étant une, comment concevez-vous, mon ami, qu'il y ait tant de manières diverses de l'imiter et qu'on approuve toutes. Cela ne viendrait-il pas que dans l'impossibilité reconnue et peut-être heureuse, de la rendre avec une précision absolue, il y a une lisière de convention sur laquelle on permet à l'art de se promener; de ce que dans toute production poétique, il y a toujours un peu de mensonge, et que ce mensonge dont la limite n'est et ne sera jamais déterminée, laisse à l'art la liberté d'un écart approuvé par les uns et proscrit par d'autres. Quand on a une fois avoué que le soleil du peintre n'est pas celui de l'univers, et ne saurait l'être, ne s'est-on pas engagé dans un autre aveu dont il s'ensuit une infinité de conséquences. La première, de ne pas demander à l'art au-delà de ses ressources; la seconde, de prononcer avec une extrême circonspection de toute scène où tout est d'accord. (*Œuvres complètes* 16: 283-84)

I said these were two little Wouwermans, and that goes for the subjects, the handling, the color, and the overall effect. I thought this technique was lost; Casanova will recover it. There are connoisseurs with demanding tastes who maintain that his handling is counterfeit, not based on any model in nature. I can't deny this, as I can't recall ever having seen anything resembling this magic; but it is so tender, so harmonious, so sustained, so vigorous that I look, admire, and am silenced. But nature being one, how can you explain, my friend, that

³⁹ Casanova (1727-1802), Italian painter and brother of the notorious womaniser and adventurer; active in Paris 1757-83.

⁴⁰ Philips Wouwermans (1619-68), Flemish painter and draughtsman, whose paintings Casanova had copied as an exercise while working in Dresden. Diderot uses the incorrect spelling "Wauvermans."

there are so many different ways of imitating it and that we sanction all of them? Isn't this because, given the acknowledged, and perhaps fortunate, impossibility of rendering her with absolute precision, there's a conventional boundary within which art is allowed to move about? Because in any poetic production there's an element of deception, and because this deception, whose limits are not and never will be fixed, allows art the liberty of deviations endorsed by some and proscribed by others? Once we admit that the sun of the painter is not that of the universe and never can be, aren't we committed to another avowal whose consequences are infinite, the first being that no more should be asked of art than its resources allow, the second that criticism of any scene in which harmony reigns should be proposed with extreme circumspection? (*Denis Diderot on Art II*, 161-62)

Diderot's essay offers the first substantial account of the effect of pastiche on its viewer. Its informal style and dialogical form underline the description of the powerful emotions triggered by pastiches:⁴¹ Diderot's wordless admiration before Casanova's paintings, which revive a style he thought already extinct, surpasses the effect of surprise tinged with disappointment, as described by Piles and Jaucourt. Moreover, it offers a striking contrast with the lame, bittersweet feeling of nostalgia, with which many later critics of pastiche have associated it (e.g., Fredric Jameson, Hal Foster, and Christian Gutleben). Diderot does not subordinate pastiches to their models but regards them as valuable works of art in themselves. Their achievement lies in their magical, inexplicable ability to convey a particular artistic method from the past to the present and make it communicate to the audience again. His description imparts both this inexplicable "magic" or uncanniness of pastiche and the delight that arises from the recognition of an old style like an old friend. For him, pastiche is not mere repetition but has an important function in revitalising an old style and enabling a special emotional experience in which the feelings triggered by the imitated style are mingled with feelings arising from the realisation of the transcendence of a temporal gap. Diderot's response to Casanova's pastiches offers an early antecedent to Richard Dyer's

⁴¹ For the dialogic narration of *Salon de 1767* and its consequences for the interpretation of Diderot's thoughts on art, see Ikonen 51-57.

emphasis on the emotive aspect of pastiche in the twentyfirst century, although Dyer appears not to know Diderot's text (see Dyer, *Pastiche* 52).

It is significant that Diderot (or his narrator) thinks that the emotive response to the pastiche leads to a consideration of a fundamental theoretical issue. The flow of the text suggests that the experience of viewing the pastiches triggered a digression in his mind to consider the justification of artistic representation in general. The element of deception apparent in pastiche⁴² leads Diderot to point out the presence of deception in all art. In his view, deception, or the measures used to mask the fact that representation always entails a loss of some kind, in fact guarantees art a certain (negative) freedom from its referent. Rather enigmatically, he claims that the lifting of the demand of strict verisimilitude has "infinite consequences". I take him to mean the ensuing relativisation of the principles by which art is to be discussed and evaluated. In the absence of definite rules, criticism must become attuned to the nuances and emphases of artworks. Diderot's own openly subjective and interrogative style could be taken as an example of tentative art criticism which avoids the objective, prescriptive take of much of his contemporary criticism. The benefits of this approach are seen in the widening perspective on the phenomena of art: while Piles and Jaucourt regard the analysis of pastiches as an exercise in comparative criticism (with a predetermined result), Diderot's discussion of Casanova's pastiches leads to a critical metalevel which is, as I seek to illustrate throughout this study, often present, covertly or not, in pastiche texts and their reception. As a form of art which falls outside accepted categories or positively transgresses the rules of art, pastiche is able to turn attention to the structure and justification of these conven-

⁴² Diderot concludes his description of Casanova's "The Marshal" by saying: "Petit Wauvermans. C'est à s'y tromper" (*Œuvres complètes* 16: 282). ("A small Wouwermans. One could really be fooled" [*Denis Diderot on Art* 2: 161].) Such a mistake was hypothetical since the paintings were exhibited in the Salon under Casanova's name; yet it is important to register the momentary feeling of doubt as it often remains in the background of pastiche reception even after the authorship of the work in question is ascertained.

tions. This may often, as it does here, take the form of questioning rather than answering.

Moving on to comment on another painting by Casanova, in a section titled "Small Painting Representing a Rider Adjusting his Boot," Diderot returns to the question of stylistic imitation, now linking it explicitly to the concept of pastiche and relating it to literature:

Autre petit morceau de la même école flamande. Mais je suis bien fâché contre ce mot de pastiche qui marque du mépris et qui peut décourager les artistes de l'imitation des meilleurs maîtres anciens. [. . .] Il me semble qu'un littérateur serait assez content de lui-même, s'il avait composé une page qu'on prît pour une citation d'Horace, de Virgile, d'Homère, de Cicéron ou de Demosthène; une vingtaine de vers qu'on fût tenté de restituer à Racine ou à Voltaire. N'avons [nous] pas une infinité de pièces dans le style marotique; et ces pièces, pour être de vrais pastiches en poésie, en sont-elles moins estimables.⁴³ (*Œuvres complètes* 16: 285)

Another small work in the same Flemish mode. I'm quite irritated by use of the word 'pastiche' to indicate contempt for such work; it tends to discourage artists from imitating the finest old masters. [. . .] It seems to me that a writer would be very pleased with himself if he'd composed a page mistaken for a passage from Horace, Virgil, Homer, Cicero, or Demosthenes, or twenty lines of verse one was tempted to attribute to Racine or Voltaire. Don't we have an infinite number of works in Marot's style, and are these works, though real poetic pastiches, any less estimable for that? (*Denis Diderot on Art II*, 162-63)

While the first quotation from *Salon de 1767* shows that Diderot took a favourable view of pastiche because it could revive lost styles and thus enrich artistic expression, here he seems to restore pastiche to the traditional mode of imitating ancient masters or the venerable authors of French neoclassicism. This vacillation between different conceptions of imitation and its purposes is by

⁴³ The poet and courtier Clément Marot (1496-1544), famous for his light and witty verses, gave the name to *style marotique*, a humorous and easy manner of writing. Although popular, Marot's style was contested and satirised by the Pléiade poets who favoured a more elevated style derived from the ancient masters. Genette analyses Marotism and other similar -isms of the neoclassical period in chapter 14 of *Palimpsestes*.

no means unusual in the art discourse of the period. Diderot's irritation at the negative connotation of pastiche bears out the tensions in the shifting assessment of the practices of imitation. As in the previous passage, he rigorously asserts that imitative nature does not retract from the value of the artwork. He stresses the quality of the result: if the work is beautiful and captivating, it does not matter how it was executed. Compared to Piles and Jaucourt, Diderot seems to be uninterested in the relationship between pastiche and its model, apart from the possibility of mistaking the pastiche for an original, perhaps because he was familiar with the inevitably derisive comparative analyses and thought them of little value.

While Diderot did not see a qualitative distinction between classical imitation and pastiche, the difference was by contrast crystal clear to Jean-François Marmontel, who offers the first more detailed account of pastiche in literature in his influential *Éléments de littérature* (1787). This work is an extensive literary encyclopedia which consists mostly of articles Marmontel had previously published elsewhere, for instance, in the *Encyclopédie*. It was frequently re-issued and remained in use until the end of the nineteenth century (Wellek 64). Marmontel's definition of pastiche is clearly influenced by that of Jaucourt in *Encyclopédie*, but he did not confine himself to repeating the earlier account. For instance, the famous definition of pastiches as "ni Originaux, ni Copies" is absent in *Éléments de littérature*. Marmontel borrows the term pastiche from painting and extrapolates it to literature:

Ce mot s'emploie par translation, pour exprimer en littérature une imitation affectée de la manière et du style d'un écrivain; comme on l'emploie au propre pour désigner un tableau peint dans la manière d'un grand artiste, et que l'on fait passer pour être de sa main.

Plus un écrivain a de manière, c'est-à-dire de singularité dans le tour et dans l'expression, plus il est aisé de le contrefaire. Mais si son originalité tient au caractère de son esprit et de son âme, si la manière qui le distingue est celle de penser, de sentir, de concevoir, d'imaginer, de voir la nature et de la peindre, la *pastiche* qu'on en fera ne sera jamais ressemblant. Il aura des imitateurs dans des hommes d'un carac-

tère et d'un génie analogues au sien; mais il n'aura point de copiste. (3: 88)

This word has been borrowed in literature, where it denotes an affected imitation of the manner and style of a writer, just as it is correctly used to describe a painting done in the manner of a great artist and passed off as having been painted by him.

The more a writer has of manner, that is, singularity of expression and turn of mind, the easier it is to imitate [*contrefaire*] him. However, if his originality derives from the characteristics of his spirit and soul; if the manner which distinguishes him is that of thinking, feeling and understanding, of seeing and painting nature, the *pastiche* imitating his works can never resemble its model. He will have imitators who have equal character and skills; but he will never have a copyist.

Again we witness a clear-cut distinction between good imitation and bad copying: here the opposites are imitation proper, which attains the essence of the author being imitated, and pastiche, which merely produces a feeble imitation of the surface appearance. At this point, style is in the process of becoming a relevant concept in literary criticism, coexisting with or replacing the older notion of manner (*manière*) (see Bouverot; Michel). As Marmontel's article on style in the *Éléments de littérature* shows, however, style was still associated with other things than the now predominant individual and expressive qualities: it was related to nationality (the Spanish style being noble and grave, the English energetic and forcible, the French superior to all others), the spiritual type of the writer, the style appropriate to each genre (history, epic, and tragic), and to the three orders of style (high, low, and middle) (3: 336-51). As the definitions of pastiche and style demonstrate, the neoclassicist conception of literature was essentially dualistic: literary works had content and form; they consisted of ideas and style, and the true originality lay in the former. This conception helps to explain why Marmontel disparaged pastiche but encouraged a practice that today usually meets with suspicion, namely plagiarism. In his view, the plagiarist has at least the potential to produce great art from the substantial ideas he had pilfered from someone else (3: 119), while the pasticheur can only assume the outward appearance of the writer being imitated. Although Mar-

montel's aristocratic and imperialist view⁴⁴ of plagiarism seems to contradict the later condemnation of this "literary crime" (to borrow Marmontel's own appellation), his article on plagiarism in fact outlines the basic principle of modern copyright legislation, which protects the form but not the content of artistic works (see, e.g., Bertrand 162ff.). The gradual shift of emphasis from content to expression and style in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries led to the empowerment of pastiche: from harmless, petty imitation it came to be seen as a practice threatening the new aesthetic value and point of legal interest: individuality.

One reason for the change in the status of pastiche is, as we shall see in the next chapter, the fact that its critical potential is discovered by critics and pasticheurs. In presenting what was to become a canonical example of pastiche in French criticism, the Montaigne imitation by La Bruyère (see the introduction), Marmontel had pointed out that while it is possible to recognise Montaigne in the imitation, La Bruyère has really only imitated his faults (89). He sees little merit in this *singerie*, or mocking imitation, because it does not attain that which lies at the heart of Montaigne's writing, his spirit or soul (*esprit, âme*).

The examples discussed by Marmontel and Diderot illustrate a shift in the characterisation of pastiche from Piles and Marmontel. The paintings discussed by the two earlier writers were so deceptive that they could be mistakenly attributed to the author being imitated, whereas the paintings of Casanova and the Montaigne imitation by La Bruyère were originally presented as the work of the pasticheur. Casanova's pictures were exhibited under his name and, whilst the first editions of La Bruyère's *Les Caractères* were published anonymously,⁴⁵ the Montaigne pastiche was

⁴⁴ E.g., "Voler un ancien ou un étranger, c'est s'enrichir des dépouilles de l'ennemi, c'est user du droit de conquête [. . .]" (3: 119). ("Stealing from ancients or foreigners is to benefit from the enemy's riches; it is to use the right of conquest [. . .].") For a similar view on plagiarism, see *Reflexions critiques* by Du Bos (2: 78-79).

⁴⁵ As John Mullan repeatedly points out in *Anonymity*, the writers of anonymous publications were either known or identified soon after the publication in literary circles.

clearly presented as an imitation, not for instance a pseudo-quotation from his work. The extension of the term to the field of literature made it easier to characterise pastiche, as examples could be given directly in the text for the readers' appraisal.

Diderot's account of pastiche, buried in the mass of his salon essays, did not provoke much further discussion but Marmontel's literary encyclopaedia, along with the *Encyclopédie* and Piles's much recycled definition, established the context for later pastiche criticism. The complex relations between pastiche and neoclassicism and with the emerging new conception of art led to two different developments in the nineteenth century: pastiche became assimilated to the pedagogical practice of classical imitation in the French school system, and its critical potential came to be utilised on a larger scale.

Pastiche in the Nineteenth Century: Criticism and School Exercise

It is sometimes thought that the idea of pastiche as a form of criticism is the product of twentieth-century aesthetics, in which a reflective attitude became increasingly important (e.g., Helle-gouarc'h, "Écriture mimétique" 108), and while it is true that the critical aspect of pastiche was prominent at the beginning of the twentieth century, it was acknowledged and analysed already a hundred years earlier. The notion of pastiche as criticism was formulated by the poet and Academician Charles Nodier in *Questions de littérature légale* (1812, second edition 1828),⁴⁶ in which he points out how "satirical pastiche has an *undeniable advantage* because it can expose the fatuousness of bad language or false talent"⁴⁷ (94, emphasis added). Thus, although he subscribes to the

⁴⁶ The first edition was published anonymously; the second, extended edition from 1828 bore Nodier's name. My references are to the latter. The work was republished in 2003, edited by Jean-François Jeandillou.

⁴⁷ "[. . .] pastiche satirique a un avantage incontestable, puisqu'il fait ressortir le ridicule d'un mauvais langage ou d'un faux talent[.]"

earlier notion of pastiche as a form of mechanical imitation which can only convey the superficial aspects of the source text (91), he is able to give it a positive function as a form of literary or cultural criticism. His examples of the use of pastiche range from Nicholas Boileau's imitations of Guez de Balzac and Voiture to the Latinate parlance of the Limousin student in François Rabelais's *Pantagruel*, which Nodier interprets as a more general criticism of the Latin influence in French. Despite what the title of his treatise might suggest, he does not treat pastiche in relation to copyright issues, seeing it as belonging under the aesthetic and moral laws of the "republic of literature". Within this sphere, he defends pastiche, plagiarism (of which he was repeatedly accused), forgery, *supercheries*⁴⁸ and other "transgressions of authority" (Jeandillou, "Le Tribunal des lettres" 62), which he sees as potentially valuable elements of literature. Pastiche, in particular, can be used as a gauge to test the degree of a writer's originality: if it is possible to pastiche him, his style can be mechanised and he therefore lacks genuine talent (Nodier 95, 98). As a literary product, pastiche appears not to have particular significance to Nodier; its value rather pertains to how it participates in the affairs of the literary world, especially the process of canon formation (see Aron, *Histoire* 115).

Questions of evaluation and classification were also central to Nodier's contemporary, Marquis de Roure, who is, to my knowledge, the first writer to call his own imitations pastiches. Roure's *Reflexions sur le style original* (1828) thus marks the extension of pastiche from a category recognised by art critics and literary theorists to an actual, acknowledged poetic practice.⁴⁹ In fact, Roure combines the two aspects of pastiche by furnishing his imitations of Rabelais, La Bruyère, Madame de Sevigné, Pascal, Voltaire,

⁴⁸ (Often sophisticated) literary hoax, forgery or a work published under a pseudonym. See Jean-François Jeandillou, *Supercheries littéraires: la vie et l'œuvre des auteurs supposés*.

⁴⁹ Two years later, in 1830, Nodier published a novel, *Histoire du Roi de Bohême et ses sept châteaux*, which he jocularly characterised as "a bad pastiche of the countless pastiches of Sterne and Rabelais" ("un mauvais pastiche des innombrables pastiches de Sterne et de Rabelais") (qtd. in Compère, "Je suis l'autre" 106; see also Aron, *Histoire* 119-23).

Rousseau and Diderot with critical commentaries. As a conscientious classicist, Roure defends the universal laws of beauty against the then new aesthetics of originality. While Nodier saw the value of critical pastiche in its ability to distinguish true talent from mannerisms and mediocrity, Roure uses it for seemingly opposite ends, namely to prove how originality, by which he understands the “particular characteristics of an individual”⁵⁰ (2), merely amounts to faults, excesses and divergence from the rules. The main target of his criticism is thus what he perceives as the excessively individual styles of those imitated, for instance, the particular ironic lightness of Voltaire’s prose or the “bird talk” (*parlage oiseaux*) of Madame de Sevigné’s epistles, but in addition Roure finds fault with his chosen form of criticism, pastiche. Unlike Nodier, who thought that a pastiche of a truly good work must fail because perfections cannot be imitated, Roure believes that even the most skilful pastiches ultimately annul the beauty of the source text in their failed attempt to reproduce it (24). In his conclusions, he explicitly reprobates the imitation of personal traits as shameful and facile (69), thus also bringing his own efforts under suspicion. Roure has internalised the negative approach that characterises his influential eighteenth-century predecessors, Jaucourt and Marmontel, and offers his pastiches as a warning and a proof of the facility of imitating the superficial stylistic traits that in his view are the prime constituents of originality (24).

Only sixty copies of *Reflexions sur le style original* were printed, because the work was intended for Roure’s friends and fellow bibliophiles, but the two editions of Nodier’s *Questions de littérature légale* attracted some attention. The works of Nodier and Roure are characteristic of the new literary culture, which expanded the sphere of interest to special collections, rarities and curiosities (Aron, *Histoire* 125), but they also contributed to the ongoing formation of such fundamental principles of literature as originality and the questions of what constitutes good style and what acceptable forms of imitation are. The fact that these two nineteenth-century developers of pastiche criticism were also fiction

⁵⁰ “[. . .] caractères propres à l’individu[.]”

writers offered them a useful dual perspective on literature. It might also be the reason why they became interested in pastiche in the first place, since it can be an apt form for exploring different aspects of literature from a viewpoint which enables simultaneous analysis and participation.

The idea of pastiche as criticism recurs in literary criticism throughout the nineteenth century. This is the context in which it is mentioned by the critic C.-A. Sainte-Beuve in *Port-Royal* (1837-59). According to him, pastiche owes its critical potential to its ability to reduce stylistic features to mannerisms. He relates how a friend of his compared it to the waffle-iron (*gaufrier*) with which the pastry-cook prints his label on the dough. Similarly, pastiche operates as a *machine à rhétorique*, a mechanism for reproducing those individual stylistic effects which are taken to function as a guarantee of authenticity. Once the pasticheur has internalised the style of another, he can endlessly produce texts that bear the “label” of the other writer (79-80). As for Nodier, for Sainte-Beuve pastiche is of interest because of its ability to reveal the stylistic weaknesses of its target, not because of the qualities of the pastiche text as such.

Some decades later, literary pastiche had already become such an established concept and phenomenon that the antiquarian and art critic Octave Delepierre could offer a brief annotated review of the earlier critics' views on pastiche in his *Supercheries littéraires, pastiches, suppositions d'auteur, dans les lettres et dans les arts* (1872). He stresses the ludic aspect of pastiche, which is often present when pastiche is used as a means of criticism of a writer or a literary group (12-13, 206-07). It is obvious that for Delepierre, as well as for Nodier, Roure and Sainte-Beuve, the critical aspect gains its force in part from humour. Its jocular or satiric tone makes pastiche akin to parody, Delepierre observes (e.g., 29-30), thus anticipating the comparison of these closely related forms in the early twentieth-century criticism.

Alongside critical pastiche, the other important aspect of pastiche in the nineteenth century pertains to educational system in which the neoclassical ideals persisted side-by-side with an in-

creasing emphasis on modern, vernacular literature. Until the educational reform of 1880 which supplanted Latin in favour of French literature and composition (Aron, *Histoire* 190; Austin 8-9, 16-21), the teaching of literature in French secondary schools relied on rhetoric and the imitation of the great masters of the past.⁵¹ A typical school exercise, *discours*, consisted of composing a text on a subject (assigned by the teacher) in imitation of the style of an appreciated author (Austin 12-13). The aim of these imitative exercises was not only to train students to write good Latin but also to familiarise them with history and with the moral norms that can be derived from the deeds of great men. The reform of 1880 shifted the emphasis of literature teaching from imitation to analysis and created a canon of French writers as the object of study (Aron, *Histoire* 191). One exercise which was carried over from the Latinate education to the new system was the “letter,” in which the student was encouraged to assume the style and mindset of a famous writer in order to compose a missive “by him” to another writer. The assignment could be, for instance, “a letter from Voltaire to J.-B. Rousseau, on the topic of the quarrel between the ancients and the moderns” (Aron, *Histoire* 192).⁵² While historical accuracy was less important in this exercise than the execution of the general impression of the writer’s style, these exercises were already closer to the practice of modern pastiche than the classical *discours*. The letter form emphasises personal stylistic features, not that which is exemplary and general in a writer’s style; moreover, in the letter exercise the student had to assume the persona of the writer and immerse himself or herself imaginatively in literary history. The focus on the personal and professional relationship between two writers in the assignment also resembles pastiche, which often demonstrates, at least implicitly, the

⁵¹ For the connections between pastiche and the development of the French educational system before 1880, see Aron, *Histoire du pastiche* (104-08).

⁵² “Lettre de Voltaire à J.-B. Rousseau, à propos de la querelle entre les anciens et les modernes.” In *À l’Ombre des jeunes filles en fleurs* Proust describes such an assignment (*À la Recherche* 2: 265-66). For a discussion of the passage in the context of pastiche, see Austin 30-42.

rapport between two writers (usually, but not necessarily, the pasticheur and the author of the source text).

The adoption of French as the primary language in literature education and the coexistence of imitative and analytic exercises in secondary education created a situation in which the language and style of individual French writers became the object of much attention. The new school system had trained a receptive audience for pastiches (Aron, *Histoire* 195): having composed imitations themselves, the readers would know how to recognise imitations and appreciate the pasticheur's skill. This undoubtedly contributed to the emergence, at the turn of the century, of a group of writers who experimented with pastiche in a new way. Jean Giraudoux, Marcel Proust, Paul Reboux and Charles Muller are perhaps the most famous pasticheurs of this generation (see Aron, *Histoire* 193, 221ff.; Austin 21-29). As Wido Hempel and Roland Mortier, for instance, have noted, pastiche can only flourish in cultures where the teaching of literature is based on a relatively stable canon of great works and where special stylistic issues attract special emphasis (cf. Hempel 171-72; Mortier 203). In France, where national identity has traditionally been linked to a conception of the supremacy of French language and literature, one of the functions of pastiche pertains to supporting this sentiment.

Furthermore, the pedagogical function of pastiche also appeared outside the school system, as can be seen in Antoine Albalat's best-selling style manual, *La Formation du style par l'assimilation des auteurs*, which was first published in 1901 and had run through seventeen editions by 1956.⁵³ *La Formation du style* offers an example of what James Austin calls "normative pastiche" (16), the typically nineteenth-century manner of using pastiche exercises in distinguishing and establishing the parameters of good style. The

⁵³ My quotations are from the third edition (1903). Albalat's book inspired the critic and writer Remy de Gourmont to compose a treatise called *Le Problème du style* (1902) which comments on and develops Albalat's conception of style. While Albalat is sometimes mentioned in histories of pastiche, Gourmont's book (to which I shall return later) has been largely forgotten.

conflation of classicist ideas and modern emphasis on individuality is evident in Albalat's inaugural definition: "Pastiche is *the artificial and servile imitation of the expressions and stylistic processes of a writer*" (57, emphasis original).⁵⁴ Like Roger de Piles, Albalat believes that mediocre writers can improve their style through pastiche, but warns that it should be practised with moderation (59, 66). While his moral and aesthetic reservations about pastiche merely recount the caveats of earlier critics, he differs from them in presenting pastiche not merely as an artistic technique or an object, but as a process which has its natural starting-point in attentive reading: "The more one esteems (*goûte*) a writer, the more inclined one is to pastiche him. One almost begins to think like him. It is the identification with personal sensibility which leads one to find similar expressions; but usually the resemblance remains at the level of exterior features" (59).⁵⁵ Pastiche is described here as an experience in which identification with the writer (or the implied author) of the text turns imaginative but "passive" reading into active creation, that is, writing. These ideas were developed further by Marcel Proust in his reflections on the poetics and practice of pastiche in the early twentieth century. Albalat, however, ignored the more interesting consequences of his idea of pastiche as process by declaring that "[p]astiche cannot be anything more than an exercise in literary gymnastics. It has no value except as a tool of the trade, and it is not a goal in itself" (59).⁵⁶

In the nineteenth century, the conception of pastiche as acknowledged imitation became established, which meant that the pasticheur's role was given more attention. The difference between the model and the imitation became the main object of interest both in the production and reception of pastiches. Mere

⁵⁴ "Le pastiche est *l'imitation artificielle et servile des expressions et des procédés de style d'un auteur.*"

⁵⁵ "Plus on goûte un écrivain, plus on est tenté de le pasticher. On arrive presque à penser comme lui. C'est l'identification de la sensibilité intérieure qui fait trouver la similitude d'expressions; mais la ressemblance, en général, s'arrête à ce contour extérieur."

⁵⁶ "Le pastiche ne peut être qu'un exercice de gymnastique littéraire. Il n'a de valeur que comme moyen de métier, et n'est pas un but par lui-même."

word-by-word copying would not have the same pedagogical potential as imaginative imitation, and a reproduction would not pass as criticism on its own. Both forms of pastiche, the pedagogical and the critical, benefit from a distance between pastiche and its source text which enables the imitation to have a commentary function. This is not merely a necessary aspect of critical pastiches, but also an important element of those pedagogical exercises, such as the letter, whose aim is to provoke an understanding of the context and poetics of a particular writer in the students.

The nineteenth-century conceptions of pastiche have not attracted much attention from later critics and thus their significance for later developments has not been fully acknowledged. For instance, in *Palimpsestes*, Gérard Genette writes that as pastiche remained on the margin of literature until the end of the nineteenth century, it had not become a “canonical” genre “capable of giving rise to autonomous publications, produced by quasi-professional specialists” (*Palimpsestes* 94).⁵⁷ The nineteenth-century conception of pastiche as a short, jocular and often entertaining form of literary criticism has however had an enduring influence, evident in the French tradition of pastiche anthologies. Collections of short, often witty imitations such as the famous *À la manière de...* (five series between 1908 and 1950) by Paul Reboux and Charles Muller, the five collections of imitations by the Goncourt-prize winner Jean-Louis Curtis (published between 1950 and 1985)⁵⁸ or *Petite anthologie imaginaire de la poésie française* (1992) and its sequel *Nouvelle anthologie imaginaire de la poésie française* (1996) by Henri Bellaunay continue the critical tradition inaugurated by Marquis de Roure and the tradition of pedagogical exercises. The pastiche anthologies activate, challenge and complement their readers’ knowledge of individual writers and literary periods and, as the tone of the pastiche often conveys an evaluation of the literary significance of the author being imitated, the readers are

⁵⁷ “[. . .] pouvant faire l’objet de publications autonomes, œuvres de spécialistes en quelque sorte professionnels” (*Palimpsestes* 123).

⁵⁸ *Haute école* (1950), *À la Recherche du temps posthume* (1957), *La Chine m’inquiète* (1972), *La France m’épuise* (1982) and *Un Rien m’agite* (1985).

persuaded or provoked to adopt the viewpoint suggested in the pastiche. Although imitation lost its significance as a school exercise in the twentieth century, pastiche is still occasionally rediscovered as a pedagogical tool. In “Le Pastiche: pédagogie de la langue et de la littérature” (1997) Jacques Bourgeacq outlines a course for non-native university students of French, based on the use of pastiche both as an exercise and as an object of study. He points out the usefulness of pastiche in covering three main aspects of studying philology: the study of literary theory (especially theories of intertextuality and originality), the analysis of style and themes, and the composition of texts in the language studied (11). A fictive example of the use of pastiche in classroom can be found in David Lodge’s novel *Thinks...* (2001) in which the creative writing students turn Thomas Nagel’s famous philosophical problem – “what is it like to be a bat?” – into literary exercises, imagining life as a bat in the styles of Martin Amis, Irvine Welsh, Salman Rushdie and Samuel Beckett (90-96). Although the texts seem like light parodic exercises, their pedagogical core (for the readers of the novel as well as for the fictive students) is the comparison of the limits between knowledge and experience in science and literature respectively (see chapter 2.3). As these examples illustrate, pastiche can have pedagogical uses beyond the improvement of one’s style through imitation.

Pastiche in Vogue: The Beginning of the Twentieth Century

Interest in pastiche increased around the turn of the century, when the greater freedom of experimentation offered a favourable ground for literary pastiches, as for instance Denis Hollier has pointed out (9168; see also Petherick xii, 13-14). Heightened self-awareness both in the production and reception of art, a sense of decadence, the trend to revival styles (especially in architecture, one of the most expansive forms of art in the urbanising Europe) and the growing demand for literary entertainment were

some of the factors behind the success of pastiche at the turn of century. Newspapers and journals seeking a wider audience entertained their readers with parodies and pastiches, the most successful of which were republished in book form.⁵⁹ Controversies between schools of literature occasionally found an outlet in collections of satiric pastiches, such as *Le Parnassiculet contemporain* (1867; republished in 1872, 1876 and 1993), which was directed at the poets published in *Le Parnasse Contemporain* (1866), a collection of verse which gave its name to the literary style parnassianism. *Déliquescences d'Adoré Floupette, poète décadent* (two editions in 1885), likewise a product of collective endeavour, targeted the style of contemporary poets, such as Stéphane Mallarmé, Théophile Gautier and Paul Verlaine, through the medium of the fictive poet Adoré Floupette, whose passionate, vibrant poems tread the fine line between plausibility and parody. *À la Manière de...* by Reboux and Muller and *L'Affaire Lemoine* (1908-09; republished in book form in 1919) by Marcel Proust were popular in their day and frequent republications have established their status as the best-known pastiche cycles from the period. Both series began as newspaper columns, the former in *Les Lettres* and the latter in *Le Figaro*.⁶⁰ They inspired other pasticheurs, and dozens of collections were published in France in the early decades of the century for the delectation of an audience trained by similar imitation exercises at school (Hellegouarc'h, *Les Conditions* 53-60, 504-05). By contrast, it seems that elsewhere only a few writers were engaged in full-blown pastiche, although less distinctive forms of imitation and stylisation were characteristic of early twentieth-century aes-

⁵⁹ For the connection between journalistic and literary pastiches see Aron (*Histoire* 148-64), and for the publication history of literary pastiches in journals, see Hellegouarc'h (*Les Conditions* 399-402). Gérard Leclerc wonders if the flourishing of pastiche in political journalism can be seen as an indication of how public figures have replaced literary classics as a sufficiently well-known source for stylistic imitation (133, 134); after all, in order to be successful, a pastiche must imitate a source which is known to the (intended) audience.

⁶⁰ For *Le Parnassiculet contemporain*, see Aron (*Histoire* 199-201); for the poetry of Adoré Floupette, see Jeandillou (*Supercherries littéraires* 230-44) and Genette (*Palimpsestes* 177-79). The pastiches of Reboux, Muller and Proust are discussed in more detail in chapter 3.1.

thetics. In Britain, Max Beerbohm's gallery of literary caricatures, *A Christmas Garland* (1912), resembles French pastiche anthologies, and James Joyce famously mixed pastiche and parody while racing through the history of English literature in the "Oxen of the Sun" chapter of *Ulysses* (1921).

Even though the history of pastiche as a literary practice lies beyond the purview of my study, it cannot and should not be completely separated from the conceptual history of pastiche. At the beginning of the twentieth century, the ties between practice and theory were particularly close: those who wrote about pastiche were usually either pasticheurs, reviewers of pastiche anthologies or literary men writing prefaces to such anthologies. At the time, the established form of a French literary pastiche was short, extending from a few paragraphs to a few pages.⁶¹ The short form was suitable for publication in magazines and anthologies, and served the purposes of literary criticism, which continued to be seen as one of the primary functions of pastiche at the beginning of the twentieth century, well. When Reboux, the period's best-selling pasticheur, characterised a collection of pastiches as "an aesthetic necessity" which enlightens the horizon of literature ("Préface" 22), he drew attention to the larger implications of critical pastiches in the assessment of the whole literary culture. Although Reboux's comments on the art of pastiche were published only in 1950, they reflect the change in the appreciation of pastiche that characterises the beginning of the century. Pastiche had evolved from somewhat suspicious, sporadic exercises into an established literary practice that was not simply confined to commenting on the style of a previous text, but was seen to have a wider-ranging impact on the ongoing definition of the culture's aesthetics values.

The nineteenth-century idea of pastiche as a form of literary or cultural criticism thus lived on in the new century. A new development, however, was the juxtaposition of pastiche with an-

⁶¹ Charles Nodier had already expressed doubts about the point of longer pastiches in *Questions de littérature légale* (92): extending the imitation would not improve the illusion of another writer's style achievable in a short text.

other critical imitative practice, parody. While they were seen as fairly similar practices, critics nevertheless maintained that they have their own, distinct characteristics. Thus the early twentieth-century critics differed from Octave Delepierre, who in the nineteenth century had stressed the difficulty of separating the two practices (1, 29-30). Although the affinity between pastiche and parody now seems almost self-evident, it has not always been so. For a long time, pastiche was first and foremost compared to forgery, because of the element of deception involved in the practice of using someone else's style. This idea still had currency at the beginning of the twentieth century, as is evident for instance in the writings of Antoine Albalat and his commentator Remy de Gourmont. However, Gourmont also points out that the element of deception has waned and turned into playful illusionism which does not aim to fool the readers (146). That pastiche was now regarded playful instead of deceptive was one of the reasons why it was thought to be similar to parody.

Like pastiche, parody had previously been considered a minor literary form, often dismissed as mere ridicule or at least deemed incompatible with more serious literary pursuits. Its fortunes changed after the turn of the century, when it became an accepted literary practice even in "highbrow" modernist literature and when it was accepted as an object of serious scholarly attention. Parody had special importance for Russian formalists who regarded it as one of the main means of *ostranie*, or defamiliarisation. Pastiche did not receive such heavy-weight interest at the time. The French critics writing about it were not academically in the same league as the Russian formalists, and most of their contributions now have only historical interest. When the fates of the two forms are compared, it could be said that while parody flourished with modernism, pastiche was in the limelight in postmodernism, when it became a key concept in cultural theory. It has not been noted, however, that most postmodern conceptions of pastiche have their roots in the early twentieth-century "discovery" of the connection between pastiche and parody.

An early analysis comparing and contrasting the two practices can be found in Fernand Brunet's article "De la Parodie et du pastiche" (1919), published in *La Minerve française*, a short-lived but influential literary magazine. Brunet pointed out that the common ground of pastiche and parody is that they are forms of imitation and hence natural to human beings, which affords them preliminary justification (130-32). Yet he maintains that the two must not be confused with each other. Parody is characterised by a satirical intention and a critical function which make its tone different from that of its model. By contrast, pastiche need not be satirical, its aim being to resemble the model as closely as possible. Hence pastiche can be interpreted as homage to the writer being imitated.

Brunet, like other early twentieth-century critics, regarded pastiche and parody as parts of the same continuum both as regards their tone and function and their relationship with the source text. Thus their difference is that of scale, not of essence. Brunet and his colleagues did not think, as Gérard Genette does, that parody and pastiche could be seen as fundamentally different practices on the basis of how they re-work the material provided in the source text. I shall return to this other way of understanding their relationship in the context of structuralist views on pastiche.

What makes Brunet's article particularly poignant is its presentation: as Maurice Allem has pointed out in "La Parodie et le pastiche" (198), the article is in fact a pastiche of the style of the critic Ferdinand Brunetière, who is implied in the author's pseudonym "Fernand Brunet." Brunet steps into the tradition of Marquis de Roure in combining pastiche with criticism, but their methods are different. While Roure used satiric imitations of individual writers to advance a normative aesthetic principle, in Brunet's view pastiche is complimentary rather than critical and, moreover, is in itself literary criticism, not merely a source or material for literary critical analysis like the pastiches of Roure. Brunet's article is one of many examples of the confluence of pastiche and theory invited by the metatextual structure of pastiche. It is a

review of six recent works of pastiche and parody, including *À la Manière...* by Reboux and Muller and *Pastiches et mélanges* by Proust, presented in the form of an outline for a scholarly treatise on parody and pastiche. The topic is, according to Brunet, too vast to be treated in a mere article. The jocular-hypothetic form allows him to skip the hardships of detailed analysis; instead he can concentrate on pointing out interesting questions and aspects.

Brunet's projected book is obviously a case of make-believe, but when the first book-length study exclusively devoted to pastiche, *Le Pastiche littéraire*, was published in 1932, it tackled many of the issues mentioned in Brunet's article. The writer of this treatise, Leon Deffoux, was a writer and critic now chiefly remembered for his contribution as a historiographer of naturalism (*Le Naturalisme*, 1929). In the preface to *Le Pastiche littéraire*, which mostly consists of brief analyses and literary examples, Deffoux contrasts the "more nuanced" pastiche with parody in which the aim of imitation is to ridicule the source text or its author in the manner of burlesque (6). According to him, the means of parody are "coarser" and influenced by theatre. In the preface to an earlier *Anthologie du pastiche 1-2* (1926), Deffoux and his co-editor Pierre Dufay take pastiche to mean "various examples of imitation, voluntary or not, where the tone is, by turn, critical, parodic or caricatural"⁶² (v). Yet they associate pastiche with a certain subtlety of treatment:

Même parodique, même caricatural, le pastiche littéraire se révèle fréquemment plus subtil. Le dol et le mensonge de la scène lui étant inutiles, il n'a pas besoin de recourir à de trop gros artifices. Alors que pour se faire comprendre, le pastiche théâtral insisterait et soulignerait, le pastiche littéraire se contente d'indiquer d'un trait volontiers léger. Une nuance suffit le plus souvent à différencier le pastiche de l'original. (viii)

Even when it leans towards parody or caricature, literary pastiche usually turns out to be more subtle. It has no use for fraud or deceit; nor does it need to resort to any great subterfuge. While theatrical pastiche

⁶² "[. . .] différents exemples d'imitation, volontaire ou non, dont le caractère est tour à tour critique, parodique ou caricatural."

makes its point by insistence and emphasis, literary pastiche contents itself with a deliberate lightness of touch. A nuance is usually enough to distinguish the pastiche from the original.

In practice, however, Deffoux and Dufay blur the distinction by extending the term pastiche to any work of literature which imitates another or which has been influenced by another work. Their inclusiveness was criticised by the literary editor and critic Maurice Allem, who reminds us in his 1927 article, "La Parodie et le pastiche," that all literary works use, echo or resemble other works, and hence extending pastiche to cover all these threatens to expand the critic's task infinitely (198-200). That Allem would use the critic's chores as a demarcation point illustrates once again the academic nature of the term. Its meaning had been and still was to a significant extent determined in critical discourse rather than in the practice of writing and publishing pastiches.

Most French critics writing on pastiche sided with the pasticheur's view, looking at the phenomenon from the producer's perspective, or analysed the traits and functions of the literary product. A rare comment on the role of the audience can be found in *Pastiche and Prejudice* (1921), a collection of pastiches and other occasional writings by the drama critic A.B. Walkley, who draws attention to the difficulty of achieving convincing imitation, both because one cannot imitate the spirit of another writer (here he echoes neoclassicists), and because theatre audiences do not appreciate careful imitation but demand exaggeration and caricature. "Parody, indeed, is the pitfall of all pastiche," he concludes (2), thus siding with his French colleagues on the subtler nature of pastiche.

While the early twentieth-century analysis of the relationship of parody and pastiche has credence even today, there is a contradiction or tension between the accepted conception that pastiche is (or can be) a form of literary criticism and the view that pastiche is a more nuanced literary form than critical parody. The emergence of parody as a point of comparison inevitably changed how pastiche is seen, highlighting some aspects and downplaying others. Juxtaposed with parody, pastiche seems subtler, tamer or

ultimately uncritical, as can be seen in Jameson's postmodern account of pastiche, which contrasts critical parody with lame pastiche. In Jamesonian postmodernism, pastiche has turned from a relative term into the opposite of parody. I shall return to their relationship in more detail in chapter 2.2.

Among the practitioners of and commentators on pastiche in the early twentieth century, Marcel Proust holds a special place. His pastiche series *L'Affaire Lemoine*, which recounts the story of a diamond forger in the styles of different authors, has become an exemplar of this literary form. Its influence is palpable even today in works such as *La Degré supreme de la tendresse* (2008) by Héléna Marienské, which varies a single theme in the styles of eight French writers. While Proust's pastiches were well-known in his own time, his thoughts about the importance of pastiche as a literary activity became known only later, for he never wrote anything conclusive about it, and his comments are scattered in letters, essays and manuscripts. These became available to French structuralists, whose theories of pastiche are heavily influenced by Proust, in the 1960s.

In retrospect, Proust's ideas about the critical function of pastiche have proved fruitful. Proust had originally planned to publish the pastiches of *L'Affaire Lemoine* alongside critical essays analysing the styles of those he imitated, but that plan was abandoned, and the only essay of this kind that he published is "À propos du 'style' de Flaubert" (1920). In an article on the importance of the heritage of the Goncourt brothers (whom he pastiched twice), Proust distinguishes between *analytic criticism*, which is the business of a review or a literary essay, and *synthetic criticism* or pastiche ("Les Goncourt devant leurs cadets" 338). Although there is no evidence that Proust was familiar with the treatise of Roger de Piles, his idea of pastiche as a synthesis of a writer's style is akin to Piles's conception of the purpose of pastiche (to capture the sense or idea of a painter). Proust stresses the immediate and in-depth quality of pastiche: it grasps intuitively what analytic criticism must take pains to explain. Hence, in a letter to Robert Dreyfus, he terms pastiche "critique en action," 'criticism in ac-

tion' (*Correspondance* 8: 61). It is also noteworthy that many of his pastiches are imitations of critical writing (Emile Faguet, John Ruskin, C.-A. Sainte-Beuve, Hippolyte Taine): pastiche was for him a means of reflecting aspects of criticism at different levels.

What makes Proust's comments on pastiche so valuable for later criticism is their personal tone. Compared to the more detached comments of other pasticheurs and compilers of pastiches, Proust's letters to friends and essay drafts seem to offer a vivid and tangible picture of the practice. There are some problems, however, in ascribing wider significance to his often brief and notoriously contradictory notes on pastiche. For instance, critics have often stuck to the description of pastiches as a "purgative" exercise in a letter to Ramon Fernandez in which Proust explains how pastiche is for him first and foremost a way of getting rid of "the most natural vice of idolatry and imitation" (*Correspondance* 18: 380; see also "À propos du 'style'" 290).⁶³ Consequently many critics have interpreted *L'Affaire Lemoine* as a manifestation of the anxiety of influence, but as James Austin points out, Proust never discusses pastiche in terms of influence (76) and, furthermore, the care Proust took with the publication of his pastiches and the ways in which he connected them to the larger themes that characterise *À la Recherche du temps perdu* indicate that pastiche is much more for him than the expurgation of influence, although that could have been part of its attraction to him as an aspiring writer. I shall return to the question of the significance of pastiche to Proust's work and aesthetics in chapter 3.1.

Another famous example of later criticism taking a detail from Proust's scattered notes and running with it, is the case of the word *aberrant*, which appears in Proust's pastiche of Ernest Renan. Although Proust regarded the word as "extremely Renanesque," Renan apparently never used it in his writings, so that Proust prided himself for having invented a word that perfectly suits Renan's style (*Correspondance* 8: 67). This word has subsequently become the emblem of the pasticheur's action for many critics, being cited as proof of how the pasticheur invents rather than

⁶³ "[. . .] vice si naturel d'idolâtrie et d'imitation[.]"

imitates the language of the source text, or how he or she represents the other author's style.⁶⁴ This individual word and the theories it has spurred have had a significant impact in dispelling the earlier conception of pastiche as a mechanical exercise, a *machine à rhétorique*, to borrow Sainte-Beuve's metaphor.

Indeed, the beginning of the twentieth century marked a turn towards a more nuanced understanding of the psychological aspects of composing a text in the style of another writer. Antoine Albalat had already commented on how pastiche can have a negative effect on one's personal style, advising that pastiche should be practised only moderately (59, 65-66). There seemed to be two different "schools" of writing pastiches. Some pasticheurs and critics thought that pastiche requires surrender to the other writer's style, or as A.B. Walkley puts it in *Pastiche and Prejudice*: "To write a pure *pastiche* you must begin by surrendering, putting clean away your own personality – how otherwise are you to take on another's?" (6, emphasis original). Others were in favour of detailed stylistic analysis which allows the pasticheur to maintain a distance from the style he or she is about to imitate. In *Le Pastiche littéraire*, Leon Deffoux ascribes the two methods of writing pastiches to Louis-Numa Baragnon, who favours passive absorption, and Paul Reboux, whose approach relies on simultaneous immersion and analytic distance (8-9).⁶⁵ The two methods correspond to the popular distinction made between involuntary and voluntary pastiche at the time. With the exception of Louis-Numa Baragnon, who deems involuntary pastiches the more successful (qtd. in Deffoux 9), all contemporary critics agree on the inferiority and harmfulness of involuntary pastiche. Deffoux explicitly sets aside the "mysterious routes" of involuntary pastiche (8), presumably because unconscious influences remain beyond the reach of literary criticism. Proust recommends voluntary pastiche as an

⁶⁴ See, e.g., Bilous, who sees in it a hypogram of "Renan" ("Intertexte/Pastiche" 142-43). Austin takes it as an example of the performative power of pastiche (99). Bouillaguet (*L'Écriture imitative* 166-67), Genette (*Palimpsestes* 101-02) and Milly ("Les Pastiches de Proust" 48-49) also discuss the significance of the word.

⁶⁵ Reboux describes his method in some detail in the preface to Masson's *À la Façon de...*

antidote to the kind of harmful influence that leads to involuntary pastiche ("À propos du 'style'" 290). In *Le Problème du style*, Remy de Gourmont describes involuntary pastiche as haunted by qualms and remorse (145), thus presupposing (unlike Proust, for instance) that involuntary pastiche does not remain unconscious, but that at some stage the writer becomes aware of the act of imitation. The threat of involuntary pastiche lies in the contagious nature of style: if one does not take heed, the style of another will catch like an infectious disease.⁶⁶ These fears witness a change towards a more psychological conception of literary creation in general and of composing pastiches in particular, but the sharp division between the two forms of pastiche also reminds one of the classicist distinction between servile and creative imitation. Like servile imitation, disparaged by Horace and generations of critics after him, involuntary pastiche functions as a channel for the existing negative connotations of pastiche whereby pastiche proper or voluntary pastiche can be redeemed as an accepted literary practice.

In addition to juxtaposing pastiche with parody and distinguishing between involuntary and voluntary pastiche, the early twentieth-century writers also turned their attention to the role of pastiche in literary history. Maurice Allem discussed pastiche in the context of the historical evolution of literary genres, pointing out how it differs from them:

Son objet étant d'imiter d'autres ouvrages, sa seule et immuable règle est de les imiter le plus exactement possible, sa perfection consistant à être confondu avec eux. [. . .] Si les genres se modifient, il ne se modifie pas en reproduisant leurs modifications; c'est, au contraire, sa seule manière de demeurer fidèle à lui-même et de ne pas évoluer. (201)

⁶⁶ Proust praises the purgative, exorcising virtue of pastiche in his essay on Flaubert ("À propos du 'style'" 290), and Deffoux warns that involuntary pastiche can lead from imitation to influence and thus to plagiarism (*Le Pastiche littéraire* 8). If writers-as-readers risk stylistic contagion, the readers of pastiches are equally at risk. Fernand Brunet cautions that pastiches should be "tasted" only moderately or else there is a risk of contagion: one could become an unintentional pasticheur by overdosing as a reader of pastiches (138).

As its objective is to imitate other works, its sole and constant rule is to imitate them as exactly as possible. Hence its perfection is to be mistaken for them. [. . .] When literary genres change, pastiche does not change itself by reproducing their modifications; on the contrary, this is the only way in which pastiche can remain faithful to itself and not change.

Allem thus presupposes that the functions and aims of pastiche never change, as if it could remain unblemished by the prevailing aesthetics of the time of their composition. This is not, however, the case, as was noted by Paul V. Rubow, later to become professor of literature at Copenhagen University, in his early study *Saga og Pastiche: Bidrag til dansk Prosaehistorie* (1923). This treatise on the forms of Danish fiction marks the first step in the legitimation of pastiche as an object of academic enquiry: it is, to my knowledge, the first academically accredited study of the phenomenon. Rubow is familiar with the French pastiche tradition, but focuses on Danish literature and develops his thoughts on the historical contexts and constraints of pastiche using Danish examples, although he admits, presumably as an indirect reference to the established status of pastiche in French literature, that Denmark does not have “any particularly fine, philological school of pasticheurs” (272).⁶⁷ He is interested in the various aspects of “Pastiche's Umulighed” (269), or the ‘impossibility of pastiche’, which arises in part from the unbridgeable gap between a writer’s own time and the historical context of the (past) style he is imitating (e.g., 78, 269, 271), in part from the practical impossibility of faithful imitation, the ideal of which is an exact copy (271). He distinguishes two kinds of pastiche, the imitation of the style of a distant historical period and the imitation of the style of a particular author, of which the latter is more likely to succeed. Rubow’s reservations about the imitation of a historical style stems from his dislike of anachronism, particularly the blending of the linguistic conventions of two periods or the expression of modern thoughts in a dated style (78, 269). Imitation ought to be scientifi-

⁶⁷ “Nogen rigtig fin, filologisk skolet Pastichør [. . .].” I wish to thank Peter Juul Nielsen for help with my translations from Danish.

cally accurate; nothing should be added to the style that is not found in the style of the model. His conception of the scope and nature of imitation in pastiche thus differs from that of many contemporary French critics, for instance Reboux, who saw pastiche as the selection and reproduction of "tics," or the striking individual stylistic features and excesses ("Préface" 14); indeed, Rubow's notion is closer to the views of the eighteenth-century critics who saw pastiche as deceptive imitation. Considering Rubow's extremely strict criteria it is no wonder that he regards successful pastiches as a near impossibility. He is, however, aware of the more general implications of this dilemma: the impossibility of pastiche turns the question to the possibility of non-imitative literature, whose apparent facility proves problematic:

Og saaledes ogsaa med Sprogfæterligning. Den falder i Skylla, som vil undgaa Karybdis, og omvendt. Naar Digteren opgiver sit eget Sprog, opgiver han ogsaa Poesien, thi Poesi er bunden til det Sprog, Poeten behersker, og kan ikke oversættes, aller mindst i døde Sprog. Og naar han forsøger at røre sig selvstændigt, bliver han ukorrekt. (273)

This is also the case with linguistic imitation. He falls into Scylla who wishes to avoid Charybdis and vice versa. When a poet gives up his own language, he also gives up poetry, for poetry is tied to that language, which the poet masters, and cannot be translated, least of all into a dead language. And when the poet tries to move independently, he becomes ungrammatical.

Pastiche or perfect imitation is just as impossible as independent creation. The reality of literary creation is found somewhere in between. Like Diderot, Rubow uses pastiche, a marginal phenomenon, to reflect back on the essential values and conventions of literature.

I have already mentioned the work of Russian formalists on parody, which contributed to the wider acceptance and appreciation of that literary form in the twentieth century. Victor Shklovsky, Boris Tomashevsky and Yury Tynyanov studied parody's role in the evolution of literary genres and its ability to reveal conventionalised features and create the effect of defamiliarisation. Their work influenced Mikhail Bakhtin, who discussed the

double-voicedness of parody in *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics* and the "Discourse in the Novel."⁶⁸ The Russian critics sometimes contrast parody with stylisation but not, to my knowledge, with pastiche; indeed, the term pastiche never took root in Russian, except in the operatic sense of *pasticcio*.⁶⁹ While stylisation in English and other European languages typically denotes conforming to a convention of representation,⁷⁰ its Russian meaning is almost identical with pastiche, as is evident from J. Alexander Ogden's definition: the "primary feature of stilizatsiia [stylisation] in literature is the copying of the style of another author, era, social group or genre" (519-20). Thus, for instance, Yury Tynyanov's distinction between parody and stylisation resembles the French critics' demarcation between subtle pastiche and humorous parody: "it is only a short step from the stylisation to the parody; the comically motivated or stressed stylisation becomes parody" (qtd. in Rose, *Parody* 123).⁷¹ These ideas have not always come across in translations. When Tzvetan Todorov translated Tomashevsky's article on thematics, he used the terms pastiche and parody interchangeably, whereas Tomashevsky writes only of parody. Presumably Todorov found some aspects of Tomashevsky's theory of parody akin to the French conception of pastiche and therefore supplanted the original term with one not used in the context of Russian formalism.⁷²

One of the characteristic features of definitions and conceptions of pastiche is the difficulty of dealing with its ambiguity, a

⁶⁸ In *Parody: Ancient, Modern, Post-Modern*, Margaret Rose discusses the forms and extent of formalist influence in Bakhtin's theories of parody (125-42, 155-70).

⁶⁹ I am grateful to Dr. Hanna Ruutu for information about Russian terminology.

⁷⁰ E.g., according to *OED*, to stylize is "to conform (an artistic representation) to the rules of a conventional style; to conventionalize."

⁷¹ Genette also comments on the similarity of Russian stylisation and pastiche (*Palimpsestes* 114-15).

⁷² Another example of such familiarisation of terms can be found in the English translation of André Maurois's pastiche of the style of Marcel Proust, titled *Le Côté de Chelsea*. When it was translated into English in 1966, it was subtitled "A Proustian Parody," presumably because the English audience is more familiar with the concept of parody than that of pastiche.

difficulty which has often led to dualistic or contradictory accounts. Rubow is one of the first to give a partial explanation of this phenomenon by pointing out the discrepancy in the contexts of the pasticheur and the dated style he or she is imitating. While he sees this as a problem, Tynyanov and Mikhail Bakhtin, especially the latter, regard ambivalence as an integral element of stylisation. To Bakhtin, stylisation means that an author uses someone else's discourse for his or her own purposes to the effect that the appropriated discourse both retains its original intention and acquires a new one (*Problems* 189). In his view "[t]wo individualised linguistic consciousnesses must be present in it: the one that *represents* (that is, the linguistic consciousness of the stylizer) and the one that is *represented*, which is stylized" ("Discourse" 362, *emphasises original*). Bakhtin locates stylisation in a continuum from imitation (where the two voices are identical and no distinction exists between their intentions) to parody, which resembles stylisation in being a double-voiced discourse but where the contrast between the two intentions is much sharper: "The second voice, once having made its home in the other's discourse, clashes hostilely with its primordial host and forces him to serve directly opposing aims. [Parodic d]iscourse becomes an arena of battle between the two voices" (*Problems* 193). Yet the distinction between parody and stylisation is subtle, as can be seen in Bakhtin's analysis of the style of *Little Dorrit*, in which Dickens has appropriated existing discourses to create a parodic effect ("Discourse" 302-08; cf. Bouillaguet, *L'Écriture imitative* 9-12).

It is clear that Bakhtin's notion of stylisation is not based on style in a narrowly linguistic sense, although he does propose some linguistic restrictions such as the ban on anachronisms ("Discourse" 363), which were also criticised by Paul Rubow. What is more important than the language as such is what Bakhtin alternately calls the intention, direction or consciousness of the text: "what is important to the stylizer is the sum total of devices associated with the other's speech precisely as an expression of a particular point of view. He works with someone else's point of view" (*Problems* 189). Bakhtin thus regards style as a way of look-

ing at things, as a standpoint or worldview. The point of stylisation lies in the discrepancy between the original standpoint and its adjustment. There is an affinity with this notion of pastiche and that of Marcel Proust, especially as regards the use of pastiche in *Le Temps retrouvé* (see chapter 3.1). Yet when Bakhtin claims that the significance of stylisation and of variation, the free incorporation of alien styles into contemporary topics, is “enormous” for the history of the novel and only surpassed by the importance of parody, we should note that despite some similarities with pastiche, he eventually sees stylisation as a much less restricted and less specific phenomenon than pastiche is, for instance, to his contemporary French and Danish critics.

Approaches to Pastiche from the 1960s Onwards: History, Influence, Mystification, Reading

Judging by the number of publications devoted to it, interest in pastiche waned before World War II and only recovered in the 1960s with the widening scope of academic literary research. That decade saw the establishment of a new powerful research paradigm, structuralism, which directed attention to many such forms of literature that had been neglected in academic study before, including pastiche. Structuralist approaches to pastiche are the topic of the following section, as I shall first concentrate on less-known, sporadic pastiche studies which have nevertheless contributed not only to knowledge about pastiche but also to its legitimation as an object of academic research. These studies have concentrated on a variety of aspects of pastiche: its history as a critical concept, its role among other forms of influence, its deceptive aspects and the “pastiche feeling” emerging in the reading experience.

Although the French have almost had a monopoly on matters pertaining to pastiche, the history of the concept and theorising the literary historical significance of pastiche have been largely

left to foreigners.⁷³ In 1965, the German Romanist Wido Hempel published an article entitled “Parodie, Travestie und Pastiche: zur Geschichte von Wort und Sache,” in which he compared the conceptual histories of the three practices.⁷⁴ Hempel’s article offers the first detailed account of the early history of pastiche, beginning with the Italian etymology and the definition given by Roger de Piles (whom Hempel quotes from a secondary source, thus inadvertently adding to the confusion concerning the origin of the term).⁷⁵ Hempel traces the semantic changes in the term from the etymological meaning (the mixed ingredients of a pie) to the artistic sense of deceptive imitation of a painter’s oeuvre and to what he considers to be its proper sense in literature: the imitation of the style, and sometimes also the themes and content, of another writer (165-69). Not only has his history remained the most extensive available until now (although it has not been known to all critics),⁷⁶ but he also uses conceptual history as a demarcation point between pastiche and parody for the first time. He points out that although the two concepts are sometimes used synonymously, their historical background is different (174) – parody hails from antiquity while pastiche came into use in the seventeenth century. Their structural similarity is put into a different perspective by the fact that they have been formed by different aesthetic, literary historical, social and ideological concerns. In ad-

⁷³ In addition to the texts discussed here which deal with the history of the concept of pastiche, there are several studies devoted to pastiche literature in different historical periods, for instance, medieval pastiches (Kudelin), French eighteenth-century pastiches (Mortier), English pastiches and parodies during the romantic era (Raimond), and French pastiches from the seventeenth century to the end of the twentieth century (Aron, *Histoire*); French pastiche in the twentieth century (Hellegouarc’h, *Les Conditions* and “Écriture mimétique”). The most recent addition to the history of pastiche writing in France is the annotated bibliography, *Répertoire des pastiches et parodies littéraires des XIX^e et XX^e siècles*, compiled by Aron and Espagnon.

⁷⁴ I am grateful to Timo Pankakoski and Professor Henri Vogt for their assistance with some of the trickier aspects of the German sources.

⁷⁵ See note 28 on p. 40.

⁷⁶ For instance, despite the similarities in their approaches and observations concerning pastiche, Genette does not mention Hempel in *Palimpsestes*.

dition to the historical aspect, Hempel suggests two further criteria for distinguishing between parody and pastiche: first, parody can imitate one particular work while pastiche in his view is always the imitation of an oeuvre; second, parody is comical while in the case of pastiche comedy or irony is often coincidental, resulting from the inevitable distance between the model and the imitation (175). Although Hempel pays attention to the shared characteristics of the two concepts, he emphasises their independence.

Hempel ends his article by mentioning homage (*Huldigung*) as one of the possible functions of pastiche (176). This aspect, which has attracted considerably less attention than the critical potential of pastiche, also interested the Danish scholar Leif Ludwig Albertsen who, in "Der Begriff des Pastiche" (1971), took up the idea of laudatory pastiche in the context of literary history. According to Albertsen, the intention of the pasticheur evoking a past style is to express affinity with that particular historical form of expression and to criticise or to put in a different perspective the values and styles of the present. He defines pastiche as follows:

Das Pastiche ist ein Werk, das sich in seiner Sprache, seinem Inhalt und seiner Haltung akkomodierend in die nicht polemische Nachfolge eines nicht unmittelbar vorhergehenden Vorbilds stellt, ohne wie die Mystifikation die Umwelt bluffen zu wollen. Das Pastiche will nicht wie in älteren Zeiten die Imitation, in neueren Zeiten das Epigonalwerk eine *ungebrochene* Tradition fortsetzen, sondern beruht auf einer persönlicher Wahl des Autors, der auf Form und Sprache eines liebgewordenen Vorbilds zurückgreift, um durch seine Nachahmung jenes Vorbild höher zu stellen als die eigene Zeit und die unmittelbare Vorzeit. (5-6 emphasis original)

The pastiche is a work which, through its language, content and attitude, positions itself as a non-polemic follower of a model which is not its immediate predecessor. Unlike mystification, pastiche does not intend to deceive. It does not seek to continue an *unbroken* tradition, as imitation did previously, or as epigonal works of more recent times; instead it springs from the personal choice of the author, who draws upon the form and language of a much-loved model in order to elevate it, in imitation, above [the aesthetic values of] his own time or the immediately preceding era.

Albertsen's conception of the function and meaning of pastiche thus resembles that of Diderot, who two hundred years previously noted the positive ability of pastiche to resurrect styles that have already vanished from the repertoire of contemporary art. Albertsen links this idea to a dialectical conception of the process of literary history. In pastiche, the distant past is evoked as a riposte to the present and the immediately preceding era. Revoking the temporal distance creates what Albertsen calls "ideal contemporaneity" (*ideale Gleichzeitigkeit*) (1-2). Thus he separates, as it were, the duality of pastiche into two distinctive functions: pastiche celebrates its source text while its criticism is directed at the pasticheur's own (literary) context. As Albertsen does not consider pastiches of contemporary works (indeed, they fall outside his definition of pastiche), he sees that the role of pastiche is to reflect on literary history, to restore the values of the past and nuance our understanding of the historical role of originality (5-6, 8).

The early twentieth-century critics and writers of pastiche had already agonised over the risk of contagion involved in pastiche. Ever since Harold Bloom published his controversial study *The Anxiety of Influence* in 1973, pastiche has often been associated with it, although Bloom mentions pastiche only once and then merely in order to dismiss it as form of poetic influence proper (26).⁷⁷ Bloom's conception of influence is so tightly anchored to a reductive antagonism between a male poet and his male predecessor that it does not accommodate the idea of the willing and complete exposure to the influence of another writer's individual style. It is possible nevertheless to discern connections between the system of influence he outlines and pastiche as a form of imitation. The last and the highest level of influence in Bloom's system, *apophrades*, or the return of the dead, is of especial interest in this respect (15-16, 139-55). Bloom locates *apophrades* towards the end of a poet's career, when the poet has already successfully struggled

⁷⁷ Bloom refers to André Malraux who had discussed pastiche as way of finding one's own style in *Les Voix du silence* (1951), a collection of essays on painting, but claims that the functions of imitation are different in literature. See Malraux (310ff) for a discussion of the function of pastiche in art.

with his precursors and created a personal style for himself. Unlike the other forms of anxiety of influence, in the phase of *apophrades* the poet willingly subjects himself to the beloved precursor's work in order to take a last revenge on him, since now the influence is watered down by the successor's own strong presence in the very text affected by the precursor:

The mighty dead return, but they return in our colors, and speaking in our voices, at least in part, at least in moments, moments that testify to our persistence, and not to their own. If they return wholly in their own strength, then the triumph is theirs. (141)

By analogy, pastiche may be seen as a willing resurrection of the other poet's voice, not only in order to celebrate it and acknowledge its higher status, but also to banish it or to replace it. According to Bloom, the perplexing effect of *apophrades* is that the new poem reverses the temporal hierarchy between the two writers and makes it seem as if "the later poet himself had written the precursor's characteristic work" (16). As I shall point out in part two, this is sometimes the effect of pastiches: they blur not only the border between the model and the imitation but also the sense of historical primacy. However, when pastiche is conventionally associated with the anxiety of influence, it is typically in the sense of negative influence, which results in an inferior imitation, "merely" a pastiche (see Bouillaguet, *L'Écriture imitative* 168-69).

The basic psychoanalytic doctrine of the inevitable conflict between fathers and sons, on which Bloom's theory of the evolution of poetry relies, has regularly been evoked as a model of interpreting and explaining pastiches. For instance, D.M. Thomas varies the theme of filial anxiety in an interesting way in his novel *Charlotte* (see chapter 3.3). In *Voleurs de mots* (1985), the writer and psychoanalyst Michel Schneider raises another possible point of convergence between pastiche and psychoanalysis when he points out that

[l]e paradoxe – apparent – du pastiche est donc celui que rencontre le psychanalyste dans son investigation: qu'est-ce qu'une identité, comment se dégage-t-elle ou non des identifications successivement ou simultanément traversées par un sujet? (67)

[t]he apparent paradox of pastiche is the same as that which the psychoanalyst encounters in his investigation: what is an identity and how can it be separated (or not) from the successive or simultaneous identifications that a subject undergoes?

According to Schneider, pastiche combats influence with its own weapons by replacing influence with deliberate mimetism, which enables the writer to discover his own style (67-68). Unlike plagiarism, which represents a flight from oneself, pastiche openly manifests its origin in the other, creating the impression that it is the source of its source (as in Bloom's final stage of poetic influence, the *apophrades*) (70). Proust's pastiches recreated the authors he imitated, demonstrating that authorial identity is always open to modification. Rather than treating pastiche, parody and plagiarism as marginal phenomena, Schneider interprets them as manifestations of the fundamental condition of literature, which is that of borrowing (71-72).

In "Je suis l'Autre: pastiche et écriture" (1996) Daniel Compère continues the theme of pastiche and psychoanalysis by arguing that pastiche cannot be explained away simply by referring to the literary notion of the Oedipal complex (108). Its special character lies in its paradoxal relation to the model, since while its aim is to resemble the source text, it nevertheless seeks to deform it (99). Compère writes:

En fait, le pastiche me paraît intéressant en ce qu'il relie d'une manière originale une double écriture et une double lecture. En effet, d'une part le pastiche est écrit avec l'Autre et contre l'Autre: sa propre existence comme texte est le prolongement d'un texte antérieur, mais avec des différences. D'autre part, le pastiche ne fonctionne que par référence à ce texte antérieur dont il constitue une lecture. (108)

In fact, for me the interest of pastiche is that it brings together in an original manner a double writing and double reading. For pastiche is, on the one hand, written with the Other and against the Other; its own existence as a text being the extension of an earlier text although with differences. On the other hand, pastiche only functions in reference to the preceding text of which it is a reading.

Pastiche is characterised by complex doubleness indicated by what Compère terms its “double signature,” or the coexistence within the text (or its paratexts) of the names of the pasticheur and the author being imitated (101, 103). This equivocal marker distinguishes pastiche from parody which is characterised by a destructive intention. Pastiche, by contrast, adds to the works of the imitated author (101). Compère notes the connection between the emergence of pastiche and the development of the copyright laws and stresses the importance of a modern notion of the author for there to be pastiches in the first place (101-02). Gérard Leclerc takes this approach further in *Le Sceau de l'œuvre* (1998), in which he considers pastiche as the saturation of the principles of authorship (135). Pastiche, he claims, is based on the idea of signatory style which is commonly understood as the guarantee of authenticity and hence of authorship:

Le pastiche, fondé sur une observation attentive et minutieuse du style de l'auteur, suppose une connaissance profonde et intime de l'*authorship* comme mécanisme culturel et social. Il est à la fois dérision moqueuse et reconnaissance sérieuse du *style* littéraire, de la signature et, plus généralement, de l'*absolu individuel* en tant qu'il est *identité*. (133, emphases original)

The pastiche, based as it is on attentive and detailed observation of the author's style, presupposes a profound and intricate familiarity with *authorship* as a cultural and social mechanism. Pastiche is at the same time mocking ridicule and serious acknowledgement of literary *style*, signature and, more generally, the *individual absolute* that is *identity*.

From their different perspectives, Michel Schneider, Daniel Compère and Gérard Leclerc take up the question of pastiche and identity, or sameness with oneself. The pasticheur transgresses this sameness in two ways: by renouncing (even if temporarily) her or his characteristic manner of expression and by adopting the style of the other. Although their notion of pastiche centres exclusively on the dynamic between the pasticheur and the author being imitated (for instance, they do not consider the possibility of imitating a school or genre), they all agree that pastiche has a bear-

ing on the fundamental principles which govern the function of literature as an aesthetic, cultural and social system.

The term pastiche was scarcely mentioned in English-language criticism before the 1980s.⁷⁸ That decade is characterised by the emergence of the postmodern concept of pastiche but the term was also applied in other, less prominent contexts, where it was used in the typically English sense of eclectic borrowing, as for instance in David Bromwich's article "Parody, Pastiche, and Allusion" (1985) which charts forms of poetry neglected by New Criticism. Bromwich's article draws attention to the relative scarcity of studies of pastiche in poetry, although there is no reason to believe that pastiches are more common in prose writing. In the article discussed above, Daniel Compère claims (but does not offer any tangible evidence) that poetic pastiches are the dominant form and prose pastiches an exception ("Je suis l'Autre" 100-01). Bromwich, for his part, points out that the commonly shared conception that lyric poetry is the authentic expression of its speaker offers a particularly fertile ground for pastiche and parody, because they can offer a sceptical stance in contrast to the (illusory) sincerity of the lyrical speaker (329). However, Bromwich's examples could not be counted as pastiches in the more restricted sense of style imitation: he compares pastiche to "the game of adaptation and half-echoing that goes on all the time in a conversation" (328) and associates it with "arbitrary or mixed effect" (333), hence turning it into a form of loose parallelism and eclectic intertextuality. The ludic aspect of eclectic pastiche is also briefly commented on by Peter Hutchinson in *Games Authors Play* (1983), where pastiche is defined as a medley and "simple" borrowing in contrast to the exaggerating or judgemental parody (95-96).

⁷⁸ Walkley (*Pastiche and Prejudice*, 1921) being a rare exception. English-language scholars working in Romance studies have sometimes adopted the French terminology, sometimes not. Agnes P. Porter writes about Proust's pastiches in two articles from the beginning of the 1970s, while Maya Slater calls Proust's imitations 'parodies' in the title of her 1979 article but 'pastiche' in the text. See also appendix.

For a more thoroughgoing account of pastiche as a game we must turn back to the French critics who have paid attention to pastiche as a form of literary *jeu* ever since Nodier's *Questions de la littérature légale*, published at the beginning of the nineteenth century.⁷⁹ The association of pastiche with *supercherie*⁸⁰ or mystification is apparent in the names of pastiche anthologies, such as *Le Parfait plagiaire* (1924), *Mascarades littéraires* (1930) or *Les Fausses Confidences* (1960), which were nevertheless published under the name of the pasticheur (Georges-Armand Masson, Yves Gandon and Michel Perrin respectively). In *Esthétique de la mystification*, Jean-François Jeandillou notes this lingering association between pastiche and forgery, which he traces back to the early definitions of pastiche (131-32), although he perhaps too straightforwardly equates pastiches with forgery (*contrefaçon*).⁸¹ He argues that the transition of the term pastiche from art criticism to literature erased the deceptive element, but the borderline between pastiche and mystification is subtle and the two forms can sometimes merge under certain circumstances. Pastiche turns into mystification only if "it forges the very modalities of its reception: in order to achieve this, additional *supercheries* are needed – in particular the use of a pseudonym or a heteronym"⁸² (136). Usually, however, the tendency to differentiation, for instance, through playful paronomasia, distinguishes pastiche from mystification and apocrypha (135).

Although the creation of a pastiche begins with reading, and although as a literary form it enforces its own particular conditions of reception, reader-centered approaches to pastiche have been few. In "Pastiche, parodie, lecture" (1989), Marie Brisson criticises the emphasis (in French criticism) on stylistic and struc-

⁷⁹ Several examples of ludic pastiches as well as ludic pastiche criticism can be found in the *Pastiches, collages et autres réécritures*, a special joint issue of the journals *Formules* and *TEM*, published in 2001.

⁸⁰ See note 48 on p. 57.

⁸¹ He refers specifically to Abbé Du Bos. For a discussion of the association between pastiche and forgery, see p. 43 and pp. 182-83.

⁸² "[. . .] lorsqu'il fausse les modalités mêmes de sa réception: la mise en place de *supercheries* complémentaires – usage d'un allonyme ou d'un hétéronyme, notamment – est pour ce faire indispensable."

tural aspects of pastiche as limiting. In her view, it is primarily characterised by the feeling of pastiche (*l'effet de pastiche*) which arises in the reading experience (71). While most critics have identified the ambivalence of pastiche either in its double relationship to the source text, its wavering between homage and criticism or its special character as a form of reading and a form of writing, Brisson claims that the ambivalence of pastiche arises in the reader's hesitation between different interpretative options: no one interpretation appears to be more authoritative than others (81). Like many approaches discussed in this chapter, Brisson's has not attracted much attention, but the idea that the readers' feelings are essential in defining the phenomenon of pastiche is given special prominence in one of the most important works on pastiche in the recent years, Richard Dyer's *Pastiche* (see chapter 1.3).

Structuralist Views on Pastiche

Of theoretical schools or approaches, pastiche is most readily associated with postmodern theory, although it also received considerable attention from critics working within or at the fringes of structuralism.⁸³ Structuralist critics writing on pastiche drew influence and ideas from three main sources: structural linguists whose systematic approach to texts they adopted, Russian formalists whose interest in parody they extended to cover pastiche as well, and from early twentieth-century French critics who had first grouped pastiche with parody and systematically analysed its functions. Structuralist critics brought the relationship between pas-

⁸³ Although I will use 'structuralist critics' as a classificatory term in the following, it is not certain whether all of the writers would accept that label. For instance, Karrer's theory is eclectic if anything, and Genette calls his approach "open structuralism" (*Palimpsestes* 557) in order to distinguish it from the kind of study that aims to resolve the challenges posed by the inner structure of literary works. However, all the critics discussed in this chapter use structuralist terminology and structuralist analytical tools.

tiche and parody as well as their respective means under systematic scrutiny and used new, often interdisciplinary methods to analyse them. They were particularly interested in the status of pastiche as an imitative intertextual practice and drew up elaborate typologies which distinguish it from other such practices. In their view, the distinctive quality of pastiche was its particular closeness to the source text. Study of the textual elements of pastiche led to discussion of the reception of pastiche, which was analysed according to the models of communication derived from the linguists Roman Jakobson and Émile Benveniste. The question of the readers' competence also came to the fore: how do readers recognise and interpret pastiches? Although the structuralist approaches may seem dated compared to the postmodern theories (see chapter 1.3), they are actually contemporaneous with postmodernism, the majority of the texts discussed in this chapter being published in the early 1980s,⁸⁴ the same time as Fredric Jameson published his two seminal texts which established the connection between postmodernism and pastiche.

The varied sources of structuralist pastiche criticism obviously created some tensions: the early twentieth-century French writings on pastiche, often subjective and saturated by classical aesthetics, are not compatible with the rigorous "scientific" objectives of formalists and structural linguists. The structuralist literary critics writing on pastiche were critical of the humanist poetics of the early twentieth-century critics and sought to replace it by analytic tools borrowed from Jakobson and Benveniste, as well as from the semioticians Yury Lotman and Umberto Eco. Moreover, they were eager to extend the perspective beyond what they perceived as the narrowly literary-linguistic sphere. In a positivistic spirit, they wanted to apply scientific methods to the study of parody and pastiche: Wolfgang Iser advocates mathematics and set theory among other things ("Parody, Travesty, and Pastiche" 195), J.-J. Hamm borrows his matrix from information theory and entropy (108ff), and Sanda Golopentia-Eretescu finds analogies

⁸⁴ Gérard Genette (1982), Patrick Imbert (1982), Daniel Bilous (1983), Pierre Laurette (1984), Sanda Golopentia-Eretescu (1984), and J.-J. Hamm (1984).

for literary concepts in physics (121-22). The emphasis is on theory, i.e., how to define exactly the nature of pastiche as a textual practice. Analyses of actual literary examples are always subjected to theoretical enquiry, although Jean Milly and Gérard Genette in particular provide insightful readings of Proust's pastiches.

Proust's poetics of pastiche – both his imitations and his comments on them – was clearly the main literary framework to which the structuralists adapted their ideas, even if they only referred to Proust in passing. Proust's significance for structuralism and later criticism is the sum of many factors. By the 1960s, Proust had become a canonised author, whose interest in pastiche helped to legitimise it as an object of study. Moreover, Proust's pastiches were readily available and relatively well-known which made them useful as examples. It is evident that by highlighting Proust's pastiches, structuralists contributed to the canonisation of *L'Affaire Lemoine* as the exemplar not just of modernist pastiche but of pastiche in general. Jean Milly edited the first scholarly edition of Proust's pastiches in 1970 (*Les Pastiches de Proust*), and a whole collection of analyses devoted to them, *L'Affaire Lemoine von Marcel Proust: Kommentare und Interpretation*, edited by Walter Pabst and Ludwig Schrader, appeared in Germany two years later. Since these inaugural publications, Proust's pastiches have become an increasingly popular object of study, to the extent that Paul Aron has entitled the chapter on modern pasticheurs in his history of pastiche as "Les grands maîtres: Marcel Proust et Paul Reboux." Thus pasticheurs of great masters have become masters themselves.

When Jean Milly published his two-part article "Les Pastiches de Proust: structure et correspondance" in 1967, pastiche was not yet perceived as an entirely legitimate object of serious academic study, as is evident from Milly's apologetic opening words. Although the title of the article gives precedence to Proust, Milly's starting-point is in theoretical issues, which take up much of the first part of the article. His aim is to show that despite its marginality, pastiche has "a certain interest" (33),⁸⁵ which he identifies

⁸⁵ "[. . .] un intérêt certain[.]"

and structures using the theory of linguistic functions developed by Roman Jakobson and modified by Michel Riffaterre (35). According to Milly, pastiche has three constitutive functions (36), the most important being the referential function, the *raison d'être* of a stylistic imitation. What makes pastiche special in Milly's view is the duality of its reference: the direct and conventional referent of the pastiche is its subject (such as the diamond forgery in *L'Affaire Lemoine*), but its real referent, to which it alludes only indirectly, is the imitated source text. The referentiality of pastiche is thus based on a tension between these two reference points. The conception of the dual reference of pastiche, which is based on the narrative choices of *L'Affaire Lemoine*, gained some popularity, although it is somewhat problematic even when applied to the case which inspired it.⁸⁶ Proust himself claimed to have come up with the topic for his pastiches, the true story of a diamond forger called Lemoine, by chance (*Pastiches et mélanges* 7n) but, as I will elaborate in more detail later, the forgery theme is implied in the use of pastiche, Proust's comment notwithstanding (see also Schneider 69-70). There are also plenty of examples of pastiches in which the "pretext" referent can in fact be seen as the more prominent one, or where the two referents become blended, as is the case of pastiches that seamlessly carry on the story of the source text. The bracketing of the "pretext" reference is also indicative of the more general structuralist aversion to issues of interpretation since, for structuralists, the salient aspect of pastiche is its function as a variant of the code provided by the source text, not so much the uses to which the variant is put.

The two other functional models provided by Jakobson, metalinguistic and conative function, are used by Milly to identify the ability of pastiche to highlight the characteristic stylistic fea-

⁸⁶ Denis Hollier endorses this approach to pastiche in distinguishing between "réfèrent apparent ou réfèrent du récit" ("apparent referent or story referent") and "le réfèrent réel" ("the real referent"). Hence he defines pastiche as follows: "il y a pastiche chaque fois que le réfèrent du texte peut être pris pour son auteur" ("it is a question of pastiche every time the referent of the text could be taken as its author") (9168). Hollier differs from Milly in that he sees the author being imitated as the real referent, not the imitated text.

tures of the source, which can thereby become objects of criticism, and the ability of pastiche to create a satiric effect and make its readers smile or laugh (36). Thus Milly defines the process of pastiche as follows:

pour l'essentiel, le pasticheur interprète comme une structure des faits redondants du modèle et que, grâce à l'artifice d'un nouveau référent, il reconstruit cette structure plus ou moins fidèlement, selon l'effet qu'il veut produire sur le lecteur. (37, emphasis original)

essentially, the pasticheur interprets the redundant features of the model as a structure and, with the artifice of a new referent, reconstructs this structure more or less faithfully, according to the effect he wishes to produce in the reader.

The influence of Proust is evident in the perspective Milly has chosen for his description: pastiche is defined as a creative process from the point of view of the pasticheur. Milly's definition does not, however, correspond in the best possible way to Proust's own comments on pastiche, in which he often emphasised the intuitive, *ex tempore* quality of pastiche writing. Milly presents pastiching as a rather straightforward and purpose-driven activity in which the pasticheur chooses the right means to produce the desired effect on the reader. While Milly thus appears to give a structuralist straitjacket to ideas derived from Proust's writings on pastiche, his adherence to Proust's ideas has the benefit of opening up the linguistically-oriented approach to wider implications of stylistic imitation, such as the conception of style not merely as a technical medium but as a world view, or, as Milly himself puts it: "style is a mental structure as much as it is a formal structure" (133).⁸⁷

Interestingly for the present study, Milly attaches the expressivity of pastiche to its duality in that it simultaneously or successively creates an effect of similarity and difference (44). A typical means for this is the concentration or highlighting of certain characteristic style features of the source text to the extent that the effect is comical, as is the case Proust's pastiche of Balzac, which has, in the course of a single page, fourteen examples of the typi-

⁸⁷ "Le style est une structure mental autant que formelle."

cally Balzacian structure “X, the Y of Z,” such as “Mr. de Talleyrand, this Roger Bacon of social nature.”⁸⁸ In addition to this kind of automatism, the nonconformity of pastiche may also appear in the discordance between form and content (46), or in the discordance between the signifier and the signified, as in Proust’s pastiche of Flaubert, where the co-appearance of completely disconnected items creates an absurd effect (47). Milly thus focuses on duality at a purely textual level and does not take up the kind of ontological ambivalence of pastiche which I will discuss in part two.

Ten years after Milly, Wolfgang Karrer published his study *Parodie, Travestie, Pastiche* (1977) which focuses on the communicative aspect of these three imitative practices. The concluding chapter of his book has been published independently in English under the title “Parody, Travesty, and Pastiche qua Communication Processes” in 1986.⁸⁹ Like many other critics, he gives special prominence to parody, treating travesty and pastiche as less significant phenomena. Karrer derives his conception of pastiche mostly from French sources but, unlike Paul Rubow, who applied them to his national literature, Karrer is more interested in theoretical delineations. The object of his criticism is what he perceives as the outdated methods of research: parody – and by implicit expansion, pastiche as well – is no longer merely a literary phenomenon and needs to be studied from an interdisciplinary perspective, combining natural sciences, psychology, sociology, mathematics, cybernetics and Chomskyan linguistics.⁹⁰ Karrer also advocates a shift away from the traditional concepts such as ‘style’

⁸⁸ For Milly’s analysis of this repetition, see “Les Pastiches de Proust” (44-45). See also Genette, *Palimpsestes* (102-03). The passage under discussion can be found in Proust, *Pastiches et mélanges* (7-9).

⁸⁹ I have used the English version as my main source. Karrer returned to the question of the relationship of parody and pastiche in 2002 in an article concerning Joyce’s “Oxen of the Sun” chapter in *Ulysses*. There his theoretical affinity is with Fredric Jameson, whose conception of pastiche Karrer sees as supporting of his own view of Joyce and Proust as proto-postmodernists.

⁹⁰ Thus he is critical of the kind of traditional humanist approach taken by Wido Hempel in his history of the concepts parody, travesty and pastiche, where the focus is on their literary manifestations.

and 'content' to those of 'system', 'relation', 'element' and 'level' ("Parody, Travesty, and Pastiche" 16), proposing that parody research could function as a kind of a test laboratory for the validity of these new theories in literature: "parody research as a whole compels us through its object of study to enter into certain problematic zones that serve as a necessary set of corrective measures that can be applied to literary studies in general" (22).⁹¹ In the "Author's Postcript" to the 1986 English translation he expands on this suggestion as follows:

Parody research is in a strategic position to challenge established and time-worn answers to questions of genre, literary property, literary production and reproduction, reader-writer interactions, media competition and dialectical or evolutionary models of literary history writing. As the discussion since [the publication of *Parodie, Travestie, Pastiche* in 1977] has shown, it can go even further in challenging the very concepts of 'subject', 'intention', 'text', 'realism', and 'understanding'. (34)

Such a re-evaluation of some of the fundamental concepts of literary study can be found for instance in the writings of Linda Hutcheon, who, like Karrer, places parody in a larger context and stresses its potential for cultural criticism (*A Theory of Parody* 100). It is telling that in the passage quoted, as elsewhere, Karrer refers only to parody, although both the title of his work and the structural analysis he offers suggest that the three forms are on an equal basis (see "Parody, Travesty, and Pastiche" 11). This is an example of a phenomenon I have also observed elsewhere: when the concept of parody is understood in the broad sense as a cultural criticism, pastiche often becomes marginalised, as is the case in Karrer's text, or presented as a contrasting practice to such critical, powerful parody (Hutcheon, *A Theory of Parody* 98). However, pastiche too can be used for the purposes of cultural criti-

⁹¹ "[. . .] sondern die Parodieforschung insgesamt wird durch ihren Gegenstand in bestimmte Fragestellungen geführt, die als notwendiges Korrektiv der sonstigen literaturwissenschaftlichen Forschung gelten können" (*Parodie, Travestie, Pastiche* 203).

cism, as some of the examples discussed in parts II and III will illustrate.

Pastiche is also discussed as a less important variant of parody in the collection of articles *Le Singe à la porte: vers une théorie de la parodie* (1984), which was edited by the Groupar research group and based on a colloquy held at the Queen's University, Canada in 1981. Two of its articles extend the discussion of the properties of parody to pastiche. Sanda Golopentia-Eretescu makes detailed distinctions between parody and pastiche according to their various textual types and the type of intertext. Although she does not stress this point herself, it is interesting to note that she grants pastiche considerable emancipatory potential: the pasticheur is relieved from "excess" personality, the reader is relieved from the governance of the authoritative author, and the source text is spared from oblivion – although Golopentia-Eretescu reminds us that the last point is debatable, as too many commentaries and variations can obscure the source text (128-29). She presents pastiche as a subversive literary practice although this aspect is almost buried under the complex technical delineations which are her main interest. Like Golopentia-Eretescu, J.-J. Hamm also highlights parody in his article "Parodie, pastiche: de l'écriture à la lecture," in which he discusses parody (and pastiche) as acts of writing or the effect of reading (108). Hamm turns to Yury Lotman's ideas of information as entropy in order to classify various cases of the creation and reception of parody and pastiche. He concludes that pastiche increases the limitations and constraints in the communicative process since it deliberately succumbs to the parameters of the source text, whereas in parody, which can take many forms, these limitations are diminished (115). Hence Hamm attaches the notion of ambiguity or indecision only to parody (115). As is already apparent in my title, I do not agree with Hamm on this point and will explain the grounds on which pastiche can be regarded as a fundamentally ambiguous or double-edged practice in more detail in chapter 2.3.

Undeniably the most influential critic with a structuralist orientation is Gérard Genette, who in *Palimpsestes: la littérature au sec-*

ond degré (1982)⁹² modified existing terminology of imitative practices, offering new theoretical perspectives and textual approaches to pastiche. *Palimpsestes* is devoted to the study of 'hypertextuality', by which Genette means the relation, excluding commentary, local allusion or quotation, between a text B (which he calls 'hypertext') and an earlier text A (hypotext) (13).⁹³ Hypertextuality is thus a principle defining the whole structure and motivation of a text, a hypertext as a whole being a transformation of the entire hypotext. Genette divides hypertextuality into four main types, which are parody, travesty, *charge* and pastiche, but his use of these terms differs somewhat from their usual meanings. He sees parody as designating the twisting of the text by means of minimal transformation; for instance, when a text is transferred almost word for word to another context, whereas travesty means changing the style of the hypotext in order to mock the subject, as for instance in Scarron's *Virgile travesti*, which supplants the epic metre and diction of the original with familiar, even vulgar style. Pastiche is divided into two sub-categories: pure pastiche, which is stylistic imitation without satirical purpose, thus belonging to the "playful mode whose primary function is pure entertainment" (*Palimpsestes* 85),⁹⁴ and satirical pastiche or *charge*,⁹⁵ which imitates

⁹² The slightly abridged English translation, *Palimpsestes: Literature in the Second Degree*, appeared in 1997.

⁹³ Genette restricts the more familiar term 'intertextuality' to the "relation de co-présence entre deux ou plusieurs textes" (8) ("relationship of copresence between two texts or among several texts," *Palimpsestes* 1). Examples of Genette's intertextuality include citation, plagiarism and allusion.

⁹⁴ "[. . .] régime ludique, dont la fonction dominante est le pur divertissement" (111).

⁹⁵ Despite Genette's distinction between *charge* and caricature, his English translators translate *charge* as caricature. I prefer to keep the French term to avoid unnecessary terminological confusion: the connotations of 'caricature' are misleading because graphic caricature combines both imitation and (satirical) transformation whereas *charge* in Genette's sense is based only on imitation. See *Palimpsestes* (40), and for the translators' explanation of their choice, *Palimpsestes* (433n). Other English terms used for Genette's *charge* are 'satiric pastiche' (Chatman, "Parody and Style" 30) and 'skit' (Dentith 12). *Charge* is not usually discussed in the context of pastiche. Roger de Piles gives a definition of *charge* in the list of art terms in *Conversations sur la Connaissance de la peinture*: "Charge est une exagération bur-

the style of the hypotext in a satirical manner in order to ridicule it (*Palimpsestes* 40, 111). Genette explains:

Autrement dit, le parodiste ou travestisseur a essentiellement affaire à un texte, et accessoirement à un style; inversement l'imitateur a essentiellement affaire à un style, et accessoirement à un texte: sa cible est un style, et les motifs thématiques qu'il comporte (le concept de style doit être pris ici dans son sens le plus large: c'est une *manière*, sur le plan thématique comme sur le plan formel) [. . .]. [I]l y a pastiche (ou charge, ou forgerie) quand un texte manifeste, en l'effectuant, l'imitation d'un style. (107, emphasis original)

In other words, the parodist or travesty writer essentially deals with a text, and with style only peripherally. Conversely, the imitator essentially deals with style, and with text only incidentally; the target is a style and the thematic motifs that it involves (the concept of style must be understood here in its broadest sense: it is a *manner*, on both the thematic and the formal level.) [. . .] We are dealing with a pastiche (or caricature [*charge*], or forgery) when the operations of its text exhibit the imitation of style. (*Palimpsests* 82, emphasis original)

The novelty of Genette's account is that, unlike most other critics, he abandons function (e.g., satirical/non-satirical function) as the primary criterion for distinguishing between parody and pastiche, emphasising their operational principles instead. An important corollary of this account is that the extensions of the terms differ from the usual. For instance, the term 'satirical pastiche' or *charge* applies to cases which would conventionally be regarded as parodies or burlesques (such as the mock-heroic poem, *Palimpsestes* 182), whereas the scope of parody is relatively diminished. While Genette is aware of the problems of his account (see 37-39, 41-42, 111), it is true that his typology differs so much from the customary uses of the terms that it is difficult sometimes to see its usefulness, as Margaret Rose has observed in *Parody: Ancient, Modern, Post-Modern*:

lesque des parties les plus marquées & qui contribuent davantage à la ressemblance, en forte neantmoins qu'on reconnoisse la personne dont on a fait la Charge" (n. pag.). ("Charge is burlesque exaggeration of the parts that are most prominent and those parts which contribute most to the effect of similarity; however, it is possible to recognise the person who is the object of charge.")

[Genette's] various typologies of parody, pastiche and travesty do not always reflect all the historical differences in the uses and understandings of those terms, while his most frequently quoted definition of parody as being, in general, a "minimal transformation of a text," omits reference to its comic functions and to their many particular complexities as well as to other of its characteristics. (*Parody* 181)⁹⁶

Since his redefinition of the terms emphasises pastiche more than parody, it is not surprising that he regards pastiche as the most significant and increasingly common form of hypertextuality (37-38). Yet contemporary examples of pastiche are scarce in *Palimpsestes*. In fact, Genette's conception of the two variants of pastiche – the humorous pastiche and satiric *charge* – is very much based on the early twentieth-century practices of style imitation, especially the anthology pastiches of Proust and Reboux & Muller, with the consequence that he is mostly interested in the relationship between the model and the imitation, not the other uses pastiches may have. For instance, he does not consider wider implications of pastiche such as its potential as a mediator between two periods, discussed earlier by Leif Ludwig Albertsen, or the use of pastiche as a realistic or period device in historical novels, a phenomenon that has admittedly come to the fore since the publication of *Palimpsestes* but of which there are earlier examples.⁹⁷

Maybe the most curious omission, as regards pastiche, is the impossibility, according to Genette's typology, of non-humorous and non-satirical pastiche.⁹⁸ In the system of hypertextuality, the "serious imitation" niche is reserved for forgery (*Palimpsestes* 43) which, given its deceptive intention, turns into a kind of impossi-

⁹⁶ Similar criticism can be found in Hutcheon (*A Theory of Parody* 18, 21) and Orr (109).

⁹⁷ E.g., the pastiches of scholarly writing in Angus Wilson's *Anglo-Saxon Attitudes* (1956) or the imitations of eighteenth-century prose in John Barth's *The Sot-Weed Factor* (1960) (for Genette's discussion of the latter example, see *Palimpsestes* 289-91).

⁹⁸ There is a sense in which all imitations are humorous, as Genette points out: the inescapable discrepancy between the imitator (and his or her context) and the imitated suffices to create a humorous effect (*Palimpsestes* 73). However, such situational comedy can usually be distinguished from the humorous or satirical intentions in the text.

bility: an imitation that seeks to disguise its imitative status. Thus the shift from the functional framework of earlier criticism to categorisation according to structural differences has not spared Genette from the problems with functional criteria. It seems that the division between the two kinds of pastiches on the one hand and forgery on the other is to a large extent determined by the demands of the structural system, not established in relation to actual literary uses and strategies.

However, in distinguishing between fraudulent imitation and pastiche, Genette provides an interesting answer to the question of how pastiche is recognised as an imitation of someone else's style. Pasticheurs usually communicate the imitative status of the text to their readers through textual markers, which Genette calls the *pastiche contract* with a nod towards the concept of the autobiographical contract introduced by Philippe Lejeune (*Palimpsestes* 172). He gives it two almost synonymous formulations "this is a text where x imitates y" (*Palimpsestes* 86, emphasis original),⁹⁹ and "the coappearance somewhere, in some form, of the name of the pasticheur and the subject of the pastiche: here, X is imitating Y" (*Palimpsestes* 128, emphases original).¹⁰⁰ Pastiche is thus linked to the affirmation of identity – that of the pasticheur as well as that of the author being imitated¹⁰¹ – which, in the case of contracts, is confirmed by an authenticating signature. (Daniel Compère and Gérard Leclerc, whose ideas of the role of the signature were discussed in the previous chapter, draw from the work of Genette.) While the terms 'contract' and 'signature' are used only metaphorically in the context of literature, Genette's decision to analyse the establishment of the status of pastiche as a contractual matter does have a bearing on legislation. As I have already mentioned, the French copyright law makes explicit allowance for pas-

⁹⁹ "[. . .] ceci est un texte où X imite Y" (*Palimpsestes* 113).

¹⁰⁰ "[. . .] la coprésence qualifiée, en quelque lieu et sous quelque forme, du nom du pasticheur et de celui du pastiché: ici, X imite Y" (*Palimpsestes* 172).

¹⁰¹ Since Genette gives precedence to pastiches of an individual author, style as the object of imitation is for him primarily personal style. For his views on genre pastiches, see *Palimpsestes* (163-66), and for a discussion of the different types of source texts in pastiches, see chapter 2.3 of the present study.

tiches (alongside parodies and caricatures). In order for a text to benefit from this concession, it must of course declare its status vis-à-vis its source texts. Without the “contract” establishing its paradoxical dual authorship, a pastiche text is in danger of falling into the category of forgery, or of being perceived as a mystification (a kind of a literary game) (see also Jeandillou, *Esthétique* 132-34). I shall return to the concept of pastiche contract in more detail in chapter 2.3. For the moment I would like to point out that while the identification of a text as pastiche has proved a difficult issue, Genette’s idea of a pastiche contract has some obvious benefits. First, it distinguishes between pastiche and two kinds of disguised imitations, forgery and mystification, where the aim is to mislead the readers. Secondly, the fact that he does not try to catalogue indicators of pastiche, for instance, but emphasises its contractual nature as a literary form, he draws attention to the role of the reader. While the contract explicates the relationship between pastiche and the imitated text, it is offered to the readers as a statement of the status of the text. Thus Genette emphasises the dependence of pastiche on readers’ recognition: without the contract, the pastiche will be misread as non-imitative text.

Despite the problems in delineating intertextual forms (in Genette’s terms hypertextual forms), *Palimpsestes* has had a significant influence on almost all subsequent French scholarly efforts in this field (see Bilous, “Sur la mimécriture” 103-05). For instance, Annick Bouillaguet bases her study *L’Écriture imitative* (1996) on Genette and Bakhtin, Christian Gutleben combines Genette’s thoughts with those of Fredric Jameson in *Nostalgic Postmodernism* (2001), and the writers of *Du pastiche, de la parodie et du quelque notions connexes* (ed. Paul Aron, 2004) each take a stance on his delineations, just to mention a few examples. One of the contributors to the latter volume, Daniel Bilous, has continued Genette’s investigation into the finer details of pastiche structuration. In “Intertexte/pastiche: l’intermimotexte” (1983), published in the journal *Texte*, Bilous draws attention to the “curious logic” of pastiche, or the requirement that “its fidelity be measured in terms of

its independence from its 'models.'" (139).¹⁰² A crucial element of this independence is the contribution of the pasticheur's own style (142). According to Bilous, the style of a pastiche, or its "inter-style," depends on the dynamic between "mimostyle," or the imitation of the style of the source text, and "autostyle," the characteristic manner of the pasticheur (143-44). In the same issue of *Texte*, Pierre Laurette combines structuralist and psychoanalytic terms in an attempt to analyse the fundamental ambiguity and ambivalence that characterise pastiche (as well as other forms of rewriting). These features can be observed in the structuring of pastiche which is based on the seemingly opposed forces of automatism and contingency, and precision and imprecision. In passing, he comments on a wealth of diverse ideas or elements that can be associated with pastiche, such as the *je ne sais quoi* quality of classical aesthetics (115), the idea of signature (115), narcissism and the mirror effect (116), fetish (121), and mechanisation (124-25), to mention just a few. The influence of Proust's ideas on pastiche is also apparent in the writings of Bilous and Laurette. Their theories can be seen as amplification of aspects of Proustian pastiche in the expansive specialist terminology of the exacting literary theory of the 1980s.

The structuralist tendency to schematise aspects of pastiche is still apparent in "L'Inflexion des voix chères" (2001) by Jean-François Jeandillou, who had already discussed pastiche in the context of mystification (see p. 87). Like Bilous and Laurette, he criticises the overly simplistic approach to pastiche which concentrates simply on the bipolar relationship between the imitation (text 2) and its source (text 1), producing detailed hierarchical models tabulating the semiotic aspects of the reception of pastiche instead. In order to grasp the point of a pastiche, the reader must be able to discern not only the apparent connotations of the enunciation, but also those of the enunciation it is based on and those of a mediating stage, an imaginary but reconstructable "text 0" which is the third element in a pastiche. Jeandillou then wilfully bends this model *as absurdum*, finally presenting a table of the se-

¹⁰² "[. . .] sa fidélité se mesure à son indépendance à l'égard des 'modèles'."

miotic structure of an imaginary parody of Flaubert written in the manner of Robbe-Grillet and inserted in a novel by Queneau (72). Structuralism, at the beginning a serious attempt at the scientific study of literature, has thus become an exercise in jocular theoretical gymnastics. It is possible to see here the influence of the topic, the ludic and ambiguous pastiche, which has from the beginning challenged critics to think about the possibilities and limitations of literature.

1.3 Postmodernism and Beyond

The Postmodern Re-Invention of Pastiche

Pastiche is often associated solely with postmodern theories of the ideological and economic conditions of cultural production. It is not surprising that pastiche became the catchword of postmodern theory, as it seems to address some of postmodernism's major concerns: excessive fragmentation and diversification; the emphasis on style, surface and effect instead of substance; and the growing difficulty of relating identities, time and history to a meaningful continuum (see, e.g., Connor, *Postmodernist Culture*; Jencks, *What Is Post-Modernism*). Theorists of the postmodern have analysed the inherent contradictions and impasses characteristic of contemporary cultural phenomena (but not exclusive to them, despite the rhetoric of novelty in postmodern criticism). According to David Harvey, "[p]ostmodernism swims, even wallows, in the fragmentary and the chaotic currents of change as if that is all there is" (44). At the heart of this chaotic flood is a crisis of representation which has surfaced in postmodern culture in the form of a fundamental vacillation of all signs which undermines such basic notions as origin, depth, history and subjectivity. Schizophrenia (Jameson), *la différence* (Derrida) and the differend (Lyotard) are examples of terms used by theorists to designate the problematic quality of the contemporary condition. Pastiche, often understood in the context of postmodernism as eclectic imitation and hybridisation, provides a form of cultural production for an era characterised by diminishing possibilities of precise, meaningful expression.

It is obvious that in associating pastiche with these issues, theorists of the postmodern have wrenched it away from its drowsy existence at the margins of (literary) criticism. Indeed, the transition has been so fundamental that it is worth asking whether we are still talking about the same thing: do the early twentieth-century descriptions of pastiche as a critical or ludic imitation have anything in common with the postmodern notion of pas-

tiche as a ubiquitous cultural condition? The terminological career of pastiche could be seen as an example of how postmodernism constitutes a radical break with the past, but, as I will argue, this impression is to some extent misleading since postmodern theories of pastiche have much more in common with the earlier notions of pastiche than they are usually taken to have.

The radicality of the postmodern conception of pastiche is largely due to the American critic Fredric Jameson, who in 1983 introduced pastiche to postmodern discourse in his article "Postmodernism and Consumer Society." An extended and revised version of the article appeared the following year in *New Left Review* under the title "Postmodernism, or the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism." The later version has become one of the founding texts of postmodern theory, often anthologised and eventually republished in a collection of Jameson's writings, to which it has also lent its name: *Postmodernism, or the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism* (1991).¹⁰³ The repetition and reformulation of these powerful ideas and their effective dissemination in different forms and forums contributed to the fact that Jameson's writings attracted much attention and indeed became canonised as cornerstones of postmodernist thinking alongside the works of critics such as Jean Baudrillard, David Harvey and Jean-François Lyotard. Moreover, Jameson's writings share an important characteristic with many other seminal theoretical initiatives, namely the scarcity of references to other thinkers, a feature which simultaneously obscures the sources of Jameson's ideas to some extent and allows his ideas to appear as more radically new than what they are.¹⁰⁴ Another

¹⁰³ I shall refer to the 1984 article as "Postmodernism" and to the 1991 collection of essays as *Postmodernism*.

¹⁰⁴ In "Post-Modern Pastiche," Margaret Rose analyses the affinities between Jameson's 1984 article and two previously published works by Jean Baudrillard, *For a Critique of the Political Economy of the Sign* (1972, trans. 1981) and *Simulations* (trans. 1983). Although Jameson refers to Baudrillard only occasionally, his thoughts on postmodernism are heavily influenced by and incorporate elements from Baudrillard's thinking. Rose points out that "what Jameson appears to have done in his characterizations of post-modern pastiche as 'blank' or 'blind' parody is to have taken Baudrillard's characterizations of modern art and of its use of parody and to have applied them to what he (Jameson) has termed 'post-modern

“novelty effect” can be perceived in the changes Jameson has made to the 1983 version before its republication a year later in the *New Left Review*. In the earlier version, he presents his ideas as hypotheses rather than definitive arguments, which is obvious from frequent expressions of uncertainty like “one could think it that way,” “supposing,” “perhaps”. By contrast, in the influential 1984 article Jameson presents his theses in a more straightforward and definitive manner, conjectures having evolved into facts.

In these texts, Jameson seeks to offer a wide-ranging analysis of postmodernism as the cultural condition of the new global social and economic order. In his view, one of the symptoms of this order is the ubiquity of pastiche, which signals two important and interconnected losses: the loss of individuality and the loss of historicity. He suggests that since modernism social and economic conditions have led to linguistic fragmentation and pluralism of the kind that makes individual, distinctive styles and their critical parodies impossible. At the same time, the increasing recourse to the styles of the past has turned the past into a commodity and consequently effaced our sense of real time and memory. In postmodernism, form reigns over content and stylisation has become an end in itself (“Postmodernism” 64-66). Thus postmodernism starkly contrasts with modernism, in which styles sprang from and could be traced back to their historical and individual sources and therefore possessed communicative potential. Jameson characterises postmodernism as follows:

In this situation, parody finds itself without a vocation; it has lived, and that strange new thing pastiche slowly comes to take its place. Pastiche is, like parody, the imitation of a peculiar mask, speech in a dead language: but it is a neutral practice of such mimicry, without any of parody’s ulterior motives, amputated of the satiric impulse, devoid of laughter and of any conviction that alongside the abnormal tongue you have momentarily borrowed, some healthy linguistic normality

pastiche’, so that the problems of modernity, and of its capitalist elements are projected onto the latter” (29; see also 28, 33). As I will point out later on in this chapter, similar criticism can be made in the context of pastiche: Jameson’s manner of contrasting parody with pastiche echoes the early twentieth-century conceptions, but he uses this opposition to characterise contemporary culture.

still exists. Pastiche is thus blank parody, a statue with blind eyeballs: it is to parody what that other interesting and historically original modern thing, the practice of a kind of blank irony, is to what Wayne Booth calls the 'stable ironies' of the 18th century. ("Postmodernism" 65)

What is striking in this often-quoted characterisation of postmodern aesthetics is its emotive impact, accomplished by the use of metaphor, simile and evocative adjectives which effectively convey the strangeness and novelty of pastiche. Rhetoric notwithstanding, the argumentative setting is familiar from earlier accounts of pastiche. Pastiche is compared to parody as in the early twentieth-century theories which established parody as a ridiculing or critical form in contrast to the serious pastiche (although at the same time criticism was seen as one of the main functions of pastiche). Moreover, Jameson's negative evaluation of pastiche in comparison to the critical and creative parody also resembles the classical distinction between servile and creative imitation. Like the eighteenth-century theorists Louis de Jaucourt and Abbé Du Bos, Jameson regards pastiche as superficial, although apparently for different reasons: while Jaucourt and Du Bos attributed the inadequacy of pastiche to its inability to attain the *esprit* of the author being imitated, Jameson shifts the focus from the individual pasticheur to culture, relating the emptiness of pastiche to the disappearance of individuality as an expressive option. Thus, in spite of its rhetoric of novelty, Jameson's conception of pastiche as opposed to parody can also be placed in and analysed in relation to the long tradition of pastiche criticism.

Jameson's claim on the newness of pastiche extends even to its origin. He argues that we owe the concept to Thomas Mann (in *Doktor Faustus*) who in turn owes it to Adorno's critical opposition between Arnold Schoenberg's "innovative planification" and Igor Stravinsky's "irrational eclecticism" ("Postmodernism" 64).¹⁰⁵ This statement of origin is made problematic by the fact

¹⁰⁵ An earlier formulation of this statement of origin can be found in *Marxism and Form* (1971) in which Jameson first paraphrases Adorno's criticism of Stravinsky in terms of pastiche and parody and then continues: "the theoretical justification

that neither Mann nor Adorno uses the term pastiche – although similarities can be found between Jameson’s own critical conception of postmodern pastiche, the themes of Mann’s novel and aspects of Adorno’s aesthetic theory (see Cobley, *Temptations* 193). It is possible to regard this attribution as a figurative one, but such an interpretation is not unproblematic, since Mann’s Leverkühn uses the term parody of the kind of empty imitation Jameson calls pastiche, the opposite of parody.¹⁰⁶ Furthermore, Jameson leaves unacknowledged the conceptual history of pastiche, which goes back at least to the eighteenth century, by fixing Thomas Mann as its point of origin. The supposed origin in a late work of a great modernist writer serves his purpose of launching pastiche as a period concept well,¹⁰⁷ and as such it has consequently become established in the English-language critical discourse.

In the passage quoted above, it is apparent that Jameson uses pastiche in a critical sense to evaluate forms of contemporary culture. This approach sometimes makes it difficult to grasp what exactly he means by the term – what kind of operation or phenomenon is he referring to. Characterisations such as “the imitation of dead styles, speech through all the masks and voices stored up in the imaginary museum of a now global culture” and “the random cannibalization of all the styles of the past” (“Postmodernism” 65-66) establish pastiche as the imitation and recycling of

for the use of such pastiche and parody has been made by Thomas Mann, for whom the act of speaking with irony through a dead style permits speech in a situation where it would otherwise be impossible” (34). In contrast to his later writings, Jameson here associates pastiche with parody and irony, seeing it as an effective means of communication in a context of shrinking possibilities of expression.

¹⁰⁶ In her article on the intertextuality of *Doktor Faustus*, Liisa Saariluoma criticises Jameson for presenting Mann’s novel as an example of postmodern “empty” pastiche. She points out that although ironic quotation and stylisation are characteristic of the novel, it nevertheless deals with the perplexities of the modern artist: the dilemma of Mann and his protagonist, the composer Leverkühn, is how the quotations and other elements borrowed from diverse sources can be transformed into authentic expression (“‘Siteeraamisen’ funktiot” 61). See also Hutcheon (*A Theory of Parody* 30) who regards *Doktor Faustus* as a parody.

¹⁰⁷ For Jameson’s conception of the necessity of periodisation, see “Postmodernism” (55-58).

styles removed from their particular historical contexts (see also *Postmodernism* 133). Yet, in his discussion of a literary example, E.L. Doctorow's *Ragtime* (1975), which recounts the story of an anonymous family in the context of the early twentieth-century American political and popular culture, Jameson extends his perspective beyond recycling of styles to the somewhat different question of representation of ideas and stereotypes of the past. Rather than an imitation of past styles, *Ragtime* is characterised in Jameson's analysis by its peculiar combination of fictive and historical characters and by its simple declarative sentences which, while perfectly grammatical, appear to violate American English at a fundamental level ("Postmodernism" 69-70). Jameson compares this effect to the linguistic innovation of Camus's *The Stranger* (French original 1942) and to Roland Barthes's analysis of it as a kind of "white writing" or style-less style in *Writing Degree Zero* (French original 1953). The "white writing" metaphor seeks to convey the idea of a "style of absence which is almost an ideal absence of style," or a self-contained style practically devoid of any emotive biases or ideological commitment (*Writing Degree Zero* 77). In Jameson's view, this metaphor corresponds to how Doctorow's "new kind of linguistic innovation" effectively works against the historical substance of the novel ("Postmodernism" 70).

This analysis of the style and impact of *Ragtime* raises some questions. Jameson's claim on the novel effect of *Ragtime's* style is somewhat undermined by the fact that he restores it to the context of mid-century literature and criticism, although in his periodisation he reserves this kind of radical loss of historicity and individuality to postmodern culture.¹⁰⁸ Moreover, the analysis of *Ragtime* differs in crucial respects both from his characterisations of pastiche (as in the quotations above) and from the film examples he discusses before turning to Doctorow's novel. Bernardo Bertolucci's *Il Conformista* (1970) and Lawrence Kasdan's *Body Heat* (1981) serve for him as filmic examples of the "aesthetic coloniza-

¹⁰⁸ Cf. the criticism Margaret Rose has made in connection to Jameson's modernist allegiances: see note 104 on p. 104.

tion" of the past through stylistic connotation (67). Their "glossy" image of the past seems to have little in common with the stylistic austerity of Doctorow who does not attempt to imitate the discourses of the time in which his novel is set. Thus, while Jameson seems to be interested in a unifying formal principle governing contemporary culture, his examples do not always appear to correspond to that principle. What *Ragtime* and the film examples have in common in his analysis is not their pastiche structuration but the effect their different stylistic strategies create.

Jameson's analysis of pastiche is thus rather impressionistic and dominated by his larger pursuit of a synthesis of the distinctive traits of contemporary culture. Hence it is difficult to take it at face value; it would make more sense, at least on some occasions, to understand Jameson's "pastiche" as a designation for the reader's uneasy feeling of not quite being able to grasp the tone and direction of a contemporary text (or a film).¹⁰⁹ A crucial aspect of this perplexity consists of the reader's inability to connect the novel's treatment of history to her or his previously acquired knowledge: thus, while traditional historical novels could still institute what Jameson calls a "narrative dialectic" between the reader's cultural knowledge and the novel's rendering of history, in postmodernism the dialectical historicity is replaced by empty repetition of "already-acquired doxa" (69-71). If pastiche is taken to be a category of reception rather than production of cultural artefacts (see Duvall, esp. 380), it can be understood as a manifestation of the "waning of affect," one of Jameson's basic postmodern concepts, by which he means the loss of feeling and emotion in how we experience art works and the ensuing impossibility of interpreting them at a deeply meaningful level (see 61-62). Yet, if pastiche were a matter of a change in the current paradigm of reception, we would not be able to perceive its difference from parody – a difference which is crucial for Jameson's conception of pastiche. These difficulties attest to how Jameson's conception of pastiche operates at several levels simultaneously, without notice-

¹⁰⁹ Richard Dyer has discussed the emotional effects of pastiche from a different perspective. See the following section.

able shifts between them. He uses the term pastiche to describe a cultural condition, a mode of production of actual art works and a mode of reception at the individual level.

Pastiche used to be criticised in the past because of the moral and aesthetic problems involved in using someone else's style, but in Jameson's account it becomes susceptible for epistemological reasons, as borrowed styles have lost their ability to refer to the past and their ability to sustain our understanding of history. Unlike Albertsen, who analyses pastiche's dual relationship to historicity – the "ideal contemporaneity" between the pasticheur and the model, and the contrast in historical styles created by the act of bringing a style from the past into the present (see chapter 1.2) – Jameson perceives the relationship between pastiche and history in more straightforwardly. In the absence of stable linguistic norms, styles have lost their referents and consequently pastiche (understood as the imitation and repetition of past styles) can only produce empty surface effects. Thus it not only interferes with our conception of the past, but also makes us lose our grasp of the historicity of our own time, which was not under threat in Albertsen's critical use of pastiche to highlight the limitations of contemporary aesthetics.

The deterministic and pessimistic view of pastiche is what is usually remembered from Jameson's writings on postmodernism, but as John Burt Foster has pointed out (112), Jameson is not altogether consistent in his conception of pastiche as "random" and "empty". Discussing the film examples, Jameson describes pastiche in terms which suggest that it can be a self-conscious, deliberate vehicle for demonstrating the new phase when stylistic connotations of pastness replace "real" history ("Postmodernism" 67).¹¹⁰ In addition, he ends the whole section on pastiche in "Postmodernism, or the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism" by suggesting that while Doctorow's *Ragtime* fails as a representation

¹¹⁰ In the 1983 article, Jameson writes that one of the "essential messages [of pastiche] will involve the necessary failure of art and the aesthetic, the failure of the new, the imprisonment in the past" ("Postmodernism and Consumer Society" 116).

of history, it may still make us marginally aware of the historical condition we live in:

If there is any realism left here, therefore, it is a 'realism' which is meant to derive from the shock of grasping that confinement, and of slowly becoming aware of a new and original historical situation in which we are condemned to seek History by way of our own pop images and simulacra of that history, which itself remains forever out of reach. (71)

The highlighting of the significance of history and of historicity throughout Jameson's postmodernism articles leads me to one final observation concerning his concept of pastiche. A contradiction seems to obtain between Jameson's critique of postmodern culture for its lack of historicity and his use of the term pastiche, which he deliberately cuts off from its historical context and labels as a late modern invention. This coup ironically turns his concept of pastiche into an example of ahistorical postmodern eclecticism – the very cultural condition he critically analyses in his articles.¹¹¹

Despite the problems I have discussed here, Jameson's concept of pastiche immediately caught on and inspired other critics to pursue his exploration of aspects of postmodern culture. Hal Foster, the editor of the 1983 collection in which Jameson's article appeared in its earliest form, adopts the concept in his article "(Post)Modern Polemics" (1985). Foster associates pastiche with a cultural trait he calls "neoconservative postmodernism" and echoes Jameson in his rather pessimistic analysis of the disintegrative consequences of this cultural form:

[N]early every postmodern artist and architect has resorted, in the name of style and history, to pastiche; indeed, it is fair to say that pastiche is the official style of this postmodernist camp. But does not the eclecticism of pastiche (its mix of codes) threaten the very concept of style, at least as the singular expression of an individual or period?

¹¹¹ It is worth noticing that in the case of his other core concept of postmodernism, schizophrenia, Jameson explicitly negotiates the difference between the clinical sense of the term and his own use of it in the context of art ("Postmodernism" 71). Perhaps pastiche as a less well established critical term did not seem to require similar negotiation.

And does not the relativism of pastiche (its implosion of period signs) erode the very ability to place historical references – to think historically at all? To put it simply, this Postmodern Style of History may in fact signal the disintegration of style and the collapse of history. (127)

Like Jameson, Foster too combines a notion of pastiche as eclectic compilation and of pastiche as stylistic imitation in a manner which sometimes makes it difficult to grasp the nature of the phenomena they are talking about. Some positions are, however, familiar from earlier criticism. For instance, Foster contrasts neo-conservative postmodern pastiche with poststructuralist postmodernism in a manner which once again harks back to the classical distinction between servile and creative imitation. While poststructuralist deconstruction can take a critical stance on contemporary culture, in neoconservative pastiche “the sign, fragmented, fetishized and exhibited as such, is resolved in a signature look, enclosed within a frame” (131). While Foster here and elsewhere follows Jameson’s notion of the role of pastiche in postmodern culture, at the end of his article he offers another point of view. Briefly, and without further elaboration, he points out that the loss of the patriarchal and bourgeois subject manifested in the use of pastiche can be seen as a gain for the previously oppressed groups (136). Thus pastiche would not be, after all, reduced to empty imitation, but could have other uses and meanings depending on its context in contemporary culture.

The significance of pastiche in postcolonial writing is taken up by Jaidev in *The Culture of Pastiche: Existential Aestheticism in the Contemporary Hindi Novel* (1993) but, unlike Foster, Jaidev does not see it as a sign of the loss of the bourgeois subject. For him pastiche is rather a symptom of the domination of the Western idea of the subject. He is critical of Indian novelists whose “[p]astiche is seldom intended; it usually follows their over-privileging of Western codes, their easy surrender before these codes, and their ‘reception’ of them at the latter’s terms” (42). In his view, pastiche prevents the Indian writers from perceiving their own cultural specificity. In fact, as Richard Dyer has pointed out, the power relations manifested in and by pastiche in post-colonial contexts are

often quite complex or even contradictory, since resistance and dependency can become mutually entangled in a pastiche imitating a hegemonic form (*Pastiche* 156-57).

Jameson's influential diagnosis of pastiche as one of the core features of postmodernism has also prompted several critical responses, some of which have rejected his totalising vision of the impossibility of invention and subversion (e.g., Ben-Porat, J. B. Foster, Shiller). In *A Poetics of Postmodernism* (1988) and *The Politics of Postmodernism* (1989), Linda Hutcheon describes postmodernism from a positive and empowering perspective, granting parody a central role in the expression of postmodernism's opposing tendencies. In an earlier work, *A Theory of Parody* (1985), she offered a formalist-influenced definition of parody as a fundamentally "bitextual" form in which repetition turns into a critical difference (7, 36-37). In that volume she made a relatively neutral distinction between double-voiced parody and "monotextual" pastiche which aims at resemblance rather than (critical) difference (38). In her works on postmodernism, she has extended the notion of double-voiced parody to cover the characteristically postmodern phenomenon of the simultaneous assimilation and subversion of tradition. Thus parody is linked with what she sees as the foremost characteristic of postmodernism, "critical complicity," and with historiographic metafiction, or the self-conscious representation of the past in fiction, to the extent that the three terms occasionally appear to become synonymous (see Duvall 379). The term pastiche, Jameson's epitome of postmodernism, is virtually absent in Hutcheon's account of postmodernism, although it functions as the negative counterpart of her conception of parody, as is evident in this passage from *The Politics of Postmodernism* in which she seems to accept Jameson's conception of pastiche, but only if balanced by a notion of critical postmodern parody:

In objecting, as I have, to the relegation of the postmodern parodic to the ahistorical and empty realm of pastiche, I do not want to suggest that there is not a nostalgic, neoconservative recovery of past meaning going on in a lot of contemporary culture; I just want to draw a distinction between that practice and postmodernist parody. The latter is

fundamentally ironic and critical, not nostalgic and antiquarian in its relation to the past. (98)

The disagreement between Jameson and Hutcheon thus relates to the possibility of parody in contemporary culture rather than to the role of pastiche therein.

Other critics have challenged this negative view of postmodern pastiche. In "Post-Modern Pastiche" (1991), Rose rejects Jameson's pessimistic view of the "random cannibalization" of the past and the impossibility of critical stances in postmodernism, highlighting the communicative potential of postmodern eclecticism, which she treats as synonymous with the term pastiche (27-28). For her, pastiche means a "device or mode of compiling different images or styles from one or more works in another" (37n). She associates it with the concept of double-coding, coined by the theorist of architecture, Charles Jencks. In *What is Post-Modernism* (1986) Jencks defines double-coding as "*the combination of Modern techniques with something else (usually traditional building) in order for architecture to communicate with the public and a concerned minority, usually other architects*" (14, emphasis original). What is slightly problematic in Rose's application of the term is that Jencks's own list of synonyms for double-coding – 'plural', 'eclectic' and 'hybrid' – does not include pastiche, nor does he extend the idea of double-coding beyond architecture, because in art and literature authors "may use traditional techniques of narrative and representation in a more straightforward way" (14). When Rose defines postmodern pastiche as double-coding, it seems that she is in fact double-coding Jencks's conception of postmodern doubleness with Jameson's terminology in order to give a more positive interpretation of postmodernity and of the role of pastiche. While the analogy may not be entirely convincing, it does however highlight an important aspect of pastiche; namely, communication between different audiences and legitimisation of older styles through their reinterpretation in a new social context. Rose is also careful to avoid any too obviously essentialist definition of pastiche. Criticising Jameson's problematic division between modern and postmodern phenomena (e.g., 29), she stresses that

pastiche, like parody, is a *device* used in several post-modernist works of art and architecture for several different 'post-modernist' purposes, and [. . .] it is, moreover, not *only* a post-modern device, as suggested by Jameson and those following him, but one which has been used, and talked about, for at least the last few centuries. Recognising these facts may, moreover, be important to understanding not only how pastiche is actually being used in post-modernist works, but also how those works may relate to those of the past from which they are understood by the post-modernist to be breaking or developing. (35, emphases original)

Thus, unlike many other writers discussing pastiche in the context of postmodernism, she is aware of its history, although she does not comment on the historical scope of double-coded uses of pastiche. For her, double-coding is a characteristically postmodern phenomenon but, as I have pointed out, the related issue of the ambiguity of pastiche and the critical uses to which it can be put have been discussed by earlier critics.

The publication of Ingeborg Hoesterey's book *Pastiche: Cultural Memory in Art, Film, Literature* in 2001 can be seen as a definitive proof of the inclusion of the term pastiche in the English critical vocabulary: it is the first English book-length account of the subject and also the first monograph devoted to pastiche since Deffoux's *Le Pastiche littéraire* from 1932. Hoesterey offers a solution to the semantic confusion pertaining to the term pastiche by introducing two new concepts, *(quasi-)homage* and *cento pastiche*. According to her, in *(quasi-)homage* the aim is to pay "homage to a great literary figure or figures through imitation, dialogical engagement, critical distance, and parody" (95). As the *(quasi-)* prefix her term indicates, this type of pastiche may be sincere homage or criticism in the disguise of homage or something between the two. *Cento pastiche* denotes a postmodern phenomenon, a patchwork of different elements from a variety of sources. In Hoesterey's view *(quasi-)homages* are typical of literature, while *cento* or *medley* is the predominant form of pastiche in other arts, especially in the postmodern era (9).

Hoesterey's solution to the terminological problem is, however, not without its drawbacks.¹¹² As a term, (quasi-)homage seems to take into account the inherent ambiguity of stylistic imitation, but in practice Hoesterey uses it in a slightly derogatory sense to designate traditional literary pastiches which cannot in her view attain the level of inventiveness and radicalism of cento pastiches (9, 21). This attitude is even more explicit in her 1995 article "Postmodern Pastiche: A Critical Aesthetic," in which she explicitly deemed literary pastiche conservative and relatively uninteresting in comparison to pastiche in other arts, claiming that "the influence of critical theory on the visual arts, including architecture and film, has led to the emergence of a pastiche style [cento pastiche] as epistemological program that transcends the codes of parody and travesty typical of traditional literary pastiches" (498-500; see also *Pastiche* 21). Her other coinage, cento pastiche, merges two terms that are semantically and temporally distant. Cento is an ancient term, meaning a poem (or more rarely, a prose text) that consists in its entirety of lines taken from the works of another poet,¹¹³ while pastiche as a critical term belongs to the context of the modern process of individualisation in art and literature and originally meant the imitation of the style of another artist (Piles, *Abregé* 102).¹¹⁴ Moreover, the aims of the two

¹¹² See also Linda Hutcheon's review of Hoesterey's book in *Comparative Literature Studies*, in which she points out the problems in Hoesterey's terminology when applied to literary examples (325).

¹¹³ See *Pastiche* 11, 80. Typical ancient examples of cento are *Cento virgilianus* (ca. 357-70) by Faltonia Betitia Proba and *Homerocentones* (after 443) by Empress Eudocia, both of which recount the life of Jesus in verses taken from an ancient authority. Centos can also be found in prose writing; for examples of Latin prose centos, see Kivistö (211ff). The term cento is rarely used in the context of modern literature, but the mode of writing has not disappeared. A contemporary, jocular example of a cento poem can be found in *The Ode Less Travelled*, in which Stephen Fry constructs a queer lyric out of lines excerpted from Wordsworth (261).

¹¹⁴ Unlike Hoesterey, who combines the terms, some other critics have stressed the difference between cento and pastiche. For instance, in *Le Problème du style* (1902), Remy de Gourmont described pastiche and cento as antonyms: a cento consists of verbatim quotations and its author may not be conscious of the bor-

practices are different, as Hoesterey herself points out. Ancient centos were primarily parodic, whereas in Hoesterey's postmodern cento pastiche parody "is no longer the first priority" (95; cf. 11). As we have seen in the quotations above, Hoesterey associates parodic tone or attitude with the literary (quasi-)homage, thereby linking parody with the more conservative version, not the critical version of pastiche. However, elsewhere in her book she nevertheless maintains that "literary travesty [. . .] presupposes, like parody, a polemical relationship of the later author to the canonical work engaged, a relationship not typical of the traditional literary pastiche of the French tradition, but often part of its postmodern version" (15). Hoesterey's indetermination as to the involvement of parodic attitude in pastiche complicates and partly effaces the distinction between (quasi-)homage and cento pastiche.

In addition to these two terms, Hoesterey uses other, vaguer characterisations such as "heavy-duty pastiche" (93), by which she means the imitation of the works of one particular author, a practice which she finds limiting and relatively uninteresting. If one does not know the particular text being imitated, how is one to "assess and aesthetically enjoy the conceit of the successor," she asks (93) and, while her question is of course a relevant one, it also implies that her perspective on such imitations does not extend beyond the imitation-model relationship. Her example of heavy-duty pastiches, the Victorian imitations in A.S. Byatt's *Possession* are, in my view, precisely the kind of stylistic imitations in which the meaning of the text results from the interaction and superposition of textual and contextual layers. The detailed imitation of a particular source text is not necessarily a restrictive factor in this type of pastiche, as I shall argue in more detail in chapter 3.3.

Despite these terminological problems, Hoesterey foregrounds several important issues which have received little attention in previous criticism. She agrees with Jameson that pastiche has become important in postmodernism but, instead of seeing

rowings while pastiche never reproduces exact phrases and is always acknowledged as imitation (145).

this as a sign of the loss of historicity, she considers pastiche a vehicle of cultural memory. She echoes the views of Albertsen in writing that “[t]oday’s intellectual pastiches are about culture as a process of meaning constitution; they critically reflect upon the historicity of aesthetic judgement and taste” (31). But unlike Albertsen, who saw that the criticism in pastiche was directed at the values of the present, Hoesterey sees that the criticism may have multiple targets: pastiche may be critical both of its sources and the construction of the aesthetic values of the present which it sets in a historical perspective. Thus for Hoesterey, pastiche is a postmodern form of allegory, revealing its critical content when read in terms of other texts (27). Unlike Jameson, she sees that contemporary intellectual pastiches have emancipatory potential which is manifested, for instance, in how they make us perceive the tradition and its influence on the present from a different perspective (29). Her study thus considerably widens the perspective in which pastiches are generally analysed and her positive evaluation of it in the context of cultural history and memory carries on the initiatives to historical enquiry of Rubow and Albertsen in contemporary criticism.

It is perhaps the emotive tone and ideological fervour of Jameson’s writings on postmodern pastiche that has induced his commentators usually to divide into two clearly opposing camps: those who share his critical attitude of the contemporary culture and society and those who disagree with his basic assumptions and with the negative conclusions he draws from them.¹¹⁵ The cooling of the debate on postmodernism in recent years has left room for mediation. In *Defective Inspectors: Crime Fiction Pastiche in Late-Twentieth-Century French Literature* (2006) Simon Kemp reads the works of Michel Butor, Jean Echenoz, Georges Perec and Alain Robbe-Grillet as instances of pastiche in the Jamesonian sense of non-satirical imitation. While Kemp accepts some of Jameson’s premises, he sees pastiche in a more positive light, as “a redirecting of parody’s techniques to create new emphasis” (147).

¹¹⁵ Cf. Hutcheon’s analysis of the two camps in the “postmodern wars” (*Politics* 17).

Kemp's starting points lie in the famous articles which introduced pastiche to postmodern debate and in "Reading and the Division of Labor" in which Jameson discusses the crisis of representation in the French context, especially in relation to the works of Claude Simon (Jameson, *Postmodernism* 131-53). As Kemp readily points out, he could have chosen term other than pastiche to designate the kind of reworking of the elements of detective fiction that is common to the writers he analyses (17). Indeed, if the term pastiche is used to designate the adoption of the conventions of detective fiction in other genres, much of today's literary fiction is pastiche, which could be seen as extending the term too far. However, what is interesting from the point of view of the present study, is Kemp's association of the term pastiche with wider literary and philosophical issues, such as the epistemological and ontological role of representations. Rather than a distancing, empty literary form, pastiche has, in his view, the ability to transcend the limitations of rigid realism towards a more open and ambiguous form of narrative that does not reduce the plurality of experience. The idea of pastiche as constituting a form of dysfunctional and fragmented, and hence truer, realism resonates with my analysis of Byatt's *Possession* in chapter 3.3. Kemp's study also attests to another important shift in the discussion on pastiche, the move away from predominantly theoretical issues to interpretation of texts, triggered by the need to understand how pastiche functions in terms of actual literary works. The emphasis on the analysis and interpretation of pastiche works is evident in Richard Dyer's work, discussed in the following section.

The mainstream of pastiche criticism from the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, discussed in the previous chapter, concentrated on pastiche exclusively as a literary phenomenon. By contrast, the postmodern discussion on pastiche is characterised by the extension of the term beyond particular art forms to culture itself. The approach is not so much comparative as assimilative: Jameson, Rose and Hoesterey start from a general definition which they apply to all the arts. Their emphasis is on the analysis of postmodernism as much as (or even more than) the analysis of

pastiche, which explains, in part, their interest in those features which all forms of cultural production share and the ensuing complications when the general term is applied to particular works in different arts. By way of concluding my analysis of the postmodern accounts of pastiche, I wish to emphasise that despite certain conceptual problems and a largely ahistorical perspective, this approach to pastiche has, first of all, made the ideological tensions pertaining to the concept apparent and secondly, opened up important new ways of analysing the culture of recycling in which pastiche participates.

Epistemology and Emotion

Since the turn of the millennium, the French criticism on pastiche appears to have had two main strands: first, the formal aspects of pastiche remain at the fore front of the discussion which is still influenced by Genette's trail-blaizing study in *Palimpsestes*; secondly, researchers have become increasingly interested in the history of pastiche as a literary form.¹¹⁶ It is perhaps a sign of the national and language barriers in academic study that postmodern pastiche has attracted little attention in France, except among those researchers who specialise in English literature, while in the Anglophone context pastiche has been little discussed outside the postmodern paradigm and, as we have seen, its long French history has been largely overlooked.¹¹⁷ However, with the passing of that paradigm and with a critical evaluation of its heritage, new perspectives have opened for pastiche research, most obviously in

¹¹⁶ See, e.g., Aron, *Histoire du pastiche*; Aron and Espagnon, *Répertoire des pastiches et parodies littéraires des XIX^e et XX^e siècles*; Dousteysier-Khoze and Place-Verghnes (eds.), *Poétiques de la parodie et du pastiche de 1850 à nos jours*; Hellegouarc'h, *Les Conditions de production et d'édition du pastiche littéraire au XX^e siècle (1908-1989)*.

¹¹⁷ The ways in which postmodernism manifested itself were, of course, culturally determined: thus Anglo-American theory might not be best suited to French expressions of postmodernism, a point which undermines Jameson's emphasis on the global nature of the postmodern condition and its cultural manifestations.

connection with one increasingly popular genre, the neo-Victorian novel, in which pastiches of nineteenth-century discourses are relatively frequent. Neo-Victorian studies, as the field is beginning to be known,¹¹⁸ continue to explore questions raised in postmodern theory, such as the elements of nostalgia and criticism in representations of the past. Commercial motives, especially the benefits of a ready audience, are seen as important features of neo-Victorian pastiches, but critics have also pointed out the possibilities inherent in the flexible handling of the past through the imitation of style. I will return to the neo-Victorian pastiches and their study in contemporary criticism in chapter 3.3.

Another area of research was initiated by Richard Dyer in his study *Pastiche* in 2007. Like Denis Diderot 240 years before, Dyer laments the gratuitously negative connotations of the term (9), and seeks to offer a more balanced analysis of the procedures that go under the name of pastiche. Although Dyer seems unaware of Diderot's writings on pastiche in *Salon de 1767*,¹¹⁹ both critics similarly stress the emotional impact of pastiche on the viewer/reader and, moreover, relate that affect to the fundamental questions of what kind of knowledge and insight we may attain through art. As we have seen in chapter 1.2, the touching effect that Casanova's pastiches have on Diderot leads him to consider the thin line between the liberties of art on the one hand and the problem of deception on the other. For Dyer, the important question is not art's claims to truth but its historicity: "The most valuable point of pastiche resides in its ability to move us even while allowing us to be conscious of where the means of our being moved come from, its historicity" (138). Moreover, he argues that "[t]he reason for being interested in [pastiche] is that it demonstrates that self-consciousness and emotional expression can co-exist, healing one of the great rifts in Western aesthetics and allowing us to contemplate the possibility of feeling historically" (4). In contrast to Linda Hutcheon's concept of 'historiographic metafiction,' which

¹¹⁸ The inaugural issue of *The Journal of Neo-Victorian Studies* was published in 2008.

¹¹⁹ He only refers to Diderot in passing, via Wido Hempel (*Pastiche* 52).

emphasises the paradoxical nature of the combination of self-reflexivity and historiographic claims in postmodernist fiction (*Poetics of Postmodernism* 5), Dyer's notion of pastiche foregrounds emotional engagement instead of alienation and the shared, popular ideas of historicity instead of "official history," the usual target of rewriting or deconstruction in historiographic metafiction.

According to Dyer, the emotional aspect of pastiche is two-fold. For one thing, pastiche is used to express emotions, as in film music that imitates emotionally-charged tunes and orchestration,¹²⁰ or to convey a feeling of how things were felt and experienced in the past. For instance, in the film *Far from Heaven* (2002), pastiche is used to enable the present-day viewers "to feel with the 1950s in terms of the 1950s" (177). This sense is created through the meticulous imitation of the details and attitude of the films from that era, especially the melodramas of Douglas Sirk (175). What distinguishes *Far from Heaven* from its 1950s source texts is the then impossible topic of homosexuality and inter-racial love.¹²¹ The other emotional aspect pertains to reception, or to the affect of pastiche. Unlike those who wish to see pastiche as a mechanical exercise or as a means of estrangement, Dyer draws attention to its ability to engage the audience emotionally, although they remain aware of the fact that they are experiencing something "secondhand" (see also Brisson). For him, pastiche deals with the layered cultural perception of historical styles and the values they convey. This is especially obvious in framed pastiches, a type largely omitted in previous studies, but of central importance to Dyer (64-91). It is often the case that the framed pastiche text is read by the fictional characters of the framing narrative, which doubles the reception of the pastiche. We have a representation of one kind of reception which may be compared to our own sense of what the pastiche text is about. These narratives of-

¹²⁰ For an example, see Dyer's analysis of the music of Nino Rota in the earlier article, "The Notion of Pastiche" (82-84).

¹²¹ Dyer's idea of how pastiche represents the past through emotional engagement thus comes close to the idea of the "structure of feeling," discussed by Ringrose in the context of children's fiction (see chapter 2.1).

ten play with a discrepancy between the reactions of the fictional characters and the targeted audience.

Dyer approaches the various aspects of pastiche through analyses of examples which range from Proust's *L'Affaire Lemoine*, spaghetti Westerns and productions of the ballet *Nutcracker* to "black" music composed or performed by Jews (George Gershwin, Irving Berlin, Al Jolson). Unlike most other English-language critics, Dyer does not associate pastiche with eclecticism, seeing it as imitation that makes us aware of the fact that it is imitation. Consequently he emphasises the close engagement of the pastiche with its source text: "A pastiche is very like that which it pastiches. In some cases, it may be all but indistinguishable from it, in others more obviously different, but it must always seem pretty close" (54). According to him, deciding whether to discuss a particular work as pastiche involves "considering a combination of paratextual, contextual and textual evidence" (47). Its recognition does not, therefore, depend solely on emotional response, but requires an element of analysis, as well.

Focusing on the emotive aspects and effects of pastiche makes Dyer particularly sensitive to the many ways in which the ambiguity of pastiche manifests itself. He says that pastiche is a particularly apt way to explore "the gap between empirical evidence and imaginative probability" (80) and elsewhere situates it at the "borderline of false but plausible" (53). He compares pastiche to 'scare quotes', the now ubiquitous indicators of simultaneous distance and being within (64), the ironic stance which is illustrated in Umberto Eco's famous example of the young man who was only able to confess his amorous feelings to his beloved by quoting the queen of romances: "As Barbara Cartland would put it, I love you madly" (*Postscript* 67). Dyer sees such ambivalence as a vantage point for pastiche. Unlike parody, which in Dyer's opinion "implies a sure position outside of that to which it refers, one of secure judgement and knowledge" (46), pastiche is

always rooted in participation.¹²² Even if its ultimate effect may be to create critical distance, that distance is achieved through engagement, and neither component has the power to cancel or annul the other. Indeed, there need not be an opposition between the emotive and epistemological aspects of pastiche; the fact that we feel the feelings may make us more aware of their cultural meanings, as Dyer stresses in the conclusion to an earlier article, "The Notion of Pastiche" (87). Pastiche acknowledges the inescapable complexity of the issues it deals with. In the history of the concept of pastiche, Dyer's study marks an important new phase that carries pastiche beyond the trenches of the two postmodernist "camps." The ambivalence of pastiche which has disturbed generations of critics is now taken as the point of departure and is accepted as one of the constituting elements of pastiche. Moreover, without actually emphasising that shift, Dyer introduces a notion of pastiche to English-language criticism that is largely compatible with the French conception of pastiche as the imitation of style.¹²³ It therefore points towards the kind of study of pastiche that would take the impact of these two different traditions of looking at this ambiguous practice into consideration.

Conclusion to Part One

During the past three centuries, the concept of pastiche has undergone several phases. Originally a culinary term used metaphorically of art works, it emerged as a concept in art criticism in France at the turn of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and became subsequently applied to literature to mean the acknowledged imitation of the individual style of another writer. Interest in pastiche peaked at the beginning of the twentieth cen-

¹²² While critics who concentrate on parody tend to undermine the role and significance of pastiche, Dyer risks doing the opposite. His tentative characterisation of parody as angry, mocking and unkind is perhaps slightly unfair (*Pastiche* 47).

¹²³ Dyer does, however, jokingly claim that his book "is trying to rescue pastiche from postmodernism" (*Pastiche* 131).

tury, when the popular pastiche anthologies directed the critics' attention to the literary form. This phase was an important influence and background to French structuralists who, from the 1960s onwards, analysed the intertextual structuration of pastiche in comparison and contrast to other imitative forms. The comparative setting remained important to the postmodern debate on pastiche, although the focus of interest shifted from the textual to the ideological and political conditions. As of the beginning of the new century, the polarised political debate has receded, and critical interest has turned to how pastiche affects its readers and elicits the texts it evokes.

By way of concluding my historical investigation, and as a preliminary overview of some of the issues discussed in part two, I wish to point out five distinctions or tensions which have characterised the concept of pastiche. The first division pertains to the cultural contexts which have shaped pastiche. Up until the 1980s, the concept was primarily defined by French critics and by French conventions of writing pastiche, such as the popular anthology, which usually consists of short humorous and critical pastiches of canonical authors. The Danish and German critics who occasionally contributed to the discussion were also researchers in Romance literatures and thus shared in the French academic context. The concept of pastiche became current in the English-language academic discourse with postmodernism and then in a sense that differs from its meaning in French. The gap between the two academic cultures is still evident in that contemporary French criticism on pastiche does not very much engage with the ideas proposed by Anglophone theorists, and those Anglophone critics who are aware of the more prominent role of pastiche in French literature are prone to downplay its significance and concentrate instead on those features which they perceive as important in their own culture. The case of pastiche thus illustrates how geographical and cultural boundaries shape the way in which concepts are used (Bal 25).

Differing notions of the cultural or critical value of pastiche constitute another important dividing factor. Both in academic

discourse and in common usage the term often has a negative connotation. The early critics of pastiche, such as Marmontel and Marquis de Roure, deplored the practice because it seeks to imitate that which is personal and therefore faulty in an author's manner, not that which is timeless and good. When the neoclassical conception of imitation was gradually replaced by individualist aesthetics, the negative connotation of pastiche however persisted, although it was now justified differently. In comparison to "original composition," to borrow from the title of Edward Young's famous essay, pastiche was perceived as a sign of the lack of individual talent. This notion was adapted to the postmodern idea of the loss of individuality in the writings of Jameson and his followers. For those who take a neutral or positive approach to pastiche, it is a literary or artistic "device," as Rose calls it, or a phenomenon which may have various cultural functions. It can delight or amuse, critically highlight the style of a particularly writer, draw attention to the principles of authorship and originality or make us aware of the roots of our contemporary culture, just to mention a couple of the more positive interpretations of its functions. These two standpoints – negative and neutral/positive – are not directly comparable, however, since the negative qualities are usually seen as something inherent to pastiche, whereas the proponents of the more positive notion tend to concentrate on its functions.

The third division was established in the early nineteenth century, when critics distinguished between voluntary and involuntary pastiche. As I suggested earlier, this division can be seen as a manner of dealing with the negative connotation of pastiche: the lack of talent associated with pastiche could be transferred to the involuntary variety, in which the pasticheur unconsciously imitates the manner of someone else. In order to be appreciated, a pastiche must be acknowledged, and must have a purpose and direction that can be glossed as the pasticheur's intention. The idea of involuntary pastiche recurs, under different colours, in Jamesonian postmodernism, in which pastiche becomes a dominant cul-

tural principle: the crisis of representation has made individual styles impossible, leaving imitation as the only option for writers.

The fourth tension in the conceptions of pastiche pertains to how it is understood to imitate its source text. In the inaugural definition of pastiche from 1699, Piles defined it as the imitation of the style (*manière*) of a particular master, where the pasticheur imitates various details and aspects of the different paintings by a single painter, usually a master. Pastiche was thus also a kind of compilation, but its sources were limited to the corpus of one artist and the resulting work was characterised by stylistic unity, not eclecticism. Piles's notion of pastiche as a concept of art criticism thus differs from the hotchpotch quality of the etymological dish as well as from the *pasticcio* opera, which typically consists of arias drawn from the works of different composers. In literary studies, the eclectic sense of pastiche became widespread only with postmodernism, undoubtedly prompted by the particularly English usage of the term to denote a medley and a compilation. Yet, even many of those who stress the compilation aspect of pastiche describe it as a form of imitation or as recycling of styles, as was seen in the case of Jameson's postmodernism articles.

Finally, a division can be detected in whether pastiche is discussed primarily in the context of literature, as in most of the French studies discussed in the previous chapters, or whether it is seen as a general term covering a wealth of cultural phenomena across various media. Like the division between imitation of style and compilation, this division can be traced back to the two academic cultures and their different traditions. The French critics tend to look at pastiche as a literary phenomenon, while in English-language criticism it has become a cultural concept, applicable to art, film, architecture, advertisements, and even to non-material entities like identity.

These divisions are sources of much of the confusion enveloping the concept, but they can also function as useful points of departure for a critical investigation. In this chapter, I have provided a historical background that in part explains where the tensions derive from and what aesthetic, ideological and cultural rea-

sons have shaped the concept of pastiche. In part two of this study, these tensions will be analysed in more detail with the purpose of outlining a more balanced way of understanding what pastiche is and what it can do in literature. The further discussion will also illustrate how the complications arise in part from the fundamental ambiguity of pastiche that makes it a difficult as well as fascinating object of study.

PART II: CONCEPT

2.1 Two Kinds of Pastiche

The emergence of the postmodern conception of pastiche in the 1980s and the establishment of the term in the English critical vocabulary has led to two competing notions of pastiche and a seemingly endless array of variations in between: on the one hand, pastiche is taken to mean the imitation of one characteristic style; on the other, it is used of eclectic works which draw elements and styles from various other works. It is of course normal for concepts to migrate and to become invested with new meanings; indeed, such shifts are essential to the development of critical enquiry. In literary and cultural studies, key concepts like *intertextuality* (Orr; Machacek 523-25), *parody* (Hutcheon, *A Theory of Parody*; Rose, *Parody*) or even *literature* (Lehtinen 196-99; Rancière 9-14; Widdowson 26-41) have acquired new meanings and are now being used of different phenomena from what they originally referred to. For instance, up until the eighteenth century, the term literature meant first and foremost learning associated with literacy or learning acquired from books. This general meaning narrowed gradually in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries to “literary knowledge” or the kind of knowledge about literary works which made it possible to make informed aesthetic judgements. Rather than with learning, the term then became associated with books as physical objects and books as literary works, in other words, the kind of book which is not primarily appreciated for its content and instrumental value but for its aesthetic, emotional and often its moral qualities. This semantic shift corresponds to the new professionalisation in literature evident in the emergence of professional fiction writers and a regulated publishing industry. Yet, the earlier senses of the term literature are still evoked in some contexts: for example, when we say we are studying literature at the university, we do not simply mean the study of literary

works (novels, poetry, plays) but also the study of “literary knowledge” – literary criticism and theory, as well as other branches of learning which help us to understand how literary works work. The fact that the current sense of the term literature is a fairly recent development means that terms like “ancient literature” or “medieval literature” are basically anachronistic. They are useful and sensible concepts from today’s perspective, but ancient and medieval people would have used different terms and different classifications for talking about “literature”.

The complex history and the multitudinous usage of critical terms often makes it difficult to identify the interrelated questions of the consistent use of a term, awareness of its historical development and awareness of the distinction between the theoretical concept and those practices or phenomena which it helps to identify and with which it interacts. For instance, when Linda Hutcheon argues for what she perceives as a productive use of the term parody, she seems to be sliding from the term to the practice and from the present to the past in a way which demonstrates the difficulties of negotiating the historical shifts in definitions and practices:

In my focus on twentieth-century art forms, I hope to suggest that there are probably no transhistorical definitions of parody possible. Nevertheless, I shall constantly be using examples from other periods to show that there are common denominators to all definitions of parody in all ages – although they are *not* the ones usually cited. It is modern parodic usage that is forcing us to decide what it is that we shall call parody today. In fact the closest model to present practice was not called parody at all, but imitation. (*A Theory of Parody* 10, emphasis original)

Hutcheon’s careful avoidance of an exact definition, which would inevitably be reductive, leads her to balance somewhat uncomfortably between a practical notion of parody derived from the present parodic usage and the historical continuity of definitions of parody; moreover, it leads her to extend the notion of parody to other forms, such as classical imitation. This makes parody into

an umbrella term for virtually all imitative practices, which threatens to undermine the particularity of the term.

Literary concepts are often elastic, open or imprecise. A certain openness and flexibility in relation to the object has been seen as an important element in literary critical terminology (Saariluoma, "Eksaktius" 126-27), but it can also be perceived as a problem, especially when critics use the same term for different ends without clarifying their use or supplying it with the relevant historical contexts. Furthermore, it is difficult to determine the level of exactitude necessary for a shared understanding of the scope and functions of a term, since some concepts tolerate fairly flexible use or indeed benefit from such variety of usages. Take for instance the concept of style: it is used both in everyday language and in critical discourse in a plethora of ways, but still it seems to retain enough coherence to be intuitively graspable and useful in many contexts. Thus it seems to be an example of a case of an exact definition detracting from the concept's potential to engage in productive ways with the object.¹ By contrast, other concepts are limited to literary discourse only, and can be defined in a fairly precise manner, such as the sonnet, with its restricted form and conventional themes. Writers have of course pushed the limits of this conception and applied both the form and the term to purposes other than the celebration of (the woes of) love, but these transgressions are nevertheless measured against the fairly consistent idea of what sonnets have been and are usually taken to be. As a literary concept, pastiche seems to be situated somewhere between these two examples: while it is dependent on general and elusive concepts such as style and imitation or compilation, it is also a specialist term denoting a particular practice or the product of that practice (although the particularity of that practice is ques-

¹ While the results of such an enquiry may not be conclusive, a discussion on the precise meaning of the concept of style may help us to better understand just why it is so difficult to grasp its meaning precisely. See Goodman (23-40) for an attempt to define the status of style; Genette (*Fiction and Diction*, 85-141) for an analytic reply; and Compagnon (222-28) for a critical summary of the discussion.

tionable in the light of the dilemma of the two conflicting meanings discussed above).

One reason why pastiche is a relevant concept for criticism today is that the complications pertaining to it can make us more attentive to the ways in which we use other concepts and to the background assumptions that govern them. A choice between concepts is always a choice between meanings and values. While the concepts of literary criticism and theory seldom have the kind of political and social repercussions that conceptual history (*Begriffsgeschichte*) analyses,² they do have effects on how literature as a human activity is perceived and how the boundaries of language and understanding are delineated. As I sought to demonstrate in the previous part, the debate on pastiche has, from its inception, centered on questions of literary value such as whether pastiche merits consideration in its own right or whether it is seen as a parasitic practice. This debate is not merely one of classification and labelling of works, but participates in a variety of larger debates on the *raison d'être* of literature, its fundamental values and the significance of authorship. Historically one of the main uses of the concept of pastiche has been to illustrate through negation that which is considered valuable or genuine in art and literature. A critic's choice between the concepts of parody and pastiche may nowadays imply the adoption of a much larger aesthetic and political agenda, as the cleft between Fredric Jameson's and Linda Hutcheon's views on the state of postmodern culture attests.

In the following, I shall first offer a practical, although admittedly fairly simple solution to the present confusion over the meanings of the concept of pastiche and then proceed to a more detailed analysis of the two different conceptions in view of their consistency and applicability. My approach is thus ultimately pragmatic, aiming at productive interaction between theory and practice, but I am aware that a concept such as pastiche could be

² Focusing on political and social concepts, *Begriffsgeschichte* analyses how concepts such as citizen, state or democracy are spread across the social system; how they become vehicles of ideologies; and how they are used in furthering particular political ends. See Bödeker for the background and objectives of *Begriffsgeschichte*.

analysed differently. As a theoretical concept it could be used irrespective of particular material practices or works, in which case it would be most useful to measure its significance against its evocative potential as a metaphor for a particular attitude, ideology or poetics within the theoretical framework in which it is used. It could be argued that this is precisely the sense in which the term was evoked in postmodern theory; however, even then it was associated with particular artistic practices, which makes it a concept of practical criticism and as such it has been adopted from Jameson's writings to wider usage. In my view, the postmodern conceptions of pastiche can and indeed should also be analysed from the point of view of their relevance to understanding actual literary works in their cultural contexts.

In part one of this study, I have already expressed reservations about particular postmodern conceptions of pastiche; here, however, my viewpoint is slightly different as I will analyse the ways in which contemporary critics have sought to describe pastiche as an eclectic literary and artistic practice. Having pointed out some of the problems with this notion, I shall turn to the conception of pastiche as the acknowledged imitation of a particular style which in my view offers a more fruitful and focused basis for critical analysis. My aim is not to censure other uses of the term, but to argue for a conception of pastiche that is relevant to existing literary practices and to the historical background covered in part one, and also to be mindful of the significant developments in pastiche criticism within postmodern cultural theory. In *Travelling Concepts in the Humanities*, Mieke Bal makes the observation that “[c]oncepts [. . .] are the sites of debate, awareness of difference, and tentative exchange. Agreeing doesn't mean agreeing on content, but agreeing on the basic rules of the game: if you use a concept at all, you use it in a particular way so that you can meaningfully disagree on content” (13). In my discussion of the critics whose notions of pastiche I find problematic, I am hoping to “disagree meaningfully” so as to be constructive rather than reductive in my contribution to the debate on the meaning and significance of pastiche.

From these conceptual issues I shall proceed to consider the elements of pastiche as stylistic imitation: what makes it a specific literary form? Unlike the more common terms parody and satire, which evoke fairly precise ideas of the kind of practice they refer to, pastiche needs explication, especially in the context of the competing theoretical stances and traditions. Chapter 2.2 will look at pastiche in the context of related literary practices, such as parody and allusion, and discuss the possibility of extending the literary notion of pastiche to other arts. These comparative perspectives will help to delineate the characteristics of pastiche, understood as the consistent imitation of a recognisable style. The most prominent of these characteristics, the double-edgedness of pastiche, is the topic of the third and last chapter of part II.

A Terminological Solution

My practical solution to the current terminological confusion is similar in principle to that offered by Ingeborg Hoesterey in *Pastiche: Cultural Memory in Art, Film, Literature*. She correctly identifies a general division in the usage of the term and seeks to illustrate this distinction by introducing two new terms, cento pastiche and (quasi-)homage. However, as I pointed out in chapter 1.3, there are some problems with these denominations, beginning with the terms themselves and extending to the ways in which Hoesterey attempts to distinguish them from each other and from other imitative practices such as parody. Another solution is suggested by Richard Dyer, who recommends in *Pastiche* that the term *pasticcio* (or *pasticcio pastiche*) be reserved for eclectic pastiches and the term *pastiche* to the more specific kind of stylistic imitation (*Pastiche* 9, 16). He justifies this use by referring to etymology – *pasticcio* as the pie consisting of various ingredients – but the distinction is open to misunderstandings, because both terms derive from the same eclectic dish and were used synonymously in the eighteenth century and occasionally later as well. Understanding the distinction

between these near-identical terms also requires a relatively high degree of academic sophistication, and it is therefore unlikely that the usage could be adopted for instance on such everyday occasions as newspaper reviews, where the term *pastiche* occasionally occurs. In journalistic use, the meaning of the term is usually implied by the context: if a reviewer writes that “x is a pastiche,” without giving further specification, he or she usually means a work drawing from a variety of sources, while the formulation “x is a pastiche of y” suggests a concentrated imitation of the style of one particular source. Despite these explicit or implicit specifications, the uses of the term in criticism and in reviews are seldom transparent, not even for someone who is aware of the distinction. My simple suggestion for ameliorating this situation is to add a modifier that indicates the general mode in which the term is used. Thus *compilation pastiche* could be used of eclectic works which borrow and amend elements from different sources or incorporate features from diverse styles, while those pastiches which imitate the style of one identifiable source could be called *stylistic pastiches*.

The modified terms I am proposing have advantages over the suggestions of Hoesterey and Dyer. Their relative transparency serves the ends of communication better than specialist terminology which requires a higher level of familiarity with the issues in hand. Either term can be used in a descriptive sense to designate a particular literary or artistic practice. My terminological suggestions are not intended to imply a hierarchical value judgement between the two practices. Both are legitimate means that can be used in more or less creative ways by writers and artists. Furthermore, I do not think that either of the practices can be attributed to postmodernism only: as a critical term *pastiche* has historical boundaries, but those boundaries do not coincide with postmodernism. For these reasons, the terms *compilation pastiche* and *stylistic pastiche* are not entirely synonymous with Hoesterey’s *cento pastiche* and (quasi-)homage, and when I discuss her analyses of *cento pastiches* below as examples of how the notion of *compilation pastiche* is applied by theorists, I

mean to suggest that cento pastiche (Hoesterey's term for emancipatory postmodern eclecticism) is a kind of a subgroup of compilation pastiche.

While I believe that a terminological adjustment of some kind – whether it be that of Hoesterey, Dyer or my own – is needed, these attempts at solving the conceptual problem suffer from at least two drawbacks. For the first, they lose the flexibility of the single term, which can be used both as a noun and a verb. *Pasticcio* and (quasi-)homage cannot be used in the verb sense (although I wonder if it is possible to “pay (quasi-)homage”), and while stylistic pastiche turns effortlessly into a verb structure (“to pastiche the style of”), compilation pastiche does not.³ For the second, in highlighting the difference between the two modes of pastiche, the terms blot out the important middle ground of vaguer notions which combine elements from both conceptions or indeed create an artificial opposition between practices that actually coexist in many forms. Despite these problems, I shall for the moment adhere to these terms in order to highlight the nevertheless markedly different emphases in the two main approaches to pastiche in contemporary criticism. While critics like Hoesterey and Dyer – and Lorna Sage in a useful dictionary article on pastiche in the *Dictionary of Modern Critical Terms* – have noted this terminological bifurcation, its scope and implications have not been investigated in detail in previous studies of pastiche.

Compilation Pastiche

The compilation sense of pastiche is now the more frequent, especially in English-language criticism, but the meaning, significance and scope of the concept seem to vary from critic to critic. In this section, I shall focus on descriptions of compilation pastiche in order to arrive at a more precise conception of this activ-

³ It is grammatically possible to “compile a pastiche” of different materials, but I have never seen this expression in use.

ity which I shall then relate to the concept of intertextuality and assess in a historical context. The analyses of examples of compilation pastiche will further illustrate what I perceive as its main problems: firstly, its indefinability, which relates to its rather strained position between a theoretical keyword that refers to larger ideological suppositions and a practical concept that seeks to identify particular practices; secondly, its somewhat artificial restriction to postmodernist literary (or cultural) works. Eclectic form, both in contemporary and older literature, is an important and difficult object of study, because of the loaded attitudes towards it and the miscellaneous theoretical models and concepts used in its analysis. As I shall seek to demonstrate in this and the following section, the concept of compilation pastiche does not altogether successfully meet these challenges.

In the descriptions of compilation pastiche in recent criticism, the pasticheur appears as a kind of *bricoleur*, a collector and compiler of materials provided by culture, from which he or she then produces a new creation (see Lévi-Strauss 19). Critics use a variety of formulations to describe this practice: a pasticheur can “paste together linguistic units (actual or virtual) from various sources” (Ben-Porat 420), allude to or incorporate citations from other works (J. Ryan 398), mix codes and period signs detached from their original contexts (H. Foster 127), “collide” art-historical and pop-cultural references (H. Foster 131), create a patchwork of textual styles (Hoesterey, *Pastiche* 83), paste together the pieces of fragmented culture (Keller 226) or compile motifs from contemporary art as well as from earlier periods (Rose, “Post-Modern Pastiche” 30). As is evident from these descriptions, critics perceive the materials, procedures and targets of compilation pastiche quite differently, although an element of compilation or mixing of disparate materials is central to them all.

While not an advocate of the compilation sense of pastiche, Richard Dyer nevertheless offers a helpful guideline when he points out that “the central notion is that the elements that make up a pasticcio [a compilation pastiche] are held to be different, by virtue of genre, authorship, period, mode or whatever and that

they do not normally or perhaps even readily go together" (*Pastiche* 10). However, as he later explains, there are *pasticci* that "do not seek to exploit differences between elements" (17), and that the incongruity may only be deducible for a knowledgeable reader or viewer. This rider draws attention to one obvious moot point in the different accounts of compilation pastiche. As discussed above, the descriptions of the procedures involved in the composition of compilation pastiches emphasise hybridity and eclecticism, but critics differ as to the dominating characteristic of the resulting work. For some, the most striking stylistic feature of pastiche is eclecticism: pastiche is a medley of styles and elements (Rose, "Post-Modern Pastiche" 30, 36n), and as such it can seem quite bewildering or confusing to its audience. In "The Novel as Pastiche: Angus Wilson and Modern Fiction," Malcolm Bradbury describes the effect of compilation pastiche as follows: "The result is a texture famously hard to read, a texture mixed from traditional and modern elements, from realism's objectivity and fantasy's subjectivity, from moral exactitude and playful mimicry" (225-26). By contrast, Hoesterey maintains that despite its eclectic sources pastiche nevertheless aims for "a single taste, manner, style derived from styles" (*Pastiche* 17).⁴ In emphasising the unified appearance of pastiche, she attempts to refute Jameson's view of it as the unavoidable form of contemporary culture, a form that cannot be used to serve critical or political objectives. The unifying aspect is not the product of random selection, Hoesterey suggests, but the locus of a political message coded by the artist. Analysing the eclectic *Christian III's Monument* (1975) by the Danish artist Bjørn Nørgaard, Hoesterey writes: "The different elements

⁴ She derives this conception from Roger de Piles, whose famous definition compared pastiche to the *pasticcio* pie in which the various ingredients nevertheless produce one flavour: likewise in pastiche the various imitations form a single truth. Passing over the problematic and at the moment quite unfashionable concept of truth, Hoesterey has stuck with flavour or taste (*goût*) with its more subjective, relativising associations. As I pointed out in chapter 1.2, for Piles the "truth" of pastiche lies in its ability to produce the sense or idea of the imitated painter, which is somewhat different from what Hoesterey is driving at with her notion of the unifying taste that arises from the disparate elements of a compilation pastiche.

of the assemblage, incongruous as they are, nevertheless strive 'à un seul goût,' toward one textual effect: a critical reflection on Danish cultural identity" (23). Thus, while compilation pastiche is a formalist concept in that it designates the structuration of a work of art or literature, it is used in an ideological sense to argue for or against the (political) significance and value of contemporary culture. I shall return to the ideological content of compilation pastiche towards the end of this section.

The etymology of the term and its specific uses, for instance, in the field of music (*pasticcio* opera) suggest pastiche as a suitable term for eclectic works or techniques; however, its recent use in this sense also draws attention to the varied terminology used of eclectic works in different arts. Art history and theory have special terminology for various eclectic works, such as collage, montage or mixed media technique, while in literature, critics do not have a similar toolkit for discussing works combining elements from disparate sources.⁵ The concept of compilation pastiche meets the need for a single term to designate such works not only in literature, but also in other arts, which makes it possible to extend the analysis of the eclectic form to a more general cultural level. It identifies a phenomenon were previously there where only individual cases and thus offers a new perspective on the study of cultural forms. In contrast to other similar concepts, such as the aforementioned art terms or descriptive terms such as eclectic or hybrid, pastiche has the advantage of being very flexible: it can be used as a noun, verb or modifier, and, moreover, can refer to a particular work, a mode or genre, or a feature or aspect (of individual works or culture as a whole). This pliability makes it a powerful concept but at the same time detracts from its precision, especially as critics seldom reflect on their shifting use of the term.

Whether apparently eclectic or not, compilation pastiche nevertheless uses elements from other texts or refers to them, which draws attention to its status as an intertextual practice.

⁵ See pp. 177-78 for a more detailed discussion of the relationship between pastiche, collage and montage.

Since quoting, alluding and borrowing procedures are considered basic features of intertextuality, it is worth asking what the particular characteristics of compilation pastiche that set it aside as a specific form are. The term intertextuality is only couple of decades older than the postmodern conception of compilation pastiche. Intertextuality came into use in the 1960s, but since then it has successfully spread across and beyond the discipline of literary study, becoming a general term in cultural studies. Coined originally by Julia Kristeva to designate a generative principle that governs cultural and social phenomena, it was quickly applied to the interrelations between texts.⁶ As the prefix *inter-* suggests, intertextuality can mean connections between texts, but it is also taken to mean the actual incorporation of bits of earlier texts into new ones or the weaving together of two or more texts (see Miller 125-26). David Macey captures the basic principle of intertextuality as follows: “any text is essentially a mosaic of references to or quotations from other texts; a text is not a closed system and does not exist in isolation. It is always involved in a dialogue with other texts, just as Joyce’s *Ulysses* is involved in a dialogue with Homeric epics and other texts” (203-04). While the term is new, it denotes a phenomenon common to literatures of all ages and cultures (Broich 249), and has – despite some sceptical voices – consequently become a generally accepted concept to signify an inalienable aspect of literature.

Given the wide distribution of the term intertextuality in literary and cultural studies, it is noteworthy that none of the proponents of compilation pastiche explicitly discusses the relation between these terms. Hoesterey mentions that her notion of postmodern pastiche is “in part derived from the semiotic model of intertextuality” which she ascribes to Kristeva (*Pastiche* 14). She also describes pastiche in passing as “intertextual style” and sees it “as a sign for the intertextual status of all writing” (94). Thus she appears to regard compilation pastiche as an overt form of the covert principle of all literature, which is intertextuality: “pastiche

⁶ For the development and meanings of the term intertextuality, see Machacek (523-25) and Orr (esp. 20-40).

effects" are, according to Hoesterey, "active agents of intertextuality" (99). Similarly, Ziva Ben-Porat defines pastiche as "a recognizable functioning intertextual structure" (423), thus enhancing the conception of pastiche as a foregrounded, active form of intertextuality and, according to Jameson, pastiche and intertextuality both lead to the replacement of "real" history by connotations of pastness ("Postmodernism" 62, 67). As a result of such uses, many introductions to cultural analysis, film studies, postmodernism, popular music and so forth group intertextuality and pastiche together. If they make a distinction between them, pastiche appears to be (to borrow the subtitle of Genette's *Palimpsestes*) intertextuality to the "second degree": blatant, enhanced, evident intertextuality.

The extension of pastiche into a general term that overlaps with intertextuality can be seen as a legitimation strategy whereby the more general term lends its credence and relevance to the more obscure one. It is not an uncommon strategy in academic politics and publication to push the limits of one's research topic in order to increase the sense of its relevance. When Hutcheon redefined parody in *A Theory of Parody* as not necessarily humorous or satirical but "repetition with critical distance" (6), she deliberately pushed the extension of the term and thus successfully argued for its relevance in critical vocabulary. I do not wish to suggest that this is merely a rhetorical strategy; on the contrary, Hutcheon's work challenged the existing notions of the ludic aspect of parody and served critical enquiry by instigating a discussion on the role of humour in how we experience and recognise parody. Yet the extension of the term may have contributed to the kind of terminological confusions I referred to earlier when quoting from *A Theory of Parody*, and Hutcheon's notion of parody has duly been criticised for excessive inclusiveness which makes it difficult to distinguish between parody and other imitative or intertextual forms:

The criticism one can make of this approach is that it stretches the meaning of parody so much as to make it cover virtually all cases of literary intertextuality; and, given that any literary work is intertextual

(both on the level of production: an author is always inspired by his or her reading and rereading; and on the level of reception: a reader rewrites the work mentally along lines suggested by works previously read), any literary work would be inherently parodic [. . .]. The term parody would then become a mere synonym of literature. (Calinescu 245; see also Rose, *Parody* 238-40)

Similar criticism can be mounted against the proponents of compilation pastiche. The association with intertextuality has helped to launch compilation pastiche as a widely applicable and seemingly relevant concept, but the same expansive force means that compilation pastiche is in danger of becoming a fashionable label or catchword that can be moulded to serve a range of mutually incompatible ends.

The unwillingness of critics to clarify the status of compilation pastiche as an intertextual form and to trace its historical relation to stylistic pastiche undoubtedly relates to their conception of it as a new, postmodern phenomenon. In the light of the descriptions of compilation pastiche already quoted, the newness of the phenomenon appears questionable, however. While strikingly eclectic and imitative forms are undoubtedly characteristic of postmodernism, they are not exclusive to it (see Broich 254). The modernist classic *Ulysses*, an intertextual work *par excellence*, would fit most descriptions of postmodernist compilation pastiche, as would Eliot's *The Waste Land* and Woolf's *Between the Acts*. An excursion further into literary history would produce countless other pastiches in this supposedly postmodern sense: the plays of Shakespeare, *Pantagruel* and *Gargantua*, *Don Quixote*. They all paste together linguistic units, mix codes and signs detached from their original contexts, refer and allude to other sources, pit high culture against the low and compile motifs from different sources.⁷

⁷ The temporal scope of compilation pastiche is also problematic beyond the field of literature. Following Charles Jencks, several critics, like Margaret Rose, have identified "double coding" as a fundamental feature of pastiche in postmodernist architecture, although traditional styles and modern building techniques have been "double coded" throughout architectural history. In fact, much of that history can be seen in the light of "neo," as terms such as neo-classicism and neo-Gothic suggest. Representative examples of the latter style can be found,

Fredric Jameson would probably object that in *Ulysses* Joyce only “quotes” materials from other sources but does not incorporate them into his individual style (see “Postmodernism” 55), or that there is a norm to which the eclecticism of *The Waste Land* or the stylistic registers of *Between the Acts* can be contrasted. However, these arguments remain debatable and the particularly postmodern identity of eclecticism is in need of further elaboration. It could be said that the novelty of postmodern compilation pastiche rests on double erasure: first, the various techniques and uses of compilation are not analysed in a historical perspective, secondly, the history of the concept of pastiche is either ignored or presented in a way which marginalises the long tradition of stylistic pastiche that does not connect very well with postmodern eclecticism.

Descriptive accuracy and historical precision are thus not the basis on which the conception of compilation pastiche as a postmodern phenomenon rests. In fact, the significance of pastiche as a postmodern concept is rather that it is a site of cultural debate, a conveniently equivocal term that can be used for different ideological ends. In this sense, it is perhaps less relevant to ask what is meant by pastiche than to analyse the use to which the term is put. It is now obvious that in the debate on postmodernism, pastiche was an important vehicle through which critics argued for their views on the status and significance of postmodern culture. These larger aims are not always compatible with insightful analyses of small-scale cultural phenomena and, as I have already demonstrated, these larger, ideological considerations have dominated the debate on postmodern pastiche to the extent that complex cultural phenomena have sometimes been reduced to rather artificial binary oppositions. Commenting on a similar development in parody, Simon Dentith argues for a more balanced view:

for instance, on the campuses of many US universities which were built in imitation of medieval architecture and the closed campus structure of Oxford and Cambridge. An extreme example of this kind of architecture is the 163-metre skyscraper, the Cathedral of Learning (1921-37) by Charles Klauder, which is the landmark of the University of Pittsburgh.

Parody can do all of the things that these opposed traditions describe; it can subvert the accents of authority *and* police the boundaries of the sayable; it can place all writing under erasure *and* draw a circle around initiated readers to exclude ignorant ones; it can discredit the authority of what has always been said *and* ridicule the new and the formally innovative. We have to recognise, in other words, that parody's direction of attack cannot be decided upon in abstraction from the particular social and historical circumstances in which the parodic act is performed, and therefore that no single social or political meaning can be attributed to it. (27-28, emphases original)

In my view, the same applies to pastiche. In order to get a fuller picture, one has to look at a range of actual instances of this particular cultural production. Only then will its multiplicity become evident. In order to aim at this fuller picture, I shall in the following look at how critics have analysed examples of compilation pastiche and especially how they negotiate the above discussed problems in connection to the interpretation of literature.

Compilation Pastiche in Critical Analyses

In "Journey Backwards: History Through Style in Children's Fiction," Christopher Ringrose defends contemporary children's historical fiction against accusations of conservatism by claiming that its use of pastiche functions as a means of creating a sense of the past. Compared to historical fiction for adults, often characterised by overtly metafictional devices that call into question the presentation of the historical reality of past subjectivities, children's historical fiction has elicited the criticism that it is either conservative or simplistic. In Ringrose's view, however, their purposes are different, since in children's fiction the focus is not so much on what can or cannot be known about the past but on how we feel the past (209, 211, 214). This feeling is created by the use of pastiche, which Ringrose sees (*pace* Jameson) as an important feature of all historical fiction (209). Ringrose associates pastiche with the artistic recreation of a "structure of feeling," a concept he borrows from Raymond Williams, meaning "a way of experiencing and re-

sponding to the world, which the reader is invited to associate with a particular time and place" (211). His main focus lies in the analysis of the stylistic means by which writers have sought to trigger this "structure of feeling." Labelled pastiche, these include a variety of foregrounded stylistic elements such as deviant grammar, tangible imagery, linguistic archaism, repetition, allusions, contrasts, (religious) references, unusual metaphors and alliteration (210, 213-14). Pastiche and what Ringrose calls "the poetic function of language" appear indistinguishable at the level of practical analysis (213). One of Ringrose's examples is the alliterative list "brayers and bleaters and grunters" from *Gatty's Tale* (2006) by Kevin Crossley-Holland which "skilfully evoke[s] a medieval bestiary or alliterative verse" and echoes Crossley-Holland's translation of *Beowulf* (213).

While his analysis of such poetic passages and their effects on the readers is enlightening, his use of the term pastiche raises some questions.⁸ If the occurrence of the aforementioned poetic effects in a text constitutes pastiche, it is worth asking what is not pastiche. Does pastiche encompass any stylistic means that can evoke in the readers a sense of the past through defamiliarisation? Moreover, although Ringrose draws the term from Jameson, he is more sympathetic to the ideological stance of Linda Hutcheon, as can be observed in his claim that "Hutcheon's position on pastiche and parody is, at least in terms of the texts discussed here, more tenable than that of Jameson" (209). Yet, as we have seen, Hutcheon is reluctant to discuss postmodern poetics in terms of pastiche. In addition to referring to these two theorists, Ringrose does not give a more specific description of what he means by pastiche, and the term is largely absent from his detailed discussion of the literary works. Its rather contradictory applications in

⁸ Compare his analysis of the effects of children's historical fiction to Dyer's analyses of the reception of (stylistic) pastiche discussed in chapter 1.3. There are many ways in which writers can create similar effects, but this similarity does not efface the significant differences in the stylistic and narrative means used. Only one of Ringrose's examples, *The Printer's Devil* by Paul Bajoria, seems to aim at creating a convincing period style; others use a variety of stylistic devices in their representation of the distant past.

two different critical approaches detract from its value as a theoretical keyword, and its inclusive use in the analysis of literary works further obscures its sense and functions.

A somewhat different instance of compilation pastiche can be found in Patrick Süskind's *Das Parfum* (1985), as analysed by Judith Ryan and as well as Hoesterey. Unlike many openly eclectic postmodern novels, *Das Parfum* does not openly declare its intertextual status, homogenising the elements it consists of (J. Ryan 397-98). Yet it implicitly invites its readers to a postmodern game of tracking references: it swarms with allusions to and imitations of the German literary canon (especially the Romantics), the French decadents Baudelaire and Huysmans, the painter Caspar David Friedrich, and the myths of Prometheus and Kaspar Hauser among others (398-99). Indeed, the echo chamber of the novel is so vast that it becomes difficult if not impossible to identify the sources of a particular allusive passage, as Hoesterey points out: "Receptions do vary, since even readers in the same field may associate different 'dead authors' with certain passages in the narrative; the horizon of expectation naturally shapes the individual act of interpretation" (*Pastiche* 100). According to Ryan, the compilation technique of the novel mirrors the profession of its protagonist, the uncannily gifted perfumer Jean-Baptiste Grenouille who brings together miscellaneous materials ranging from expensive oriental extracts to dead bodies in order to produce the perfect scent (396). Since he is depicted simultaneously as a genius and monster, by analogy the aesthetic principles of the eclectic novel are brought under suspicion (e.g., 401).

Ryan's analysis of the novel is again indicative of the multiple sources for the use of the term (compilation) pastiche in contemporary criticism. While she refutes the negative postmodern conception of pastiche (396) derived from the works of Fredric Jameson, she adheres to Jameson's key term without making explicit how her use of it differs from the conception she is criticising. Moving on to the analysis of the novel, she uses pastiche alongside and sometimes interchangeably with parody, allusion and intertextual reference. The term pastiche is thus used to single

out one of the intertextual practices of *Das Parfum*, but its special status in postmodern discourse means that it is metonymically extended to the entire novel as well, whereby all the other forms of appropriation and intertextuality used in the novel become its constitutive elements. Ryan's analysis of *Das Parfum* as (compilation) pastiche is typical of the contemporary usage of the term in connection to postmodern literature in that the term is introduced in such a general theoretical framework that its precise meaning and functions remain unspecified. The strong theoretical stances and the detailed analysis of the intertextual practices do not, on the whole, interlock.

If the children's novels analysed by Ringrose as well as Süskind's *Das Parfum* were not altogether straightforward in acknowledging their intertextual status, *Travesties* (1975) by the British playwright Tom Stoppard is openly eclectic. Set in Zürich during the First World War, the play depicts an imaginary meeting between James Joyce, Vladimir Lenin and Tristan Tzara through the memories of a minor officer at the British consulate, Henry Carr, who is also based on a real person. The play swarms with quotations and imitations from the works of the principal threesome, as in the following scene from the beginning of the play which introduces us to two of the main characters:

TZARA. Eel ate enormous appletzara
 key dairy chef's hat he'll learn oomparah!
 Ill raced alas whispers kill later nut east,
 noon avuncular ill day Clara!

[. . .]

JOYCE (*Dictating to GWEN*). Deshill holles eamus...
 GWEN (*Writing*). Deshill holles eamus...
 JOYCE. Thrice.
 GWEN. Uh-hum.
 JOYCE. Send us bright one, light one, Horhorn, quickening and
 wombfruit.
 GWEN. Send us bright one, light one, Horhorn, quickening and
 wombfruit.
 JOYCE. Hoopsa, boyaboy, hoopsa!
 GWEN. Hoopsa, boyaboy, hoopsa!
 JOYCE. Hoopsa, boyaboy, hoopsa!

GWEN. Likewise thrice?
JOYCE. Uh-hum. (2)

Here we have what appears to be a fairly faithful imitation of the style of Tzara's apparently nonsensical Dadaist poetry, followed by a hilarious scene where Joyce is seen dictating the beginning of the "Oxen of the Sun" chapter in *Ulysses* to his secretary. The change of context from a novel to the scene of dictation makes Joyce's text appear as absurd as the gibberish of Tzara.⁹ These poetic blabberings are later contrasted with excerpts from Lenin's political speeches, likewise transformed by their insertion into Stoppard's comical play. *Travesties* is stylistically diverse: it includes poetry and propaganda, letters and legal documents interspersed with puns and other kind of verbal acrobatics, often with reference to other texts or to history. According to Neil Sammells, "[t]he play invokes style after style, exploits each to the point of exhaustion, and moves on" (382).

The character of Henry Carr is an amateur actor involved in the performance of Oscar Wilde's *The Importance of Being Earnest* organised by Joyce, and echoes from that play are present throughout *Travesties*.¹⁰ For instance, the disappearance of Joyce's manuscript for the "Oxen of the Sun" chapter prompts a parodic transformation of the already parodic scene in Wilde's play where Lady Bracknell identifies Miss Prism:

LADY BRACKNELL. [. . .] Is this Miss Prism a female of repellent aspect, remotely connected with education?
CHASUBLE [*somewhat indignantly*]. She is the most cultivated of ladies, and the very picture of respectability.
LADY BRACKNELL. It is obviously the same person. (353)

In Stoppard's version the question of identity pertains not to a person but to the manuscript:

⁹ The gibberishness of Tzara's poem is, however, only an illusion (Hunter 135). For a discussion of the larger implications of Tzara's limerick, see Polvinen (*Reading the Texture* 105-06).

¹⁰ For a detailed discussion of the relationship of Wilde's play to *Travesties*, see Sammells.

CARR. And is it a chapter, inordinate in length and erratic in style, remotely connected to midwifery?

JOYCE. It is a chapter which by a miracle of compression, uses the gamut of English literature from Chaucer to Carlyle to describe events taking place in a lying-in hospital in Dublin.

CARR. It is obviously the same work. (70)

In addition to such textual appropriation, the play swarms with references to Wilde's play. Its fictional female characters – Gwendolen and Cecily – are named after the leading ladies of Wilde's play, its repetitive structure mirrors that of *The Importance of Being Earnest* and it even includes a poignantly banal summary of the play by Joyce (34). In *Travesties*, "[i]nterpretation and transformation of Wilde's play go hand in hand," writes Sammells (383).

For Hoesterey, *Travesties* counts as pastiche, since it "pastichees the fictional encounter of three historical figures" (101). Hoesterey's formulation suggests that pastiche can take any imaginary entity as its object, an extension that would make pastiche synonymous with representation. The cento quality of Stoppard's play consists, in Hoesterey's analysis, of the concoction of the different approaches to literature, art and society voiced through the characters of Tzara, Joyce and Lenin (101). A more detailed account of *Travesties* as a (compilation) pastiche can be found in "Writing *Tom Stoppard*," in which Ira B. Nadel reflects on the challenges he encountered while writing Stoppard's biography *Double Act*, published in 2002. Nadel tentatively associates Stoppard's use of (compilation) pastiche to his eclectic social and cultural background (21) and to the traditional idea of learning a trade through imitation (26, 28), which was discussed here in the context of the nineteenth-century pedagogical uses of pastiche (see chapter 1.2). Nadel writes:

Pastiche, for Stoppard, is the playful, loose imitation of or borrowing from another text to formulate a new one. [. . .] Pastiche imitates not a single text but the indefinite possibilities of texts which Stoppard dramatically renders when Tzara tears up Shakespeare's Sonnet 18 and then reassembles the poem in a new fashion interspersed with other Shakespearean lines in *Travesties*. It is Joyce speaking in limericks,

Lenin offering political lectures, or Herzen condensing his political philosophy in *The Coast of Utopa* [sic]. It is a technique Stoppard finds seductive in its appeal to his sense of comedy at the same time it shows his respect for, and reliance on, other works. Pastiche also solves his problem in working out plots and originating characters, always a difficulty for him. (27)

Unlike Hoesterey and many other critics, Nadel does not associate such compilation with postmodern sensibility connecting it instead to the example of Shakespeare and other Renaissance dramatists, who “constantly imitated, borrowed, alluded to, or simply stole from earlier sources and even contemporaries,” and to the development of Stoppard’s own personal voice and vision through the appropriation of other writers (28).

The identification of *Travesties* as a pastiche (whether it be a pastiche of an imaginary meeting or the “indefinite possibilities of texts”)¹¹ perforce draws attention to its title, which refers to a somewhat different textual practice.¹² Commonly understood as imitation which transposes the elevated style of its model into “low demotic of coarse accents,” to borrow Simon Dentith’s definition (195), travesty is characterised by a style shift which often has a satirical or parodic function.¹³ Hoesterey and Nadel do not discuss the mode suggested by the title, but for other critics the title has suggested the primary context in which to read the work. Toby Zinman interprets Stoppard’s play as a travesty of its principal references, the works of Joyce and Wilde but, unlike a case of simple reversal, travesties in Stoppard’s play paradoxically elevate what has been trivialised. He writes:

[T]he impulse of travesty is itself an impulse to double, to twin the original. Thus, Stoppard may be doing to Wilde what Joyce was doing

¹¹ Nadel’s formulation is derived from Hutcheon’s somewhat problematic characterisation of pastiche in *A Theory of Parody* (38).

¹² For a discussion of the relationship between pastiche and travesty, see pp. 185-86.

¹³ It is interesting that Hoesterey does not comment on the title of Stoppard’s play, because in her introduction to literary compilation pastiches she seeks to separate postmodern cento pastiches from parody and travesty (*Pastiche* 95, see also 15, 83).

to Homer, although just as Joyce started with a work as monumental as the *Odyssey* and seemed to diminish it by the quotidian, yet finally exalted the quotidian by the 'travesty' of the Homeric source [. . .], so Stoppard works apparently in reverse, beginning with the apparent triviality of *The Importance of Being Earnest* and exalting it through his travesty. (124)

Consequently travesty becomes a form of homage (125). Thus Zinman both reads Stoppard's play in the context of travesty and presents it as a rethinking of what that activity might mean. Similarly, Neil Sammells discusses the cumulative travesties within the play and points out how

[t]he design of *Travesties* is the design of denial; self-inspection and self-contradiction are combined in self-criticism as the play continually examines its own conventions and terms of existence. [. . .] The presiding genius of *Travesties* is not Joyce, but Oscar Wilde: the Wilde who, in his criticism and his drama, championed a literature which, by contradicting its own claims to tell the truth, could tell a truth of sorts. (385)

Thus the reversing strategies of travesty, together with its tongue-in-cheek feeling, seem to offer a fruitful interpretative framework for Stoppard's play. The replacement of the given context with that of another concept is an interesting and not unproblematic choice. One is led to wonder if and how the reception of the play would change, were it entitled *Pastiches* instead of *Travesties*.

The need to describe and classify eclectic or stylistically deviant works such as *Gatty's Tale*, *Das Parfum* and *Travesties* draws attention to the lack of a single term that would capture their characteristic quality in the manner of the art terms collage or montage, used of assemblage works (see pp. 177-78). In contemporary critical discourse, the term pastiche has been applied for this purpose in literature, although there are several problems with this usage, as the analyses of Ringrose, Hoesterey, Ryan and Nadel illustrate. Not only is the term at risk of being confused with the other meaning, stylistic imitation, but its similarity to or downright synonymy with the whole intertextual apparatus makes it difficult to perceive its distinctive quality. Moreover, while its poten-

tially conflicting sources in the different branches of postmodern theory (Jameson and Hutcheon) could be seen to accord with its eclectic character, they in fact detract from its usefulness, as it remains unclear why the term is thought to be particularly applicable in these contexts. If the critics are more willing to accept Hutcheon's more positive view of postmodernism, why do they not adopt her concepts (parody, historiographic metafiction) or negotiate the position of pastiche in relation to those concepts? In order for compilation pastiche to become a more convincing critical concept, its specificity as a distinct form of intertextuality as well as its meaning either in the context of postmodernism or in the context of literary history (illustrated by Nadel's analysis of *Travesties*) need to be argued more carefully than has been done in the studies so far.

Stylistic Pastiche

Although older, the concept of stylistic pastiche has remained the more marginal one in English-language criticism. It is, however, a valuable addition to critical vocabulary, as it may help us to understand the dynamics of imitation of style in literary works better. In the following I shall briefly outline how its historical continuum and its characteristics as a literary form contribute to its applicability as a critical concept in a variety of contexts before turning to particular examples to further illustrate its features and functions. At the end of this section, I shall return to the problem of two meanings by contrasting the concept of pastiche with that of allusion which likewise has two different, although partially overlapping meanings.

The concept of stylistic pastiche can be traced back to Roger de Piles, who at the very end of the seventeenth century defined pastiche as the imitation of the manner of another painter with the objective of attaining the sense or the idea of that painter. At first associated with forgery and deception, stylistic pastiche soon became to be understood as the acknowledged imi-

tation of the characteristic traits of an author's style. As I pointed out earlier in chapter 1.1, stylistic pastiche also differs from the older tradition of imitation by virtue of its adherence to a modern conception of style as an element of authorship, although both forms of imitation are in constant interaction until the end of the nineteenth century. Citing Piles as the source of the notion of stylistic pastiche may seem somewhat problematic, given that his famous comparison between pastiche and the eclectic dish *pasticcio* is constantly evoked as historical justification for compilation pastiche (e.g., Hoesterey, *Pastiche* 6, 17; Rose, "Post-Modern Pastiche" 36-37n). This apparent contradiction results from the fact that only a section of Piles's discussion on pastiche has been available to critics. Looking at the whole passage in which Piles elaborates on the details of this artistic procedure, it becomes obvious that he means pastiche to be compilation only insofar as it imitates elements from different works of the same author to create a convincing impression of the style of that author. The inaugural definition of pastiche, which had a considerable impact on how the practice was understood in various countries, does not directly support the conception of pastiche as an eclectic work combining elements from different sources.

De Piles's conception of stylistic pastiche was mediated to literary criticism by Jean-François Marmontel, and became established in the works of such nineteenth-century critics as Nodier, Roure, Sainte-Beuve and Delepierre. As we saw when looking at the history of the concept in part one, various critics have since approached stylistic pastiche from their own vantage points, but the idea that pastiche works in and through style has nevertheless persisted over the years. Thus, while Marquis de Roure used the notion of stylistic pastiche to further neoclassical aesthetics, Paul V. Rubow to advance an ideal of stylistic purity, and Richard Dyer to argue for a more nuanced understanding of the consumption of popular culture, these views can be seen as partaking of the same historical continuum. In fact, the concept of stylistic pastiche has often functioned as a mediator between two different and sometimes seemingly opposed traditions, as when it has

brought together the older practice of pedagogical imitation and the more modern appreciation of individuality, or when it has inspired critics to combine structuralist theoretical apparatus with author-centred criticism. The weight of its historical continuum – the heterogeneous but nevertheless connectable views expressed over three hundred years – distinguish it from compilation pastiche which has been (re)invented as an emblematically postmodern phenomenon. In other words, while compilation pastiche is now strongly associated with one historical period and line of critical enquiry, stylistic pastiche has been formed in interaction with several different ideas concerning the purposes and limits of literary creation.

It seems that the concept of stylistic pastiche emerged before artists and writers themselves started to use the appellation in the context of their works. Stylistic pastiche became established as an acknowledged literary practice in the nineteenth century, and works such as *À la Manière de...* by Reboux and Muller or *L’Affaire Lemoine* by Marcel Proust have shaped the concept and set the parameters for further stylistic pastiches. The connection with a living artistic practice has set some boundaries for the concept: for a contemporary notion of stylistic pastiche to be historically relevant and justified, it has to accommodate the iconic classics of that literary form. Similar restrictions do not apply to the concept of compilation pastiche, which does not correspond to a distinct literary or cultural tradition.

In my view, historical scope is one of the elements that make stylistic pastiche a viable and relevant concept, also when applied to contemporary literature, but others have taken a more negative view, suggesting that stylistic pastiche is a literary historical phenomenon that has little relevance to the forms of pastiche in contemporary culture.¹⁴ This is an understandable view if one foregrounds the notion of compilation pastiche, but the distinction between the two kinds of pastiche cannot be explained by the historical succession of one type by another. As I shall demon-

¹⁴ See Hoesterey, “Postmodern Pastiche” (498). Dyer comments on the deprecating attitude towards literary pastiches in *Pastiche* (59).

strate in chapter 3.3, stylistic pastiche is a productive concept, for instance, in discussing aspects of the increasingly common imitation of Victorian literature in contemporary British fiction and, despite the fact that the most prominent and the most explicit form of stylistic pastiche has been the French pastiche anthology,¹⁵ it is by no means the only kind. The awareness of the expressive possibilities and commercial potential of stylistic pastiche, together with the general interest in recycling previous literary forms and styles as well as the literary critical interpretations of such activity, have contributed to the increase in the ways in which stylistic pastiche is used in fiction.

As a term, stylistic pastiche intuitively translates as “imitation of style,” but it is by no means clear what this phrase means, given the inclusiveness of both of its elements, imitation and style. It is noteworthy that most critics writing on stylistic pastiche have not tried to define either term precisely, which has undoubtedly also contributed to the confusions pertaining to the concept of pastiche. Earlier I suggested that style may be a useful concept just by virtue of its buoyancy and intuitive force: it can mean slightly different things in different contexts but these have enough in common to be gathered under the same concept. If we look at descriptions of stylistic pastiche in literary criticism and analyse the ways in which pasticheurs create an affinity with their source texts, it is possible to arrive at a three-part rough conception of what style is as the object of imitation in pastiche.

First of all, in a stylistic pastiche, style pertains to *language*: it is the ways in which the words and structures, idioms and tropes are used by an individual writer or in a characteristic discourse (e.g., Reboux “Préface” 14). Stylistic pastiche foregrounds the materiality of literature, thus making the readers aware of the stylistic choices and their implications. This feature can be used as a means of defamiliarisation, but it can be used for other purposes as well, for instance, in a pastiche sequel to a beloved classic

¹⁵ Although past its heyday, the pastiche anthology is still a popular form. Recent examples include Bellaunay’s *Petite anthologie imaginaire de la poésie française* (1992); Crick’s *Kafka’s Soup* (2006) and *Sartre’s Sink* (2008); and Faulks’s *Pistache* (2006).

where the familiar phrases are evoked precisely to create a sense of familiarity, a sense of *déjà-lu*. The analysis of stylistic pastiches thus cannot avoid a comparative element.

Secondly, as Genette has pointed out, imitation in pastiche is not confined to the linguistic aspects of style but extends to matters of content as well (*Palimpsestes* 139). It can thus include the ways in which the narrative is constructed (voice, focalisation, tempo and so forth), the ways in which characters and settings are described and employed as well as the development and use of themes and motives in so far as these are thought to be characteristic of the imitated style and of the worldview of the its author. Hence the typical dictionary definition of pastiche as the imitation of the style *and* ideas of another author.¹⁶ It would be difficult if not impossible to radically dissociate the linguistic aspects of a style from the content (ideas) it represents or produces without losing its recognisable “feel.” A successful imitation of the late style of Henry James, for instance, is bound to preserve the characteristic feeling of abstractness or intangibility which has to do with his preoccupation with the consciousness of his characters and the fragility of human relations.¹⁷ This feeling is not merely the product of linguistic effects; it also pertains to larger narrative structures and themes.

Although the imitation of linguistic style involves elements of content as well, the same logic does not automatically apply to imitation or variation of the so-called content elements which can often be rendered without thoroughgoing imitation of the language of the original. This factor distinguishes stylistic pastiches from many other kinds of imitative works. For instance, Christa Wolf's *Medea* is not a stylistic pastiche of the tragedy of Euripides, although it derives its characters, setting, themes and many other elements from that play. Nor is Michael Chabon's *The Final Solution* a pastiche of the Sherlock Holmes stories, even though the novel invites its readers to identify the anonymous protagonist as

¹⁶ See appendix for examples, and Albertsen for a discussion of the “style and ideas” formulation (4).

¹⁷ For examples, see Chatman, *The Later Style of Henry James*.

the famous detective and even though it employs the conventions of detective fiction to the mystery pertaining to the disappearance and destruction of Jews during the Second World War. Both novels are stylistically distanced from their sources, not attempting to reproduce the tone of the originals at the sentence level, although both successfully evoke something of the feel of their models.

Thirdly, the style imitated in a stylistic pastiche is not, strictly speaking, the actual or objective style of the source text, but an impression or an image of that style; it is style filtered through personal reading experience and shaped by a tradition of reception and commentary. This inevitable distortion was one of the reasons why Paul V. Rubow thought in the 1920s that an accurate pastiche was an impossibility. Later critics with a structuralist orientation have paid attention to the fact that pastiche always imitates "past" its source text. Daniel Bilous came up with the term "interstyle" to designate the melange resulting from the interaction between the style of the source text and the pasticheur's own style ("Intertexte/pastiche" 142), and Jean-François Jeandilou suggested that the stylistic pastiche is based on a "text zero," an abstracted scheme or model of the style of the source text ("L'Inflexion" 64-65). A more fluent formulation of this phenomenon can be found in Dyer's *Pastiche*, where he states that "pastiche imitates the idea of that which it imitates" (*Pastiche* 55). Whereas the French critics have stressed the effects of the pasticheur's individual style on the resulting imitation, Dyer shifts the focus to culture, drawing attention to the fact that imitations are always conditioned by the historical context of their making. Two imitations of the same source text made in two different periods will be recognisable as the products of their own times, and their renderings of the source text may be quite different.

This third aspect of style may appear to contradict the first, which presupposes a degree of actual linguistic similarity between the imitation and its source. Yet both are relevant for stylistic pastiche, the significance of which is built upon a tension between difference and similarity. On the one hand, linguistic accuracy helps to guarantee the recognition and acceptance of the pastiche

status of the text, since readers will be able to compare the imitation with their conception of the style of the source text (or even read the two side by side if they wish). As imitation, the focus of stylistic pastiche is, after all, the object, the style of which it seeks to render in a convincing and recognisable manner. On the other hand, stylistic pastiche must differ from its source text since it is not a reproduction but a representation and interpretation of the source. These two poles of pastiche in fact reflect the very polarities of style which is both objective (consisting of observable features) and subjective (often experienced unconsciously and always filtered through the subject's reserve of experiences and knowledge).

It is therefore not surprising that stylistic pastiche has been regarded on different occasions as a particularly apt way of approaching or analysing style. Marquis de Roure and Marcel Proust, for instance, used it to highlight a particular individual style, and Seymour Chatman begins *The Later Style of Henry James* not with a discussion of James's own texts, but by contrasting two imitations of his style, which will later serve as the test material against which he measures the accuracy of his own analysis of Jamesian style features (1-2).¹⁸ In the tradition of pedagogical pastiche, stylistic imitation is seen both as a means of improving one's own style and a means of learning about styles. Antoine Compagnon even claims that "pastiche proves style"¹⁹ (223): in his view, the fact that pasticheurs have applied different styles to the same topic (as in *L'Affaire Lemoine* where Proust recounts the case of the swindler Lemoine in the styles of different authors) offers a proof that styles are to some extent independent of their contexts and the purposes for which they were first used. In other words, pastiche helps to illustrate that there can be different ways of saying roughly the same thing (and conversely very similar ways of saying very different things). To be precise, Compagnon need not have recourse to pastiche to prove this point – any series of stylistic

¹⁸ Here, as in "Parody and Style," Chatman uses the term parody to designate the kind of stylistic imitations which are pastiches in the sense discussed here.

¹⁹ "[. . .] le pastiche prouve le style[.]"

variations of the same theme would suffice – but his intuition that pastiche can be used to test contesting claims about style is not groundless.

The other general term used in defining stylistic pastiche, imitation, functions as shorthand for a variety of techniques and approaches used to create an impression of similarity. Since pastiches are often shorter than their source texts, condensation and selection of characteristic elements is an inevitable part of the imitative process. The pasticheurs can heighten the sense of similarity by adding allusions (phraseological adaptations) and references to the source text or citing elements of it. They can also produce likeness in ways that do not have direct counterparts in the source texts. Parodic pastiches in particular use exaggeration, which accentuates the tension between similarity and difference, and sometimes overdoes the latter: as Walkley pointed out, “parody is the pitfall of pastiche” (2). The famous case of Proust’s *aberrant* (see pp. 72-73) is often evoked to show how the pasticheur in fact creates the style he or she is imitating.

Understood as the imitation of the style of a recognisable source text, the status of stylistic pastiche as an intertextual practice is more easily defined than that of compilation pastiche. As Gérard Genette pointed out, a stylistic pastiche as a whole is a transformation of its source text (*Palimpsestes* 13, 16). Thus it can be discussed as rewriting, a subcategory of intertextuality, which “involve[s] a reference of some structural significance (as opposed to a mere mention or passing allusion) to one or more texts” (Calinescu 245). Like the concept of intertextuality, rewriting is a fairly recent coinage, although the practices it denotes are as old as literature itself. According to Matei Calinescu, forms of rewriting include “imitation, parody, burlesque, transposition, pastiche, adaptation, and even translation” (243). In *Translation, Rewriting, and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*, André Lefevere enlarges the notion to encompass “literary histories or their more compact spin-offs, reference works, anthologies, criticism [and] editions” (8) and emphasises the power of rewritings to shape literary culture and canon formation (2). Despite being a very loose and in-

clusive group, rewritings differ from many forms of local, intermittent or hybrid intertextuality by virtue of their close association with the source text (or a group of source texts), which enables a more thoroughgoing engagement with the processes and values of the literary institution. In "Rewriting, Literariness, Literary History," Didier Coste draws attention to the inevitably dual nature of rewriting and its consequences:

As repetition and recycling, it has a transmissive, traditional, conservative and stabilising function, it builds up a canon and confirms it, it provides, together with gloss, commentary, academic criticism, standard editions and so on, the building blocks of the institution of literature; it is on the side of ritual, commemoration, community-building as maintenance of habits, we could call it 'underwriting.' As recontextualisation and defamiliarisation, as reshaping, distortion, deconstruction and mutation, it is iconoclastic and subversive more than adaptive and accommodating, it is on the side of defacement and revolution, new starts (whether by uniting, or dividing the extant) and closure of an era, we could call it 'overwriting.' (10-11, emphasis original)

Understanding stylistic pastiche as a rewriting of the style of a particular source text entails that it cannot be reduced to mere production of surface effect but that it has a more substantial, albeit dual relationship towards its source text. This characteristic double-edgedness makes it a versatile form for exploring issues governed by a sense of irresolvability, such as the deeply problematic but seemingly inexorable notion of originality to which I shall return in chapter 2.3.

Yet, compared to the inclusiveness of compilation pastiche and to the ideological debate and general excitement it has spurred in the last twenty-five years, the notion of stylistic pastiche may seem disappointingly limited and old-fashioned, akin to the traditional branch of literary studies called influence studies. While compilation pastiche benefits from the rich multiplicity of postmodern intertextuality, stylistic pastiche seems to be a dull one-way path from the works of an appreciated stylist to the pale imitations that repeat highlights of the original. Moreover, since no one intertext is privileged in compilation pastiche, it can be conceived as a postmodern "echo chamber" which "liberates the

reader into reading his own meaning from (or into) the text, following some of the intertextual echoes of the text while ignoring others and at the same time bringing in his own associations with additional texts" (Broich 252). Stylistic pastiche, by contrast, is always governed by the shadowy presence of one particular text or discourse. Readers who are not familiar with the source text may not be able to grasp the meaning of the text to the full or even be able to identify it as an imitation in the first place. For these reasons, it is easy to see why stylistic pastiche has been perceived as the less appealing of the two forms in a time which celebrates multiplicity and openness.

However, this is not the only way of conceiving the significance and mutual relation of the two practices. As Mary Orr suggests in *Intertextuality*, the notion of multiple, emancipatory intertextuality has been created in juxtaposition to a deliberately derisive conception of influence as a negative and repressive force. Instead of thinking of influence in terms of debt, she proposes to regard it as "credit" to the party influenced (84):

The other, and positive, 'influence for' reverses hierarchies or understands influence as complex and plural. Contrary to Bakhtin's concept of monologism and intertextual glosses on it, a so-called authority may also be multiple, dialogic or reciprocal, just as a number of strands plaited together make a more diverse but stronger rope. Or, more radically, a truly influential work may be one that knows its own increase by being central to others subsequently. Power is in having given to, not usurping from. (83)

In contrast to Bloomian "anxiety of influence," this positive notion of influence highlights the enabling factors of engaging with the past and the rich ways in which later works rework their predecessors. Unlike the postmodern model of intertextuality as an infinite, multi-directional network, the positive notion of influence acknowledges the temporal dimension not only between the preceding text and the later text which reworks it, but also towards the future: "Positive influence [. . .] permits proleptic recognitions, since it acknowledges those of the past" (86). The persistent conception of (stylistic) pastiche as an indicator of a nega-

tive susceptibility to foreign influences or as an early phase in the process of finding one's own style disregards the complex and subtle forms of interaction involved, and, moreover, deprives pastiche of a potentially mediatory role in the literary system by judging it a dead-end of creative activity.

A second problem with privileging the phenomenon of compilation pastiche over stylistic pastiche pertains to the supposition that the meaning of stylistic pastiche is governed by its source text, i.e., that its only function is to imitate and comment on the source text. However, the fact that a pastiche is based on the careful imitation of a source text does not mean that it could not have other functions. Imitation can serve as a stepping-stone to wider issues, such as questioning the conventions of social life in the Montaigne pastiche by La Bruyère cited in the introduction, or it may be a means to create a thought-provoking contrast between two kinds of style and the worldviews they project. In that sense, stylistic pastiche is a literary means that can be used for many different ends.

Finally, it is possible to conceive of stylistic pastiche as the more versatile of the two forms, since it is not associated with a particular period or cultural condition in the critical discourse. The notion of stylistic pastiche, as derived from a history of definitions and criticism, can be applied to a long literary tradition as well as contemporary works and, moreover, it allows for a variety of forms ranging from straightforward commercial sequels to thought-provoking metafiction. Thus, the hierarchical opposition constructed between the two forms of pastiche is largely based on generalisations that can be questioned and, as I have also pointed out elsewhere, it is not useful to project such essential characteristics onto practices that are in reality used in different ways and for different purposes. One is reminded here of other examples from the history of criticism, such as the opposition of poetry and prose, where poetry was seen as the nobler art.

Examples of Stylistic Pastiche

An example of the procedures of stylistic pastiche has already been given in the introduction to this study, where I quoted and discussed La Bruyère's imitation of the style of Michel Montaigne. Rather than compilation of elements from the works of Montaigne, it is written in imitation of his circumlocutory style and presented as if it could be ("Montaigne would say") a quotation from his *Essais*. Its brevity, poignancy and critical edge are all characteristics that can be found in many of today's stylistic pastiches but, in addition to literary and social criticism, stylistic pastiche has been put to other uses as well, as the following two cases will illustrate.

A.S. Byatt's novel *Possession* provides one of the most exciting contemporary examples of the uses of pastiche: the whole novel, which I will examine in more detail in chapter 3.3, swarms with carefully crafted imitations of both Victorian literature and contemporary criticism. Set alternately in the present time of Thatcher's Britain and in the Victorian period, the novel recounts the adventures of a group of literary scholars in their search for the poems and letters of two Victorian poets. One of the texts the researchers encounter in the course of the novel is the following lyric poem, presented as the work of the fictitious Victorian poet Christabel LaMotte:

It came all so still
The little Thing –
And would not stay –
Our Questioning

A heavy Breath
One two and three –
And then the lapsed
Eternity

A Lapis Flesh
The Crimson – Gone –
It came as still
As any Stone (381)

For the readers of the novel, it is obvious that the character of La Motte and her work are in many ways based on actual historical models. Anyone familiar with the poetry of Emily Dickinson will quickly decipher the source of this brief lyric poem. Dickinson is an apt source for stylistic pastiche since few poets have as idiosyncratic and immediately recognisable style as she. The capitalisation of common words, lavish dashes and succinct lines alone suffice to evoke her poetic style. The diction likewise has a familiar feel. *A Concordance to the Poems of Emily Dickinson*, edited by S.P. Rosenbaum, cites, in her whole oeuvre, 54 occurrences of the word 'eternity,' 32 of 'stone,' 32 of 'breath,' 17 of 'flesh,' 6 of 'crimson,' and one of 'questioning.' The only alien word here seems to be 'lapis', Latin for 'stone,' and also shortened from lapis lazuli whose blue colour is evoked as a contrast to the crimson of blood. However, references to other kinds of precious stones are common in Dickinson's poetry (see Patterson 74-93). The use of the word lapis can be seen as an example of the type of metonymic reference or substitution that is typical of stylistic pastiches (see Jeandillou 66; Milly, "Les Pastiches de Proust" 48-50). The source text is evoked by using terms which are not necessarily identical with those in the source text, but which belong to the same class or category. In stylistic pastiche, metonymy is a way of avoiding redundancy while retaining the imitative relation to the source.

The narrative in which the pastiche poem is embedded suggests that it deals with the terrible loss of a newborn child. The themes of death, loss, and absence dominate Dickinson's poetry and often find expressions in the use of truncated sentences, ellipses and powerful metaphors. Here the absence is manifested in the fact that the subject of the poem – 'It,' 'The little Thing' – is never named as a baby. The child is discussed through bodily metonymies (breath, flesh) as if it is too painful to state the fact of her death directly. The convergence of LaMotte's life situation and the substance of the poem leads Maud Bailey, one of the ficti-

tious literary scholars of *Possession*, to interpret it to mean that LaMotte's baby had been born dead (422).

There appears to be no single Dickinson poem on which Byatt's stylistic pastiche is based. The pastiche thus draws from Dickinson's whole oeuvre, or a conception of her style. In her poems, Dickinson never took the persona of a mother lamenting the loss of her child, but the quietness and ordinariness of death is a common topic in her poetry, as the following extracts illustrate. In the first fragment the poem's form suggests the rhythm of feeble breaths, ceasing quietly; in the next one, the death of a friend is described similarly not as a major shock but as a slight, light change:

[. . .] To die – takes just a little while –
They say it doesn't hurt –
It's only fainter – by degrees –
And then – it's out of sight – [. . .] (*The Poems of Emily Dickinson* No. 255, p. 183)

— — —

[. . .] She mentioned, and forgot –
Then lightly as a Reed
Bent to the Water, struggled scarce –
Consented, and was dead – [. . .] (No. 1100, p. 774)

In one of her poems Dickinson imagines the death of a little child. The beginning of this poem illustrates Dickinson's frequent use of repetition as well as her typical rhyme pattern – a-b-c-b – both of which are imitated in Byatt's pastiche:

[. . .] On such a night, or such a night,
Would anybody care
If such a little figure
Slipped quiet from its chair –

So quiet – Oh how quiet,
That nobody might know
But that the little figure
Rocked softer – to and fro – [. . .] (No. 146, p. 104)

Unlike these examples, the pastiche has a shorter metre: two iambic feet as opposed to three or four feet per line.

The similarities between the pastiche and Dickinson's poetry are not limited to the textual and thematic levels, but extend to the interpretation as well. Dickinson's love of riddle and enigmatic expression makes her poems famously challenging to interpreters, especially when they try to understand Dickinson's life – her loves and losses – through her poetry. The latter is what Byatt's literary scholars are also doing when they regard the pastiche poem as evidence of the fact that Christabel LaMotte's illegitimate love child died in its infancy. However, as the ending of *Possession* famously attests, this is not the case (499ff.). The child survived, and the poem – although no less estimable for that – recounts the imagined horror of witnessing a child's death. If a biographical explanation is needed, the poem could be seen as a genuine expression of a terrible loss since Christabel had to hand her child over to foster parents and renounce her motherhood for good, and, moreover, to live in the same household with the child without ever divulging her true relationship to it. What the fictitious scholars of *Possession* do not take into account is the distancing of the self in the poem, and the communal viewpoint adopted (as in "our Questioning"). The viewpoint, together with the indirect references to the subject, the baby, raise the poem to a certain level of generality, or abstraction, which the fictitious researchers do not take into consideration. This is a typical pattern in Dickinson's poems too: they combine concrete everyday situations with abstract thought. By offering us the imagined reception history of the pastiche poem, *Possession* draws attention to the problems of speculative interpretation. At a more general level, the pastiche poem contributes to the larger discussion on the biographical and other sources of literature and the limits and possibilities of interpretation. I shall pursue these questions in more detail in chapter 3.3.

The example of "It Came All So Still" illustrates the many levels of interaction a stylistic pastiche can have with its source text. They include form (rhythm, stanza division, rhyme scheme),

diction (key concepts such as 'eternity', names of precious stones), poetic devices (metonymy, combination of abstract thought and concrete observations, riddle), themes (death, loss), and the interpretational dimension (especially problems of biographical reading). The context of Emily Dickinson's life and work also gives extra resonance to the character and literary works of Christabel LaMotte. Furthermore, the pastiche poem has an important role in the framing narrative, where it functions as a (misleading) clue towards the solution of the novel's central literary and biographical mystery. This example illustrates how the identification of an imitative text as a stylistic pastiche is only a preliminary phase, not an end that might explain or close the text's meaning.

To be sure, an ordinary reader of *Possession* does not sit next to shelves of Dickinson criticism and cannot verify her intuitive identification of the poem's source in such detail. In everyday reading experience, the recognition of pastiche is less the product of detailed analysis than that of intuition and feeling. Thus it may sometimes be difficult to determine whether a text is a stylistic pastiche or whether it compiles rather than imitates elements from different sources. Such is the case of *Travesties*, in which Stoppard imitates the dialogue of *The Importance of Being Earnest*, paraphrases its plot and borrows its basic structural principle (the repetitive travesty). Would it be then possible to regard Stoppard's play as a pastiche of the style of Oscar Wilde? Such an interpretation would have to bracket the presence and significance of the various other stylistic elements in *Travesties* which merge into or alternate with the Wildean elements.

For an example of a consistent stylistic pastiche of Oscar Wilde, we may turn to Peter Ackroyd and his novel *The Last Testament of Oscar Wilde* (1983). Presented as the journal of Oscar Wilde from the last year of his life, the novel combines the sharp brilliance of his early plays with the bitterness of the convicted old man, the author of the autobiographical *The Ballad of Reading Gaol* (1898) and *De Profundis* (1905). Thus it is a kind of a compilation, but only in the Pilesian sense of being a condensation of the stylistic variety of a writer's entire career, not cutting-and-pasting of

elements from separate works. This technique serves well the biographical purpose of the novel, which is written in the first person and recounts Wilde's life more or less in chronological order. In the following extract, the narrator (the character Oscar Wilde) talks about his meeting of John Ruskin in Oxford:

After his lecture, he asked for help with building his road to Ferry Hinksey, and I volunteered at once. It was not out of a desire to enter into physical labour of any sort – one should only engage in those activities where one can become preeminent – but simply in order that I might meet him. I knew that, if I could spend some hours with him, I could fortify my own character by imitation. The road itself was not a success: I believe it stopped somewhere in the middle of a field. Indeed, I learned so much about the body of man under socialism that afterwards I cared only to write about the soul. (*The Last Testament* 34)

It is easy to recognise in this passage the highly manneristic and witty style of Oscar Wilde, complete with the aphoristic quality of individual expressions and the love of paradoxes (as here in the idea of fortifying one's own character by imitation). The trademark elements of Wildean style include sharply ironic witticisms which are based on a tension between the repetitive structure and the reversion of ideas, as in his famous declaration, recorded in the journal of André Gide: "I put all my genius into my life; I put only my talent into my works" (Gide 339). This rhetorical figure is imitated in the last sentence of the above passage. Its reference to Wilde's *The Soul of Man under Socialism* (1891) together with the foregrounding of the theme of imitation indicates the larger themes of Ackroyd's narrative. The novel investigates the paradoxes of authorship, its dependence on appropriation and individuality, while offering a meticulously researched, reflective account of the life and works of an extraordinary writer. Thus it challenges those attitudes to (stylistic) pastiche which tend to belittle its potential by deeming it a mere stylistic exercise with little or no significance as a literary work.

These three examples – an essay fragment, a lyric poem and a novel – illustrate the specificity of the phenomenon of consistent, concentrated imitation of the recognisable style of another

writer. Since imitation of style is their predominant feature, it is difficult if not impossible to ignore it in their reception and analysis. There is no other single term that could accommodate their specific status, since imitation is too vague on its own, as is intertextuality. Neither term catches the extent of their preoccupation with the source texts. In these examples, as in many other stylistic pastiches discussed further on, the imitation of style is not merely a matter of form but an integral element of the whole signification of the text. It is reflected in and gives shape to the central themes of the texts, such as the contradiction between convention (manners) and authenticity (genuine feelings) in La Bruyère, the blurring of the boundary between life and death, the past and the present in Byatt, or the investigation of the paradoxes of creativity in Ackroyd. Although other intertextual forms are also based on the dialectics of borrowing and invention and can be used to explore similar issues, the fact that pastiche is comprehensive imitation of a recognisable style gives it its characteristically ambivalent nature. Through style, pastiche becomes intimately involved with ideas concerning individuality and originality (which it both flouts and reinforces) and with issues of value and power as they are manifested in the use of a particular style. Herein lies the interest of stylistic pastiche: its characteristic double-edgedness, manifested through the extensive interaction with a previous discourse but not necessarily confined to that relationship, invests it with the power to question some of the principles on which the literary institution is based as well as the values and worldviews conveyed through style.

Thus, for reasons of coherence, historical continuity and applicability, I find stylistic pastiche a more tenable conceptual tool than the ambitious but also deeply problematic concept of compilation pastiche. This preference does not, however, lead me to bracket postmodernist theories of compilation pastiche, since the two concepts and the practices they designate have much in common. For reasons of clarity, I have concentrated in this chapter on those aspects which distinguish compilation pastiche from stylistic pastiche, but since both variants are derivative forms

which draw heavily on earlier sources, theoretical insights proposed by those critics who favour the compilation sense can be valuable to the analysis of stylistic pastiche, and vice versa. Indeed, the examples discussed in the following sections will illustrate the partial overlap between the two forms. Compilation pastiches may include separate passages of stylistic imitation, and stylistic pastiches may draw from other sources in addition to the primary model of imitation. Yet the tendency towards one kind of appropriation or the other is usually so evident that the two practices can be distinguished from each other. Sometimes both terms have been applied to the same work, but for different reasons. A.S. Byatt's *Possession* is a case in point. Its various embedded texts – poems, letters, diaries and extracts from works of literary criticism – have led some critics to discuss it as a pastiche in the compilation sense (e.g., Hoesterey, *Pastiche* 91-94), but it is also possible to look at the individual embedded texts as stylistic pastiches (see chapter 3.3). The difference between the two approaches is in that the former takes *Possession* to be a pastiche as a whole, while according to the latter the novel includes several individual pastiches. To complicate things further, there are a number of critics who do not distinguish between imitation of style and compilation of disparate elements and for whom pastiche consequently involves both aspects. I have already pointed out the tensions in Fredric Jameson's theory of pastiche which result from emphasising, on the one hand, the connection between pastiche and the imitation of style, and, on the other hand, associating pastiche with much more general stylistic deviation (as in the case of Doctorow's "linguistic innovation") or with the repetition of basically any kind of element invoking the past. Another example of such an uncertain conception of pastiche can be found in the *Encyclopedia of Aesthetics*, where Peggy Zeglin Brand describes pastiche as follows: "A strict formal textual imitation, it is a borrowing of words, phrases, visual, or musical motifs from the original that are reproduced in imitation" (444). She also claims that pastiche always imitates another art form (444), which raises the question of the status of imitations within in an art form. The aspects of

compilation and stylistic imitation are also combined in J.A. Cuddon's *A Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory*, where pastiche is defined as

[a] patchwork of words, sentences or complete passages from various authors or one author. It is, therefore, a kind of imitation and, when intentional, may be a form of parody. An elaborate form of pastiche is a sustained work (say, a novel) written mostly or entirely in the style and manner of another writer. A good modern example is Peter Ackroyd's brilliant *The Last Days of Oscar Wilde* [sic] (1983), which is a diary. (644)

The initial definition in fact sounds more like the ancient cento, a text composed entirely of borrowed passages, than of the kind of compilation pastiche favoured for instance by Hoesterey. A patchwork creation is quite different from the sustained imitation of the style of another writer, but the dictionary article remains silent on how this gap can be bridged. Since the two variants of pastiche have not been analysed as different practices that have arisen from different backgrounds, pastiche is frequently defined in somewhat confusing and vague terms which combine elements from both notions.

Pastiche does not suffer alone from the problem of dual meaning. In "Allusion," Gregory Machacek discusses a similar case regarding a related intertextual practice:²⁰

Critics use *allusion* to name two phenomena that, while similar in some respects, are ultimately distinct. If a poet mentions a little-known fact or makes a roundabout reference to a well-known fact, we speak of this as an allusion. But we also use *allusion* for a poet's incorporation into a poem of a short phrase reminiscent of a phrase in an earlier work of literature. (526, emphases original)

As he points out, the two practices called allusion share a number of characteristics. For one thing, the two kinds of allusion may coexist, as when a writer uses phraseological imitations or near-quotations to evoke a reference to the author of the imitated phrase. For another, both forms of allusion depend on what

²⁰ For a discussion of the relationship between pastiche and allusion, see p. 176.

Machacek calls “advanced literacy” (526): they presuppose that the readers have a certain level of cultural knowledge. In the case of the learned reference (the first sense), the author and reader must share the same cultural background, while in the case of phraseological adaptation, they must be familiar with the same text, usually a canonical work in their (shared) culture. There are, however, also a number of important differences between the two practices. On encountering a learned reference that he or she cannot gloss, the reader nevertheless becomes aware that he or she is missing something. This is not necessarily the case with the more restricted kind of allusion, which is usually integrated unobtrusively into the alluding text. Machacek gives as an example a couple of lines from a poem by Denise Levertov – “the world is / not with us enough” – which would make “a basic kind of sense” even to readers who do not recognise the allusion to the title of Wordsworth’s sonnet “The World Is Too Much With Us” (527). Moreover, this kind of allusion highlights the materiality of language as it treats earlier texts as materials that can be “cut, reworked and incorporated into a new setting” (527). These differences lead Machacek to consider alternatives to the term allusion. By way of conclusion, he suggests that “*allusion* and *echo* be used with a greater mindfulness of their inadequacy and that a term like *phraseological adaptation* be available for cases when a more precise description of the phenomenon is desirable” (528).

Although the case of the two senses of allusion is not directly analogous with pastiche, it is nevertheless useful to observe some important similarities. In both cases, the use of the term without sufficient contextualisation can lead to misunderstandings. As in pastiche, one of the senses of allusion is more general in its reference, and the other more restricted and more intimately connected to the source text, which is treated as material for textual variation. Machacek’s suggestion to amend the situation by specifying terminology is similar in principle to my effort to clarify the uses of the term pastiche with the concepts of compilation pastiche and stylistic pastiche. Yet, as I pointed out earlier, this solution, in the case of pastiche, is only a terminological clarification

which does not resolve the more serious theoretical problems underlying the bifurcation of the term. I wish to reiterate that neither conception is “right” or “wrong” – the partly overlapping but still essentially different meanings of the term are the result of different critical traditions and theoretical aspirations, as well as the differences in the meaning of the term *pastiche* in French and English (see appendix). My criticism of compilation *pastiche* is criticism of the theoretical problems related to it, as well as of the insufficiently bridged gap between theoretical generalisations and the reality of literary practices. As defined in contemporary criticism, compilation *pastiche* is too nondescript to be distinguished properly from intertextuality, and its attribution to postmodernism is rendered problematic by the use of different techniques of compilation in previous literature as well as by its contested relationship to parody in theories of the postmodern.

Having discussed both the theoretical problems of compilation *pastiche* and demonstrated the obvious differences between compilation *pastiche* and stylistic *pastiche*, I shall from now on concentrate on the latter. For convenience, I will for the most part drop the modifier “stylistic” but I wish to stress that my investigation of the various forms and characteristics of *pastiche* in the following chapters is primarily meant to cover instances of consistent imitation of style. Yet, as I pointed out above, theories of postmodern compilation *pastiche* are in part relevant to stylistic *pastiche* as well, and I will, where possible, continue to include them in my discussion.

2.2 Conceptual Cousins and Sister Arts

Even if stylistic pastiche appears to be easier to grasp than the more elusive compilation pastiche, it is by no means an unproblematic literary form that could be effortlessly distinguished from all other forms of imitation and rewriting. In this chapter, I shall offer an overview of the characteristics of stylistic pastiche – from now on simply ‘pastiche’ – and its status as a literary term in juxtaposition to such related terms as parody and translation, among others. In addition, I shall in this chapter investigate the possibility of extending the notion of pastiche as the imitation of style to other arts.

Related Literary Practices

My survey of the history of the concept of pastiche in part one showed how pastiche gradually parted company from copies and forgeries, with which it was associated in the eighteenth century, and was connected with parody, which came to be seen as its nearest equivalent among literary forms at the end of the nineteenth century. This shift illustrates how concepts do not develop independently or simply in connection with their objects but also in interaction with other, related concepts. Contrary to how they are often presented in textbooks, dictionaries of literary terms and sometimes also in more sophisticated literary theory, the relationships between concepts do not form a fixed system of conveniently exclusive meanings. Change in the scope, meaning or weight of one concept affects other concepts, and one concept may gradually be replaced by another. While investigating the partial overlap of or similarities between related concepts will inevitably demonstrate the intermingledness of literary critical vocabulary, it will also give us some grounds on which to distinguish between one practice and another.

At the end of the previous chapter, I briefly discussed the similarities between pastiche and allusion from the point of view of their dual meanings. Here I shall discuss pastiche in the context of three different types of related concepts that are often used as points of reference when critics are attempting to characterise pastiche.²¹ First I shall look at terms describing the ways in which a later text may borrow from and transform an earlier text. These terms include allusion (in the sense of phraseological adaptation), citation, collage, montage, stylisation and translation, each of which constitutes a material transformation or recontextualisation of the source text (or a recognisable discourse or register in the case of stylisation). The following set of concepts – forgery, plagiarism, hoax, mystification and simulacrum – pertains to various forms of deception in art and literature and offers a background for discussing pastiche as acknowledged imitation which nevertheless retains some aspects of disguise or duplicity. Thirdly, I shall look at perhaps the most pertinent companions of pastiche – burlesque, travesty and parody – as different ways of understanding the imitative relationship between two (or more) texts. I shall end this investigation into related practices with a fairly recent term, fan fiction, that will offer a point of comparison for the study of the social aspects of pastiche. As my interest is pastiche, I have concentrated on those elements that provide useful analogies or points of comparison with it, which means that some other important aspects of the individual practices are left undiscussed. I have sought to maintain (where relevant) a balance between the history of the concept, its customary usages and its applicability to the analysis of actual literary works. Situating pastiche thus in the larger field of literary terminology will help clarify its special character as the close imitation of the style of a recognisable source

²¹ Systematic attempts to chart the relations of pastiche and other imitative forms can be found in Karrer (*Parodie, Travestie, Pastiche*) and Genette (*Palimpsestes*). More recently, pastiche and similar practices have been discussed by Aron (*Histoire* 281-83), Dyer (*Pastiche* 7-51) and Hoesterey (*Pastiche* 10-15). For similar terminological investigations from the point of view of the concept of parody, see Dentith (190-95) and Rose (*Parody* 54-99).

text, as well as reveal points of overlap with other literary phenomena.

In its more limited sense, allusion was shown above to designate the incorporation into the text of a “short phrase reminiscent of a phrase in an earlier work of literature” (Machacek 526). Like pastiche, this kind of allusion operates on existing texts by modifying and recontextualising them. The result is often near quotation (528), which is also the often sought-after effect of stylistic imitation in pastiche. What distinguishes allusion from pastiche is its locality: allusion is a relatively restricted adaption of an earlier text, rarely exceeding the length of a phrase or a line in a poem.²² When recognised, it triggers a connection between the two texts; when not, it becomes assimilated into the style of the text in which it is incorporated and has effect on the readers only indirectly. By contrast, pastiche seldom goes unnoticed. Either it is explicitly announced to the readers in the title or through some other indicators, or its stylistic difference from the context or from the text in which it is incorporated will alert the readers to the fact of imitation. Moreover, since its aim is to represent (the style of) its source text, a certain extension is necessary for the pastiche to be successful. The requisite length of pastiche remains a moot point. Some critics, like Jeandillou and Karrer, maintain that a pastiche can be as short as one sentence or phrase.²³ In my view, such brief imitative phrases might be more usefully discussed as allusions (or parodies, if that be their tone) than pastiches.

A more extensive form of material incorporation, citation, means the transposition of the source text or its part into a new textual environment. Usually furnished with a source reference and with quotation marks that separate it from the framing text, citation is characterised by its locality. It is a limited instance of

²² The *OED* defines allusion (among other senses) as a “passing or incidental reference.”

²³ Jeandillou discusses an example of a title that he considers to be a pastiche in the style of *Le Canard enchaîné* (63). See also Karrer, “Parody, Travesty, and Pastiche qua Communication Processes” (37n).

textual incorporation from one context to another. If understood in this way as brief *verbatim* reproductions of the original, citations differ from pastiches that create the illusion of style through imitation and variation. However, when Proust quotes inaccurately from memory in *À la Recherche du temps perdu*, one may wonder if the “quotations” are indeed more akin to pastiches (see Genette, *Palimpsestes* 115).

Critics and writers disagree as to whether quotation is an approved technique in pastiche. Proust opposes it (*Correspondance* 9: 54), and, following him, Genette claims that pastiche “can never condescend to direct quotations and borrowings”²⁴ (*Palimpsestes* 78). By contrast, in his famous “recipe for pastiche” Reboux mentions that he and Muller always spiced their pastiches with authentic phrases from the authors imitated (“Préface” 18). Citation can be an effective means for a pastiche to evoke its source text, as is exemplified by the opening phrase of D.M. Thomas’s *Charlotte*: “Reader, I married him” (9). The novel then continues as a quotation from *Jane Eyre* for a while, but gradually the pastiche mode takes over and the text becomes an imitation. Furthermore, quotation or direct incorporation is a crucial element in pastiche novels that continue an unfinished manuscript by a famous author. *Poodle Springs* by Raymond Chandler and Robert B. Parker, *Sanditon* by Jane Austen and an *Another Lady*, and *Thrones, Dominations* by Dorothy L. Sayers and Jill Paton Walsh are examples of such cases: each novel begins with the more or less untampered original manuscript which is then seamlessly taken over by the pastiche mode. Unlike citation proper, the limits of the borrowed text are not marked in these works, and the claim to exactness of reproduction is consequently less strict (the pasticheurs may have changed some details in the original to enhance the continuity from the manuscript to the imitation).

Previously I pointed out the lack of established terms for literary works which incorporate and imitate elements from various sources. The art terms collage and montage are sometimes borrowed in literary discourse, although their visual connotation

²⁴ “La citation brute, ou emprunt, n’y a point sa place” (*Palimpsestes* 102).

remains primary. Collage incorporates pre-existing materials on a two-dimensional surface, while in montage the disparate elements overlap or become (partly) merged into each other. In literary discourse, the *Cantos* of Ezra Pound are often discussed as collages, while the appellation 'montage novel' is sometimes used of *Berlin Alexanderplatz* by Alfred Döblin, *Doktor Faustus* by Thomas Mann or *Cynics*, a less-known modernist novel by Anatolii Mariengof.²⁵ This usage reflects the connection of both terms to the modernist aesthetics which they stem from, but it is not uncommon to use them in a more general sense. For instance, Ulrich Broich equates collage with intertextuality, stating that "the collage is a prominent form of literature (and of art in general) of our time" (251-52). Collage and montage are sometimes given as synonyms for pastiche (or *pasticcio*), especially in the English dictionaries, which emphasise the compilation aspect of pastiche. Other usual synonyms for pastiche in this context are hotchpotch, medley, patchwork and potpourri, but rather than literary concepts, they are descriptive words or metaphors for the hybrid structure of literary works.

Stylisation was briefly discussed earlier as a term in Russian literary criticism (see pp. 77-79), where it is used in a sense very close to pastiche. However, this use is exceptional: in other languages, stylisation usually means either conforming to certain existing stylistic conventions or a representation in which details or realistic accuracy are abandoned in favour of giving precedence to style. Compared to pastiche, stylisation thus seems a less specific way of highlighting style: it does not imitate a style, nor does it target the style of one particular author.²⁶ Unlike the word stylist,

²⁵ See Ryan (398), Saariluoma ("Siteeraamisen funktiot") and Huttunen respectively.

²⁶ There are, however, quite different notions of the meaning and scope of stylisation. The equivocality of the term is illustrated by two differing definitions given by Daniel Compère. In an article from 1992, he defines pastiche as ridiculing imitation (*l'imitation moqueuse*) and stylisation as serious imitation ("L'Entrevue" 135, 137), in a manner reminiscent of Genette's distinction between *charge* and serious pastiche. In 1996, Compère uses stylisation to mean the imitation of certain discourses (*langages*) without reference to any particular author ("Je suis

which is often used positively to describe a writer who “is skilled in or cultivates the art of literary style” (*OED*), stylisation carries a negative connotation of conforming to norms rather than developing an original style or style particularly suited to the object.

My last term for the processes of borrowing and transformation, translation, has recently been extended to describe any cultural activity which “carries” or “transports” discourses from one context to another (e.g., Godard; Lefevere), not just the activity of translating texts from one language to another with the aim of communicating the form and content as accurately as possible. In the first sense, translation becomes nearly synonymous with rewriting, which was discussed earlier as a form of intertextuality that also includes pastiche. Pastiche can convey old texts and styles into the present context, thereby translating, or making available and understandable, the textual conventions of the past. It can also carry a style from one context to another, as for instance in Lodge’s *Thinks...* where literary styles are used to manifest and criticise a scientific problem.

Pastiche may also be related to translation in the more traditional sense of the term. Since pastiche replaces the words and phrases of the source text with (near-)synonymous expressions, it can be regarded as translation *within* a language. Like a translator conveying a text from one language to another, a pasticheur also submits herself to the stylistic parameters of the original, which she seeks to retain in her version of it. Such close adherence to a model inevitably raises the issue of fidelity. How well is the original rendered in the translation or the pastiche? The expectation of fidelity governs the reading process and establishes a preliminary relationship of trust between the readers and the translator/pasticheur. Since readers of translations and pastiches do not usually have immediate access to the source text, they have to rely on the translator’s/pasticheur’s capacity to render the original.²⁷ In a global culture, translations are so common and so indispen-

l’Autre” 101-02). His example, Rabelais’s imitation of the Latinate parlance of the Limousin student, cannot be considered “serious imitation” in the 1992 sense.

²⁷ For truth and trust in translation, see Chesterman (178-183).

sable that trust in them usually goes without saying. We are only alerted to the possibility of inaccuracy if something in the translation deviates from our expectations. By contrast, the case of pastiche appears to be slightly more complicated. It goes with the idea of pastiche as stylistic imitation that the pasticheur has tried to imitate the style of the source text faithfully. Like good translations, convincing pastiches can persuade their readers to accept without reservation the claim of fidelity. For instance, the translator of Proust's *L'Affaire Lemoine*, Charlotte Mandell, had never read Henri de Régnier, but confessed that after reading Proust's pastiche of him that she feels like she "knew him perfectly" (Mandell, n. pag.). Yet the lingering association of pastiche with forgery and a sense of immorality associated with the adoption of the style of another writer are prone to make readers initially more reserved about it. The conditions of pastiche can give rise to at least two kinds of suspicion. On the one hand, readers may wonder whether the imitation of the style of the source text is accurate enough. Does it sound right? Does it convey the characteristic features of the source text? On the other hand, the readers may be suspicious of the intentions of the pasticheur. Why is she imitating this style? What is the point of this imitation?

The dependence of stylistic pastiche on a close textual equivalence and on a shared literary historical context has discouraged imitators from crossing language borders, and pastiches of texts originally written in another language tend to be rare. When pastiching John Ruskin, Proust was in effect pastiching his own French translations of Ruskin's works, and the rather awkward pastiche of the style of Arthur Conan Doyle by Reboux and Muller in *À la Manière de... II* relies mostly on parading stock details from the original stories added to French cultural stereotypes of the English. (Has anyone ever heard of a gin-drinking Holmes before?) In their pastiche of Tolstoy, Reboux and Muller faced the problem of how to convey Tolstoy's conspicuous use of French expressions in the flow of the Russian text. They present their pastiche as a translation in which the "originally" French words are marked in italics (*À la Manière de... I-II*, 25). As in the case of

Doyle, the foreign aspects of Tolstoy's writing are wildly exaggerated (witness such place names as the government of Kartimskrasolvitchegosk or the district of Ortoupinskaïeskaïa-Tienswlapopol). Pastiche of a foreign author seem to turn into outright parodies more readily than do imitations of writers in the same language, where a more subtle stylistic play can be effective enough. It is possible to identify here a tendency to protect one's own culture by presenting foreign styles and writers as strange and absurd, which is in direct contradiction with the idea of translation as bridge-building between cultures.

In fact, pastiches pose a challenge to the mediating function of translation: if it is well-nigh impossible to pastiche a pastiche, as I suggested before, how is it possible to translate a pastiche from one language to another, when in addition to imitating an imitation the translator must also try to mediate its cultural trail? When Byatt's *Possession* was translated into Finnish in 2007, the task was divided between two translators. The poet Leevi Lehto had to find inventive ways of conveying the Victorian pastiches and their resonances with earlier literature into the much more recent Finnish literary culture, which did not have a nineteenth-century equivalent for the kind of sophisticated poetry imitated in Byatt's novel.²⁸ Even if Finland had had such poetic traditions, using the marked styles of nineteenth-century Finnish poets in the translation would have interfered with the British context of the novel. In Lehto's translation, the pastiche poetry comes across as distinctly archaic but vague in reference. The trochaic metre and many of the lexical choices create associations with the history of Finnish poetry (especially early twentieth-century poetry), but the topics and themes are largely alien to that context. Despite these inevitable changes, Finnish reviewers in general judged Lehto's balancing act successful and functional in the context of the novel as a whole. Sometimes translators of pastiches can rely on existing translations of the source texts into the language they are working in. Mandell, the translator of *L'Affaire Lemoine*, had previously translated Balzac and Flaubert, which undoubtedly facilitated the

²⁸ The prose of the novel was translated by Marja Alopaeus.

rendering of Proust's pastiches of those writers into English. When translating Maurois's *Le Côté de Chelsea* into English, George D. Painter wrote that he has "tried, but certainly failed, to make [his] translation as close a pastiche of the immortal Scott Moncrieff [Proust's first English translator] as the original is of Proust" (8).

Like translation and citation, pastiche acknowledges its source text, whether directly or indirectly. The distinction between transparent and opaque forms of appropriation is, however, a fairly recent phenomenon, arising from the modern notion of authorship that emphasises the necessity of knowing the origin of the work. As I demonstrated in part one, the status of pastiche was rather vague in this respect, as the term pastiche was used of works exhibited under the name of the artist being imitated. However, pastiche is now understood as a form of transparent imitation, which distinguishes it from forgery and plagiarism. A forger typically presents an unauthentic work as belonging to a famous author, while the plagiarist presents the work of another under his or her own name. In the eighteenth century plagiarism, was perceived as an accepted form of creation, provided that one pilfered from deceased or foreign authors (e.g., Marmontel 3: 119), but the heightened awareness of the moral rights of authors has rendered it a generally unacceptable and reprehensible practice. Similarly, forgery is today seen almost exclusively in a negative light, although it can be regarded as a necessary counterpoint for authentic creation (see Groom; Ruthven).

There is also another point of convergence between pastiche and the kind of forgery that imitates an existing source.²⁹ Since forgery by definition disguises its spuriousness, we can only have knowledge of failed forgeries that have been exposed to the public. When read against this context, how do forgeries differ from pastiches? Do we not read them as stylistic imitations of existing sources? Furthermore, if the forgery is intended as a hoax, and the author reveals the false identity of the text within a rela-

²⁹ Not all forgeries are made in imitation of a classic. A forger may exhibit a genuine work by a less-known writer as the work of a renowned author.

tively short period after the publication, does this revelation turn the text into a pastiche? The case of the famous Rimbaud forgery “La Chasse spirituelle” from 1949 serves as an example of how the reception of a literary work is conditioned by its status. Although its authors Akakia-Viala³⁰ and Nicholas Bataille divulged their authorship only two days after the publication of the poem, many people, including the editor of *Mercur de France*, in which the poem appeared, continued to believe in its authenticity. The general opinion was changed only gradually, when an increasing number of critics had judged the poem to be too awful to be really by Rimbaud, and when its direct quotations from Rimbaud’s work were disclosed. Since it was at first presented as an original and therefore had to be exorcised from the canon of Rimbaud’s works, critics were eager to find fault with it and eventually it came to be seen as a poor imitation of Rimbaud’s style. Had it been presented as a pastiche to begin with, the reception would probably have been more favourable (Genette, *Palimpsestes* 220-22; Morrisette).

Another concept for deception in literature, the term mystification is used to refer those perplexing cases in which the identity of the author or the text remains a mystery to the readers, or cases in which readers join in the game instigated by the author and read the text as if it were written by someone other than its real author.³¹ Imaginary authors, such as the heteronyms of Fernando Pessoa, or pseudonymous publication of the sort undertaken by Søren Kierkegaard, fall into the category of mystification. Since there is usually no real confusion as to the identities of the imitating and author being imitated, pastiches do not really mystify anyone, not even when they are attributed to fictive authors such as Adoré Floupette or Christabel LaMotte.

In the postmodern debate, pastiche is sometimes associated with simulacrum or deceptive appearance. This connection can,

³⁰ Pseudonym of Marie-Antoinette Allévy.

³¹ See Jeandillou, *Ésthetique de la mystification* (esp. 130-37) and Leclerc, *Le Sceau de l’œuvre* (134-35) for discussions of pastiche in the context of mystification and apocryphism respectively.

again, be traced back to the writings of Jameson and to the largely unacknowledged source of his famous postmodernism article(s), Jean Baudrillard, who in *L'Échange symbolique et la mort* (1976) and *Simulacres et simulation* (1981) offers an analysis of the history of representation as an ever-deepening crisis of signs which culminates in postmodernism, where all that remains is simulacra, or signs that have lost their reference to reality. According to Baudrillard, in postmodernism we are surrounded with copies that have no originals. Although the term is now primarily associated with postmodernism, it derives from a much-discussed passage in Plato's *The Sophist*, where Theaetetus and the Elean Stranger make a distinction between exact copies (*eikôn*) and semblances (*phantasma*, Lat. *simulacrum*) which distort the scale of the object for perspectival reasons (235d-236b). The semblance or simulacrum does not attain the internal similarity with the object or its idea, the relationship which legitimises copies, but creates an external illusion of similarity, which disguises its real dissimilarity to the object (see Deleuze 47-48).

While Piles's definition of pastiches as "neither originals nor copies" might seem to suggest an affinity with simulacrum in the postmodern sense – pastiche could be seen as a reproduction for which no original exists – such an interpretation is made problematic by confounding three quite different contexts: the visual simulacrum of Plato's *The Sophist*, the imitation of the style of a painter and the postmodern loss of the referent. Moreover, although postmodern theory has made simulacrum into a metaphor of the general cultural condition, its strong visual and spatial connotations have discouraged its use in discussions that focus on literature. In my view, the most fruitful connection between the two concepts and that of forgery is that they share the same cultural function. As Deleuze points out, simulacrum "calls into question the very notions of the copy... and of the model" (47), and similarly pastiche and forgery act to displace the opposition between the two. However, their critical potential should not be exaggerated or generalised too swiftly for, in addition to questioning the opposition of originals and non-originals, they also foster the

“cult of originality” since their existence is, by negation, the proof of originality.

Returning to established literary terminology, I shall now turn to three concepts describing the kind of imitation that subverts either the style or some other characteristic elements of the source text. Burlesque and travesty are sometimes treated as synonyms; however, one critical tradition distinguishes them on the basis that burlesque retains the style but changes the content while travesty retains the subject but presents it in another style. In burlesque the incongruity arises from the use of an elevated style to describe a low topic, as Henry Fielding explains in his preface to *The Adventures of Joseph Andrews*: burlesque “is ever the exhibition of what is monstrous and unnatural, and where our delight, if we examine it, arises from the surprizing absurdity, as in appropriating the manners of the highest to the lowest” (2). In *Gaudy Night* Dorothy L. Sayers offers a denser characterisation: “Heroics that don’t come off are the very essence of burlesque” (405). While travesty, by contrast, uses particularly vulgar style in its rewriting of an esteemed literary model, it is sometimes characterised as ‘low burlesque’ or ‘burlesque imitation,’ and both are often treated as synonyms of mock-heroic, satire or parody.

Like the term pastiche, burlesque and travesty became current in the eighteenth century but, unlike pastiche, which engages with the modern conception of authorship and style as the mark of individuality, burlesque and travesty seem to belong to the older aesthetic tradition in which styles were ascribed to particular genres or topics (see chapter 1.1). This background explains in part why the epic genre has been a common target of burlesque and travesty, as in *Virgile travesti* by Scarron or in *The Rape of the Lock* by Alexander Pope (often discussed as a mock-heroic). The association of burlesque and travesty with older literary conventions has probably contributed to their gradual disappearance from critical discourse where parody is now most commonly used of works deploying such an incongruity between style and topic.³²

³² While it might have waned as a literary critical term, burlesque has recently attracted much attention as a form of performance and masquerade that draws

In a time of stylistic plurality, it has become difficult, if not impossible, to make the kind of clear distinction between the style and the content of a work required by the notions of burlesque and travesty.

Pastiche is sometimes discussed under burlesque or assimilated to it (Jump 32-35; Karrer, *Parodie, Travestie, Pastiche* 189). In practice, humorous or satirical pastiches may employ stylistic incongruity, as in Proust's pastiche of Henri de Régner, where a piece of mucus is described in loving detail and compared to a sparkling diamond (see pp. 269-70), or when in *Pistache* Sebastian Faulks mocks J.K. Rowling's Harry Potter series in the style of Martin Amis: "In the bed next to mine was Harry Potter, a weapons-grade geek with a thunderbolt of acne through his candidly sebaceous forehead, who told me he lived in a *cupboard* for fuck's sake" (4, emphasis original). Faulks's imitation is an example of what could be called a portmanteau pastiche which conflates the characters and themes of one text with the style of another; if humorous, such imitations can equally well be discussed as parodies (e.g., Brett 275-92; Reboux & Muller 125-49). Their combination of elements from two or more sources also makes them a fairly distinct hybrid of stylistic pastiche and compilation pastiche.

Parody is today often given as a synonym of pastiche, but the two have not always been perceived as sibling terms. Their affinity dates back to the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, when they came to be grouped together as forms of extensive interaction with a previous text (see chapter 1.2). While their connection has persisted, the grounds on which the two forms have been linked with or separated from each other have not remained the same. At first they were distinguished from each other on the basis of tone and purpose. According to the famous definition of parody by Jonathan Swift, the parodist "personates the style and manner of other writers, whom he has a mind to ex-

from variety, striptease and pin-up fashion. The neo-burlesque, as it is sometimes called, is characterised by active participation that blurs the distinction between the performers and the audience.

pose" (85; cf. also appendix). Parody is thus the imitation of other writers with the intention to "expose," that is, to criticise or ridicule the author being imitated. A derisive attitude was the main criterion for distinguishing parody from pastiche in the early twentieth century, when French literary critics classified parody as critical or humorous imitation and pastiche as its more neutral or serious counterpart. There is some truth in this distinction. For instance, Byatt's Dickinson pastiche, which was discussed earlier, displays no apparent parodic tone or intent, whether towards the source text or some other target. It could be claimed that merely the fact of imitating another writer creates parodic/humorous incongruence, but even then it would be hard to discern any parody or humour in the pastiche poem. By contrast, the Montaigne pastiche by La Bruyère can certainly be interpreted as a mockery of the excessively diffuse style of the famous essayist (see Marmontel 3: 89). While the early twentieth-century critics regarded criticism as one of the main functions of pastiche, they did not elaborate on the distinction between a critical parody and a serious pastiche that criticises its source text. The idea that pastiche and parody can be distinguished by the different emphases of tone works in many cases, but it does not explain all often subtle differences between the two.

Later attempts to define the two in symmetrical terms tend to lead to similar difficulties. For instance, when Roland Mortier writes that "parody is defined in *opposition* to the work to which it refers while pastiche seeks to establish the greatest possible *analogy* with its model"³³ (203, emphases original), he excludes the numerous cases in which the point of parody has little to do with the text being imitated or where it in fact pays homage to its model. In the same vein, Linda Hutcheon characterises parody as a "bitextual synthesis" (with reference to Sanda Golopentia-

³³ "[. . .] la parodie se définit *contre* l'œuvre qui lui sert de référence, alors que le pastiche recherche la plus grande *analogie* possible avec son modèle[.]" Mortier bases his definitions on Hempel.

Eretescu)³⁴ or “repetition with critical distance, which marks difference rather than similarity,” which leads her to emphasise the “monotextual” character of pastiche which “stress[es] similarity rather than difference” (*A Theory of Parody* 6, 33). Yet the linguistic and structural similarity in pastiche does not mean that the inevitable differences are not marked: indeed, since pastiche is not a copy, but a form of imitation, the choices of emphasis and even omission may sometimes create an effect of difference. This is most apparent in such blasphemous pastiches as Thomas’s *Charlotte* or Dibdin’s *The Last Sherlock Holmes Story*. The kind of duality or ambiguity that arises from the tension between similarity and difference in parody is not exclusive to it; however, the fact that the element of such doubleness is obvious in both parody and pastiche does not reduce them to each other.

In recent years, it has become common, especially in the English-language context, to distinguish between parody and pastiche based on their inherent value. This, like so many other aspects of the Anglo-American discussion on pastiche, can be traced back to Jameson’s definition of pastiche as “blank parody” that is “amputated of the satirical impulse” (“Postmodernism” 65). Consequently many critics have described pastiche as flawed parody, similar to it in means and appearance, but lacking its subversive power. Compared to parody, pastiche seems nostalgic and conservative. Such value oppositions are not infrequent as means of distinguishing between two similar cultural forms or practices. In the neoclassical context, the distinction was made between creative and servile imitation on the basis of literary quality and inventiveness, while in the context of postmodern theory the criteria usually pertain to cultural politics and ideology. Furthermore, in contemporary criticism pastiche is not the only literary form that is defined in negative terms in contrast to parody: satire is often described as a reductive practice which lacks the constructive aspect of parody (e.g., Rose, *Parody* 83). This kind of essentialist conceptual analysis proves problematic in terms of the analysis of

³⁴ Golopentia-Eretescu’s views on pastiche and parody were discussed in chapter 1.2.

actual literary works since pastiche is not always conservative and parody critical, nor is parody always constructive and satire destructive. All these forms can be used in different ways to different ends.

Thus neither evaluative criteria, nor analysis based on tone or intention succeed in grasping the differences between pastiche and parody satisfactorily. The problems of these approaches indicate that the distinction between the two practices cannot be an exclusive one. In my view, a more fruitful way of looking at the matter would be to regard them as parts of the same continuum or family of imitative practices, which allows for a certain degree of overlap. In addition to elements of attitude or tone, it is useful to compare the ways in which these practices draw from and transform their source texts.

Therefore, in my view the difference between pastiche and parody is one of emphasis rather than of essence. In its broad sense today, parody includes a wide range of practices, which means that the minimal common denominators for parody are slight: even a passing reference or token imitation in the text may be enough to alert the readers to the parodic intention. In the *New Critical Idiom* volume on parody, Simon Dentith gives the following working definition: "Parody includes any cultural practice which provides a relatively polemical *allusive imitation* of another cultural production or practice" (9, emphasis added). Dentith's formulation suggests that in a parody the imitation need not be continuous and in depth; it can be "allusive," that is, local or roundabout, depending on which sense of the term allusion is referred to. Thus, the range of parodies extends from parodic utterances – a single sentence can constitute a parody – to extensive reworkings of a previous text. Such variability in extension also suggests that parody works in many ways; in other words, it can use the whole range of imitative and assimilative techniques.³⁵ Pastiche, by contrast, imitates the style of its source text and is therefore often strikingly similar to it; moreover, it is, as a whole,

³⁵ See Rose (*Parody* 37-38) for a list of possible parodic features in the text and the reception of the text.

always based on another text. Partial pastiche ceases to be a pastiche if and when the imitative relationship becomes either intermittent or too weak for the readers to recognise it. The difference between the inclusive, flexible parody and the more confined pastiche is also reflected in the terminology. Like 'ironic' and 'satiric', the adjective 'parodic' can be used to indicate one aspect of the object, not necessarily dominant, whereas the term pastiche does not yield to similar adjectival usage.

The specificity of pastiche is also apparent when compared to the range of source texts available for parody. Unlike pastiche, which usually imitates a text originally written in the same language, parody can effortlessly cross the borders between languages and different media (see Hutcheon, *A Theory of Parody* 38). It is for instance possible to imitate a film in a verbal parody, but it would be much more challenging to create a convincing pastiche of a film in literature (unless it be a pastiche of the style of the script); or opera, for that matter: in the introductory note to his pastiche of *Pelléas et Mélisande*, Proust is careful to point out that he imitates the libretto of Debussy's opera, not its musical style (*Contre Sainte-Beuve* 206). Moreover, parody need not have one specific source text since it can combine elements from several discourses, which makes it similar to compilation pastiche. While both parody and stylistic pastiche are imitative practices, pastiche is first and foremost identified through and characterised by its relatively close relation to the source text, whereas parody is more readily characterised by the manner in which it treats the materials it imitates or alludes to. Defined above by Dentith as "relatively polemical," the range of parodic attitudes extends from gently humorous to sharply critical and even antagonistic.

The partial overlap of parody and pastiche means that in considering actual imitative works it is sometimes meaningless to try to enforce one or the other denomination as the correct one. In my view, it makes perfect sense to talk about parodic pastiches or parodies that use pastiche as (one of) their means. The jocular French term "parostiche" is sometimes used in referring to such texts. Aron defines the contamination as "all cases of transforma-

tion of style associated with a writer's name or an appreciated literary movement" ("Formes et fonctions" 255), thereby acknowledging the common ground of parody and pastiche. More important than trying to decide upon the correct classification is the use to which the term chosen is put and the insights it can yield in interaction with the text being analysed. As Dyer points out, the analysis of certain works as pastiches stands or falls, in the last instance, "by the degree to which treating them as pastiche illuminates them, how much intellectual and affective sense it makes of them" (*Pastiche* 48). Discussing a particular mimetic text as parody usually gives precedence to its incisive attitude and to those aspects in which it most markedly deviates from its model, while the term pastiche in the same context is more likely to direct the critic's or reader's attention to the more subtle stylistic play of similarity and difference. If read as parodies, the imitations of contemporary writers in Lodge's *Thinks...* could be seen as contributing to the comic quality of the novel, while seen as pastiches, they might more readily draw attention to one of the novel's central themes, the issue of how different literary styles and narrative viewpoints can give us access to the consciousnesses of others.³⁶ To take another example, when George D. Painter discusses Maurois's novella *Le Côté de Chelsea* as a parody of Proust in his introductory note on the volume (1), he perhaps inadvertently projects the comic and subversive aspects of the style being imitated onto the imitation itself. If discussed as pastiche, as it was explicitly termed in the French original, *Le Côté de Chelsea* can be seen as rendering the hilariously pedantic and often subtly (self-)parodic style of Proust's Narrator.³⁷ Painter's choice of term is informed by the common English usage which favours parody over the more unfamiliar pastiche, but the change of term may affect the readers' experience of the literary work. Although writers may not always offer the most accurate characterisations of the status of

³⁶ For a more detailed analysis of *Thinks...* see pp. 248-50.

³⁷ Following the conventions of Proust criticism, I refer to the autobiographical narrator-character of *À la Recherche* as the Narrator.

their works,³⁸ it seems problematic to me to ignore the paratextual information about the status of the work, as I have already pointed out in connection to Stoppard's *Travesties*.

One particular difficulty in distinguishing between parody and pastiche is the increasing inclusiveness of the latter. In the last decades of the twentieth century especially, parody has become an umbrella term covering works that were previously regarded as burlesques, travesties, satires or pastiches (e.g., Korkut 20-22). When the first series of the *Critical Idiom* editions was published between 1970-85, parody was only briefly discussed in the volume devoted to burlesque, whereas in the new series the roles have been reversed, and burlesque is treated under parody (Jump 18-36; Dentith ix, 123-54). The rise of parody is further accentuated by the fact that satire, which had its own volume in the old series, has not been introduced in the new publishing programme as yet. Even in France, where pastiche has long been recognised as an independent practice, articles on pastiche are nevertheless conventionally found in collections devoted to parody (e.g., *Dire la parodie, Le Singe à la porte*), which is suggestive of the critics' habit of treating it as a minor variant of parody.

Although pastiche is thus often treated as a variety of parody, its own career as a critical concept displays some similarity with that of parody, since the recent notion of compilation pastiche has considerably increased its scope and importance. Compared to burlesque and travesty, which emerged as critical terms at the same time in the eighteenth century, but which today have an antiquarian feel to them, pastiche has been rising in the critical vocabulary. As I suggested earlier, burlesque and travesty stem from a now dated conception of style, and, furthermore, their synonymy with each other and proximity to parody have ren-

³⁸ Titles of pastiches are sometimes deliberately misleading. For instance, several pastiche collections include the term plagiarism in their titles (see Jeandillou, *Esthétique* 130). However, rather than a sign of ignorance on the authors' part, this can be seen as a deliberate strategy to evoke the affinity between pastiche and illegitimate plagiarism or as a means to emphasise the role of the pasticheur as the author through equivocal understatement (e.g., *Le Parfait plagiaire* by Georges-Armand Masson).

dered them superfluous to some extent. The increasing critical interest in both forms of pastiche, the compilation and the stylistic variety, illustrates the evocative power of the concept which has prevented it from becoming assimilated to parody despite the similarities. The relationship between the two forms demonstrates how terms develop in interaction with and in contrast to other terms.

Juxtaposing pastiche with parody also serves to highlight one further aspect of these imitations, namely the question of their generic status. Are they literary genres or perhaps modes or techniques available to writers within different genres and, more importantly, what are the implications of either usage? It is apparent that parody and pastiche share a number of characteristics with literary genres, such as a cumulative tradition and a relatively distinct repertoire of conventions. Yet the fact that they can be either intermittent (parodic aspects in a work) or embedded texts (pastiche or parodies included in a work) would seem to detract from or complicate their claim to generic status (see Milly, "Les Pastiches de Proust" 34-35). The rather loose French usage of the term *genre* (often applied to both parody and pastiche) leaves unspecified the role of these two imitative forms vis-à-vis the category of the literary genre. In literary criticism, parody is often treated as an aspect or mode than a genre of literature (e.g., Dentith 37; Thomson 97), but for instance Clive Thomson has argued for the importance of the genre of parody. In "Parody/Genre/Ideology," Thomson criticises what he calls the semantic and syntactic approaches to parody (exemplified in the works of Linda Hutcheon and Geneviève Idt respectively) for their narrow perspective on parody. Only when parody is treated as a genre, can the textual level of analysis be combined with a historical point of view which allows for the recognition of the ideological aspects of parody (95, 102). In *Kinds of Literature: An Introduction to the Theory of Genres and Modes*, Alastair Fowler terms pastiche and parody as "quasi-generic" literary forms, but he seems to be thinking only of the generic status of pastiches or parodies stemming from one work, such as the imitations of

Horace's Fifth Ode (127). What is apparent in these accounts is that the designation of a generic status to pastiche and parody is not simply a question of classification but also evaluation: given generic credentials, the forms are furnished with a historical pedigree that foregrounds their historical and cultural significance. If seen from a more strictly textual point of view, it is easier to tone down their role.

The final term to which I would like to relate pastiche is more recent than the others. The new publishing opportunities provided by the internet have given rise to countless fan fictions, continuations or variations of popular novels, films and TV series written by fans to a community of fans.³⁹ These fictions typically take a character or episode from an existing story and elaborate on it according to the rather sophisticated generic conventions developed within this type of literary production. In many of the fan fictions, the erotic or pornographic tone is dominant, as in "slash" which invents homoerotic subplots to the original story or "mpreg" where a male character gets pregnant.⁴⁰ Emphasis on stylistic similarity varies according to the source text: fan fictions of television series must find a literary format acceptable to the fandom, while in fan fictions of such stylistically ambitious literary works as the novels of Jane Austen and J.R.R. Tolkien, stylistic similarity can (but do not necessarily) become an important issue. Thus some fan fictions may be stylistic pastiches, but stylistic pastiche seems not to be, on the whole, an important concern within this type of writing. Moreover, pastiche has more "high" literary connotations: the source texts tend to be either classics or popular novels appreciated for their literary aspects as well and, unlike fan fictions, pastiches appear not have increased noticeably with the vogue of the internet, but continue to be rooted in older publishing practices, books and magazines.

There are however interesting points of overlap between the practices, and thinking of pastiches as a sort of fan writing (if not

³⁹ I am grateful to Professor Robin Reid and Dr. Irma Hirsjärvi for advice and reference material concerning fan fiction.

⁴⁰ For the genre conventions of fan fictions, see Busse and Hellekson (10-12).

fan fiction in the established sense) will help to illustrate some of the particular traits of this kind of imitation. While a writer might be provoked to write a pastiche because he or she dislikes the style of the source text intensely, in practice most pastiches involve an element of homage. Writing a pastiche is a way to deepen one's involvement with the source text and a way of creating a network of bonds or affinities between oneself and other writers, which resonates with the strong social aspect of fan fictions and fandom in general. When Seamus Heaney chose to write a memorial poem to the fellow poet Joseph Brodsky in the style of Auden's "In Memory of W.B. Yeats" (in *Electric Light*, 2001), he not only paid homage to Auden's celebrated poem but also to Brodsky, who greatly admired Auden. The layers of homage in the poem create poetic affiliations that transcend the constraints of time and death. Another point in common with fan fictions can be found in the neo-Victorian pastiches which very often deal with the sexual relationships of Victorians in a manner which might seem deliberately voyeuristic (see Gutleben, *Nostalgic Postmodernism* and chapter 3.3 of the present study). Adding explicit sexual themes to the source texts breaks their code of decorum, turning pastiches and fanfictions into highly mixed tributes.

Investigating pastiche in the context of related literary practices has thus revealed a number of points of convergence but also highlighted the idiosyncratic traits of pastiche. Two of its central characteristics help to distinguish it from many similar practices. First of all, the exceptionally close relation to the source text separates pastiche from less specific forms of imitation and appropriation as well as from forms in which the imitative aspect is lacking altogether (e.g., citation); secondly, the foregrounding of its imitative status separates it from forgery and plagiarism but also from some forms of parody, in which the connection to the source text may be much less specific and where it is thus not as essential to point out the source text. It is important to note that these differences pertain only to stylistic pastiche; compilation pastiche does not necessarily share these characteristics, and thus its distinctiveness would have to be argued on a different basis.

Although the concepts discussed above describe particular literary practices, many of them have been used in a metaphorical sense to describe more or less the same prominent tendency in cultural production, a tendency to repetition and recycling. When used in this broad sense, they nevertheless retain aspects of the more specific uses of the terms. Thus, for instance, expressions such as “culture of pastiche” and “culture of simulacrum” suggest a critical attitude towards the phenomenon, arising from the generally negative connotations of the two concepts, while the use of the term translation to designate the mediatedness of culture implies a more positive conception of the possibilities of cultural communication. Citation can be used in a more neutral sense, whereas the meaning of parody in this general usage depends on whether one wishes to stress the critical aspects or the derisive, negative side of the layered nature of culture, both of which can be activated through the term parody. The metaphorical extension of these critical terms indicates once again the necessity to negotiate between the more concrete and figurative senses of the terms; between the level of larger cultural analysis and particular practices within that culture.

Pastiche in Other Arts

The conception of stylistic pastiche has been strongly associated with literature and, for instance, few French critics writing on pastiche have drawn any parallels between the literary practices of imitation and those in the other arts.⁴¹ The concept’s long historical association with one art form has inevitably shaped it in ways which make its interdisciplinary application challenging. Thus it has been seen as a less useful term than compilation pastiche which is unburdened by similar history. Forms of compilation and

⁴¹ The nineteenth-century critics cite examples of pastiches in visual art that hail from Piles and Jaucourt. In the early twentieth century, Deffoux and Dufay as well as Walkley discussed instances of theatrical pastiche.

eclecticism can be found in all the arts, calling for terminology that could be applied to similar cases across disciplines. Moreover, the concept of compilation pastiche is in accord with the paradigm shift caused by the rise of cultural studies at the end of the twentieth century. With its broad scope of analysis, cultural studies has rendered discipline-specific viewpoints and terminology suspect (see, e.g., Bal 6-8, 24): since different media are seen to partake in the same historical and ideological context, focusing on traditional art forms and using the exclusive methodologies developed in their study is sometimes perceived as a conservative and limiting view of culture. Hence the interdisciplinary approach taken in the studies on postmodern pastiche: Jameson discusses examples of film and literature, to which Hoesterey adds visual arts and advertisements, while Rose and Hal Foster draw their examples from architecture and painting. These choices illustrate, however, that despite the emphasis on a broad perspective, "culture" is still very much defined by traditional representational art forms and their conventions, not for instance by newer or less institutionalised cultural forms, such as graffiti, computer games, graphic novels or street fashion, each of which could provide relevant examples of postmodern compilation. The broad notion of compilation pastiche and the conception of stylistic pastiche endorsed in this study are both historical concepts arising from particular art forms, which to some extent confines or determines their use in critical discourse, and they cannot therefore be opposed and evaluated on the basis of their extension and apparent flexibility in any simplistic manner.

In this section I shall indicate some of the problems in extending the notion of stylistic pastiche, as outlined in the previous sections, to all arts equally or even to culture in general. In so doing, I wish to draw attention to the different media and traditions in the various arts which condition the artists' and writers' expressive possibilities. However, I do not mean to imply that stylistic pastiche occurs only in literature. At the end of this chapter, parallel examples are drawn from film and photography to give an idea of the ways in which stylistic imitation works in these visual art

forms, although, as the examples suggest, the use of a similar technique does not imply that its functions would be identical with those in literature. As this study focuses on literary pastiche, I shall limit myself to a few observations concerning the variations of stylistic pastiche in other arts forms, a topic which deserves a further study of its own.

One of the problems with the use of pastiche in relation to all art forms arises from the status of style. As a manner of doing or expressing, style is intimately tied to the means and forms available within the particular art form, and the significant differences between the arts have posed a serious challenge to a general theory of style (Ross 232-33). In literature, style is manifested in language through linguistic means of expression and narration, while in film, for instance, style is mediated through a combination of visual means (camera techniques, colour, editing, etc.), sound, setting (studio or real locations), dialogue and acting, all of which contribute to the stylistic impression the film makes on its audience. Consequently, imitation of style involves somewhat different procedures in each art form. The complexity of multimedial and performing art forms makes it particularly difficult to find analogies in them for pastiche as it is practised in literature. For instance, when is a theatre performance a pastiche in the stylistic sense of the term? If it imitates an earlier staging of the same play, how can the imitative quality be conveyed to the audience, most of whom have presumably not seen the predecessor? The term pastiche is not much used in the context of performance and the absence of the headword 'style' in dictionaries of theatre terms could perhaps be seen as an indication of the absence of the kind of conception of dominant style that characterises literary critical discourse.⁴² Instead, theatre critics and reviewers tend to split the style into the director's style, the style of the décor, the style of

⁴² For instance, the *Dictionnaire du Théâtre* (1996) by Patrice Pavis records neither 'pastiche', nor 'style'. Moore and Varchaver define pastiche (under the headword *pasticcio*) as a composite work by several authors in *Dictionary of the performing arts* (344), and Terry Hodgson relates it to literature, pointing out how burlesque and travesty are more common terms than pastiche in the theatrical vocabulary in *The Batsford Dictionary of Drama* (267).

acting and so forth. Even performances governed by an imitative purpose, such as the staging of Shakespeare's plays in the Globe Theatre in London, are not typically discussed as pastiches or imitations of style, but analysed under the term of reconstruction. Imitation of, for instance, another actor's or character's manner is, of course, a stock device in the theatrical repertoire, but will it not be perceived as parody rather than pastiche by the audience?⁴³ As these preliminary examples illustrate, the manifestation and recognition of instances of stylistic imitation are different in the performing and collective arts than in literature and the visual arts.

The range of media available in the visual arts illustrates another challenge to the application of a notion of stylistic pastiche beyond literature. How is style conveyed from one visual medium to another? I shall take as an example *The New Painting* (2000-04), a series of photographs by the Finnish artist Elina Brotherus.⁴⁴ As a part of this series, Brotherus explores the relationship between photography and painting by producing her own versions of the iconic *Der Wanderer über dem Nebelmeer* by Caspar David Friedrich (which was identified by Judith Ryan as one of the sources for the compilation pastiche in Süskind's *Das Parfum*; see p. 146 of this study). Brotherus's *Der Wanderer 2* (2004) represents a figure clad in a long tight black overcoat standing on a rocky mountaintop, her back facing the viewer (the model is Brotherus herself) (*The New Painting* 63). The spacious view opening before her invites the viewer to join in the meditative contemplation of the serene beauty of the distant, snowy highland. The reference to Friedrich is obvious and immediate as it is conveyed through the striking resemblance of the composition of the picture and the meditative pose of the subject, the viewer's proxy. However, the photographic clarity and detail – the rusty moss on the rocks, the unfocused wavering of the hem of the coat in the breeze – contribute

⁴³ Cf. Deffoux and Dufay, who claim in *Anthologie du pastiche* that theatrical pastiches must use coarser means than literary pastiches to communicate their imitative quality (viii).

⁴⁴ The series has been exhibited at least in Britain, Finland, France and Ireland, as well as published as a book in 2005.

to a remarkably different stylistic effect from Friedrich's misty scenery in which the visible brush strokes foreground the material quality of oil painting.⁴⁵ It is not immediately clear what an accurate and insightful characterisation of Brotherus's photograph might be. Is it pastiche, homage, adaptation, variation or version?⁴⁶ If one regards it as a stylistic pastiche, how does one account for the inevitable stylistic "loss" necessitated by the different media?

The example of Brotherus's *Der Wanderer 2* also draws attention to a difference between the production and reception aspect of such imitation. Although the photograph is executed under completely different material circumstances from Friedrich's painting, it is debatable whether the material context makes a great difference to the way in which the audience responds to the work. Both versions, the original and the photograph, invite the viewer to partake in the experience of sublime stemming from the complex interaction between the contemplating character and the vast panorama of the mountains. Had Brotherus actually painted her version of Friedrich's painting (which would of course tamper with the whole underlying ethos of *The New Painting*, intended as a photographic exploration of some painterly themes and qualities), would the audience react to it differently? The example suggests that the notion of stylistic pastiche is more dependent on the producer's than the receiver's point of view, and thus great differ-

⁴⁵ Brotherus's other versions of the *Wanderer* theme show less resemblance to Friedrich's *Der Wanderer über dem Nebelmeer*. *Der Wanderer* (2003) represents a woman clad in bright-coloured clothes in front of gently sloping hills and in *Der Wanderer 5* (2004) the figure is facing an illusion wall depicting a classical landscape. Brotherus's work can be viewed online on the digital service of Finnish National Gallery or at the artist's own website (www.elinabrotherus.com, viewed 19 Jan 2010).

⁴⁶ When Brotherus's *The New Painting* series was exhibited at the Finnish Museum of Photography in 2006, I asked her if she saw the *Wanderer* photographs (*Der Wanderer 2* in particular) as pastiches. The answer was negative: she rather regards *The New Painting* project as homage to the tradition of painting through the employment of such iconic painterly elements as mountains or bathers. She associates the term pastiche either with humorous imitation or with usurpation, neither of which she identifies as being an aspect of her own work (interview 14 Jan 2006).

ences in the material production of the imitative work would interfere with its pastiche quality. The foregrounding of the producer's perspective, especially the manifest intention to imitate the style of the source text, has been seen as one of the fundamental elements that constitute stylistic pastiche as a specific imitative practice. I shall return to the issue of intention in the following chapter.

The variation in what constitutes the materials of style in the various forms of art thus presents a problem for a general notion of stylistic pastiche. A further problem pertains to the meaning and tradition of pastiche in the respective contexts of the arts. As my survey of the definitions and theories of pastiche in part one demonstrated, the idea of authorship as defined by individual style is central to literary pastiche, but this conception of the creative activity is not equally important in other arts. Despite the blooming star cult and various forms of auteurism, film, opera and theatre are collective pursuits in which an individual's input is conditioned by that of others. In architecture and design commercial demands often condition the author's expressive possibilities: an architect's individual vision can be drastically altered in the building process, and a designer is often required to adjust his or her style to the purpose commissioned.⁴⁷ Instances of stylistic imitation in these arts are therefore often generic rather than directed at an individual style, and consequently issues of authenticity and legitimacy, central to literary pastiches, are less important, or discussed under other terms: Ikea is said to produce copies or replicas of iconic designer furniture, not pastiches of them. John N. Duvall and Noël Carroll have drawn attention to a similar problem of incompatibility in the case of the term postmodernism,

⁴⁷ Of course it is possible to find examples which defy these general formulations, such as the film-makers Alfred Hitchcock and Woody Allen, who have a highly recognisable style which can be and has been imitated by others. It is also true that literary works are shaped by other people than their named authors, such as editors and critics at the manuscript stage. My point, however, is to draw attention to the different basic conditions of these art forms, not to deny the possibility of manifestations of individuality in film or to hold on to the illusion of a solitary creation in literature.

used to signal a common phase in the various arts (Duvall 380-81; Carroll 91-92). The imposition of this general term in dance and architecture has led to the effacement of crucial historical developments within these art forms, developments that would, moreover, challenge or contradict the general approach.

In raising these problems my intention is not to confine pastiche to literary uses only, but to direct attention to the inevitable material and historical differences between the arts which makes the straightforward use of pastiche as a transart concept problematic. Certainly it is possible to find examples of stylistic pastiche outside literature. For instance, Steven Soderbergh's film *The Good German* (2006), set in the aftermath of the World War II, pays homage to the *film noir* genre, especially *Casablanca*, whose famous airport scene it restages at the end. Shot in black-and-white, *The Good German* reproduces the feel of the 1940s film to the extent that the archive footage of Berlin in ruins incorporated in the film runs smoothly into the narrative scenes shot in elaborate studio sets.⁴⁸ *Pleasantville* (1998), directed by Gary Ross, takes the pastiche mode even further as it self-consciously plays upon the juxtaposition of contemporary level of the story (shot in ordinary colour film) and the 1950s level (shot in black-and-white) which gradually merge into each other. The satirical allegory juxtaposes the fragmented, insecure contemporary experience with the smooth,

⁴⁸ The period feel of the film did not convince all critics. In her article in the *Sight and Sound*, Amy Taubin writes: "To be precise, *The Good German* is not a black-and-white film but a black-and-white-looking film that's shot on colour stock and either chemically drained of colour during processing or digitally drained during post-production. For a variety of reasons [. . .] it looks less like a 1940s film as it would have looked in the 1940s and more like the kind of degraded dupe of such a film we're used to seeing today. [. . .] [T]he lighting doesn't quite simulate either that of classic 1940s studio films or of film noir, the radically dissimilar styles Soderbergh gave himself the liberty of mixing as they would not have been mixed in the 1940s, since each expressed a view of the world that was in opposition to the other. There's no way to take bits of a classic studio project like Curtiz's *Casablanca*, graft on the atmosphere of even a not very noirish noir like Reed's *The Third Man*, and end up with a movie that's coherent in either meaning or form" (28-29). Taubin's detailed assessment shows the level of expert knowledge a critic needs to analyse in depth the techniques and functions of stylistic imitation in a particular art form.

homely 1950s television show called "Pleasantville." The contemporary characters are accidentally transported to the black-and-white idyll which consequently undergoes a series of changes as the contemporary characters bring with them the ideas and morals of their own time. Finally, the two levels become mixed and as a symbol of this process, "Pleasantville" gradually turns into colour film. Introduction into the sanitised 1950s of characters from the contemporary reality leads to a violent satire that exposes the hidden injustices and discriminations which are the constitutive elements of the idyll. Pastiche is here used for deliberately political ends (though the film's mixture of criticism and nostalgia can be baffling)⁴⁹ and in a manner which can be compared to those literary pastiches that explore the ideologies of two juxtaposed periods through style (see, e.g., Albertsen 1-2).

A further powerful instance of pastiche can be found in the photographer Sally Mann's *Deep South* series: taken with a traditional view camera with broken lenses and treated to look old, the beautiful scenic photographs from Virginia, Georgia and Mississippi are heavy with the shadows of the past, the wounds of slavery and the battles of the Civil War.⁵⁰ Their depth and patina imitate the documentary photographs of the Civil War, the first war to have been extensively recorded on camera but, as Mann points out in *What Remains*, a documentary film directed by Steven Cantor, the quality of the Civil War photographs is actually much better than that of her own pictures, in which she wilfully plays with the random effects created by cracked lenses, artificial stains

⁴⁹ For the political aspects of the film, see Porter's "Habermas in *Pleasantville*." The question of whether to read the film as cultural criticism targeted at the idealised past or whether to see it as a more ambiguous presentation of the still topical conflict between today's slacker mores and the more disciplined morality of the past remains undecided. Of the two siblings, the nerdy David returns to the present with confidence and experience, whereas the unruly and sexually active Jennifer is tamed into the role of a 1950s woman and stays behind in "Pleasantville." This hardly counts as a liberating and politically progressive conclusion in Jennifer's case.

⁵⁰ A selection from the *Deep South* series can be seen online on the website of the Edwin Houk Gallery (www.houkgallery.com/mann-deepsouth/mann_1.html, viewed 6 Mar 2009).

and overexposure. It is interesting to note that the target of imitation here is not the style of any individual war photographer or even the generic style of war photography but rather the effects that technical restrictions and patina have on photographs. They contribute an elegiac feeling to the often serene scenery, adding a hint of terror to the beauty of trees, ruins and waterfalls. The fact that the prints are bigger (38 x 48 inches) than the mid-nineteenth-century war photographers could execute helps to enhance the emotional effect of the pictures on viewers. Unabashedly romantic and unfashionably straightforward, Mann's pastiche photographs seem to defy the demands for irony, detachment and self-conscious reflexivity imposed on contemporary art.

These examples show that the notion of stylistic pastiche has relevance beyond the confines of literature, but they also illustrate how its uses are always conditioned by the means, conventions and traditions of each art form. In extending the term to cover phenomena in different art forms, it is necessary to negotiate a middle ground between conceptual flexibility and precision by defining the degree of similarity or analogy needed to juxtapose instances of imitation in various arts under the term pastiche. In *Pastiche*, Dyer lays the basis for such investigation by offering insightful analyses of stylistic imitation in various art forms, including the performing arts, which have often been left out in comparative analyses.

In this chapter, pastiche has been investigated in the contexts of related critical concepts and practices of imitation in various arts. The comparisons have revealed a number of areas of overlap but they have also helped to distinguish those areas and emphases that are typical of stylistic pastiches as a literary form. In particular, stylistic pastiche in literature is characterised by a pervasive sense of double-edgedness, the manifestations of which are the focus of the following chapter.

2.3 Aspects of Double-Edgedness

The Pastiche Contract

The term pastiche contract was introduced by Gérard Genette to distinguish pastiche as a deliberate literary practice and to draw attention to the practical means by which the imitative status is communicated to the readers. Genette attributes his idea of the pastiche contract to Philippe Lejeune, whose autobiographical pact has become an influential concept in the study of autobiographical narratives. The autobiographical pact is an attempt to resolve the issue of credibility in life narratives which derive their legitimacy from the connection with real, lived experiences. Since the connection to reality cannot be projected from the text by textual or narrative means, Lejeune turns to the evocative power inherent in the name of the author:

Dans les textes imprimés, toute l'énonciation est prise en charge par une personne qui a coutume de placer son *nom* sur la couverture du livre, et sur la page de garde, au-dessus ou au-dessous du titre du volume. C'est dans ce nom que se résume toute l'existence de ce qu'on appelle *l'auteur*: seule marque dans le texte d'un indubitable hors-texte, renvoyant à une personne réelle, qui demande ainsi qu'on lui attribue, en dernier ressort, la responsabilité de l'énonciation de tout le texte écrit. Dans beaucoup de cas, la présence de l'auteur dans le texte se réduit à ce seul nom. Mais la place assignée à cet nom est capitale: elle est liée, par une convention sociale, à l'engagement de responsabilité d'une *personne réelle*. (*Le Pacte autobiographique* 22-23, emphases original)

In printed texts, responsibility for all enunciation is assumed by a person who is in the habit of placing his *name* on the cover of the book, and on the flyleaf, above or below of the title of the volume. The entire existence of the person we call the *author* is summed up by this name: the only mark in the text of an unquestionable world-beyond-the-text, referring to a real person, which requires that we thus attribute to him, in the final analysis, the responsibility for the production of the whole written text. In many cases, the presence of the author in the text is reduced to this single name. But the place assigned to this name is essential: it is linked, by a social convention, to the pledge of responsibility of a *real person*. (*On Autobiography* 11, emphases original)

Like autobiography, pastiche too depends on a referential relationship to something or somebody outside the text but, unlike autobiography, there is not just one conventional way to achieve that reference. In *Palimpsestes*, Genette defines the pastiche contract as a feature of the text which informs the reader of its imitative status: “*this is a text where x imitates y*”⁵¹ (*Palimpsestes* 86, emphasis original). The pastiche contract thus means the activation of two proper names – and consequently two persons – as authors in a manner which makes explicit who is the imitator and who the target of imitation without quite settling the question of who is responsible for the text. Although similar textual acknowledgements occur in other forms of intertextuality, for instance in parodies, they seldom raise the question of responsibility and consequently of authority in the way pastiches do.

As Lejeune remarks (*On Autobiography* 125-26), the term “contract” connotes an official agreement, drawn up in a conventional form and signed by the affected parties, and it may therefore seem somewhat out-of-context with the actual literary practices by which pastiches conventionally establish and communicate their imitative status. I shall turn to these forms in a moment, but first I would like to briefly comment on the official aspect of the pastiche contract, which is not elaborated by Genette. For him, the pastiche contract is first and foremost a means of distinguishing pastiche from forgery and plagiarism within the domain of mimetic literary practices. However, it is also possible to see it as a legal necessity. As was discussed in chapter 1.1, the intellectual property law of France does not consider pastiche a violation of the original author’s rights. In the law, this exemption to the protection of the author’s integrity is justified by a roundabout

⁵¹ “[. . .] *ceci est un texte où X imite Y*” (*Palimpsestes* 113, emphasis original). The other formulation Genette gives to the pastiche contract is “the coappearance somewhere, in some form, of the name of the *pasticheur* and the subject of the pastiche: *here, X is imitating Y*” (*Palimpsestes* 128, emphases original). (“[. . .] la co-présence qualifiée, en quelque lieu et sous quelque forme, du nom du pasticheur et de celui du pastiché: *ici, X imite Y*” [*Palimpsestes* 172, emphasis original].)

reference to the “rules of the genre”⁵² which, it is safe to assume, includes the following three conditions: first, that a dependence on another work or author is the *raison d’être* of pastiche in the first place; second, that the source of the pastiche is indicated sufficiently clearly so that the pastiche is not confused with its model; third, that the pastiche differs from the source text. The pastiche contract thus functions as an assurance that the pasticheur plays according to the “rules” of the game: the contract discloses the intention (“this is an imitation”) and the target (“of N.N.”) as well as the name of the pasticheur. In the absence of such a declaration, the imitative text loses its pastiche status and, depending on the circumstances, would be perceived either as mystification, forgery or plagiarism (Jeandillou, *Esthétique* 132), the last two of which constitute a violation of authors’ rights in the eyes of the law. A sufficiently explicit pastiche contract is therefore needed to protect the pasticheur from charges of copyright infringement. However, the contract is not established between the pasticheur and the author being imitated (who might be dead or completely oblivious to the existence of the imitation), but between the pasticheur and the reader. It is an invitation to read the text as if it were written by the author being imitated, but also simultaneously a request to look for those essential differences that legitimise the imitation as pastiche. One of the benefits of the pastiche contract, with its association with the definition of autobiography and with its legal consequences, is that it removes pastiche from the narrow sphere of purely textual relations to the larger domain of literature, understood as an intersection of social and cultural practices. It especially highlights the ways in which pastiches are presented and marketed to the audience: a change of context in which a text is presented may completely alter its status.⁵³

⁵² “[. . .] compte tenu des lois du genre” (L122-5). The English translation of the section in question reads as follows: “Once a work has been disclosed, the author may not prohibit [. . .] parody, pastiche and caricature, observing the rules of the genre” (Intellectual Property Code).

⁵³ For an example of a text variously seen as original, forgery or pastiche, see my discussion of “La Chasse spirituelle” on p. 176.

The pastiche status of a text is thus tied to the pasticheur's intention to imitate a foreign style and to acknowledge the imitative status of this text. As Dyer has remarked, acknowledging the intentionality of pastiche does not mean that one has to commit to a strong conception of intention as the source of a text's meaning (*Pastiche* 2). Pastiche is akin to parody and satire in that all these forms depend on the divulgence of the author's intention – either to imitate, to parody or to satirise. But unlike many instances of the other two forms, in pastiche the more particular motivation of the imitation is not always clear. Parody and satire usually have a relatively clear target or tone and, while it is often possible to identify whether a pastiche inclines towards homage or criticism, its ambivalence poses a challenge for authors and interpreters alike: even if the author had intended the pastiche as homage, it might be read as critical of its source. Hence the contradictory responses, for instance, to La Bruyère's Montaigne pastiche discussed in the introduction.⁵⁴

There are in practice many ways in which a pastiche can communicate its status and the identity of the source texts being imitated. The most obvious *pastiche indicators* are titles and other paratexts. Proust's *Pastiche et mélanges*, in which the pastiche cycle *L'Affaire Lemoine* was published, makes its status explicit in the main title, and the titles of the individual pastiches announce the source text ("From a novel by Balzac," "In 'The Goncourt Journals'"). Similarly, in *À la Manière de...* the name of the author being imitated is placed at the end of the imitation as if the text were signed by him or her. In Ackroyd's *The Last Testament of Oscar Wilde* the names of the author being imitated and the pasticheur both appear on the cover of the book. Sometimes the pastiche may be attributed to the pastiched author, although usually not in a way which would lead to serious confusion about the authorship of the text.⁵⁵ Pastiche also often provide the contractual informa-

⁵⁴ See note 6 on p. 5.

⁵⁵ In her otherwise lucid analysis of Byatt's *Possession*, Hilary M. Schor mistakenly attributes the pastiche of the Victorian man-of-letters Henry Crabb Robinson to Samuel Rogers, despite the fact that Crabb Robinson is explicitly mentioned as

tion in the form of a pun or a puzzle. Lipograms or bare initials can be used to declare the name of the author being imitated in disguise, often in a manner that highlights the ludic aspects of this literary form, or the pastiche may be attributed to a fictitious writer whose life can be glossed as that of the author of the source text.

Sometimes the pastiche contract is fulfilled through what readers will perceive as false authenticity effects. K.K. Ruthven defines authenticity effects as the ways in which a text performs authenticity, i.e., how it creates the illusion of an origin that never existed (74). In pastiches, these authenticity effects are deliberately transparent. Many Sherlock Holmes pastiches, for instance, are furnished with a preface or an editor's note, which claims that the narrative is a previously unknown story written by Dr. Watson, although the novel is published under the name of the pasticheur. These pastiches in fact reproduce the ploy of authorship created by Arthur Conan Doyle, who presented the Holmes stories as written by Dr. Watson. While some of the nineteenth-century readers of Doyle's stories actually believed in the authorship of Watson, and regarded Doyle merely as a publisher, the false claim of authenticity in the pastiches has a double function: it imitates the source text but also functions as a way to engage the readers in the pastiche contract. As my analyses in chapter 3.2 will illustrate, the excess of "authors" associated with the Sherlock Holmes pastiches raises the intermingled questions of authorship and authenticity in a way which does not radically interfere with the fictitious world. Pastiche can thus "lay bare" its devices in a way which adds to the credibility of the representation.

In addition to introductions – fictitious or straightforward – other paratextual elements such as tables of contents, footnotes and postscripts can also serve as pastiche indicators. Moreover, visual means, such as anachronistic orthography or lettering may

the "author" of the pastiche journal (Schor 249n; *P* 23-25; see also Gutleben's *Nostalgic Postmodernism* [26] for a discussion of the Crabb Robinson section). Since the other Victorian pastiches of *Possession* are attributed to fictitious authors (who have real life counterparts), it is easy to see how such a mistake took place. Misattributions of pastiches are, however, the exception.

draw the readers' attention to the imitative status of the text, and period illustration may enhance the sense of pastiche in the text. In his pastiche autobiography of Thomas Chatterton in the eponymic novel, Peter Ackroyd uses eighteenth-century spelling to reinforce the pastiche effect (*Chatterton* 81-95). In *Mururoa mon amour* by "Marguerite Duraille" (pseudonym of Patrick Rambaud) even the cover of the novel, published by JC Lattes, imitates the classic white-and-blue covers of *Éditions du Minuit*, the publishers of Marguerite Duras. Although *Mururoa mon amour* was published and alphabetised in bookshops under the alias Duraille, the novel was marketed with a bright red wrap-around riband praising the *talent masqué* of Patrick Rambaud, the real author, who had also signed the (fictitious) preface of the novel. The co-presence of several different indicators, as here in *Mururoa mon amour*, maximises the contract by making it difficult if not impossible not to recognise the text as an imitation and to associate it with the source text. This effect is especially important to critical and/or parodic pastiches in which the main target is the text being imitated; by contrast, the contract can be more subtle in pastiches which are meant to function as parts of a whole.

Although not exclusive to pastiche, these ways of signalling the imitative status of the text are commonly used to direct the readers' attention to the derivative nature of the text. Genette claims that only "vulgar" pasticheurs succumb to producing such effects, which he describes as dotting the *i's* (*Palimpsestes* 116), but they are common in all kinds of pastiches, straightforward or parodic. A paratextual declaration of imitative status is of course not sufficient alone: the claim must be confirmed by the text's style. Sometimes pastiche is initially recognised merely as a stylistic shift or anomaly, and its imitative status and the source text are inferred only retrospectively. This is arguably the case with Joyce's "Oxen of the Sun" chapter in *Ulysses*, where the chronological progress of the parodies and pastiches serves as a tacit pact on their imitative status (Genette, *Palimpsestes* 173-74). However, it seems most likely that a majority of the readers of *Ulysses* resort to commentaries for a confirmation of the sources of individual imi-

tations in that chapter. Thus the pastiche contract can in practice be reinforced or explained in the critical commentary.

As defined by Genette, the pastiche contract is a textual feature or a combination of features intended to guide and govern the reading process. By contrast, Dyer has suggested that pastiche could be an attitude chosen by the audience. Although he does regard pastiche as deliberate imitation, he nevertheless suggests that, "it is possible to attend to a work in such a way that you only see that it is imitating [. . .]; camp is probably now the most familiar form of this" (*Pastiche* 3; cf. 2). Pastiche would thus become a term expressing subjective taste, and while it is sometimes used in that sense, such contingent use reduces the term into a pejorative label that has little to offer to criticism.⁵⁶ In fact, Dyer's suggestion evokes the early twentieth-century convention of dividing pastiches into voluntary and involuntary imitations, where the latter was thought to be the result of harmful influence undetected by the writer him- or herself. Thus it could be detected only by the readers who were able to perceive the similarity between the text and the source of influence. Whether to include such fleeting or intermittent similarity as pastiche has remained a moot point among critics. As early as 1927 Maurice Allem criticised the extension of pastiche to all kinds of influence and textual similarity, whether marked in the text or not, since the ubiquity of such connections makes the notion of pastiche nondescript (200). Similar criticism is raised by Catherine Cano in her review of Annick Bouillaguet's *Proust lecteur de Balzac et de Flaubert: L'imitation cryptée* (2000). In this study, Bouillaguet analyses what she calls the "hidden" or "undeclared" pastiches of *À la Recherche du temps perdu* but, as Cano points out (163), if any even a slight textual reminiscence, a common theme or similar narrative situation can be called pastiche, the term becomes synonymous with intertextuality

⁵⁶ Camp is a problematic analogy for this type of usage of the term pastiche, since camp is usually based on a shared experience, not individual opinion or preference. As an attitude, camp can be a social phenomenon, a way of for a group to distinguish itself from the mainstream, or people who do not perceive the camp aspects of a particular cultural form or representation.

in the widest possible sense. The notion of involuntary (or hidden) pastiche is thus susceptible to criticism similar to that of compilation pastiche, which has already been shown to include so many different intertextual phenomena that its distinctiveness and evocative power threatens to disappear.

To complicate things further, not all instances of explicit imitation of style correspond to the notion of pastiche as outlined here. For instance, when in Jane Austen's *Emma* (210), the eponymous heroine mimics the chatter of the tiresome Miss Bates, it is not a question of a writer imitating another discourse, but a character imitating another within the same fictional world. A more complex case is found in Proust's *La Prisonnière* (*À la Recherche* 3: 635-38), where Albertine embarks on a eulogy on the various qualities of ice cream in the rambling style of the Narrator. Here the object of imitation is not the conversational style of the Narrator (of which we have only a few examples in the whole novel), but his characteristic written style. However, at the time when the scene takes place, the Narrator has written precious little, so that Albertine paradoxically imitates the style of his novel-to-be, or the style of the novel in which she appears, the *À la Recherche du temps perdu* by Marcel Proust. Her imitation enforces the autobiographical connection between the Narrator and the author, but also renders it problematic by transgressing the temporal order of linear biography and disrupting the distinction between fiction and factual biography.

Albertine's imitation is an example of *autopastiche* or *self-pastiche* where the writer pastiches his or her own style.⁵⁷ At the level of commonplace all writing is self-pastiche but, properly speaking, self-pastiche diverges from ordinary expression by virtue of its distance from the object of imitation, which is achieved here by rendering the imitation through the relationship of two fictional but autobiographical characters. The apparent difficulty of achieving such a distance makes self-pastiche very rare, as Genette remarks in *Palimpsestes* (166). He points out the paradox:

⁵⁷ For analysis of this scene, see Brown; Genette (*Palimpsestes* 167-69); and Jeandillou ("L'Inflexion" 67-68).

“literally, ‘to write in the style of oneself’ signifies nothing or, more accurately, nothing that is exceptional and therefore *notable*. What is notable is of course to write differently”⁵⁸ (*Palimpsests* 127). Self-pastiche is, to a much greater degree than ordinary pastiche, dependent on the existence of an explicit paratextual pastiche contract:

L'autopastiche simplement conforme, ou fidèle, ou ressemblant (non caricatural et non satirique) [. . .] ne se distingue en rien de n'importe quelle autre page du même auteur. Son existence se réduit donc à sa *déclaration*, au pacte (auto)mimétique consistant dans le titre (*Autopastiche* ou toute autre variante); et l'on voit ici que l'impossibilité du genre ne fait qu'un avec sa trop grande, si j'ose dire, trop absolue facilité: pour produire un autopastiche fidèle, un auteur n'a qu'à prendre n'importe quelle page de lui, déjà rédigée, pour plus de sûreté, hors de toute intention mimétique, et à l'intituler *autopastiche*. (*Palimpsestes* 171, emphases original)

[. . .] a merely conforming or faithful or look-alike self-pastiche (not caricatural and not satiric) is indistinguishable from any other passage by the same author. Its existence is therefore reduced to its *declaration*, to the (self-)mimetic pact inherent in the title (*self-pastiche* or any other variant). We see here that the impossibility of the genre is entirely one with its too great and, I dare say, too absolute facility of production: to produce a faithful self-pastiche, an author has only to take any page, already written – to be safe – with no mimetic intention whatsoever, and title it *self-pastiche*. (*Palimpsests* 127-28, emphases original)

The paradoxical practice of self-pastiche represents an extreme case of how pasticheurs test the limits of what can be imitated. Traditionally speaking, pastiche can be seen as the imitation of what is supposed to be inimitable – the personal style of an author which functions as a guarantee of the authenticity of his or her work. Simply in crossing that boundary, pastiche seems to es-

⁵⁸ “[. . .] littérairement, ‘écrire à la manière de soi-même’ ne signifie rien, ou plus exactement rien d’exceptionnel et donc *notable*; le notable, bien sûr, est plutôt d’écrire autrement” (*Palimpsestes* 171). Apart from Proust’s self-pastiche in *La Prisonnière*, Genette discusses Paul Verlaine’s poem “À la manière de Paul Verlaine” (from *Parallèlement*, 1889) and mentions Joyce and Nabokov as further examples of writers who possessed the necessary level of stylistic sophistication for self-pastiche (166, 169-71).

establish another: while it imitates another text, it cannot be itself imitated: a pastiche of a pastiche would be confounded by its own impossibility. One could imagine a pastiche, say, of the highly acclaimed pastiche of Flaubert by Proust, but such an exercise seems pointless beyond the fact that its very futility could make it seem attractive to some aspiring stylist.⁵⁹ In a pastiche in the second degree, the room for differentiation would be severely limited, which in turn would make it difficult to manifest the pastiche contract at the level of imitation. The virtual absence of pastiches of pastiches evidences the necessity of differentiation even when aspiring for similarity, a notion to which I will return later on.

Pastiches of a Particular Work, Period or Genre

While Genette's concept of the pastiche contract is useful in that it draws attention to the ways in which pastiches communicate their status to the audience and govern the process of their reception, its formulation presupposes that pastiches only occur between two individual writers, one of whom imitates the other. This conception arises from the historical connections between pastiche and the emergence of stylistic individuality as a relevant aesthetic value as well as the development of authors' rights under pressure from the new market forces. Thus authorship as defined by and exemplified in stylistic repertoire lies at the heart of the modern notion of pastiche. Especially in the French tradition of pastiche writing, imitations of other writers' styles are the most prominent variant, but the conception of pastiche as the imitation of a recognisable style does not exclude other discourses from the

⁵⁹ In "L'Inflexion des voix chères" Jeandillou expands from the discussion of pastiche to consider the possibility of a parody of Flaubert written in the manner of Robbe-Grillet and inserted in a novel by Queneau (72), and Genette even claims to have written a Bossuet by Proust by Queneau (*Palimpsestes* 165). In contrast to these imaginary examples, André Maurois was inspired by Proust's *L'Affaire Lemoine* when writing his pastiche of the style of Proust, *Le Côté de Chelsea*, which makes the latter work a kind of a meta-pastiche.

range of potential source texts. In addition to authorial styles, it is generally agreed that pastiches can imitate a particular work, the characteristic style of a literary historical period or school, the style of a group or institution (such as the style of a magazine) or the style of a literary genre. Apart from the first case (pastiche of a work), the issue of authorship is virtually absent; however, as the following examples will illustrate, each variant of pastiche touches upon the theme of originality or authenticity and manifests the characteristic double-edgedness of this literary form.

When the source text of a pastiche is an individual work, it is typically either a well-known classic or a high-profile contemporary work, which, by virtue of its status, is considered an iconic piece, representative of the author's style in general. Thus focusing on one work may be a means to convey a concentrated impression of the author's style, heightened by the repetition of the characteristic themes and traits of a prominent text. The pastiche of Georges Perec's novel *La Disparition* in *La Degré suprême de la tendresse* by Héléna Marienské is motivated by the shared themes of these novels, detection and disappearance, but by imitating what has become an iconic Perec novel, famous for the complete absence of the letter 'e', Marienské's pastiche evokes Perec's style and experimental poetics in a more general sense as well. *La Degré suprême de la tendresse* consists of eight loosely connected pastiches, some of which imitate a work, and some the style of the author in a more general sense, and as such it serves as an illustration of the rather slight differences between the two types of pastiche.

Pastiches of a recognisable style of an earlier period shift the issue of authenticity from that of authorship to that of historical veracity or accuracy. Such pastiches often occur in historical novels, which can be written in imitation of the style of the time of action or which can include passages written in that style. In historical fiction, pastiche of period style tends to create a somewhat contradictory impression. On the one hand, the use of historical style is a means to strive for authenticity or to create the kind of "structure of feeling," discussed earlier in the context of children's historical fiction. As a stylistic technique, imitation of period style

can enrich the reader's experience of the historicity of the representation and therefore have a realistic function, or it may be necessary for the writer as way of engaging with the past. In her essay collection *On Histories and Stories*, Byatt describes how adopting the style of the Victorians felt necessary for her to access them, to be able to write about them (46-47). On the other hand, period style is an even more equivocal construction than individual style since it is based on a necessarily vague conception of the unifying stylistic traits of texts produced within a particular time frame that may be as extensive as a century. Since period pastiches are based on a shared but usually not formulable cultural conception of how people used language in the past rather than on a corpus of identifiable texts from that time, the context of the time of the writing of the pastiche is usually even more obvious than in pastiches of a single author's style. Consequently, the impression created by a pastiche of historical style may be perplexing or alienating rather than add to the veracity of the representation.⁶⁰ For instance, reviewers of D.J. Taylor's *Kept* (2006), a historical novel set in the Victorian period and written in imitation of some of its prominent writers and works, expressed reservations about what they perceived as its artificial and strained rendering of the Victorian period feel (e.g., Karlin, "D.J. Taylor's Victorian Mystery"). The critical reaction shows how the readers' willingness to accept the "authenticity" of the imitation is crucial in a pastiche of period style.

In the debate on the role of pastiche in postmodernism, its relation to history has been of central importance. Alternatively pastiche has been seen as a vehicle of cultural memory (Hoesterey) or a sign of the loss of historicity (Jameson). The latter view associates pastiche with nostalgia, a painful longing for a past which is irretrievably lost. Although the associations of nostalgia are, like those of pastiche, often negative in critical discourse, it is possible to regard nostalgia as an ambivalent feeling

⁶⁰ The unavoidable anachronisms of period pastiches were the reason why Rubow thought that convincing pastiches of past styles were impossible (see chapter 1.2).

that has also a meaning-producing and sorting function (e.g., Kukkonen 15). It selectively interprets the past in ways that have significance to the present. In stylistic pastiches of the Victorian period, the nostalgia relates to the ways in which characters are represented and the narrative unfolded in the historical setting. The pastiches seek to reproduce the emotional effect of powerful Victorian novels which continue to fascinate generations of readers. Commenting on the adoption of the period feel in the neo-noir films, Dyer writes:

noir now must trail a sense of where the style came from, what it came out of, and thus allow the possibility of inhabiting its feelings with a simultaneous awareness of their historical constructedness. But they are not the less feelings for that. Pastiche makes it possible to feel the historicity of our feelings. (*Pastiche* 130)

Nostalgia is therefore not necessarily the antithesis of historical representation, nor does it altogether preclude critical aspects. It can rather be seen as one of the elements through which the double-edgedness of pastiche manifests itself.

Since literature as an art form has historically favoured individual working methods to the kind of master-disciple method common in the history of art, pastiches of the style of a group or a school do not often appear. Such imitations typically have a satirical or critical edge to them as can be seen in perhaps the most famous example of a pastiche of a group, the *Déliquescences d'Adoré Floupette, poète décadent*, which imitates the styles of Mallarmé, Gautier, and Verlaine. At the time of its writing, in the early 1880s, these writers were not generally perceived as a group and, as Genette has argued, by concentrating on the similarities in their style, the pastiches contributed to the recognition of their mutual connections (*Palimpsestes* 177). Moreover, the *Déliquescences* is one of the first occasions on which the term decadent is used in the context of these writers who later came to be grouped under that term. However, it is perhaps more usual to target a "group style" indirectly through the imitation of the style of one of its members. Ian McEwan's *Atonement* (2001) includes an example of the critical assessment of a literary school – Bloomsburian modernism – in

the form of a pastiche of the style of a literary critic, in this case Cyril Connolly, the editor of the literary review *Horizon* (1940-49). The protagonist of *Atonement*, the young aspiring writer Briony Tallis has sent the manuscript of her autobiographical first novella "Two Figures by a Fountain" to *Horizon* for evaluation. The novella is not printed in *Atonement*, but we get to read the polite, encouraging letter of rejection signed "CC". In the letter, Connolly suggests that Briony's novella "owe[s] a little too much to the techniques of Mrs Woolf" (McEwan 312), and criticises its static world and the exclusive concentration on fleeting observations and feelings at the expense of a more structured narrative which would, as can be inferred from *Atonement*, reveal the moral consequences of the characters' actions. The high modernist style represents an escape for Briony from the all too real consequences of her actions (see Finney 71-72). The Connolly pastiche reads as a critical evaluation of the modernist heritage, but it also functions as a reverse *mise en abyme*, suggesting that Briony's text is a different (and inferior) version of the novel we are reading when we read *Atonement*. It indicates a silence at the centre of the novel: the original version of Briony's novel has been modified and displaced in the process of rewriting as an act of atonement.

In order to imitate the style and conventions of yet another general category, the literary genre, a pastiche has to mark its distance from what can be called "straightforward genre production" (Dyer, *Pastiche* 92). Moreover, the generic style imitated has to be specific enough to be recognised. It is for instance not possible to imitate the novel genre as such, since it is far too inclusive and heterogeneous a form to possess the kind of stylistic cohesion which pastiche could imitate. Examples of genre pastiches can be found in Raymond Queneau's *Exercices de style* (1947), where Queneau recounts the quotidian events of a bus ride for instance in the style of blurbs and official letters. Although *Exercices de style* is sometimes mentioned as a pastiche (e.g., Mandell n. pag.; Compagnon 223), in my view it rather serves to illustrate the point that not all stylistic experiments are pastiches: most of Queneau's versions of the basic story do not imitate an existing style but acqui-

esce in an invented restriction, such as narration through negatives or in a particular tense. The insertion of a genre pastiche in a work of another genre helps to create a stylistic contrast, which highlights the imitative quality of the former. The two fairy tales and one fairy tale fragment included in Byatt's *Possession* are recognisable as pastiches by virtue of their juxtaposition with other pastiches in a novel which also explicitly thematises the issue of "borrowing" a voice or a discourse.⁶¹ However, the fact that the two complete stories were included as free-standing pieces in *The Djinn and the Nightingale's Eye*, a collection of fairy tales that Byatt published in 1994, four years after *Possession*, calls for a re-evaluation of the tales. While they are read as pastiches in the context of *Possession*, does their presentation in a collection of fairy tales reduce the distance from the generic model necessary for pastiche to distinguish itself? I would argue that the feminist tone of the stories suffices to mark them off from the generally conservative world of classic fairy tales which they indirectly comment on.⁶² The reflective purpose of the stories of *The Djinn and the Nightingale's Eye* is evident in the title story, which combines the narrative of a fictitious literary scholar, Gillian Perholt, with the fairy tales she examines. The collection thus testifies to Byatt's "dual impulse" between narration and analysis (Hadley 125), for which purpose pastiche is an apt form, as I shall argue in more detail in my analysis of *Possession* in chapter 3.3.

In *Pastiche*, Dyer turns his attention to the wider significance of genre pastiches. Discussing examples of generic imitation in film, he points out how the cultural shifts and dislocations typical of genre pastiche can give it an important role in cultural history: "pastiche may have the effect of affirming the existence of a genre by the very fact of being able to imitate it (arguably of both the early period of the Western and of the neo-noir) and also be a

⁶¹ Two of the fairy tales, an untitled excerpt (P 51-51) and "The Glass Coffin" (P 58-67) are presented as the work of Christabel LaMotte while Gode's story (P 356-62) is recounted in the diary of Christabel's cousin, Sabine de Kercoz.

⁶² Unlike the feminist versions of classic fairy tales written by Angela Carter (e.g., *Bloody Chamber and Other Stories*, 1979), Byatt's tales do not radically diverge from or parody the narrative and stylistic conventions of fairy tales.

stage in generic renewal (neo-noir being a step towards normalising contemporary noir production)" (132-33). Discussing the spaghetti Western *In mio nome è nessuno* (*My Name is Nobody*, 1973), he draws attention to the recurrence of apparently unmotivated, meticulously executed riding scenes that are underlined by the evocative music of Ennio Morricone. He claims that "these sequences are slight exaggerations of blockbuster Western elements, made all the more notable by their lack of any significant narrative function, so that they become displays of generic form qua form, that is, pastiche" (102). This kind of exaggeration and intensifying of generic conventions is typical of Westerns, but Dyer is careful to specify that "spaghetti Westerns are seldom, perhaps never, all pastiche" (105). Pastiche is then, according to Dyer, merely one aspect of their recreation of and reflection on the earlier genre. That genre pastiches should be especially important in film and less frequent in literature again reflects the differences between the art forms. Genre styles are much more relevant and attainable source texts for cinematic pastiches than any kind of individual style.

Since period pastiches and genre pastiches are based on a less circumscribed source, their pastiche feel may not be as strong as in pastiches of an individual style or a particular work. Thus it is sometimes difficult to decide whether a text imitates a period or generic conventions only intermittently or whether it is the kind of extended and detailed imitation characteristic of stylistic pastiches. One possible criterion for such uncertain cases is the issue of authenticity. If the text engages with its source discourse to the extent that it either implies or directly asks (for instance, through metafictional commentary or through thematisation) questions of origin, genuineness or sincerity, then it might be useful to discuss it within the tradition of pastiches. These questions are activated if we can discern in the text the imitative intention glossed by Genette as the pastiche contract. However, the difficulties of distinguishing between pastiches and other, less extensive forms of appropriation illustrate the inevitable looseness of literary critical

terms: they do not form neatly exclusive categories in the way Genette and other critics have often wished to present them.

The Impossibility of Repetition

Having discussed ways in which pastiches acknowledge their imitative status and engage with the different types of intertext, I move now to look at the procedure of pastiche, or what it *does*. We will see how the characteristic double-edgedness of pastiche is based on the paradoxical logic of repetition. In *Port-Royal*, Sainte-Beuve imagined pastiche as *machine à rhétorique* which, when the “code” of the author is cracked, can serve to produce works in his (or her) manner endlessly. The idea of pastiche as mechanical repetition recurs in many variations, for instance, Jameson’s conception of pastiche as a kind of automatic practice for which there are no alternatives (“Postmodernism” 65-66). It is often the gist of such condemnatory remarks as “x is merely a pastiche of y,” which implies that x does not improve, contest or modify its source. According to this view, pastiche remains within similarity and thus fails to fulfil the criteria of novelty and difference against which artistic achievements are usually measured. From the perspective of post-classicistic criticism, repetition is seen as redundant, not worth attention or further commentary.

As many critics have pointed out in the latter half of the twentieth century, however, there is more to repetition than meets the eye.⁶³ In a fundamental sense, repetition is impossible: any act of repetition, however faithful, always involves an element of change, or an element of difference. Referring to Gertrude Stein’s famous line “A rose is a rose is a rose is a rose,” Daniel Abondolo writes:

⁶³ See, for instance, Deleuze, *Difference and Repetition* (2004); Derrida, *Writing and Difference* (1981); Eco, “Innovation and Repetition”; J. Hillis Miller, *Fiction and Repetition* (1982).

Repetition in discourse is frequently seen as 'adding nothing', and the classic example of repetition so viewed is tautology. But in poetic process as in music, tautology is impossible. Put in philosophical terms, a proposition such as 'X is X' is, in poetic process, significant. [. . .] The poetic process challenges the perceiver to rethink any and all of the elements of the code, seeking meanings and connections not before noted. (69-70)

As repetition creates a distance between itself and its model, the meaning of the repeated discourse changes. Repetition is different from the model but it also changes the model, since both elements are altered in the process.

There is also another aspect to the impossibility of repetition. As a secondary instance, repetition presupposes the existence of something outside itself, the origin which is repeated. In "The Paradoxical Status of Repetition," Shlomith Rimmon-Kenan investigates the impossibility of origin in the contexts of mimesis and reading. She points out the contradiction in two basic conceptions of the role of narrative – that it is the imitation of a pre-existent reality or text and that it reproduces reality – and concludes: "Narrative, we can argue, also repeats by creating, and what it repeats is the absence from which it springs and which it renders present through its creation. It is in and through narration that 'reality' exists, and the only true reality in narrative is that of the narration itself" (157). As to reading, instead of seeing it as the decoding of the message encoded in the text (hence a kind of repetition), it is possible to regard the reader's activity as performance of "an absence as a present experience" (157). Thus the inevitability of repetition challenges the conception of the original, unique, immutable.

As a form of repetitive writing usually based on repeated readings of the source text, pastiche is multiply involved in the paradoxes of reiteration. At a basic level, pastiche repeats the characteristic stylistic elements of the source text through variation and recontextualisation. It imitates features that are foregrounded in the source text, often because they are repeated within it. This first instance of repetition is then repeated in the pastiche, which offers variations of the foregrounded element, as

in Proust's pastiche of Balzac which includes, in one page, fourteen different instances of the Balzacian comparison "X, the Y of Z." Such extravagance draws attention to the recurrence of this structure in Balzac's own works and to the construction of the so-called original stylistic features in self-repetition. If it were used only once in Balzac's oeuvre, the formulation would not be part of the Balzacian style, the effect of which Proust seeks to reproduce in his pastiche. The fact that pastiche highlights such prominent features has elicited the criticism that it in fact loses the power of the style being imitated. The eighteenth- and nineteenth-century critics, such as Marmontel and Roure, thought that the essence of style is its harmoniousness, which remains unattainable for pastiche because it can only produce the quirks and flaws of a text, in other words, precisely those personal elements that break the harmony of the text. A similar argument can be advanced from a quite a different point of view. In *Le Style en mouvement*, Anne Herschberg Pierrot discusses style as a formative process that moulds the work from its earliest stages and that is itself moulded in the reception of the works. She considers that pastiche "loses this dynamism of a work's style and its original character"⁶⁴ (42), because it constructs a static model of the style based on the repetitions and recurrences of certain elements in the source text, and thereby checks the essential flow of style. Although she mentions Proust's pastiches as an example, her conception of pastiche as negative repetition is in interesting contradiction with Proust's idea of pastiche as a means to penetrate the depths of a writer's style (see chapter 3.1). In fact, while Pierrot's insistence on the emergence of a literary work leads her to emphasise the role of rewritings in the stylistic process, she does not see that rewritings by others could contribute in an artistically relevant manner to the process. James Austin, who likewise uses the pastiches of Proust as the starting-point for his analysis, takes a different view: "This, I would argue, is one of the most powerful aspects of pastiche: pastiche has the potential to be not so much imitation, as the ability to posit and define retroactively ex-

⁶⁴ "[. . .] perd cette dynamique du style d'une œuvre et son caractère inouï."

isting writerly styles, and with them our vision of literature. Proustian pastiche, then, is a striking case of what I would term performative stylistics" (98). This realisation leads him to adjust his previous definition of pastiche as an imitation of the style of another cultural production, pastiche being "an instance in which a cultural production performs the style of another cultural production" (101). The variations in the execution and purposes of pastiches make it difficult to reconcile the two different viewpoints. Some pasticheurs offer a deliberately banal version of the style of the source text for the purposes of literary criticism, while others aim at fairly unmarked, subtle imitation.

At a more general level, pastiche can be said to repeat its source text as a whole, not just a selection of its stylistic elements. Pastiche often stands in a metonymic relationship to the source, by virtue of being presented as an extract (*Le Côté de Chelsea*) or as a continuation of it (Alexandra Ripley's *Scarlett*, the sequel to *Gone With the Wind*). Some pastiches are "remakes" (to use Eco's terminology, "Innovation and Repetition" 195), offering an alternative version of a famous classic, as is exemplified in Thomas's *Charlotte* (see chapter 3.3).⁶⁵ Whatever form its repetition of the source text takes, pastiche is always also an interpretation of its source text. It contains, at least implicitly, an idea of what the source text is like and how it should be read. Thus it differs from straightforward seriality where, in the most typical case, a set of characters and plot patterns is repeated from part to part: in pastiche, the paradoxical distance created in the act of stylistic imitation brings in a reflective aspect which is missing in straightforward series. Pastiche is, like parody, a form of metafiction, or fic-

⁶⁵ Some critics have sought to distinguish continuations, remakes, prequels from pastiches and parodies. In "Transfictionality Across Media," Marie-Laure Ryan argues that unlike the former, pastiche does not fulfil the criteria of transfictionality (a term describing the kind of fictions that transpose the fictional world of a previous text to a new setting), as it concentrates on the signifier, not the signified. She also suggests that the emphasis on textuality prevents the readers of pastiches from immersing in the fictive world represented in the imitation (387, 389, 393).

tion that comments on its own conditions, even though this aspect sometimes relates rather to its form (to the fact that it is fiction modelled on the style of another work) than to its content (it does not necessarily deal with the conditions of literature in any explicit way) (see Rose 91-99).

A particular case of the repetition of the source text is the kind of pastiche that actually incorporates the source text in itself, for instance, a manuscript left unfinished by a popular author. Such is the case of Jane Austen's *Sanditon*, of which only twelve first chapters remain and which has attracted many rewriters, among them the pseudonym "Another Lady."⁶⁶ What makes *Sanditon* a particularly interesting case of the processes of repetition in pastiche is that the themes and setting of the remaining manuscript differ markedly from those of the other (published) novels of Jane Austen. The pasticheur therefore has to make the decision whether to follow the new development (and hence inevitably distance herself from the mainstream of Austenian fiction), or whether to twist the unusual beginning to comply with the expectations raised by the published novels. "Another Lady" tries to balance both and, judging by the re-edition of the novel in 1998, has been found successful enough in her attempt (cf. Morton 191). The fact that the source text is made available to the readers of the imitation so that they can make direct comparisons adds to the difficulty of the pasticheur's task. It also points out, in a particularly straightforward manner, an important aspect of pastiches, namely the simultaneous presence and absence of the source text in the imitation. In *Sanditon*, the material presence of the source text as the "original version" is rendered problematic by the fact that Austen's text is a rough manuscript, not the kind of polished literary work in which form the audience has become familiar with her other novels.⁶⁷

⁶⁶ Her version was published in 1975. The same pseudonym has also completed Charlotte Brontë's *Emma*. She has chosen her pen name as a homage to Jane Austen – both in letting her be the only named author and in adopting Austen's own authorial acknowledgement "By a Lady."

⁶⁷ The "original" Austenian fragment in *Sanditon* is in fact an edited and standardised version of the manuscript held at the King's College, Cambridge.

Apart from such very concrete ways in which pastiche manifests the presence *and* absence of its source text, the effect of pastiche depends to a great extent on whether the readers are able to experience the source text through the imitation. Conditioned by many contingent factors, such as the reader's familiarity with the source text and the quality of the imitation, the feeling of the presence of the source text is indispensable for the pastiche to have an effect on its readers as an imitation. Yet the element of difference undermines the feeling of presence, making pastiche a paradoxical site of indeterminacy. Pastiche gives us something avid readers yearn for – yet another novel by Jane Austen, yet another chapter of *À la Recherche du temps perdu* – but at the same time it signals the impossibility of such an addition.⁶⁸ It thus serves the commercial logic of never quite satisfying the consumer's desire well, so that the desire can be activated again and again.

In addition to the partial and integral repetitions of the source text, pastiche can repeat the text in which it is included. In the introduction, I pointed out how Montaigne's voice is evoked in *Les Caractères* to support La Bruyère's moral point, and indeed the pastiche passage is nothing more than a repetition (albeit in extended form) of the initial sentence in which La Bruyère denounces presumption. Yet it can be seen to be a repetition of La Bruyère at a more fundamental level. The pastiche follows the same structural principle as many of La Bruyère's own moral observations, beginning with a declaration of opinion (I do not like self-important snobs whom I cannot greet without risking my own status), continuing with an elaboration or a series of examples and ending with a moral guideline or, as here, with an assertion which is to be interpreted as morally instructive. Moreover, as

⁶⁸ Sometimes pastiches are inspired by or activate the hope for unexpected manuscript finds. Maurois's idea of presenting *Le Côté de Chelsea* as a supplementary chapter of *Albertine disparue* was probably influenced by the then just completed editing process of Proust's novel, widely discussed in the newspapers and cultural circles. Likewise, the Goncourt pastiche in *Le Temps retrouvé* derives from the speculation over the unpublished volumes of the Goncourt *Journals* (see chapter 3.1 for details).

Daniel Bilous demonstrates, the pastiche repeats and varies the expressions in La Bruyère's opening sentence: *je ne puis* is repeated twice in the pastiche and the *sans... et sans* structure is replaced by *sans remords ne conséquence* ("Récrire l'intertexte" 112). The pastiche also takes the dual structures of that sentence to the extreme by cultivating pleonasms almost obsessively.⁶⁹ These similarities seem to undermine La Bruyère's insistence on separating the imitation from his own text and, moreover, counteracting the critical distance created by the contrast between the two styles. Attempts at differentiation turn into similarity: the pastiche displays affinities as well as similarities between the enclosing text and the enclosed imitation.⁷⁰

The layers of repetition in pastiche suggest that instead of merely another instance of the same, pastiche is based on a logic that flouts the distinction between the original and the repetition. As a cultural form, it draws attention to both the problems and inevitability of that distinction, on which so much of our culture depends. It does this more incisively than many other forms of intertextuality that do not privilege one "origin" (one source text) or that refer to the source only intermittently. The strong illusion of similarity in pastiche is set up and denied simultaneously, which creates a peculiar feeling of ambiguity, directing attention to how identity and authenticity are constructed and experienced in literature.

⁶⁹ Bilous lists total eight pleonastic or redundant expressions in the pastiche, such as "courtois & affable," "bonnes qualitez & conditions," "forcer & contraindre" ("Récrire l'intertexte" 111).

⁷⁰ For another example of pastiches that repeat or reflect the framing narrative, see my discussion of the use of pastiches as epigraphs in Byatt's *Possession* in chapter 3.2.

Double Signature

While Genette's concept of the pastiche contract concentrates on the ways in which pastiche makes its status known to the readers, double signature, another concept deriving from French criticism, combines the elements of acknowledgement and repetition in a paradox of double authentication. The term itself exemplifies the problem: as there are no signatures in literature, at least not in the same authenticating sense as in the visual arts, the author's name nevertheless possesses signatory power (see, e.g., Brunn 225), and, moreover, the co-appearance of two contesting signatures confounds the claim for authenticity and origin supposedly guaranteed by one signature. Following Gérard Leclerc, who investigates the precariousness of marks of authenticity in literature in his *Le Sceau de l'œuvre*, I suggest that the concept of double signature offers a useful perspective on pastiche precisely because of its problematic nature.

Literary works are not signed and, even though the author may sign the manuscript before submitting the work to the publisher or signing a publishing contract, there is no continuous and secure way to link this signature to the name that appears on the cover and flyleaf of a published work. The signatory power of the author's name in the context of the work is therefore a culturally determined convention, not based on any traceable actual signature (Leclerc 25-26; see also Bennington 151). In "Signature Event Context," Jacques Derrida contrasts the signature's ability to connote presence to the inalienable physical presence of the subject of a spoken enunciation. Since writing is cut off from its source, the written signature offers at best an illusory guarantee of origin (understood both as the originator – the author – and the time and place where he or she produced/signed the text) (20). According to Derrida, signature is deceptive because, unlike the organic relation of speakers and their voices, it offers only a conventional sign which, like any other sign, can and must be repeated in order to be understood. Thus signature calls for what Derrida terms *countersignature*, repetition that can be executed by the first

signatory or someone else (“Countersignature” 17-19). Indeed, the whole culture (or cult) of the signature is based on acts of repetition, such as the necessity, on some occasions, to verify the authenticity of the primary signature with the signatures of witnesses, or the duplication, in daily transactions, of the signature inscribed on the back side of a debit card.

In literature, this paradoxical logic of signature results in a situation in which the signatory power of the author’s name must be supplemented with other elements, such as the (illusory) conception of the existence of an original signature somewhere, of which the printed name is a merely a confirmation, or such as the idea of the signatory power of style, evidenced in repetition (Leclerc 25-26, 133-34; see also Foucault 81-83). The notion that an author’s oeuvre is characterised throughout by consistent personal style becomes especially important in cases where the authorship of an acknowledged classic is suspected or where a new text, supposedly written by an appreciated author, is found. A decision as to whether to include a text in a writer’s canon is often made on the basis of stylistic comparison.⁷¹ In addition to these ways in which the repetition of the author’s name or individual style can be seen as the countersignature guaranteeing the authenticity of the text, the author’s signature is also confirmed and contested by the “signatures” of others, namely readers and rewriters who filter the text through their own sensibility and experiences.

The problem of signature coincides with some of the fundamental elements that characterise pastiche as a double-edged cultural practice. The fact that signature always depends on repetition undermines the notions of authenticity and originality associated with autographed signature and, by metaphorical extension, with the name of the author in literature as well. As Bennington points out, “the fact that my signature, if it is to be a signature, must be repeatable or imitable by myself entails just as necessarily the possibility that it can be imitated by another, for example

⁷¹ Stylometrics, or the quantitative analysis of style (usually involving corpus linguistic methods) is often used in authorship attribution and sometimes also in the analysis of pastiches (see Sigelman and Jacoby; Somers and Tweedie).

counterfeiter" (162). Likewise, the signatory style of an author can be repeated by a pasticheur, which inevitably calls into question the supposed inimitability of personal styles and the value ascribed to originality in post-Romantic Western cultures. Canonisation of styles, as that of literary works, is in fact largely the result of repetition through the different forms of rewriting, one of which is pastiche.

If double signature is understood in the narrow sense of the co-existence of the names of the pasticheur and the author being imitated, as for instance Daniel Compère seems to do ("Je suis l'Autre" 101, 103), much of the evocative power of the concept is lost. Even though double signature is inevitably metaphorical, it can offer a useful framework for investigating the duality of pastiche. As an example, I shall in the following analyse what could be called the "signatory elements" in André Maurois's *Le Côté de Chelsea* (1929), a pastiche of Proust's *À la Recherche du temps perdu*, presented as a missing chapter of *Albertine disparue* (or *La Fugitive*, 1925).⁷² This is the first work in which Maurois engaged with Proust, who became the subject of many of his later works, such as *De Proust à Camus* (1963), *De la Bruyère à Proust: Lecture, mon doux plaisir* (1964) and in particular the biography *À la Recherche de Marcel Proust* (1949). Although Maurois added his authorial signature to that of Proust several times, the first occasion differs from the others in that there Maurois not only writes of Proust, but writes *him* in his style. Although Proust's name is not mentioned in connection to the pastiche in all of its published versions,⁷³ the head-

⁷² Maurois was originally commissioned to write a sequel to *A Sentimental Journey* by Laurence Sterne but the task was unpleasant for him from the beginning. He soon abandoned the project and began instead to write what he calls "une suite aux *Pastiches et mélanges*" ("a sequel to *Pastiches et mélanges*") which gave him much pleasure and inspiration (*Fragments* 31-32; see also 40, 58, 68).

⁷³ *Le Côté de Chelsea* was originally published in *Revue de Paris* in January 1929. It was published in volume form by Éditions du Trianon in 1929 and by Gallimard in 1932, which is the edition I am using here. There are two English translations, one by Hamish Miles (published in 500 copies in 1930) and another by George D. Painter, published in 1966. In the *Revue de Paris*, the novella was introduced with the following author's note (quoted here in the English translation by Hamish Miles): "Proust himself, in his *pastiches* of Flaubert, Saint-Simon and oth-

ing of the novella unmistakably evokes the titles of the first and third parts of his *À la Recherche du temps perdu, Du Côté de chez Swann* (1913) and *Le Côté de Guermantes I-II* (1920-1921), and consequently also the two ways (*côtés*) of living between which Proust's Narrator hovers through much of the novel. On the one hand, there is the way of the *haute bourgeoisie*, represented in the character of the art connoisseur Charles Swann, who is eventually shown to fail in the two most important pursuits of his life, securing the love of Odette and completing his study of Vermeer's art. On the other hand, the Narrator is tempted by the aristocratic way of life, represented by the Guermantes family and their social circle. Seen from afar, this way seems to offer exciting possibilities, but when the Narrator is introduced into society, he gradually comes to realise the hollowness and corruption of the people he at first admired. To these thematic backbones of Proust's *magnum opus*, Maurois adds a third possibility, the Chelsea way, which takes the Narrator away from his familiar France to the bohemian circles of the Bloomsbury group on the other side of the Channel. Unlike the first two, which lead to various degrees of disappointment, the Chelsea way is presented as a more positive option, which offers all the delights but little of the hardships of the other two. It allows the Narrator to enjoy the eccentricity of society characters without compromising the intellectual joys of proper conversation.

It is common for pasticheurs to create alternative scenarios for the works they are imitating, but in this case the imaginary digression from the plot of the original is loaded with symbolic meaning. As is well known, neither Proust nor his Narrator ever visited England which was, by contrast, familiar territory to Maurois, who had lived there and whose literary career began with works engaging with various aspects of English literature and cul-

ers, showed that these exercises can help a writer to understand a style different from his own – and one that he admires. A.M." (n. pag., emphasis original). See also the bibliographical note in Painter's translation.

ture.⁷⁴ Thus the Chelsea way of the title has a double function: it evokes the signatory titles of Proust's novel, but it also refers to England as *le côté de Maurois*. By choosing England as the location for the action of the pastiche, Maurois marks the imitation with a theme that is closely associated with his person, with his knowledge of England and the English. Because detailed, often humorous descriptions of the English and the sights of London and Surrey are the overt topic of the novella, Maurois's "signature theme" pervades the imitation of Proust's style. The Narrator's role as a keen observer of social life and his characteristically detailed descriptions, which are often powered by metaphorical contrasts between things, are well suited to Maurois's chosen topic, the reflection on a different way of life across the Channel.

Taking its cue from the metafictional elements of Proust's *L'Affaire Lemoine*,⁷⁵ by which it was inspired, *Le Côté de Chelsea*, in an apparently realistic setting, demonstrates the complexity of double signature, or the tension between the two mutually incompatible sources of authorial power. Set in the time following Albertine's death, the novella recounts the Narrator's trip to England with Andrée, one of the girls from the Balbec group which captivated his attention years before (in *À l'Ombre des jeunes filles en fleurs*). The choice of companion comes naturally, considering the plot of *À la Recherche*, but it also means that Proust's alter ego is accompanied on his trip by the feminine namesake of André Maurois. Although the plot of the novella stays within the limits of the plausible, considering its model, Andrée is interestingly portrayed as the more powerful, even the more authoritative of the two characters. This can be observed for instance in the following extract, where the Narrator describes his relationship with

⁷⁴ Maurois's literary début, the novel *The Silence of Colonel Bramble* (1918) addressed the national differences between the French and the English (it was based on his war-time experience as a liaison officer for the British Army). Later he published several works on English literature and culture, including *Ariel, ou la vie de Shelley* (1923), *Les Anglais* (1926), *Un essai sur Dickens* (1927) and *Disraeli* (1927). See also Painter's introduction to *The Chelsea Way* (4-7).

⁷⁵ See chapter 3.1.

their English maid, Tuttle, whose character is based on the headstrong Françoise of *À la Recherche*:

Elle ne refusait pas me rendre des services, et elle était admirable dans l'art de donner un coup de fer à des pantalons ou de plier des vestons dans une valise, mais elle ne voulait pas recevoir de moi l'ordre d'accomplir ces actions qui d'ailleurs, en elles-mêmes, lui étaient agréables. Si je les sollicitais d'elle, elle allait voir Andrée dans la chambre à côté, la consultait et, ayant reçu confirmation de l'ordre qui, *signé par une personnalité sans autorité légale*, n'avait pu être pris au sérieux, elle se décidait à l'exécuter. (60–61, emphasis added)

She did not refuse to perform services for me, and was admirable in the art of running the iron down a pair of trousers or in folding waistcoats in a suitcase, but she declined to take the order to carry out these functions, although in themselves they were a pleasure to her, from myself. If I did ask her for such favours, she went to see Andrée in the adjoining room, consulted her, and then, having received confirmation of an order which, *as it was signed by a personage without due authority*, she had been unable to take at its face value, she made ready to execute it. (*Chelsea Way 28*, emphasis added)⁷⁶

This seemingly insignificant domestic detail can be read as a statement of the changing order of authority. Given the identification of the Narrator as Proust's *alter ego*, the Narrator's powerlessness in the face of the English maid becomes an attribute of his creator. Although Tuttle is based on Proust's invention, the character of Françoise, his writer-narrator cannot command her because he does not have the necessary authority, *his signature is not valid*. Only André(e) can authorise the command in this fictive world which belongs to *À la Recherche* but which is no longer governed by Proust or his Narrator. A similar scene takes place later in the novella when the Narrator is about to give Tuttle orders related to their trip to Surrey:

– Tuttle, lui dis-je (elle tourna la tête un instant de mon côté avec surprise, puis la replaça dans la direction d'Andrée, estimant peut-être que si elle ne pouvait malheureusement me supprimer, au moins les sons venus de moi, se réfléchissant sur Andrée, lui parviendraient alors d'une source plus convenable). (100-01)

⁷⁶ My references are to the 1930 translation by Hamish Miles.

'Tuttle,' I said (and for an instant she turned a surprised head in my direction, then fixed it again towards Andrée, judging, I suppose, that although she could not, alas, suppress me, still the sounds emanating from me would then, by a sort of refraction from Andrée, reach her from a proper direction). (*Chelsea Way* 49)

André(e) is here presented paradoxically both as a mirror reflecting the original (represented in the character of the Narrator) and a source of authority. This kind of ambiguity is also characteristic of pastiche which both mirrors its source text and undermines the cultural authority it possesses.

This covert theme culminates at the end of the novella, in the four-page long last sentence which returns to the question of influence under geographical terms. All through *Le Côté de Chelsea*, the Narrator has been focusing on the differences between France and England, but here he suddenly realises that all the places and persons he has encountered in England have their counterparts in France: the novelist Desmond Farnham reminds him of Bergotte, Ashby Hall has become as dear to him as Combray, and his feelings toward Lady Patricia are beginning to resemble those he felt towards his earlier loves, Gilberte, the Duchess of Guermantes and Albertine. The recognition of this pattern of replacement leads him to analyse the feeling of being at home. Despite all the similarities between the two countries there remains something he cannot place, a residue of a thing or a feeling that does not have an equivalent in his new world:

il restait après l'expérience et tout au fond de la cornue je ne sais quel résidu, mince mais irréductible, tel que je ne pouvais malgré tous mes efforts trouver une substance anglaise avec laquelle il eût quelque affinité, résidu qui me semblait insatisfait, presque plaintif, qui ne pouvait entrer en combinaison stable avec rien de ce qui m'entourait et qui, par sa minuscule présence (telle une légère anomalie dans l'orbite d'une planète, constante, irritante, inexplicable par une erreur de calcul prouve à l'astronome l'existence d'un astre invisible) me faisait sentir à chaque instant la présence lointaine, obscure, silencieuse et pourtant certaine de la France. (119-20)

after the experiment, at the very bottom of the retort, there remained a sort of indescribable residue, slight but irreducible, and such that not

all my efforts could produce an English substance with which it had any affinity, a residue that seemed to me unsatisfied, almost plaintive, powerless to achieve a stable compound with anything in my present environment, and which, by its microscopic presence (just as some slight aberration in the orbit of a planet, constant, vexatious, and inexplicable by any mathematical error, is proof to the astronomer of the existence of some invisible heavenly body) made me continually aware of the presence, the distant, veiled, silent, and yet unmistakable presence, of France. (*Chelsea Way* 58)

A conventional reading of this passage would, quite rightly, set it in the context of travel narratives and see here a reflection of Maurois's sympathy with England and the English, which is nevertheless surpassed by a patriotic longing for France. Yet it can also be interpreted as mixed tribute to *À la Recherche* through the geographical/authorial symbolism underlying Maurois's novella. As the invisible star that affects the planet's course, *À la Recherche* enacts a powerful role in forming the world of *Le Côté de Chelsea*. Not only does the source text furnish the novella with models for characters and themes but it also surpasses it in a way comparable to a natural force. This could be a brilliant acknowledgement of the superiority of the source text if it were not formulated ambiguously. The presence of France – i.e., the presence of *À la Recherche* and its author – is plaintive, obscure, and silent, almost spectral. It penetrates the Narrator's existence in England: it is silent, unsatisfied, annoying and yet certainly *there*. The paradox of pastiche: it gives voice to the source text and silences it at the same time.

The publication history of *Le Côté de Chelsea* offers another example of how the logic of countersignature functions in pastiches. Only some months after the publication of the original in *Revue de Paris*, an abridged translation of it into Finnish appeared in the magazine *Sininen kirja* in 1929 under the general title "World Literature" (Maurois, "Chelsean puolella"). This is in fact the first contact Finnish readers had with Proust's style in translation, since the first volume of *À la Recherche* was published in Finnish almost forty years later. The pastiche attests to the power of rewritings to supplant or even precede their source texts in some

areas (whether institutional, cultural or geographical). One may wonder at the Finnish translator's motives – why choose pastiche over the “original,” why present it under a lofty title that implies literary value and significance which are usually not associated with pastiche. Was there something new and appealing in the phenomenon of stylistic imitation that caught the translator's (or editors') interest? Perhaps it was simply chosen as an economic way to introduce Proust's epic novel, which would confirm Proust's own idea of pastiche as synthetic criticism, an intuitive and concise analysis of the source text. Whatever the reasons for its translation, the pastiche effectively confirms the authority of its source text which is presented as a major addition to world literature, but simultaneously cancels that authority by overwriting the source text and by usurping its place.

Shadows of Originality

One of the aims of my study has been to show the multiple ways in which pastiche is linked to a notion of originality and how it simultaneously challenges that conception and relies on it. The concept of pastiche is, like the notion of plagiarism, a result of the new interest in authenticity in the eighteenth century, characterised by Marilyn Randall as follows: “*Original* as ‘authentic’ comes to mean a sincere and unique expression having its source in an individual whose identity is fully (increasingly) self-possessed and unrepeatable. The new criterion of sincerity reinforces both the authenticity of origins and the authenticity of individuality” (528). One of the corollaries of this development is the reinforcement of the status of the critic: as the early definitions of pastiche illustrate, critics were needed to distinguish between various kinds of copies and imitations so that the authenticity of the original could be ascertained. In chapter 1.2 we saw how, in Marquis de Roure's treatise on style, the texts being imitated were proved originals by the act of pastiching their distinctive traits that were, by virtue of imitation, labelled original. Although Roure disparaged his chosen

method, Piles, by contrast, seemed to take pleasure in the kind of detailed comparative analysis that allows the critic to distinguish the originals from pastiches. Thus it seems that while pastiche and plagiarism have similar function as negative doubles of originality, an important difference lies in how they are received by the academic community. As Randall points out, successful plagiarism undermines the authority of the institution of criticism which takes its revenge when and if the plagiarism is exposed, since a previously valued work is then pronounced (530; see also Ruthven). By virtue of being a temporarily deceptive or openly acknowledged form of imitation, pastiche, by contrast, reinforces the critics' status as experts as it calls for a critical analysis and evaluation. As a "divergent" literary mode, it invites commentary and explication, and is often already furnished with a metafictional critical apparatus or other self-reflexive means, as my examples from pastiche fictions have illustrated.

Even with such helpful notions as plagiarism and pastiche, the critics' task of pinning down the nature of originality has proved difficult. Associated with such powerful but elusive conceptions as "new," "authentic" and "individual," originality appears to be graspable only through metaphors, analogies and counterpoints. One solution to this dilemma is offered by the computer-aided stylometric analysis which is used in determining original authorship. By measuring statistical differences in the lexicon of two or more texts, stylometrics reveals whether the texts have been composed by a single author. Pastiche has a double function in this kind of analysis. On the one hand, it can be used as a test case to measure the sensitivity of the existing authorship attribution techniques; on the other, pastiches can be studied for the purpose of deciding their merit against the originals. Given this starting-point, it is not surprising that pastiches are found lacking in the stylometric analyses, and their "threat" to the originality is dispelled.⁷⁷ Such comparisons are, however, based on a somewhat simplistic notion of pastiche as mechanical

⁷⁷ See Somers and Tweedie for an overview of the results of a number of stylometric studies on pastiche (409-12).

repetition, although in reality it selectively imitates distinctive elements from the source texts. These elements are not the object of analysis in stylometric studies, which concentrate on the occurrence of certain grammatical markers that have little impact on how style is perceived in the creative process or on how the work is received. Hence the result of the analysis of Lee Sigelman and William Jacoby, who discovered, to their surprise, that what they perceived as the worst example in their corpus of Chandler pastiches, Robert B. Parker's *Perchance to Dream*, turned out to be the most "faithful" one on closer statistical analysis. Sigelman and Jacoby interpret this outcome as a proof of the inimitability of Chandler's style:

That Parker's fairly feeble effort has, by our reckoning, come closer than any other pastiche to capturing Chandler's style testifies more eloquently than any other evidence we have yet considered to the inimitability of Chandler's style. Many have tried, but if *Perchance to Dream* is the best they have produced, it should be obvious that none has yet succeeded." (25)

Similarly, A.Q. Morton finds *Sanditon*, completed by "Another Lady," "an excellent imitation" but inevitably distanced from the style of Jane Austen (191).⁷⁸ The advanced methods of analysis thus only prove what has been known since Piles: pastiches are inferior to the originals.

Another marked difference in the attitudes towards plagiarism and pastiche is that while the former is usually condemned for moral reasons, the latter is not. As I pointed out in chapter 1.1, however, pastiche meddles with precisely those values that are protected by authors' rights: the rights of attribution and integrity. The moral implications of pastiche are often referred to in passing but seldom, if ever, explicated. For instance, Jaidev writes that

⁷⁸ The apparently accurate statistical methods of these studies are undermined by the somewhat problematic points of comparison. Sigelman and Jacoby construct an imaginary "standard" language to which they compare Chandler's works and the pastiches, and Morton does not divulge the editions of Austen's works he has used in his analysis, although there are significant differences in the nineteenth-century versions and contemporary editions of her works.

pastiche “can co-exist with parody as well as other modes such as realism, but when it does, the text is marked by a double pull, moral on the one hand and aesthetic and self-reflexive on the other” (35), and A.S. Byatt tells us that she prefers the term ventriloquism for parody and pastiche, which are loaded with “moral implications” (*On Histories and Stories* 43). A sense of guilt or shame is evident in pastiche fictions, which are often furnished with what I shall call *apologies for pastiche*: paratextual or metafictional defences or acknowledgments of offence by which the pasticheur seeks to justify his or her actions. They often function as negative *ars poetica*, explanations from a defensive position of the principles according to which the pasticheur acts.⁷⁹ The defensive tone is apparent in “Audenesque,” Heaney’s memorial poem for Brodsky, written in the succinct trochaic feet of Auden’s “In Memory of W.B. Yeats”:

Its measured ways I tread again
 Quatrain by constrained quatrain,
 Meting grief and reason out
 As you said a poem ought.

Trochee, trochee, falling, thus
 Grief and metre order us.
 Repetition is the rule,
 Spins on lines we learnt at school. (64)

What is striking in this excerpt from the poem is the multiple expressions of constraint and compulsion. The obligations of tradition coupled with a sense of loss (“grief and metre order us”)⁸⁰ govern the writing process. The adopted formal restrictions both accentuate the difficulty of the task at hand – how to address a dead friend and fellow poet – and offer a ready-made pattern to follow. A different kind of acknowledgement of creative con-

⁷⁹ Apologetic tones are – or were – occasionally found in academic studies as well. For an example, see Milly (*Les Pastiches de Proust* 33).

⁸⁰ This line includes an allusion (in the sense of phraseological adaptation) to the title essay of Brodsky’s collection *On Grief and Reason*, an analysis of the poetry of Robert Frost.

straints can be found in the afterword of the edition of *Sanditon* discussed above. Entitled “An Apology from the Collaborator,” its account of the difficulties in completing a novel by a classic author concludes with the following question:

So what was there left to worry about in completing Jane Austen’s last manuscript? Only the way she wrote it. Her language, her integrity and her painstaking methods of work – that terrifyingly accurate and meticulous technique – combine to give us the same sense of serenity and assurance in the six novels in which she brought her world to life and made it real for us. None of these things can be faithfully copied. And for their deficiencies in this seventh novel, I do apologise. (329)

In a backhanded gesture, the pasticheur simultaneously apologises for what she has done and adds her work to the canon of Austen’s novels, thereby erasing the distinction between originals and pastiche continuations she is intent on stressing. A similarly bold example can be found in the *Petite anthologie imaginaire de la poésie française* by Henri Bellaunay, which is prefaced with an excerpt ostensibly attributed to Victor Hugo’s essay on Shakespeare.⁸¹ In this essay pastiche, Bellaunay justifies his probes into the history of French poetry by contrasting pastiche, personified as a tender lover, with ruthless parody, and comparing the object, the poetry being imitated, to “a good girl [who] accepts abuse as a homage” (15).⁸²

Although attention has been paid to the ways in which pastiche acknowledges its imitative status, apologies like those above have not been identified as a common characteristic of pastiche. They have, however, an important role in framing the pastiche text and affecting the reader’s interpretation of it. While such rhetorical devices are not exclusive to pastiche but occur in other forms of rewriting as well, the apologetic tone is typical to pas-

⁸¹ Aron and Espagnon quote this text in *Répertoire des pastiches et parodies littéraires* as if it were indeed by Hugo (7). Yet I have not been able to find either in the electronic versions of Hugo’s essay, available through Google Books, or the 1864 print version. Hence I would take it to be a pastiche by Bellaunay and a relatively rare example of a truly deceptive pastiche.

⁸² “[. . .] bonne fille, [qui] accueille l’outrage comme l’hommage.”

tiche. Parodists, by contrast, do not seem to feel a similar urge to excuse their textual interventions: instead, they often boldly mark the fact of usurpation. As an extreme and highly ambiguous form of apology, some pasticheurs have chosen to accept more than their fair share of the blame by calling their pastiches “theft” or “plagiarism” in the titles. These ostentatious titles are mitigated by the absence of actual plagiarism in the works themselves, but they do suggest the pasticheurs’ sense of “permitted crime” and the enduring association of pastiche with the negotiation of the moral rights of authors.

Despite the example of *Sanditon* in which a female author pastiches another, and Bellaunay’s evocation of the act of pastiching as the (violent) seduction of a girl, the associations of originality, as it is typically constructed and contested in pastiche, are peculiarly male. In the tradition of pastiche writing, as presented in the most extensive historical bibliographies of this literary form, male writers imitating other male writers are a striking majority.⁸³ Commenting on a similar gender bias in forgeries, Ruthven suggests that the paucity of women forgers is not necessarily a historical fact, but the product of the positive agenda of feminist literary criticism: “a laudable desire to show that women can write as well as men was not accompanied by a corresponding urgency to reveal that they can behave just as badly” (181). The reasons for the scarcity of pastiches by or of women writers may be somewhat different, however, as the historical invisibility of women writers obviously has an effect on their scarcity as models for pastiches, and the doubly marginal position of pastiches written by women may have led to their disappearance from circulation and from general consciousness.⁸⁴ However, I would suggest that the particular preoccupation of stylistic pastiche with originality and the masculine associations of originality are crucial con-

⁸³ See Aron *Histoire du pastiche*, Aron & Espagnon (eds.), *Répertoire des pastiches et parodies littéraires des XIX^e et XX^e siècles* and the bibliography of pastiches published in *Pastiches, collages et autres réécritures*, a joint special issue of *Formules* and *TEM*.

⁸⁴ See London, *Writing Double: Women’s Literary Partnerships* (esp. 8-9) for an account of the similarly erased tradition of women’s collaborative writing.

tributing factors in the male-centeredness of this literary form. Reviewing the traditional imagery of original authorship in *The Madwoman in the Attic*, Sandra M. Gilbert and Susan Gubar conclude that “[i]n patriarchal Western culture, therefore, the text’s author is a father, a progenitor, a procreator, an aesthetic patriarch” (6).⁸⁵ As the absence of women writers in Bloom’s *The Anxiety of Influence* attests, the traditional discourse of originality pertains to men, who have the chance to attain it or fail in the pursuit, while women are excluded from the equation.

In this tradition, pastiche is often taken to signal the lack of talent required of original authors, but my investigation of it suggests that its roles are more versatile. Pasticheurs are often sensitive to the ambiguities deriving from the ostensibly derivative status of their chosen literary form and have used it to negotiate their position vis-à-vis authorship and originality. In particular, they have used pastiche to create connections and reveal affinities. This social, group-building aspect is an important element in the writing and publication of pastiches.⁸⁶ The ambiguous homage rendered by pastiching another writer seems to be a typically male manner of acknowledging and constructing poetic friendships and affinities. In the cycle of poems, “Florence: Works of Art” (from *An Italian Visit*, 1953), Cecil Day Lewis describes five classical art works (all by male artists) in the styles of major English-language poets: Thomas Hardy, W.B. Yeats, Robert Frost, W.H. Auden and Dylan Thomas. Described as an exercise in “hero-worship” (Balcon xv), the poems acknowledge Day Lewis’s admiration for the first-rank poets of his day (Hardy being the only representative of the older generation).⁸⁷ Moreover, in projecting the par-

⁸⁵ They concentrate on the sexual aspects of the creation myth, which I set aside here, but return to in chapter 3.3.

⁸⁶ See Austin (105-18) for a discussion of the performative power of pastiche in social relations. He concentrates on the cameo roles of Proust and his friends in the pastiches of *L’Affaire Lemoine*.

⁸⁷ Perhaps out of modesty, perhaps as a challenge to his readers, Day Lewis follows the convention of giving only the initials of the writers he is imitating. It is, however, easy to identify the sources. The individual poems in this cycle are entitled after the artworks and artists they describe.

ticular sensibilities of the English-language poets on the masterpieces of Renaissance art, Day Lewis is engaging in what could be called mutual cultural reinforcement: the poets are being bolstered by their connection with the masters of art history, and the art works of the old masters are updated in the context of twentieth-century literature. Originality is used to reflect another kind of originality. Another example of a perhaps even bolder connecting can be found in Heaney's "Audenesque." Heaney's choice of presenting his friendship with Brodsky in the style of Auden implies that he and Brodsky (both of them winners of the Nobel prize, like Yeats) hold as important a position in the poetic canon as their predecessors. The fact that the poem is patently set in the tradition of imitating great masters functions, however, to undercut this interpretation in a manner typical of double-edged pastiches.

Works like these – there are plenty of similar examples – construct fellowships and canons of male writers in an act of mutual benefit. The pasticheur benefits from the company of the great men he has invoked in the stylistic imitation and the authors being imitated gain prestige in being rewritten. Only a few male authors have wanted to manifest their affinity with women writers in this manner. An exception is the poet Anna de Noailles, the model of at least five known pastiches by Henri Bellaunay, Fernand Gregh, Marcel Proust and Paul Reboux (who pastiched her twice) (see Hellegouarc'h, "L'Intertextualité" 72).⁸⁸ To what extent these pastiches reflect intimate engagement with her poetry and to what extent they derive from her position as an influential noblewoman whose salon attracted the leading intellectuals and artists of her day remains an open question, but one can hardly avoid seeing here a group of pasticheurs courting the hostess rather than the poet.

As pastiche uses existing power structures and canons, it is one of the conservative forces of culture, imposing the models of

⁸⁸ Proust's pastiche of Noailles is included in a letter to Reynaldo Hahn (see Milly, "Introduction" 14). Proust also pays homage to her in the Saint-Simon pastiche of *L'Affaire Lemoine*.

the past as normative examples. At the same time, however, it undercuts that project by rejecting originality, the central value that governs those structures. Its double pull has suggested to some critics that it is a particularly apt form for subversive projects, including feminist re-evaluation of culture. Dyer describes the heightened activity of pastiche in a time of cultural shifts and dislocations such as when a cultural practice is mediated across “geographic, temporal, ideological, gendered or cultural” borders (*Pastiche* 179) and sees that the term belongs, due to its culinary origin, to a feminine sphere of low, domestic culture (5). In “Theorizing Feminist Discourse/Translation,” Barbara Godard counts pastiche as one of the forms of feminist discourse which “involves a transfer of a cultural reality into a new context as an operation in which literary traditions are variously challenged in the encounter of differing modes of textualization” (89; see also 93).⁸⁹ In the light of the masculine tradition of the practice and its strong association with originality as the attribute of male writers, these conceptions seem problematic. It is certainly true that the marginality and ambivalence of this form can render it an effective means of subversion, but this has not been one of its major uses historically speaking. Pastiche has been written to support the idea of originality and the value systems based on it, and while the form’s inevitable double-edgedness undermines this project, it does not thwart the pasticheurs’ intentions.

My interpretation of the role of pastiche vis-à-vis originality has so far stressed their mutual dependence, the involvement of pastiche in the construction and deconstruction of this powerful but problematic conception that remains one of the cornerstones of the institution of literature as we now know it. But can pastiche suggest an alternative system? Can it lead us to reconsider authorship as founded on completely different criteria? It is certainly charged for the lack of such new openings, but these charges do

⁸⁹ In feminist literary criticism, pastiche is often referred to in the postmodern compilation sense of the term. For instance, when Bonnie Braendlin analyses Alice Walker’s *The Temple of My Familiar* as pastiche, she describes it as a “clash of traditional and contemporary ideas and ideologies” (51).

not mean that it would be possible, for a single practice arising from the culture of authorship, to transcend the very principles on which that culture rests. As the seminal writings of Barthes and Foucault on the death of the author attest, it is easier to indicate the limits than reject them: both writers only theorised about a culture without what they perceived as the oppressive figure of the author, and continued to publish according to the conventions that granted them the authoritative authorial position. The power of stylistic pastiche, in my view, lies in part in its ability to manifest the contradictions in the ways in which we think about authorship and originality, and it cannot escape the logic of those contradictions without losing its identity as a recognisable literary practice.

Pastiche as a Test Laboratory

Even though the inescapable double-edgedness of pastiche can thwart the pasticheurs' intentions (for instance, when a homage turns into inadvertent parody), it can also be put to use in testing some of literature's home truths. Pastiche can function as a test laboratory for various literary questions and dilemmas. This idea is powerfully illustrated in Maurois' *Le Côté de Chelsea*, which evokes the pasticheur as a kind of Dr. Frankenstein, exposing the source text to morbid experiments. Earlier in my analysis of this novella, I drew attention to its geographical symbolism, whereby France is associated with Proust's corpus while England becomes the territory of André Maurois, who had extensively engaged with the country and its culture in his works. On board the ship from Calais to Dover, the Narrator describes how the French coast fades from view while at the same time the English coastline takes form and becomes more distinct. Similarly, the familiar world of *À la Recherche du temps perdu* wanes as *le côté de Maurois* becomes increasingly foregrounded. In a typically Proustian metaphor, the Narrator compares this complex visual and emotional phenomenon to a

scene in a fantasy film where a scientist transfuses the vitality of a living woman to an inanimate statue.⁹⁰

A l'arrière la côte français pâlistait et devenait imprécise, dans la mesure exacte où, à l'avant, la côte anglaise prenait du relief et de la netteté si bien que je croyais assister à quelque mystérieuse transfusion de vigueur comme on en peut observer en un de ces films fantastiques et cruels où le savant à longue barbe d'alchimiste vêtu d'une blouse de chirurgien se sert d'une femme vivante pour animer une statue, et où l'on voit le beau corps étendu sur la table devenir flasque et s'évanouir tandis que l'être artificiel, ouvrant les yeux, s'anime et sourit au monde. (31-32)

Behind us the French coast became paler and more faint, in the same degree as the English coast ahead of us grew sharper and more distinct, so that I seemed to be watching some mysterious transfusion of strength, such as one can see taking place in some of those cruel and fantastic films in which the scientist, with his long alchemist's beard and his surgeon's overall, makes use of a living woman to animate a statue, and one sees the beautiful body outstretched on the table becoming limp and collapsed whilst the artificial creature opens its eyes, comes to life, and smiles all around. (*Chelsea Way* 13-14)

In the context of pastiche that is animated by the vitality of its source text, this scene reads as a metaphor for the activity of the pasticheur. The esteemed, canonised source text is made to yield to its artificial substitute, a dummy. It seems as if Maurois had uncannily anticipated Jameson's later characterisation of pastiche "a statue with blind eyeballs"⁹¹ in this metaphor, which presents pastiche as artificial but also very much alive. Although Maurois's pastiche is respectful, the metaphor brings up – or rather thrusts upon us – the element of destruction and usurpation that is inherent in all pastiches, if ever so minimally. Pastiche threatens to destroy its model, the authentic work, by replacing it – and in some cases it can be said to have succeeded. As I have already pointed out, the translation of Maurois's pastiche preceded the translation

⁹⁰ Although Proustian in form (and in length), the metaphor does not stem directly from *À la Recherche du temps perdu* – the new art form, film, is scarcely mentioned in Proust's novel.

⁹¹ In "Postmodernism, or the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism" (65).

of its source text into Finnish by decades, and there are also examples of the pastiche now being better known or more widely read than the source text. For instance, Proust's pastiche of the *Journal* of the Goncourt brothers in *Le Temps retrouvé* probably has more readers today than its source text, although the Goncourts have not fallen into oblivion.

I wanted to begin with this scene from a pastiche published in 1929 in order to emphasise the fact that the paradoxical double-edgedness of pastiche has been recognised and appropriated by writers even before postmodernism, although critics now tend to associate such metafictional investigation and celebration of indeterminacy primarily to postmodernism. It has undeniably become more prominent in recent decades, no doubt because of writers' increased awareness of the debates concerning pastiche and of the metafictional potential inherent in this literary form. Discussing the relationship between theory and fiction today, Michael Greaney writes: "it seems reasonable to ask whether what we are dealing with here is a question not of *influence* of theory on fiction, but of a new *confluence* between the two – a creative intermingling of discourses that dissolves the traditional boundaries between literary text and critical metalanguage" (3, emphasis original). Pastiche is a good example of such a confluence: neither "pure" fiction, nor straightforward literary criticism or theory, it can be used in experimental writing that combines elements from both. The idea of pastiche as a critical evaluation of the source text has been around from the beginning of the nineteenth century, but it is also possible to conceive of pastiche as literary criticism in a broader sense.

The idea of a test laboratory connotes an artificial environment, separated from normal everyday life. Yet such an environment is necessary for the discovery of new substances and phenomena which can be found, for instance, by virtue of simulating aspects of reality. In the case of pastiche what is simulated is not reality, but other texts, although the highly textual nature of the imitation does not preclude questions of, for instance, representation, power and veracity, which extend beyond the boundaries of

strictly literary matters. Nor do the paradoxes of double-edgedness mean that pastiche would be caught in the vicious circle of affirmation and negation. It can be made to serve particular purposes, as the example of David Lodge's *Thinks...* illustrates. *Thinks...* includes two sets of pastiches, separated from the rest of the text. They are presented as the exercises of one of the two protagonists of the novel, Helen Reed, who teaches creative writing at the University of Gloucester. The novel offers very little direct commentary on them and thus it would be easy to regard them merely as comic interludes. They do, however, serve an important purpose by offering a counterpart to the scientific experiments and philosophical thought experiments discussed in the novel. As Greaney points out, Lodge's fiction is based on "binary structures [that] provide the framework for comic interplay between supposedly antithetical ideas and incomparable people" (25). In *Thinks...* Lodge pitches cognitive science and creative writing against each other. The question that occupies the other protagonist of the novel, the neuroscientist Ralph Messenger, is whether we can ever have access to the consciousness of another person and find out what she thinks or what she feels. Messenger's enthusiastic endorsement of scientific scepticism challenges Reed to assign two philosophical texts as the "content" which the student can then translate into the styles of their chosen authors. Both of these classic texts – "What Is It Like to Be a Bat" (1974) by Thomas Nagel and "What Mary Didn't Know" (1986) by Frank Jackson – are thought experiments meant to illustrate the impossibility of describing someone else's experiences or what is in their mind. A Martin Amis version of Nagel's experiment begins like this:

Well, we hang out a lot during the day. We hang out in caves, crevices, under eaves, inside roofs, anywhere that's dark and warm. Caves are favourite. We hang from the ceiling and crap on the floor, only it seems like we're hanging from the floor and crapping on the ceiling because we're upside down. Crapping when you're upside down is an art. The crap generates heat as it decomposes; also, of course, a smell.

When it gets dark we go out to eat, insects mostly. We gobble them up on the wing, using our radar equipment. *Beep, beep, beep, beep, beepbeepbeepbeep POW!* It's cool. I can zap two fruitflies inside a second, flying blind. Tom Cruise, eat your heart out. (90)

In a Henry James version of Jackson's thought experiment,⁹² the guinea pig of the experiment, Mary, who has been deprived of any sensation of colour from birth, dies of shock when she is finally presented with a red rose: "The redness of the rosebud had penetrated her brain like an arrow, and her fragile heart, overcharged by the intensity of the sensation, had stopped" (157). The parody of these pastiches is directed not only at the writers being imitated but also the crudity of the philosophers' thought experiments, revealed in the difficulty of expanding them into full, credible narratives.

Mere parody does not make these stylistic pastiches into "test laboratories" in the sense I am describing here, however. In the construction of the novel, pastiches manifest literature's ability to solve the central problem of neuroscience. Well before the scientists, authors of fiction were interested how to convey as fully as possible the inner thoughts of a character. It is no coincidence that Henry James is one of the writers most referred to in the novel, since he solved the incompatibility of objective and subjective viewpoints by using the narrative method of centred consciousness. The pastiches prove the superiority of literature in describing the inner world of an individual compared to science which flattens thinking and emotions into chemical and mechanical processes. Science has its own truths, but literature responds to Messenger's problem in a way which is easy to understand and which relates the foreign experiences to our own experiential sphere. Moreover, literature's advantage is not strictly speaking its ability to *describe* another person's thoughts but its ability to convey them in the style that other person would use or in a style penetrated by by that person's character. The pastiches written by

⁹² The James pastiche also foregrounds the homage to James's *What Maisie Knew* in the title of Jackson's article.

Reed's students (seven of which are included in the novel) are juxtaposed with the crude computer programmes developed by Messenger's students to model emotions. In Reed's view, literature has already attained what these computer programmes are trying to achieve, while Messenger dismisses literature as mere illusion. Although in terms of personal inclinations the conflict remains unresolved at the end, it is possible to observe that the pastiches are fairly good evocations of their source texts while the computer programmes remain very poor imitations of the complexity of human emotions. Pastiche is, in Lodge's *Thinks...*, literature's way of putting its own abilities to the test.

There is some irony in Lodge's use of pastiche to prove the value of literature, because pastiche is usually deemed worthless, a mere digression from "real" literature. In the guise of humour, the pastiches allow him to explore different ways of viewing the world through a style which is taken to reflect the unique consciousness of a writer. There is a strong humanist ethos in Lodge's pastiches, and the traditional idea of originality gets re-fashioned as uniqueness of consciousness.⁹³ Another irony pertaining to the pastiche texts/tests is that they are unique as well: unlike the experiments of scientists and philosophers, the pastiches themselves cannot be repeated, since two pastiches never correspond to each other. Imitable and inimitable acquire new meanings in Lodge's literary laboratory.

The speculative, experimenting aspect has been an element of literary pastiches from the beginning, as the "what if" quality of La Bruyère's Montaigne pastiche illustrates. The use of stylistic imitation to address moral and social questions or questions about the value of literature or the insights it can offer provides a privileged perspective to these issues, not easily attainable by other forms of rewriting or adaptation. For instance, though Maupassant's famous story *La Parure* has been the object of several film and stage adaptations and literary rewritings, the question of the

⁹³ The themes of *Thinks...* were carried on in his next novel, *Author, author* (2004), a fictional portrait of James, as well as in the collection of essays *Consciousness and the Novel* (2002).

value of the original as opposed to a copy has special resonance when treated in the form of pastiche by Reboux and Muller. Although a simple, straightforward case of portmanteau pastiche,⁹⁴ it alerts the readers to the question of why pastiche – or any second instance – is considered worthless even if there are no perceptible differences between it and the original. The pastiche story ironically hints towards the tragic consequences of the cult of originality, as told in the original, but rescues the Loisels from their misery in the end. Told in the sentimental style of Alphonse Daudet, the story ends with Madame Forestier returning the gratuitous fortune to the Loisels, who live happily ever after in a cottage named “Chalet La Parure” (“Castle ‘Necklace’”) (*À la Manière de... 1-2: 148-49*).

Even without such openly metafictional cues, the experience of pastiche can function as a test of the reader’s expectations and values. While enjoying a detective story pastiche that resurrects a favourite sleuth, the reader is differently occupied with issues of credibility than when reading the originals. The feelings evoked by the familiar but yet different style may alert the reader to the particular emotional attachment that is part of the reception of such fictions and on which the sense of credibility lies to a large extent. Thus, when readers are engaged in assessing the inevitable question of whether the pastiche is a good one, whether it attains the quality of the original stories, they are also testing their own reader-responses to a case that is not quite what it appears.

⁹⁴ The story is furnished with a preface which explains how Maupassant’s friends Dickens, Edmond de Goncourt, Zola and Daudet found a sketch for the story after Maupassant’s death and decided to complete it together (*À la Manière de... 1-2: 127-29*). The story is accordingly divided into four chapters, each written in the style of one of the “authors.”

PART III: PRACTICE

Literary critical analyses of pastiches tend to fall into two loose categories that correspond to the division identified earlier between the orientations of Francophone and Anglo-American critics. French critics analysing pastiche fictions often work within a structuralist framework (today usually adapted from the work of Genette), but in practice their approach is akin to the traditional branch of textual criticism tracing influences and allusions. These studies, like Jean Milly's thorough analyses of the pastiches of Proust or Daniel Bilous's account of the Montaigne pastiche by La Bruyère, offer valuable information about the structuration of the pastiches. However, their concentration on the relationship between the pastiche and its source text as well as the focus on textual (and in some cases biographical) information can seem somewhat confined: the significance of pastiches is not necessarily restricted to the context of their source texts. Anglo-American studies of pastiches, by contrast, stress the importance of the larger cultural context and ideological background of pastiches, but since they usually discuss the compilation variety of pastiche, they in fact speak of a somewhat different cultural phenomenon than what is my focus here. For many critics outside these paradigms, the labelling of a text as pastiche is enough: as imitative, derivative texts, pastiches do not merit more careful analysis. The scarcity of more detailed, engaging analyses of pastiche fiction is, in my view, reflected in the rather one-sided conceptions of pastiche that one often encounters in literary criticism and theory.

In this part of my study, I shall look at three cases of pastiche in more detail. Their analyses differ from those in part two in that here I am not using literary works to illustrate one particular feature of pastiche, but instead the aim is to look at the texts from a wider perspective that includes aspects of their publication history, reception, and functioning in the relevant larger contexts, in order to gain a more complete picture of the literary practices of pastiche. The three cases analysed here represent the most common forms of literary pastiche: anthology pastiche, embedded

pastiche and continuation pastiche, each of which has its own particularities.¹ Proust's pastiches offer examples of the former two. As I pointed out in chapter 1.2, Proust's influence in French criticism on pastiche has been considerable: his stylistic imitations have more or less set the standard for this literary form. Proust is thus hardly a figure that could be bypassed here. In my discussion I shall take into consideration texts from both his published and posthumous pastiches and read them in the light of two less well known sketches for *À la Recherche du temps perdu* and *Contre Sainte-Beuve*, where Proust discusses pastiche as a means of forging a connection between two writers and two ways of thinking by going beyond their appearances to the "depths" of style (the metaphor is his). Although critics tend to praise Proust's pastiches for their supreme accuracy of tone, they do not see in them much else than mere exercises, humorous takes on writers Proust liked or was annoyed by. In my analysis, I shall set them in a wider perspective and show how they manifest the important intermediate space between poetics and fiction, reading and writing.

The three Sherlock Holmes pastiches, discussed in chapter 3.2, represent only a fraction of the numerous rewritings inspired by the oeuvre of Arthur Conan Doyle. They can be termed continuation pastiches in so far as they reprise the original stories and offer new adventures of the famous detective. Due to their stylistic affinity with the source text, the pastiches tend to engage more deeply with Doyle's stories and worldview than, for instance, those rewritings, which freely adapt Holmes or some of the minor characters in a new context. In their Sherlock Holmes novels, Michael Dibdin and Nicholas Meyer rewrite the conflict between the rational and irrational tendencies in the source texts by offering alternative explanations to the famous death and return of Sherlock Holmes. In so doing, they explore the stylistic constraints of the source texts and speculate about what lies beneath the illusion

¹ These three variants of pastiche are not mutually exclusive. An embedded pastiche may, for instance, function as a continuation of the source text, as is the case with Thomas's *Charlotte*. The terms describe typical instances of pastiche, and are not meant as a definitive or comprehensive classification of its variants.

of transparency in the classical, solution-oriented detective story. The pastiches of Adrian Conan Doyle and John Dickson Carr are a paradigmatic case of reverential homage, but their almost obsessive circulation around issues of authenticity, imitation and inheritance reveal a subplot hinting at the literary “crime” of usurping the style of another writer.

In chapter 3.3 I look at the ways in which A.S. Byatt’s *Possession* and D.M. Thomas’s *Charlotte* use pastiche to investigate the Victorian past and its relevance to contemporary culture. In each novel, the embedded pastiches are juxtaposed and complemented with a contemporary narrative which sets authorship and derivation as one of the central issues. Although they are quite different in tone, the pastiches by Byatt and Thomas have in common a tendency that I analyse in terms of transgression. In Byatt’s case transgression pertains to the desire to resurrect the Victorian voices, while Thomas’s idea of pastiche as transgression centres on the muddled sexual-textual origins of creativity. Both novels create a network of analogies and metaphors to explain and also to justify the use of pastiche.

While the examples are not historically representative, they do give indication of the variations of the literary form from the anthology pastiche format popular at the beginning of the twentieth-century to the use of embedded pastiches in historical novels in the recent decades, which I am inclined to see as the result of a widening understanding of the possibilities offered by this double-edged practice. Moreover, the examples discussed here challenge the common conception of pastiches as merely one-off stylistic takes. Pastiche can become an integral part of a writer’s poetics, not just a digression from “normal” authorship or a formative phase at the outset of a writer’s career. Proust is sometimes taken to be an exceptional writer in this respect, as the detailed research into his oeuvre has revealed the significance of pastiche to his whole writing career beginning from the school years and ending with *Le Temps retrouvé*, but also the other writers discussed here

have explored the possibilities of pastiche (and parody) in their previous or subsequent works.²

² For instance, Dibdin has continued experimenting with borrowed styles in the parody of Agatha Christie in *The Dying of the Light* (1993), Byatt returned to Victorian styles in *Angels and Insects* (1991) and Thomas written pastiches of Freud as well as been accused of plagiarism (Nicol 1-12). The uproar raised by Thomas's acknowledged use of a holocaust testimony in *The White Hotel* illustrates how the origin of a text and the manner in which the text is appropriated can be of utmost relevance. This is especially true in the context of holocaust testimonies and fictions – witness also the case of “Binjamin Wilkomirski’s” faux-memoir *Bruchstücke: Aus einer Kindheit 1939-1948* (1995). For the reverberations of *The White Hotel* case, see Nicol and Randall.

3.1 Style as Vision: The Pastiches by Marcel Proust

The corpus of Proust's pastiches is extensive and varied. From the 1880s until his death in 1922, Proust wrote about forty texts imitating the styles of various, mostly French writers.³ As Genette points out, Proust's continuing interest in this literary form attests that for him pastiche "is not an incidental practice, a purely stylistic catharsis, or a simple prenovelistic exercise. It is, along with reminiscence and metaphor, one of the privileged – and, in truth, necessary – modes of his relationship to the world of art"⁴ (*Palimpsests* 119-20). In this chapter, I will go even further and suggest that the two major Proustian themes – memory and metaphor – are involved in the pastiches which reflect not only the fundamentals of Proustian poetics but also more generally the power and limitations of this literary form.

The Two Pasticheurs: Proust and Reboux

Proust published his best-known pastiches – the *L'Affaire Lemoine* series – in 1908-09, at the watershed that marked the abandonment of the unfinished *Jean Santeuil* (1896-99) and *Contre Sainte-Beuve* (1908-09) for a novel project that was to become *À la Recherche du temps perdu*. The pastiches were published prominently on the front page of the literary supplement of *Le Figaro*, but it took until 1919 for Proust to find an editor (Grasset) willing to bring out a volume entitled *Pastiches et mélanges* in which the series is re-

³ For listings of Proust's pastiches, see *L'Affaire Lemoine* (14-15) and Aron (*Histoire* 287-91).

⁴ "[. . .] n'est [. . .] une pratique accessoire, pure catharsis stylistique ou simple exercice pré-romanesque: il est, avec la réminiscence et la métaphore, l'une des voies privilégiées – et à vrai dire obligées – de son rapport au monde et à l'art" (*Palimpsestes* 160).

published along with some essays and pieces of travel writing.⁵ The series is named after the sordid case of the engineer Lemoine, whose claim that he could manufacture artificial diamonds caused a minor uproar on the stock market at the beginning of the twentieth century. The trial of Lemoine was reported in the press in 1907-09 and Proust chose it – by accident, as he claims (*Pastiches et mélanges* 7) – as the topic of his pastiches. True to the idea that pastiches should imitate prominent and recognisable source texts, Proust imitates classics (Saint-Simon), the already canonised nineteenth-century writers (Balzac, Flaubert, Sainte-Beuve, Michelet) and prominent contemporary authors (Henri de Régner, Ernest Renan and the theatre critic Émile Faguet).⁶

Proust did not come to this literary form by accident. As I explained in chapter 1.2, the French educational system provided a background for the rise of pasticheurs in Proust's generation: Reboux and Muller, Jean Giradoux, Fernand Gregh and many others. Connected by a privileged educational background and social networks, these young men were the motors of the rise of pastiche during the first decades of the twentieth century. Proust's *L'Affaire Lemoine* was preceded by *À la manière de...* by Paul Reboux and Charles Muller,⁷ which was published to modest acclaim in 1907, but which became a veritable bestseller after 1910 when it was reissued with the support of a prominent advertisement campaign. Having sold over 400,000 copies before 1950, it

⁵ For the publication history of the pastiches, see *L'Affaire Lemoine*, edited by Jean Milly, and Hellegouarch (*Les Conditions* 420ff). A shorter account can be found in Aron's *Histoire du pastiche* (221-32).

⁶ The pastiche of Saint-Simon, which is much longer than the others, was only added to the 1919 volume; however, it is based on an earlier pastiche Proust published in 1904. The other pastiches also underwent considerable revision before publication in book form. In *L'Affaire Lemoine*, Milly discusses the changes made to individual pastiches. The posthumous Lemoine pastiches include another Sainte-Beuve as well as imitations of Chateaubriand, Maeterlinck, Ruskin, Taine and the libretto of Debussy's *Pelleas et Mélisande*.

⁷ After Muller's early death in 1914, Reboux continued to write pastiches on his own. The last, fifth volume of *À la Manière de...* was published in 1950.

probably stands as the best-selling pastiche series ever.⁸ Along with these two prominent pastiche series, which remain in print even today, the early decades of the century were the golden age for short, humorous, literary critical pastiches. Newspapers and magazines were the most common publication forums; only the distinctly literary variety of pastiche qualified for book publication. One of the reasons for the ready acceptance of this kind of literature, not innocent of the negative undertones of repetition and inauthenticity, was that it was perceived as educational (see, e.g., Hellegouarc'h, *Les Conditions* 422 and chapter 1.2). The educational potential of pastiche pertained to its ability to make the readers more aware of the individual styles of particular authors and to reinforce their sense of the importance of the literary canon. Considered educational entertainment, tens of thousands of copies of *À la Manière de...* were sent to the front during the First World War for the enjoyment of the soldiers. In those conditions the pastiches represented carefree normality, fostered nostalgia towards the soldiers' school years and promoted the cultural significance and superiority of France (cf. Reboux, "Préface" 20).

It is impossible to imagine a similar fate for Proust's *L'Affaire Lemoine*, even if it had been available in an inexpensive book form at that time. Even though the two pastiche cycles have much in common and imitate many of the same authors, their underlying ethos is different. Reboux was a pasticheur of the old school, intent on poking fun at the follies of writers and promoting the virtues of simple style – style devoid of particularities, excesses or flourishes (Genette, *Palimpsestes* 126-28). Accordingly, the pastiches of *À la Manière de...* are essentially collections of stylistic eccentricities and faults. Reboux was especially critical of contemporary and avantgarde literatures which he opposed with the arsenal of classicist ideals (Aron, *Histoire* 230). The satiric edge of the imitations was heightened by the presentation of this stylistic criticism in the form of a humorous narrative. This was another trademark of the imitations of Reboux. He believed that the

⁸ For the publication history of *À la manière de...*, see Aron (*Histoire* 224-26), and Hellegouarc'h (*Les Conditions* 419ff).

success of pastiches lays in their ability to tell a diverting story, as if mere imitation of style would not be entertaining enough ("Préface" 12). The success of this formula (400,000 sold copies) attests to the power of normative pastiche. The entertaining imitations were certainly a more efficient medium for distributing conservative aesthetics than Reboux's literary critical essays, which were his other medium for advocating political and aesthetic conservatism.

Proust's method of pastiche is quite different, and so are the results. In "À Propos du 'style' de Flaubert" Proust describes the origin of pastiche in an engaging reading experience: when one finishes a fascinating novel, one would like to continue speaking in the voice of its author, a voice one has learned by heart during the reading process (594). "One must let it go on for a moment, let the pedal prolong the sound,"⁹ he writes ("À Propos du 'style'" 594). What is striking in Proust's various descriptions of the act of pastiching is his use of musical terms as metaphors for the effect of the style of another writer in the reader/pasticheur. He speaks of the characteristic melody underneath the language (*parole*) of each author, a melody he begins to hum while reading (*Contre Sainte-Beuve* 303), or he speaks of the rhythm ("À Propos du 'style'" 594) to which he adjusts his internal metronome (*Correspondance* 8: 67). The use of musical terms emphasises the immediate nature of the stylistic affect: it is not purely linguistic or mediated via reflection and analysis. In chapter 1.2, I have already referred to the distinction Proust made between the synthetic criticism of pastiche and the analytical criticism of the literary essay. For Proust, pastiche was not passive immersion – it has a critical edge – but neither is it the kind of mechanical, distancing operation described by Reboux in his preface to Masson's *À la Façon de...*

Unlike Reboux, who emphasised the role of narrative in pastiches, Proust was more interested in grasping the underlying tone of a writer than telling an entertaining story. Choosing a current affair as the overt topic freed him from the details of the

⁹ "Il faut la laisser faire un moment, laisser la pédale prolonger le son [. . .]."

“plot”: the absurd story of the diamond forger was familiar to his readership from the newspapers and provided the comic quality readers would have expected from a pastiche. The pastiche cycle does not tell the story of Lemoine, or really offer different view-points to it (since some of the pastiches barely refer to it); the emphasis is clearly on the personal styles of the authors being imitated.¹⁰ On this view, it is interesting that the English translator and publisher of *The Lemoine Affair* have decided to include the pastiche in a series entitled “The Art of the Novella”: it hardly counts as a mini-novel and if read as such, the experience will most likely be bewildering.¹¹

Thus Proust was after something other than offering stylistic criticism in the guise of a diverting story. Style, for him, was not primarily a matter of linguistic qualities, but of a particular vision belonging to the individual writer, and of the way in which that vision shapes and is shaped by the topic, experience or thought the writer is engaging with.¹² When a literary magazine enquired about his views on reforming style, Proust answered: “I do not at all ‘sympathise’ (to borrow the terms of your questionnaire) with writers who would be ‘worried about originality of form.’ One ought to be concerned solely with the impression or idea to be translated. The eyes of the soul are turned inwards, one must strive to convey the internal model as faithfully as possible” (“Enquête” 645).¹³ Style is thus an element of personality and

¹⁰ The pastiche of Émile Faguet’s theatre review offers the most complete account of the twists and turns of the Lemoine case, but other pastiches either concentrate on one of its details or only mention Lemoine in passing.

¹¹ *The Lemoine Affair* is the first unabridged translation of the whole pastiche cycle in English. Parts of the cycle have previously been translated by Chris Taylor (<http://www.yorktaylor.free-online.co.uk/>, viewed 12 May 2009) and Richard Dyer (*Pastiche* 186-88).

¹² For a more detailed account of Proust’s ideas on style, see Milly’s *Proust et le style*.

¹³ “Je ne ‘donne nullement ma sympathie’ (pour employer les termes mêmes de votre enquête) à des écrivains qui seraient ‘préoccupés d’une originalité de forme.’ On doit être préoccupé uniquement de l’impression ou de l’idée à traduire. Les yeux de l’esprit sont tournés au-dedans, il faut s’efforcer de rendre avec la plus grande fidélité possible le modèle intérieur.”

therefore also a constituent of the things and ideas as an individual perceives them. According to Proust, a good writer is sensitive to his or her own observations and feelings and knows how to give them a form which simultaneously remains faithful to the originating experience and creates a vivid impression in the readers, “translating” the experience for them. Although it is an element of personality, style is not a matter of course: writers can fail because they resort to artificial style or because they suppress their own style in favour of a more realistic mode of representation. Hence Proust’s criticism of Balzac: “Style is so largely a record of the transformation imposed on reality by the writer’s mind that Balzac’s style, properly speaking, does not exist” (*By Way of Sainte-Beuve* 127).¹⁴

Yet Balzac had enough style to end up being imitated in *L’Affaire Lemoine*. The idea at the heart of Proust’s notion of style that authors should rely on their inner ability in order to focus on and convey an experience is one that he explicitly connected to pastiche in the sketches to *Du Côté de chez Swann*. These sketches are related to the scene in which the young Narrator is about to burst with excitement at the sight of the sudden beauty of the forest after rain, near the pond at Montjouvain (*À la Recherche* 1: 152-53). Despite the intensity of the experience, or perhaps because of it is so overwhelming, the only thing he can say is to repeat “Gosh, gosh, gosh, gosh!” The incompatibility between the verbal outcome and the depth of the experience alert him to the necessity to go beyond the apparent reality (the fact of the beauty of nature) to the simultaneously confused and clear core of the experience (Why does it affect me so? Why do I react to it in this way?). In the sketch he connects this necessity to pastiche (I quote the sketch from Milly’s introduction to *L’Affaire Lemoine*):¹⁵

¹⁴ “Le style est tellement la marque de la transformation que la pensée de l’écrivain fait subir à la réalité, que, dans Balzac, il n’y a pas à proprement parler de style” (*Contre Sainte-Beuve* 269).

¹⁵ The latter part of the sketch is included in the Pléiade edition (*À la Recherche* 1: 836); both are also found in Finn (138-39). Those familiar with the details of Proust’s novel will notice that the sketch confuses the two directions of the Narrator’s childhood (in so far as the published version of *À la Recherche* is “cor-

le pastiche est au fond cette perception en littérature car là où un autre dit c'est délicieux je descends au-dessous et je prends connaissance du thème clair. [. . .] qd d'autres parlent de la jolie langue de Renan, je descend [sic] plus bas, jusqu'aux choses qui s'enlacent au fond de sa prose [. . .]. Dans cet ordre d'idées, les pastiche qu'on a lus de moi ne sont que la continuation de l'effort qui commence sur le pont-vieux, du côté de Méséglise, et au lieu de dire devant Renan ou Flaubert 'Zut que c'est beau' de tâcher à revivre exactement ce que nous exprimons d'une façon si inadéquate et confuse. (*L'Affaire Lemoine* 46-47)

pastiche is, essentially, this same perception in literature, for whereas someone else will say 'that's delightful' I descend beneath and make contact with the pure theme [...] whereas others speak of the beautiful language of Renan I descend lower still, to the things that are intertwined in the depths of his prose. [...] In this order of ideas, even the little pastiches of mine that people have read are but the continuation of the effort that begins on the old bridge, on the Méséglise Way, and instead of saying, reading Renan or Flaubert, 'Gosh, is that ever beautiful!', I attempt to relive exactly what we express in such an inadequate and confused fashion. (qtd. in Finn 138-39)

Pastiche would thus answer to an urge on the part of a reader to distil the essence of the impression a style has made on him or her. For Proust, pastiche is therefore not merely the reproduction of the characteristic stylistic elements of the source text, the "fads, faults, obsessions [and] errors"¹⁶ highlighted by Reboux ("Préface" 14), but deeper investigation that begins from the reader's personal experience.

rect"): Pont-Vieux is on the Guermantes Way, while the experience of natural beauty that renders Narrator incapable of uttering anything more than "gosh" takes place on the Méséglise Way.

¹⁶ "[. . .] les toquades, les fautes, les obsessions, les erreurs[.]"

Style, Vision, Memory: The Goncourt Pastiche of *Le Temps retrouvé*

At the beginning of *Le Temps retrouvé*, the Narrator, a sick, ageing man who has abandoned his writerly ambitions for good, is visiting the love of his youth, Gilberte, who is now the mistress of Tansonville. Gilberte lends him the latest volume of the *Journal* of the Goncourt brothers as night-time reading in which the Narrator to his surprise encounters some familiar figures. The following extract is the beginning of the passage from the pastiche *Journal*:

Avant-hier tombe ici pour m'emmener dîner chez lui Verdurin, l'ancien critique de *La Revue*, l'auteur de ce livre sur Whistler où vraiment le faire, le coloriage artiste de l'original Américain, est souvent rendu avec une grande délicatesse par l'amoureux de tous les raffinements, de toutes les *joliesses* de la chose peinte qu'est Verdurin. Et tandis que je m'habille pour le suivre c'est de sa part, tout un récit où il y a par moments comme l'épellement apeuré d'une confession sur le renoncement à écrire aussitôt après son mariage avec la 'Madeleine' de Fromentin, renoncement qui serait dû à l'habitude de la morphine et aurait eu cet effet, au dire de Verdurin, que la plupart des habitués du salon de sa femme ne sauraient même pas que le mari a jamais écrit et lui parleraient de Charles Blanc, de Saint-Victor, de Sainte-Beuve, de Burty, comme d'individus auxquels ils le croient, lui, tout à fait inférieur. (*À la Recherche* 4: 287)

The day before yesterday Verdurin drops in here to carry me off to dine with him – Verdurin, former critic of the *Revue*, author of that book on Whistler in which the workmanship, the painterly colouration, of the American eccentric is interpreted sometimes with great delicacy by the lover of all refinements, all the *prettinesses* of the painted canvas, that Verdurin is. And while I am getting dressed to accompany him, he treats me to a long narrative, almost at moments a timidly stammered confession, about his renunciation of writing immediately after his marriage to Fromentin's 'Madeleine,' a renunciation brought about, he says, by his addiction to morphine and which has the result, according to Verdurin, that most of the frequenters of his wife's drawing-room did not even know that her husband had ever been a writer and spoke to him of Charles Blanc, of Saint-Victor, of Sainte-Beuve, of Burty, as individuals to whom they considered him, Verdurin, altogether inferior. (*In Search* 6: 27)

Monsieur Verdurin, the petty society host familiar from *L'Amour de Swann*, *Sodome and Gomorrhe* and *La Prisonnière*, is here portrayed as an art critic on a par with Elstir and Swann, the former idols of the Narrator. While the narrator of this passage – Edmond de Goncourt – is getting dressed for the dinner, Verdurin recounts to him the sad story of his professional oblivion, thus adding one in the long series of disillusioned characters in *À la Recherche*. From here the pastiche continues for a good nine pages, catering to its readers with vivid descriptions of the Verdurins' residence, especially of their exquisite china, and with reported conversations covering a variety of topics ranging from the medical treatment of dual personalities to the reminiscences of Madame Verdurin of their vacations in Normandy. One after another, the characters undergo a similar metamorphosis to that of Verdurin at the beginning: it turns out that Madame Verdurin was a source of inspiration for Elstir and the silly and socially awkward doctor Cottard is described as a philosopher and “man of real distinction”¹⁷ (*In Search* 6: 36). Although the Narrator knows well enough (or knew, in the past) the personalities described, the Goncourt *Journal* suddenly forces him to see them in a completely new and fascinating light.

It is not a coincidence that writing, art and society should be the topics of this pastiche, since they also dominate the acknowledged source text, the literary journal of the Goncourt brothers, edited and published by Edmond de Goncourt in 1887-96.¹⁸ Started as a joint project and carried on by Edmond alone after the death of Jules de Goncourt in 1870, the diary remains a treasure trove of anecdotal information about art and society in late nineteenth-century France. The testament of Edmond de Goncourt gave permission to publish the unedited volumes twenty years after his death in 1896. However, their publication was de-

¹⁷ “[. . .] l’homme tout à fait distingué” (*À la Recherche* 4 : 294).

¹⁸ In addition to being his reader, Proust knew Edmond de Goncourt socially. Proust’s mixed views of the man and his works can be read in “Les Goncourt devant leurs cadets: M. Marcel Proust,” an essay he wrote after receiving the Goncourt prize in 1919 for *À l’Ombre des jeunes filles en fleur*. The essay appeared in the posthumous edition of *Contre Sainte-Beuve* (337-39).

laid in 1916 because of the war, and it took another thirty years before they were published in their entirety. The postponement was widely discussed in the press and undoubtedly inspired Proust to compose the pastiche and add it to *Le Temps retrouvé* (Milly, "Le Pastiche Goncourt" 816). The pastiche carefully reproduces the most striking elements of the Goncourts' famous *écriture artiste* – its peculiar syntax, foreign expressions and invented words. As Jean Milly (in "Le Pastiche Goncourt") and R.A. Sayce have demonstrated in their careful analyses of the pastiche, most of the motifs, tropes, and linguistic structures used by Proust have almost verbatim equivalents in the *Journal* or in other writings of Edmond de Goncourt, most notably *La Maison d'un artiste* (the two-volume description of his home published in 1880).¹⁹ In the pastiche these elements are woven together into a dense, rich texture, a concentrated synthesis of Goncourt's style. It also displays the typical ambiguity of pastiches. On the one hand, it uses accurate imitation to reveal the artificiality and superficiality of Goncourt's writing as well as his self-centredness and his complete, naïve acceptance of the most uninteresting, doubtful or downright ludicrous anecdotes and pieces of information. To nail down the criticism, Proust makes his Narrator, the incurable insomniac, fall asleep in the middle of the reading. On the other, the pastiche evidently pays homage to the evocative power of Goncourt's decorative style and to the inclusiveness of the period detail in his writing. The retrospective mode of the Narrator (who writes in the past tense) is interrupted by Goncourt's energetic present, which can be seen anticipating the series of retrieved past experiences later in *Le Temps retrouvé*.

¹⁹ See especially Sayce (105-09). Sayce notes for instance the dramatic opening sentence of the pastiche: "*Tomber* [literally: to fall] is in this sense ['to drop by'] a favorite word of Goncourt and a number of examples could be adduced, two being especially close: 'Ce matin, dans ma toilette du matin, tombe Réjane tout tourbillonnante dans une pelisse rose' [. . .]; 'Ce matin, tombe chez moi, envoyé par Daudet, Barié le bras droit de Potain' [. . .]. The effect of this construction is to throw tremendous emphasis on the long-delayed subject; curiosity about this as yet unnamed person grows as the sentence progresses" (106-07). In the pastiche, the surprise effect is heightened by the fact that Goncourt discusses the dull Monsieur Verdurin, of all people.

In *Pastiche*, Richard Dyer highlights the precarious position of embedded pastiches which are simultaneously within and outside the framing narrative (64), the truthfulness of which they can either support or contest. In *Le Temps retrouvé*, the pastiche passage is followed by a lengthy commentary in which the Narrator analyses the mixed feelings created by the *Journal*, thus giving an indication of the role of the pastiche within the novel. Although the Narrator of course believes he is reading the real Goncourt diary and cannot therefore comment on its pastiche quality, his comments in effect constitute an indirect evaluation of the imitative aspect as well.

The Narrator's experience of the Goncourt *Journal* is influenced through and through by his own personal disappointment in literature, which is tied to his inability to begin a creative project. Thus he weighs the merits of Goncourt's writing in somewhat defensive terms, contrasting them to his own style, his own inner vision:

Comme un géomètre qui dépouillant les choses de leurs qualités sensibles ne voit que leur substratum linéaire, ce que racontaient les gens m'échappait, car ce qui m'intéressait, c'était non ce qu'ils voulaient dire mais la manière dont ils le disaient, en tant qu'elle était révélatrice de leur caractère ou de leurs ridicules; ou plutôt c'était un objet qui avait toujours été plus particulièrement le but de ma recherche parce qu'il me donnait un plaisir spécifique, le point qui était commun à un être et à un autre. [. . .] Aussi le charme apparent, copiable, des êtres m'échappait parce que je n'avais pas la faculté de m'arrêter à lui, comme un chirurgien qui, sous le poli d'un ventre de femme, verrait le mal interne qui le ronge. J'avais beau dîner en ville, je ne voyais pas les convives, parce que, quand je croyais les regarder, je les radiographiais. (*À la Recherche* 4: 296-97)

Just as a geometer, stripping things of their sensible qualities, sees only the linear substratum beneath them, so the stories that people told escaped me, for what interested me was not what they were trying to say but the manner in which they said it and the way in which this manner revealed their character or foibles; or rather I was interested in what had always, because it gave me special pleasure, been more particularly the goal of my investigations: the point that was common to one being and another. [. . .] So the apparent, copiable charm of things and

people escaped me, because I had not the ability to stop short there – I was like a surgeon who beneath the smooth surface of a woman's belly sees the internal disease which is devouring it. If I went to a dinner-party I did not see the guests: when I thought I was looking at them, I was in fact examining them with X-rays. (*In Search* 6: 39-40)

The Narrator operates, like the pasticheur in the previous sketch to *Le Côté de chez Swann*, at the deeper levels of observation, while the Goncourt *Journal* can only reproduce the superficial aspects of things. Therein lies the difference between art and documentation in the Narrator's view: art cannot yield to demands of truth as correspondence to the apparent – it reveals its own, inner truth. He thus makes the indirect claim that the characters of the Verdurin circle, as readers of the novel have learned to know them, are portraits created using this X-ray technique, while the new, surprising sides revealed in the Goncourt pastiche are the result of much more superficial observation.

Despite his criticism of the style of Goncourt, which rather takes the form of an apology for his own viewpoint, the Narrator is enchanted by the portraits offered by Goncourt. “[The p]restige of literature!” is his immediate reaction to the text that raises in him the urgent desire to meet the old acquaintances from the Verdurin circle again and while he recognises the dangers of illusion, this feeling does not loosen its grip on him (e.g., *À la Recherche* 4: 301). The pastiche demonstrates the ability of literature to make the past feel alive again and thereby to reinvigorate the readers' interest in its effects on their present lives.

It is maybe ironic that Proust chose to illustrate (not just describe) the power of literature in the form of pastiche. In fact, the Goncourt pastiche of *Le Temps retrouvé* has a unique position in *À la Recherche*. The most important artists of the novel – Bergotte, Berma, Elstir, Vinteuil – are all fictitious, and as much as the narrator describes their works and the effects they have on him, he does not offer his readers the possibility to experience them directly, not even in the case of Bergotte, the novelist. Nor are there any extensive quotations from the real writers the Narrator or his characters read or refer to. The pastiche of Goncourt, the only

work of art incorporated in the novel which engages intensively with art and literature, attests to the special insightfulness that Proust associated with this literary form.

Pastiche and Metaphor

Earlier, when discussing Maurois's pastiche of Proust, *Le Côté de Chelsea*, I suggested that its subtle metafictional theme is derived from *L'Affaire Lemoine*. I shall now look at how the power and limitations of pastiche are treated in Proust's own work and trace the connections between pastiche and Proust's conception of the structure and function of metaphor. Although Proust claimed to have picked the topic of the series by accident, the fact that he writes pastiches about a diamond *forger* is hardly innocent. For one thing, pastiche carries with it a persistent association with deception and counterfeiting and, for another, the diamonds Lemoine claims to be able to manufacture are in fact nothing but pastiches of diamonds, their artificial imitations (Genette, *Palimpsestes* 134).

The metafictional potential of the Lemoine topic is perhaps most evident at the end of the pastiche of Henri de Régner, a novelist and a poet, later also a member of the Académie française. Proust admired Régner's style despite some reservations,²⁰ and considered his Régner pastiche among the best in the cycle (*L'Affaire Lemoine* 133). It has not, however, attracted as much critical attention as the celebrated pastiche of Flaubert, analysed in detail by Genette (*Palimpsestes* 136-60), for instance. The Régner pastiche makes the most of the original author's predilection for creating suspense which never climaxes: Lemoine is shown waiting for someone in a garden, but the larger context of the scene is left deliberately obscure. The passage is characterised by an op-

²⁰ Michael R. Finn has aptly characterised Proust's approach to Régner as a particular blend of "deference and partially veiled disapproval" (136). Proust was critical of Régner's confusing use of pronouns as well as his predilection for repetition.

pressive sense of stagnation, until the text reaches a somewhat surprising conclusion:

Lemoine s'enrhumait. De son nez qu'il oubliait de moucher, un peu de morve avait tombé sur le rabat et sur l'habit. Son noyau visqueux et tiède avait glissé sur le linge de l'un, mais avait adhéré au drap de l'autre et tenait en suspens au-dessus du vide la frange argentée et fluente qui en dégouttait. Le soleil en les traversant confondait la mucosité gluante et la liqueur diluée. On ne distinguait plus qu'une seule masse juteuse, convulsive, transparente et durcie ; et dans l'éphémère éclat dont elle décorait l'habit de Lemoine, elle semblait y avoir immobilisé le prestige d'un diamant momentané, encore chaud, si l'on peut dire, du four dont il était sorti, et dont cette gelée instable, corrosive et vivante qu'elle était pour un instant encore, semblait à la fois, par sa beauté menteuse et fascinatrice, présenter la moquerie et l'emblème. (*Pastiches et mélanges* 23)

Lemoine had a cold. From his nose, which he forgot to wipe, a little mucus had fallen onto his shirtfront and onto his suit. Its viscous, warm core had slipped down the linen of one, but had adhered to the cloth of the other, and held the silvery, fluent fringe that dripped from it in suspense above the void. The sun, piercing them, confused the sticky mucus with the diluted solution. One could make out just the one single succulent, quivering mass, transparent and hardening; and in the ephemeral brilliance with which it decorated Lemoine's attire, it seemed to have fixed the prestige of a momentary diamond there, still hot, so to speak, from the oven from which it had emerged, and for which this unstable jelly, corrosive and alive as it was for one more instant, seemed at once, by its deceitful, fascinating beauty, to present both a mockery and a symbol. (*The Lemoine Affair* 34-35)

Whilst it might be interpreted as mockery of Régnier, the irony in this passage is also present in the source text, Régnier's *Le Bon plaisir* (1902), a historical novel including a description of the nightly procession of the Sun King through a small country village. The monarch's impressive retinue is followed by a group of musketeers on their neatly groomed horses. A keen observer with a taste for the piquant detail, Régnier's narrator ends his description of the pompous parade with the following sarcastic remark: "The solid rumps were glistening. One of them dropped a lump

of manure, golden like the medal of some monarch" (117-18).²¹ This detail provided Proust with an idea for the ending of his pastiche of Régnier.²² Not merely an expansion of the brief original – for sometimes pastiche expands on a trait or a detail instead of condensing it – the description also exemplifies the contradictory poetics of Proustian pastiche. Like the drop of mucus, which here poetically stands as both the mockery and symbol of a real diamond, pastiche too is a mockery and an emblematic synthesis of its counterpart, the supposedly unique, valuable source text.

The satire of the passage quoted above is thus not directed primarily at Régnier, although most readers unfamiliar with the passage in *Le Bon plaisir* might assume so – such indeterminacy of meaning being a constant feature of pastiche – but rather at Proust's own project, his elevation of the sordid tale of Lemoine into the topic of what Roland Barthes called "truly great theoretical analyses of style" ("La Crise" 5).²³ Nowhere in *L'Affaire Lemoine* is the silly topic elevated as pompously as here. The pastiche cuts both ways: it underlines the absurdity of the whole *L'Affaire Lemoine* but does so with a virtuosity that renders the text meaningful beyond its seemingly irrelevant topic.

I suggested earlier that the ending of Maurois's *Le Côté de Chelsea* – the elongated comparison between England and France that culminates in the astronomical metaphor emphasising the paradoxically invisible presence of France – is based on this structurally similar and likewise metafictional ending of Proust's pastiche of Régnier, where the piece of mucus is described in terms that make it an emblem for the doubleness of pastiche. The juxtaposi-

²¹ "Les croupes solides luisaient. L'une d'elles laissa tomber un crottin doré comme une médaille à quelque effigie souveraine."

²² The image of the falling lump of manure must have made an impression on Proust since there is, in his Régnier pastiche, another incident inspired by it: "Votives et pansues, des colombes venaient se percher dans les voussures de l'archivolte ou sur l'ébrasement du piédestal, et en laissaient souvent tomber une boule fade, écailleuse et grise" (*Pastiches et mélanges* 22). ("Votive and potbellied, doves came to perch in the alcoves of the archivolt or on the splay of the pedestal, and often let fall a drab ball, flaky and gray" [*The Lemoine Affair* 33].)

²³ "[. . .] très grandes analyses théoriques sur le style[.]"

tion of the two pastiches – “Proust” by Maurois and “Régnier” by Proust – reveals a further source of ambiguity in the description of the transitory diamond above: while the description of mucus as a diamond is inspired by Régnier’s style and while it rewrites the humorous description from *Le Bon plaisir*, the passage actually very much resembles Proust’s own style, especially the complicated layered metaphors which are one of the most distinctive stylistic features of *À la Recherche* (cf. Genette, *Palimpsestes* 134). Proust’s conception of metaphor goes beyond the ordinary linguistic understanding of the term: for him, metaphor means a kind of “double vision” whereby two distinct experiences or memories become connected (Milly, *Proust et le style* 87). This conception is one of the governing principles of *À la Recherche*, ranging from the smallest details to the larger structural frameworks. Metaphor provides for Proust (or for his Narrator, since the two are somewhat difficult to keep apart) a means of defeating the oppressive dominance of time’s flow: it is through this metaphorical layering that he is able to retrieve the lost time in his memory. In the quotation above from *Le Temps retrouvé*, the Narrator described this approach in terms of finding “the point that was common to one being and another.” Herein also lies the crux of Proust’s pastiches: they do not explore the “faults” in the individual writers’ styles, but the common points Proust felt between his own vision and those of the other writers. To be sure, the pastiches stress differentiation, and criticism is one of their functions, but there are also points at which the connection between Proust’s own style and that of the author being imitated becomes apparent. One is the exaggerated ending of the Régnier pastiche, another, the pastiche of the Goncourt *Journal* in *Le Temps retrouvé*. While the Narrator’s comments stress the fundamental difference between his own X-ray vision and the superficial vision of Goncourt, the juxtaposition of the two styles makes it possible to observe the similarities between the two writers. Both have a predilection for digressions, cultural references, anecdotes and the general diffuseness of writing (see the notes to the Pléiade edition, esp. *À la Recherche* 4: 1189). Both are accurate observers of social

behaviour and both insist on the fundamental inseparability of art and life (witness “Goncourt’s” description of Madame Verdurin as the heroine of Fromentin’s novel). While it brings out the differences between styles and writers, pastiche is thus also the site for exploring the affinity, the common points between two writers; a literary aspect of the metaphoric observation that constitutes the method, so to speak, of *À la Recherche*.

An expression for the connection between pastiche and metaphor can be found at the end of *Contre Sainte-Beuve* where the narrator²⁴ describes his talent at catching the underlying tone of a writer’s style but considers this talent wasted since he has not been able to put it to use in a creative project:

Je savais bien que si, n’ayant jamais pu travailler, je ne savais écrire, j’avais cette oreille-là plus fine et plus juste que bien d’autres, ce qui m’a permis de faire des pastiches, car chez les écrivains, quand on tient l’air, les paroles viennent bien vite. Mais ce don, je ne l’ai pas employé et, de temps en temps, à des périodes différents de ma vie, celui-là, comme celui aussi de découvrir un lien profond entre deux idées, deux sensations, je le sens toujours vif en moi, mais pas fortifié, et qui sera bientôt affaibli et mort. (*Contre Sainte-Beuve* 303)

I knew quite well that, if never having been able to work I was no good as a writer, my ear for this sort of thing was sharper and truer than is common, which was what had enabled me to produce literary imitations [sic], since when one picks up the tune the words soon follow. But I have not put this gift to use; and at different periods of my life I feel it, as likewise that other gift for discovering a profound affinity between two ideas or two feelings, still intermittently alive in me; but never taking hold, and soon to dwindle and die out. (*By Way of Sainte-Beuve* 193)

He then goes on to describe this ability personified as a young man (*garçon*) who lives in the ruins of his castles in the air. Nourished by ideas and by the connections they spark, or the “rarefied affinity” between one book and another, “[h]e, and no other, should write my books,” the narrator concludes, adding: “But

²⁴ The earlier version of the more prominent Narrator of *À la Recherche*.

would they be the better for it?" (*By Way of Sainte-Beuve* 194).²⁵ In this complex and confused description of the origins of creative activity, pastiche is juxtaposed with insight, and authorship is described as a kind of creation by proxy. Yet, this proxy can be none other than the writer himself, the only way to produce art being to take the way of introspection, discovery within the self (cf. *À la Recherche* 4: 459). Michael R. Finn, who looks at the pastiches of *L'Affaire Lemoine* in the context of Proust's development as a writer, analyses their significance as follows:

Proust's attentiveness to his own propensity to mime eventually led him to differentiate between instinctive style and intellectual style, to see that he parodied the manner of other writers in an instinctive reaction but that that same instinctive miming of physical impressions was the basis of his own creative writing" (137).

He goes on to describe Proust's creative process as a "self-pastiche": "When the writer realizes that the stuff of his novel is the impressions and memories of his own life, re-experienced with new awareness through a more attuned consciousness, he is free to 'write himself', and to write endlessly" (139). The pastiches reveal their larger significance in connection to Proust's other writings: in this perspective it is no longer tenable to think of them as mere stylistic exercises or literary play.

The Indeterminate Space of Pastiche

Even though Proust from time to time expressed impatience with pastiche – for instance in a letter to Princess Bibesco, where he declares himself to be "the enemy of all pastiche, except when it is intentional, and then too!" (*Correspondance* 9: 242),²⁶ the great care and pride he took in his pastiches is evident. In addition to the published pastiches which he polished and in some cases exten-

²⁵ "Il n'y a que lui qui devrait écrire mes livres. Mais aussi seraient-ils beaux" (*Contre Sainte-Beuve* 304).

²⁶ "[. . .] l'ennemi de tout pastiche, excepté quand il est voulu, et encore!"

sively rewrote for *Pastiches et mélanges*, he also wrote a number of occasional pastiches to amuse his friends. One of them – his imitation of the style of the critic Hippolyte Taine – is particularly interesting for the present discussion. Appended to a letter to his close friend Robert Dreyfus, who had earlier expressed great admiration of *L’Affaire Lemoine*, the Taine pastiche presents a critique of Proust’s own pastiche cycle in the style of the great nineteenth-century critic. Although it is obviously meant as a joke and as an indirect acknowledgement of Dreyfus’s praise, it nevertheless manages to condense in a few sentences not only Taine’s authorial tone but also the basics of his positivist criticism, according to which literature ought to be evaluated in its socio-historical context and in relation to the writer’s temperament. I enclose in my quotation the framing remarks from the letter in which the pastiche was included:

Merde pour les pastiches!

Explication par H. Taine des raisons pour lesquelles tu me rases à me parler des Pastiches

“Vous ouvrez un volume et vous tombez sur la première page: *L’Affaire Lemoine par Balzac*. Bon, dites-vous, voilà un écrivain qui connaît le fort et le faible des autres écrivains, qui se fait un jeu de reproduire avec l’allure générale de la pensée, la même gesticulation du style. Il sait que rien n’est négligeable de ce qui peut éclairer un type ou renseigner sur un temps ; il ne néglige aucune de ces particularités de la syntaxe qui trahissent le tour de l’imagination, les mœurs ambiantes, les idées reçues, le tempérament hérité, la faculté primordiale. C’est de la bonne caricature. Voilà qui va bien. Mais la caricature fatigue vite et vous n’aimez pas à être fatigué. Vous tournez la page et vous voulez aller aux choses sérieuses. Vous lisez la première ligne. *L’affaire Lemoine par Renan*. Bon Dieu, pensez-vous, voilà qui est abuser. Vous voulez bien d’une ou deux caricatures dans un vestibule, avant d’entrer dans la bibliothèque. Mais il est ennuyeux de rester indéfiniment dans le vestibule.[”]

Cela peut continuer longtemps comme ça! M.P. (*Correspondance* 9: 135)

Fuck the pastiche!

An explanation by H. Taine of the reasons why you bore me by talking about the Pastiches

“You open a book and your eyes fall on the first page: *The Lemoine Affair* by Balzac. Fine, you say, here is a writer who knows the strengths and weaknesses of other writers and who can easily inhabit a similar thought in order to reproduce the same stylistic gestures. He knows the importance of all those details which could throw light on a type or explain a period; he doesn’t ignore any of the syntactic details which can reveal the flight of imagination, the prevalent customs, the received ideas, the inherited temperament, the quintessential talent. It is a good caricature. So far so good. But caricature soon becomes tiresome and you don’t like being bored. You turn the page and want to proceed to serious matters. You read the first line. *The Lemoine Affair* by Renan. Good God, you think, is there no limit to this. You might enjoy one or two caricatures in the vestibule before entering the library. But it is annoying to remain forever in the vestibule.[”]

This could carry on and on! M.P.

This is a slyly twisted text. On the surface a critique of *L’Affaire Lemoine* in particular and pastiche form in general, it nevertheless celebrates Proust’s ability to capture and master other writers’ styles and reflects the pleasure Proust took in Dreyfus’s praise. Yet it voices a serious consideration: what are pastiches worth as literary creations? According to “Taine,” very little: they might amuse you for a moment, but ultimately you will be bored. They are merely paraliterature that detains readers from the more elevated company of originals. This is a common enough criticism and not one that may be easily dismissed. Proust answers this by turning the criticism ultimately against Taine himself: if the very qualities that Taine ascribed to a good critic apply equally well to the art of the pasticheur, does this not twist and annul Taine’s criticism or turn it against his own critical writing?

This is a clever example of pastiche as self-congratulatory criticism, but what interests me more than the critical acrobatics is the metaphor of pastiche as a vestibule that one traverses on one’s way to the library. A vestibule is a transitory space, a threshold that simultaneously connects and separates the inside and the outside. “Taine” chooses to interpret it in the latter role: pastiche is a hindrance that keeps the readers (or writers for that matter) from entering into the space of literature proper. Proust, by contrast, seems to wander to and fro: his career as a writer did not lead

through imitation to originality, following the paved path of tradition, but traversed the vestibule of pastiche several times. In the light of his writings on pastiche, it appears to be a contact point between reading and writing, a fruitful interface that nourishes both activities.

3.2 The Apocryphal Adventures of Sherlock Holmes

Detective fiction is a privileged genre for pastiche, for its popularity and conventions make it a particularly rewarding object of imitation. The genre is multiply involved in repetition. Favourite detective novels are usually part of a series built around the character of a detective. Repetition and variation of the central elements guarantee the unity of the series, the success of which depends on its ability to maintain a balance between the known and the surprising. The plots of detective fictions (whether part of a series or not) are based on reversed repetition: the detective begins with the outcome of the criminal's action – usually the body or the theft – and works backwards towards the starting-point. Thus the detective is simultaneously the double and the rival of the criminal: by retracing the crime, he or she aims to outwit the perpetrator. This process often includes various partial repetitions such as the witnesses' accounts or a staged reconstruction of the crime. The highly formulaic nature of detective fiction is in part explained by the genre's strong inclination to imitation. Successful plot devices and character types are quickly reproduced in other contexts. Detective fictions do not usually shy away from acknowledging their literary quality or debts, although this is often done in an offhand manner. An example can be found in Arthur Conan Doyle's first Sherlock Holmes novel *A Study in Scarlet* (1887), where Watson remarks that Holmes reminds him of Edgar Allan Poe's famous detective Dupin, and Holmes replies: "[I]n my opinion, Dupin was a very inferior fellow" (22). This repetitiveness of the genre lends itself to adaptation and rewriting. A special case of rewriting, pastiche takes the repetitiveness of the genre much further than many other kinds of rewriting, since in detective fiction pastiches the imitation of style is reinforced by the borrowing of character types, schematic plots and typical themes.

In this chapter I shall look at three pastiches of the Sherlock Holmes stories by Arthur Conan Doyle. In addition to the repetition that I identified above as a generic element, I will consider issues of authentication and contextualisation which are shown to be especially important in these three works. Nicholas Meyer's *The Seven-Per-Cent Solution* is now one of the best-known pastiches of the Sherlock Holmes stories. When published in 1974, it became a worldwide bestseller, followed by a film adaptation (1976, directed by Herbert Ross) and two sequels, *The West-End Horror* (1976) and *The Canary Trainer* (1993). It thus illustrates how a pastiche of a serial source text can become a series of its own.²⁷ *The Seven-Per-Cent Solution* introduces the famous detective to Sigmund Freud, and together the two solve a mystery that threatens international peace. *The Last Sherlock Holmes Story* (1978) is the first novel by Michael Dibdin, now chiefly known for his Aurelio Zen series. In this novel, Sherlock Holmes investigates the infamous Jack the Ripper murders.²⁸ The last example I shall look at actually precedes the other two: *The Exploits of Sherlock Holmes* (1952), co-authored by Arthur Conan Doyle's son Adrian Conan Doyle and the American mystery writer John Dickson Carr, is a collection of short stories which present Holmes in his familiar surroundings, solving cases with his faithful Dr. Watson. These pastiches arise from the background of a wealth of what could be called apocryphal publications about Sherlock Holmes: imitations, adaptations, parodies, semi-academic studies and academic studies. In addition to commenting on their immediate source texts, the pastiches reflect on the tradition they stem from.

Detective fiction pastiches provide a test case for my claim that pastiches tend to highlight issues of authorship and originality. It is often claimed that authorship is a secondary issue in

²⁷ The Sherlock Holmes stories have given rise to several series, such as the Irene Adler novels by Carole Nelson Douglas, Mary Russell series by Laurie R. King and the Sherlock Holmes series by June Thomson.

²⁸ Holmes has been associated with Jack the Ripper in a number of other works as well, such as the film *A Study in Terror* (1965, novelised in 1966) and Edward B. Hannah's novel *The Whitechapel Horrors* (1993). Likewise, Holmes and Freud have met several times, for instance, in Keith Oatley's *The Case of Emily V.* (1993).

popular literature. For instance, K.K. Ruthven writes that “[f]iction has to be ‘serious’ before authorship is taken seriously. Since neither spy-novels nor detective stories are thought of as literature with capital ‘L’, questions about who wrote them are considered not worth asking” (113). Similarly, Clive Bloom asserts in *Bestsellers* that “[p]seudonymous authorship [. . .] was and is almost *de rigueur*, the opposite of the cult of the author in ‘serious’ fiction” (8), and Gérard Leclerc compares popular literature to oral narration, neither of which bestows much emphasis on authorship (272-97). According to Leclerc, the authors of popular narratives resemble oral narrators in that both work with pre-existing materials such as plot patterns and character stereotypes which they assemble and transform into new combinations according to the requirements of the context. They are mediators rather than originators, and while the stories might survive, their tellers tend to be forgotten. Leclerc points out that although the author’s name almost invariably appears on the cover of the book, popular literature is essentially governed by anonymity (288), which manifests itself in various ways, ranging from the readers’ inability to name the authors of the popular novels they have read to the common use of pseudonyms which obfuscate the connection between the writer and the book (284-85, 289). Leclerc notes that the use of pseudonyms is remarkably frequent in nineteenth- and twentieth-century popular literature as well as in today’s detective fiction, seeing this as a manifestation of “the novelist’s denial of his authorship”: rather than as authors fully responsible for the text, writers of popular fiction regard themselves as craftsmen and textual workers (289).

The career of Arthur Conan Doyle offers some support for these views. Even though Doyle published the Sherlock Holmes stories under his own name, the fact that he used a prominent, realistic first-person narrator lead at least some credulous readers to believe that the stories were in fact written by Dr. Watson and that Arthur Conan Doyle acted merely as Watson’s literary agent (Sinclair ix). At first the Sherlock Holmes stories were a means for Doyle to mend his ailing finances, but as his literary aspirations

rose and the monetary worries were abolished by the huge commercial success of his stories, Doyle developed a deep dislike of his hero, who overshadowed his more ambitious literary projects (see Knight 97-101). Famously he solved this dilemma by plunging Holmes to the depths of the Reichenbach falls in the story entitled "The Final Problem." Once rid of the detective, he could concentrate on writing historical fiction, or so he thought, but the audience decided otherwise. Ten years later, Doyle resurrected Holmes in "The Empty House" and kept on producing more and more adventures and case-books of Holmes. In total, the Sherlock Holmes "canon" includes four novels and fifty-six short stories written between 1887 and 1927.

It could be said then, that Doyle did not assert himself strongly as the author of the Sherlock Holmes stories and that he used the figure of the detective for instrumental reasons. Moreover, he yielded to the pressure of the audience (although money issues paid a role as well) and brought his hero back on stage again. Like so many popular fictions, the Sherlock Holmes stories are now more readily known by the name of the character than that of the author. The strong claims about the insignificance of authorship in popular fiction quoted above, however, seem problematic in the light of Doyle's case. For one thing, Doyle did also take pride in the success of the stories, and his heirs have jealously protected the copyrights and Doyle's reputation over the years.²⁹ Moreover, while the Sherlock Holmes stories have spanned a wealth of imitations – De Waal's bibliography from 1980 lists over a thousand parodies and pastiches and more are published every year – the flood of rewritings has only consolidated the "original canon." It is indeed telling that the corpus of Doyle's Sherlock Holmes stories is usually referred to as the canon – literally a collection of sacred or authentic texts.³⁰ Doyle's stories are

²⁹ For instance, all the pastiches discussed in this chapter have been published with the permission from the copyright holders.

³⁰ E.g., Edgar W. Smith's introduction to a Sherlock Holmes story by Arthur Conan Doyle that was published under the puzzling title *The Field Bazaar: A Sherlock Holmes Pastiche* (1947). Smith presents the "canon" as a collection of sacred writings authored by Watson and discusses Doyle's original story as a pastiche or imi-

still very much the standard by which the new stories are evaluated, despite the fact that Holmes has become a shared cultural myth, a personification of rationalism.

Corrective and Complementary Pastiches

In hindsight it is easy to analyse the elements of the success of the Holmes stories. The warm-hearted, not too bright and immediately likeable Dr. Watson makes an interesting contrast to the eccentric detective. Although Holmes lives on as the never-erring superhuman defender of justice, especially in the popular imagination, in Doyle's stories he is described as a strikingly contradictory character who suffers from boredom, does not shy away from criminal activities if they help him to get what he wants and resorts to the cocaine-syringe in bouts of melancholia. In the stories, the rational ethos and scientific method of Holmes are counteracted by the irrational and sensational elements. A peculiar element of the stories' charm consists of the omissions that have given rise to ardent speculation. Who is Professor Moriarty (apart from Doyle's means of getting rid of Holmes in "The Final Problem"), and whence does his reputation as the criminal mastermind stem? Why does Holmes have such a problematic relationship with women? Moreover, Doyle's unwitting errors and gaffes have puzzled readers. References to Watson's wives are confusing (is he a bigamist?), and the doctor's trademark wound travels from the elbow to the foot. The stories, which purport to provide rational answers to the dilemmas presented in them, are in themselves full of gaps and inconsistencies that offer fruitful starting-points for rewritings (see Belsey 109-17).

tation: "As imitations go, it is a good one," he writes, "it is, in fact, one of the best ever done, despite the readily-observed lapses and lacunae which stamp it as Conanical rather than canonical." (9) Originally published in the student magazine of the University of Edinburgh in 1896, *The Field Bazaar* is a self-parodic fragment of a story in which Doyle makes fun of his own mannerisms. It was never included in the collected Sherlock Holmes stories, hence its "apocryphal" status.

The pastiches of the Sherlock Holmes stories divide into two main groups according to their relationship to the source texts. *Corrective pastiches* – such as *The Seven-Per-Cent Solution* and *The Last Sherlock Holmes Story* – return to the world of the originals in order to account for the inconsistencies and mistakes. Favourite targets are the short stories “The Final Problem” and “The Empty House” which are presented as “hoaxes”: by contrast, the pastiches offer what they claim to be a truthful account of the sudden disappearance of Holmes at the Reichenbach falls. The original stories and their improbable solution to the disappearance and return of Holmes become the mystery to be solved in the pastiches, in which the gaps and gaffes function as clues to the fuller narrative behind the unsatisfactory account provided by Watson/Doyle. The pasticheurs thus use Holmes’s ratiocinative method to account for the improbabilities in the source texts. Yet the unity and order they seek to establish in the narrative of Sherlock Holmes will in some sense always fail: they can neither completely eradicate the source texts – the “wrong” versions – nor account for their existence (why did Watson/Doyle write these bogus stories)? The corrective impulse is evident already in the title of Dibdin’s *The Last Sherlock Holmes Story*, which implies that it is the last and hence definitive story that can be told of Holmes. Yet it also parodies Doyle’s titles “The Final Problem” (1893) and “His Last Bow” (1917), neither of which really was the last Sherlock Holmes story. Moreover, by staging the famous rush to the Reichenbach falls twice (see pp. 290-91), Dibdin underlines the playful repetitiveness of the pastiche.

The other type of pastiches continues the original series in a straightforward manner. These *complementary pastiches* – for instance *The Exploits of Sherlock Holmes* and June Thomson’s Sherlock Holmes series³¹ – draw their inspiration from the many stories Watson refers to but does not recount in full. These references point out the “absence” of texts from the canon, a gap comple-

³¹ This now five-volume series began with *The Secret Files of Sherlock Holmes* in 1990. The latest volumes are *The Secret Documents of Sherlock Holmes* (1997) and *The Secret Notebooks of Sherlock Holmes* (2004).

mentary pastiches aim to fill. Unlike corrective pastiches, they do not aim to criticise and contest the existing stories: they stay within the familiar story-world and extend its perpetual present. Holmes does not change or get old, and he and Watson are ever ready for new adventures.

Regardless of the orientation, a common feature in the Sherlock Holmes pastiches is their pseudo-academic appearance: they are furnished with prefaces, explanatory notes and epilogues. Detective fiction is a bookish genre – letters, ciphers, literary quotations are common – and the habit of Doyle of investing his novels with (sub)titles such as “Being a reprint from the reminiscences of John H. Watson MD, late of the Army Medical Department” or “Extract from the diary of Dr. Watson” may function as an inspiration for the paratexts framing the pastiches, but their excesses call for further interpretation. Moreover, some of the stories in Doyle’s corpus, such as the prominent “The Final Problem” and “The Speckled Band” are in fact presented as corrective rewritings to begin with. At the beginning of the former, Doyle’s narrator Dr. Watson writes:

My hand has been forced, however, by the recent letters in which Colonel James Moriarty defends the memory of his brother, and I have no choice but to lay the facts before the public exactly as they occurred. I alone know the absolute truth of the matter, and I am satisfied that the time has come when no good purpose is to be served by its suppression.” (*Sherlock Holmes* 421)

He then goes on to review three earlier accounts of the death of Sherlock Holmes which are all dismissed as inadequate. Corrective pasticheurs in particular have benefited from this acknowledgement, which illustrates the power of rewritings or fictions of rewritings. Textual lineage – whether imagined or real – gives the text a special kind of credibility. The fact that so many Sherlock Holmes pastiches are also presented as rewritings where Watson returns to an enigmatic case and offers a more satisfactory account of it, underlines the commentary relationship the pastiches have to their source texts. They participate in the construction of a canon within the canon by referring frequently to certain stories

and castigating others (e.g., Meyer, *The Seven-Per-Cent Solution* 5-6), and draw attention to the central elements as well as the gaps in the source texts. The pseudo-academic apparatus also functions as a commentary on the pastiches: the notes and prefaces justify the imitation and establish its connection to the source texts. Metafictionality is thus an element of realism both in the source texts and the pastiches.

Finally, the Sherlock Holmes pastiches are – despite their varying aims – fundamentally homages. This is of course a common effect in pastiches, but the perspective of narration in the original Sherlock Holmes stories markedly enhances the effect. Doyle's Watson depicts his friend as an admirable character and it would be hard to pastiche the originals in a convincing way if one wanted to alter this emotional undercurrent of the narration. Watson's admiration, devotion, and unfailing friendship reflect a common pasticheurs' attitude towards the texts they imitate. None of the three pastiches under investigation radically destroys Holmes or turns Watson against him. All of them even quote Watson's verdict of his (supposedly) dead friend at the end of "The Final Problem": "He was the best and wisest man I have ever known" (Dibdin 165, 190; Doyle and Carr 338; Meyer, *The Seven-Per-Cent Solution* 38).

Deceptive Appearances: *The Seven-Per-Cent Solution* by Nicholas Meyer

The pastiches of the Sherlock Holmes stories abound with iconic paraphernalia. It is apparently impossible to imitate Doyle without referring to central imagery of Holmes and his surroundings: the Persian slipper (where he keeps his tobacco), his Stradivarius or the smoke-filled atmosphere of the bachelor pad at 221b Baker Street where the ring of the doorbell or hasty steps on the stairs

announce the appearance of a new client.³² But to create an illusion of Doyle's style and to justify the paratextual claims of authenticity, a pasticheur must do something other than merely recycle the famous props. Much of the source text's power lies in the dramatic, detailed prose that guides the reader towards the climax and solution of the mystery. The following scene from "The Speckled Band" (1892) offers a condensed and effective example of some of the common stylistic means used by Doyle. Watson and Holmes are discussing the preceding visit of a client when they are suddenly interrupted:

'[. . .] But what, in the name of the devil!'

The ejaculation had been drawn from my companion by the fact that our door had been suddenly dashed open, and that a huge man framed himself in the aperture. His costume was a peculiar mixture of the professional and of the agricultural, having a black top-hat, a long frock-coat, and a pair of high gaiters, with a hunting-crop swinging in his hand. So tall was he that his hat actually brushed the cross-bar of the doorway, and his breadth seemed to span it across from side to side. A large face, seared with a thousand wrinkles, burned yellow with the sun, and marked with every evil passion, was turned from one to the other of us, while his deep-set, bile-shot eyes, and the high thin fleshless nose, gave him somewhat the resemblance to a fierce old bird of prey.

'Which of you is Holmes?' asked this apparition. (*Sherlock Holmes* 145)

Even though the readers remain at this point unaware of the identity of the intruder (Dr. Grimesby Roylott of Stoke Moran), there is no doubt that they have encountered the villain of the story. Watson's description of him is in accordance with Holmes's method of investigation, in which special attention is given to the interpretation of details. Instead of a list of pure facts, Watson offers us a dramatic presentation which immediately makes us grasp the nature of the character. The scene is carefully constructed

³² The famous deerstalker is, however, the invention of illustrators and filmmakers. The trademark line "Elementary, my dear Watson" – which appears in many pastiches (Doyle and Carr 313; see also Meyer, *The Seven-Per-Cent Solution* 148) and almost all parodies – is, as Catherine Belsey points out, a misquotation (111).

with suggestive details: Holmes's instinctive exclamation "in the name of the devil" foregrounds the devilishness of Roylott, and the surroundings seem to shrink in comparison to the powerful presence of the man – the door is narrowed into an aperture, and Roylott's hat brushes against its cross-bar. The hunting crop implies a violent character but also alludes to the means of the murder (Roylott uses a whip to control his "weapon," a poisonous snake). The sentences are fairly complex, and the description proceeds in an organised manner from the overall appearance to the man's eyes and beak-like nose which prompt a typically Doylean animal comparison that captures the essence of the man. The picture of Dr. Roylott as a bird of prey complements the description given earlier of his intended victim as a "hunted animal" (138). The style of the passage is in accordance with the "fair play" rule of classic detective fiction: the reader has access to the relevant information and can compete with the detective in figuring out the puzzle.³³

The unexpected or otherwise dramatic entrance of a significant character is a trademark scene of Doyle's and a common subject of imitation in the pastiches. The following passage from Nicholas Meyer's *The Seven-Per-Cent Solution* offers a subtler but still recognisable variant of the situation:

I was on the point of asking Holmes to explain his remark when the door was opened and into the room stepped a bearded man of medium height and stooped shoulders. I took him to be in his early forties though I subsequently learned he was only thirty-five. Through his faint smile I saw an expression of infinite sadness, coupled, as it seemed to me, with infinite wisdom. His eyes were more remarkable than anything else in his face. They were not particularly large, but they were dark and deep-set, shadowed by an over-hanging brow and piercing in their intensity. He wore a dark suit with a gold chain peeping under his jacket and stretched across his waistcoat. (89-90)

³³ This convention was, however, only in the process of emerging at the time when "The Speckled Band" was written. For an account of the function of clues and the development of the detective fiction genre, see Franco Moretti, "Graphs, Maps, Trees: Abstract Models for Literary History 3" (*New Left Review* 28 [2004]). Today's readers might find the fantastic or absurd elements of the stories more appealing than their apparent rationality.

The gentleman greets Holmes and Watson politely but gets an agitated response from (the cocaine-ridden) Holmes:

‘You may remove that ludicrous beard,’ he [Holmes] said [. . .]. ‘And kindly refrain from employing that ridiculous comic opera accent. I warn you, you’d best confess or it will go hard with you. That game is up, Professor Moriarty!’

Our host turned slowly to him, allowing for the full effect of his piercing gaze, and said, in a soft voice: ‘My name is Sigmund Freud.’
(90)

Some stylistic differences are evident in this passage: the sentences are less complex, Holmes sounds like a cross between the Victorian detective and an action film hero, the description does not conclude in a suggestive trope,³⁴ and Watson’s point of view (“I took him to be,” “I saw,” “it seemed to me”) is more explicit than in the extract from “The Speckled Band.” The introduction of Freud may strike us as less effective than that of Dr. Roylott, but the difference is justified, since the description reflects the character of the person in question and, unlike his brutal colleague, Dr. Freud appears to be a calm yet compassionate scientist.³⁵ Both descriptions note the same features: the man’s posture, his clothing and the social status they imply, the expression on his face – in short, his overall appearance. This kind of style invites a

³⁴ Meyer’s Watson nevertheless uses the device elsewhere in *The Seven-Per-Cent Solution*: for instance, when he compares Holmes to a bloodhound (194) and the (fake) Baroness reclining in her divan to a “graceful bird at the centre of her nest” (172). The pastiche comparisons are as straightforward as Doyle’s own animal metaphors.

³⁵ For yet another example, compare the introduction of Freud to a less vivid but still characteristic description of the client in Doyle’s “The Five Orange Pips”: “The man who entered was young, some two-and-twenty at the outside, well-groomed and trimly clad, with something of refinement and delicacy in his bearing. The streaming umbrella which he held in his hand, and his long shining waterproof told of the fierce weather through which he had come. He looked about him anxiously in the glare of the lamp, and I could see that his face was pale and his eyes heavy, like those of a man who is weighed down with some great anxiety” (*Sherlock Holmes* 86).

straightforward interpretation: the person is as he looks. Royslott is a brute, Freud a deeply perceptive scientist.

Appearances can, however, be deceptive. In Doyle's stories, Sherlock Holmes turns this to his advantage by performing investigations in disguise. The disguise motif is often repeated in pastiches, and in Meyer's novel (e.g., *The Seven-Per-Cent Solution* 67-69), where the overt, material disguises, such as false beards, are juxtaposed with the more complex psychological roles and masks studied by Freud. The novel seeks to supplement the world of the source texts with an understanding of the unconscious and brings together the two great turn-of-the-century methodologies: psychoanalysis in its nascent state and Holmes's method of rational detection. The choice of the pastiche form proves problematic for the presentation of the former: the realistic style of the source texts does not allow for the exploration of the unconscious except fairly superficially. (Meyer is especially fond of the therapeutic cliché of hypnosis, hinted at in the description above by the mention of Freud's fob watch.) The similarities and differences between psychoanalysis and the science of detection are used instead to ignite a personal competition between Holmes and Freud. Unlike Dr. Royslott, who poses a physical threat, Dr. Freud offers an intellectual challenge to Holmes. In the above scene Freud clearly has the upper hand: he calmly evaluates the situation while the cocaine-ridden Holmes makes himself a fool since he cannot read the signs correctly. Meyer supplants Professor Moriarty with Dr. Freud and reverses the traditional roles: now Watson is the one in the know, and Holmes is the client in need of professional help.³⁶ Although Holmes later exhibits the powers of his mind by solving a mystery relating to one of Freud's patients,³⁷ it is Freud who in

³⁶ In *The Seven-Per-Cent Solution* the criminal mastermind Professor Moriarty is revealed as the product of Holmes's troubled mind. The real Professor Moriarty, tells Meyer's Watson, is an ordinary mathematics tutor, who taught the young Holmes.

³⁷ This mystery takes up less space in the novel than the solution to Holmes's cocaine problem. It includes, however, a number of elements with special significance for the pastiche form: the crime involves a case of inheritance, patricide and the supplanting of the "original" (the real wife of the Baron Von Leinsdorf)

the end manages to discover the root cause of Holmes's depression – a discovery which elicits from Watson the praise: "You are the greatest detective of all" (*The Seven-Per-Cent Solution* 231).

The Seven-Per-Cent Solution is a corrective pastiche because it seeks to offer a true account of the case that led Watson to write the bogus story "The Final Problem," but also because it offers a psychoanalytical interpretation of many of Holmes's stranger habits. His cocaine addiction, aversion to women and obsession with "wickedness" and "injustice" are shown to derive from the childhood trauma of witnessing his mother's infidelity being punished by the father (227-28). Thus the novel offers a larger context for the original Sherlock Holmes stories, to which it frequently refers. The notable popularity of Meyer's novel is in part due to its relationship with the "canon," which it introduced to a new readership: the frequent references to the source text and explanations of details serve as a helpful résumé of the canon. *The Seven-Per-Cent Solution* updated the corpus of Doyle's stories by bringing it into interaction with one of the most notable figures of the era, thus linking the famously ahistorical stories to a cultural context. Moreover, the psychoanalytic criticism of detective fiction had, ever since the 1950s, established a connection between psychoanalysis and detection, based on the central roles that gaps, inconsistencies and interpretations have in both phenomena. Meyer's novel thus illustrates how pastiches often arise from a cultural context larger than their immediate source texts and how they comment on the reception history of the originals. Corrective and contextualising, *The Seven-Per-Cent Solution* has subsequently become established as a "canonical" pastiche of the Sherlock Holmes stories, and has served as a source of inspiration to many subsequent rewriters.³⁸

with an impostor. In addition, the real Baroness is traumatised to the extent that she has become mute (cf. pastiche as the usurpation of someone else's voice).

³⁸ For the publication history, initial reception and further reputation of *The Seven-Per-Cent Solution*, see Meyer's "Seven-Per-Cent at Thirty: Memories and Reflections."

Reichenbach Revisited: *The Last Sherlock Holmes Story* by Michael Dibdin

Michael Dibdin's *The Last Sherlock Holmes Story* begins with the key question of detective fiction – whodunit – but in this case the question applies first to the narrative itself. Who is its author? The fictitious editors of the preface claim to have found a manuscript purporting to be the true account of the death of Sherlock Holmes, written by Dr. Watson. Convincing evidence is offered to support its authenticity. The “manuscript” itself begins with a familiar scene – Watson describing yet another quiet morning at the Baker Street lodgings, interrupted by hasty steps on the stairs. At this point, the narrative comes to a halt and Watson confesses that he was not the author of the original stories, which were written by his “friend A.C.D.” on the basis of his notes (14-17). Here we have Watson writing a story for the first time and discouraged by the example of A.C.D. only after half a page: “No, this really won't do. I thought I might give my story a little more conviction if I at least tried to echo A.C.D., but I cannot even manage that” (13). *The Last Sherlock Holmes Story* thus opens with a negative pastiche contract – “here Watson/Dibdin is not imitating Arthur Conan Doyle” – which simultaneously affirms the source text and gives the pasticheur more freedom with details than a claim to faithfulness would give. Yet “Watson's” report reads very much like the stories of Arthur Conan Doyle, whose style is evoked both in imitation and quotation. Readers familiar with the “canon” will recognise extensive quotations from and variations of “The Final Problem” and “The Empty House” (1903) as well as the novel *The Sign of Four* (1890). The negative pastiche contract proves to be one of the false clues typical of the detective fiction genre, and as such is indicative of the playful metafictionality that characterises Dibdin's novel as a whole.

In the fictive world of *The Last Sherlock Holmes Story*, the whodunit question pertains to the famous Whitechapel murders investigated by Holmes. Holmes identifies Professor Moriarty as Jack the Ripper and chases him to the Reichenbach falls, where

the Professor dies, and Holmes returns to England. Watson, however, becomes gradually aware of the inconsistencies in this alleged solution to the abominable murders and discovers, to his horror, that Jack the Ripper is no other than Holmes himself. Another chase to the Reichenbach falls follows, ending with a final moment of insight when the mentally disturbed Holmes realises the consequences of his crimes and commits suicide by plunging into the depths of the falls. The novel takes its cue from the historical fact that at the time of the Whitechapel murders the police received a number of letters – written in different styles – where “Jack the Ripper” confessed the murders. Published in the newspapers, the letters produced what could be called pastiche effects: they brought about hoax letters signed by Ripper and possibly also led to copycat murders.³⁹ As the story evolves, the novel gradually constructs an analogy between the acts of the pasticheur and the acts of the murderer. Both involve a play of identity – Holmes acting as Ripper/Moriarty and Dibdin acting as Doyle/Watson – but the novel also suggests an affinity between their respective deeds. Holmes kills, mutilates, and dismembers the women, while Dibdin cuts pieces from the source text, imitating it in a deliberately subversive manner and creating a new story which attacks the “truths” of the source text. In the end, Dibdin finally does away with Holmes, letting him plunge once again into the Reichenbach Falls – this time haunted by an inner demon.

The rather grim analogy between the murderer and the pasticheur is reinforced with the final piece of evidence that compels Watson to acquiesce in the fact that his beloved friend is indeed the cruel murderer. It is a pastiche poem attached to a jar containing the womb and foetus of one of the victims. Based on the Christmas carol “Once in Royal David’s City,”⁴⁰ the poem celebrates the brutal killing of the prostitute:

³⁹ See the entry on the Ripper in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*.

⁴⁰ “Once in royal David’s city, / Stood a lowly cattle shed, / Where a mother laid her Baby, / In a manger for His bed: / Mary was that mother mild, / Jesus Christ, her little Child.” (Lyrics by Mrs. C.F. Alexander.) The poem written by Holmes is modelled on “Eight little whores, with no home of heaven,” a poem based on a children’s song and published in the Ripper’s name.

Once in Royal Victoria's City
stood a lowly courtyard shed
Where a Mother took a stranger
He took her, and now she's dead:
Kelly was that Mother wild
In this jar her little child. (165)

This is the final blow that turns Watson against Holmes, despite their friendship: "How dangerously demoralising it was [. . .] to confront a man capable of brutally murdering a young mother, bottling her gravid womb, and then celebrating this infamy with a diabolical pastiche of one of our finest Christmas hymns!" (172) Identified explicitly as a pastiche (although it could also be termed a travesty), the poem has a similar function to the historical letters sent to the police by (or in the name of) Jack the Ripper, being both a confession ("this novel is a pastiche") and a challenge to the readers whose task it is to detect and decide on the motivation of the imitation. If pastiche is a crime, as Dibdin's novel suggests, wherein lays its target and what precisely makes it illicit?

Dibdin's pastiche novel destroys Holmes as an ideal and ideological figure, the defender of justice and champion of rational deduction. Unlike Meyer, who uses a rival figure (Freud) to challenge Holmes, Dibdin turns Holmes into Moriarty, his worst adversary, by transferring the battle between the good and the evil inside Holmes's head. Thus he only internalises what was already apparent in Doyle's stories. He highlights the dark side of Holmes – the misogyny that aligns him with the historical Ripper, his cocaine addiction and his *Übermensch* beliefs.⁴¹ *The Last Sherlock Holmes Story* is a corrective pastiche in the sense that it claims to offer the true version of Holmes's death but also in the sense that it seeks to alert its readers to the darker elements of the source text. Like the pastiche hymn written by Holmes/Ripper, Dibdin's novel blasphemes by imitating a "holy" text, the "canon" of the original stories by Arthur Conan Doyle.

⁴¹ In "The Norwood Builder" (1903), Holmes laments the death of Professor Moriarty, which left him without an intellectual equal (*Sherlock Holmes* 456).

Yet the novel also preserves the source text and its values. The story is engaging and full of details, and Watson is ever the faithful friend and companion. Holmes is defeated but yet glorified in the final sober moments before he commits suicide at the Reichenbach falls. A.C.D. is discredited yet indirectly celebrated as the author of the source text. The famous stories “The Final Problem” and “The Empty House” are deconstructed only to be reconstructed. A double-edged literary form, pastiche adds another metafictional layer to the Holmesian story-world without compromising the necessary reality effect and turns the blasphemous treatment of the source texts into an ambiguous act of homage.

Anxiety of Authenticity: *The Exploits of Sherlock Holmes* by Doyle and Carr

Like *The Last Sherlock Holmes Story*, *The Exploits of Sherlock Holmes* by Adrian Conan Doyle and John Dickson Carr begins with a quest for the author. It differs, however, from Dibdin’s novel, as well as from the works of Meyer and June Thomson, in that its preface is not a part of the fictive world where manuscripts are found and authenticated. Signed by anonymous “editors,” the preface seeks to explain and justify the origin of the pastiche stories and thus direct the way in which the stories are read. It begins as a protracted eulogy to Arthur Conan Doyle, always titled “Sir Arthur,” who is straightforwardly identified with the hero of the stories: “[t]he chivalry of Holmes, his penetrating mind, his erudition, his physical feats and his entire character are really and truly those of the genius who created him” (vii). This claim suggests that the pastiche collection offers a normative, sanitised version of the originals, for the Holmes of Arthur Conan Doyle is perhaps more famous for misogynist prejudice than chivalry (which is

Watson's cup of tea),⁴² and his education is found sorely lacking in *A Study in Scarlet* (18). The identification of the author with his protagonist (which is never suggested in the source texts) is a means of reinforcing Doyle's authority as it places the origin of the stories in the author's unique life experiences.⁴³ The preface to *The Exploits of Sherlock Holmes* thus suppresses the original fiction of authorship, whereby Watson is the author of the stories and Doyle merely his publisher or agent. Furthermore, it replaces that authorship with another fiction by constructing an autobiographical relation as a guarantee of authenticity. This significant relationship is, claim the editors, inherited by his son, Adrian Conan Doyle:

Adrian Conan Doyle, the author of *Heaven Has Claws* (a personal-experience book about his deep-sea fishing expeditions), was brought up in the tradition of the Victorian era and in close contact with his father. Like the elder Doyle, Adrian developed a lust for adventure, for relics of the past, and the same sense of chivalry that so completely characterized his father – or should we say Holmes?

Adrian Conan Doyle used the very same desk on which his father wrote. Surrounded by the same objects that his father handled, he in every way endeavoured, in his new Holmes tales, to recreate each particle of atmosphere that formed Sir Arthur's environment. (ix)

It is not uncommon for pasticheurs also to be presented as authors of their own (and therefore authentic) works, since it proves them to be something more than mere epigones. But in this case the writer's own merits are inconsequential when juxtaposed with the more important source of authority, his similarity to his father: both men have the same upbringing (although Adrian was born in 1910 and grew up in Edwardian, not Victorian England) and have

⁴² The image constructed of Holmes/Doyle in the preface is actually undermined in one of the stories of *The Exploits of Sherlock Holmes*, in which Watson explicitly draws attention to Holmes's "unreasonable aversion to women" (336).

⁴³ Sir Joseph Bell, the tutor of Doyle senior, is usually identified as the real-life model for Holmes. The preface of *The Exploits of Sherlock Holmes* neither mentions Bell nor Holmes's immediate literary models, the most important of which is Poe's detective Dupin.

worked at the same desk. By twisting facts and highlighting suggestive details, the editors of the preface weave together the father and his two “sons,” the literal and literary son. Together Doyle Sr., Holmes and Doyle Jr. are meant to form a unity (or rather a trinity) that guarantees the authenticity of the pastiches in *The Exploits of Sherlock Holmes*.

Where does the almost compulsive need to assert the authenticity (both of the originals and the pastiches) stem from? *The Exploits of Sherlock Holmes* was published in 1952, when it was already obvious that Holmes had secured a position in the imagination of an ever-growing readership. The characters and style of the original stories were still protected by copyright laws (Doyle Sr. having died in 1930), which made it necessary to distinguish authoritative sequels from the illegitimate ones which were sprouting everywhere. The preface furnishes the pastiches of *The Exploits of Sherlock Holmes* with the same pedigree as the source texts in an effort to open the canon to further authentic adventures, but also to close it from other appropriators. Like Dibdin’s last Holmes story, *The Exploits of Sherlock Holmes* seeks to pre-empt other rewritings but, unlike Dibdin, who ironically acknowledges the impossibility of the task, the editors of *The Exploits of Sherlock Holmes* are more earnest in their attempt.⁴⁴ The family connection proves an apparently indisputable argument: if the son is an image – an imitation – of the father, it is natural that he should be allowed to pastiche his father’s work. The contribution of John Dickson Carr is understandably toned down in the preface.⁴⁵

As to the stories themselves, the preface claims them to be “painstaking reproductions of the originals” although they never-

⁴⁴ At the end of the last story of *The Exploits of Sherlock Holmes*, Watson writes: “My task is done. My note-books have been replaced in the black tin deed-box where they have been kept in recent years and, *for the last time*, I have dipped my pen in the ink-well” (337, emphasis added).

⁴⁵ Carr co-authored the first six stories of *The Exploits of Sherlock Holmes*, while the six remaining adventures are by Adrian Conan Doyle alone. Carr is yet another example of a pasticheur who has also written a biography of the author whom he pastiches (*The Life of Sir Arthur Conan Doyle* was published in 1949, three years before the pastiches).

theless have “new plots” (x). Each of them is based on a specific case Watson alludes to in the stories of Doyle Sr., but which are, for one reason or another, left untold. Unlike most pastiches, which indicate the source text they are based on, the pastiches of *The Exploits of Sherlock Holmes* therefore refer to stories that do not exist. Thus the apparent contradiction in the claims of the preface – how can a story be a faithful reproduction and yet new at the same time? – is further complicated by the virtual absence of the “originals,” which gives them an aura of the paradox of the simulacrum, a copy for which there is no original (see pp. 182-83 of this study).

As it turns out, however, the stories of *The Exploits of Sherlock Holmes* are in fact concoctions of elements from the existing stories. For instance, “The Red Widow” begins with a scene which repeats the beginning of “The Cardboard Box,” where Holmes seems to be reading Watson’s thoughts,⁴⁶ and the ingenious solution – the murderer is hiding inside the wall of an ancient house – is taken directly from “The Norwood Builder.” “The Seven Clocks,” where the sanity of a nobleman is in doubt because he smashes all the clocks that he sees, draws its inspiration from the peculiar mystery of “The Six Napoleons” where busts of the emperor incite similar acts of vandalism. The revenge of a foreign secret society provides a puzzle for Sherlock Holmes both in “The Five Orange Pips” (by Doyle Sr.) and “The Dark Angels” (by Doyle Jr.). Thus on closer inspection the *exploits* turn out to be

⁴⁶ In the scene from “The Cardboard Box,” Watson is sitting in his arm-chair thinking when Holmes interrupts: “‘You are right, Watson,’ said he. ‘It does seem a most preposterous way of settling a dispute.’ ‘Most preposterous!’ I exclaimed, and then suddenly realizing how he had echoed the inmost thought of my soul, I sat up in my chair and stared at him in blank amazement. ‘What is this, Holmes?’ I cried. ‘This is beyond anything which I could have imagined.’” (Doyle, *Sherlock Holmes* 257) Compare this with Doyle and Carr: “‘Your conclusions are perfectly correct, my dear Watson,’ remarked my friend Sherlock Holmes. ‘Squalor and poverty are the natural matrix of crimes of violence.’ ‘Precisely so,’ I agreed. ‘Indeed, I was just thinking –’ I broke off to stare at him in amazement. ‘Good heavens, Holmes,’ I cried, ‘this is too much. How could you possibly know my innermost thoughts!’” (311) Both scenes are followed by Holmes’s explanation of how he deduced Watson’s train of thought.

exploitation, rather straightforward selection and variation of plot patterns or themes from existing stories.

Nowhere is this as evident as in the story of “The Deptford Horror” (written by Adrian Conan Doyle alone) which repeats, in minute detail, the plot of one of the most famous Sherlock Holmes stories, “The Speckled Band,” which is often said to have been the personal favourite of Doyle Sr.⁴⁷ Although the pastiche is set in urban London, and the original mostly in rural Surrey, both recount a story about an eccentric man, who after many years abroad settles back in England and attempts to murder his niece/protégée in the hope of securing the girl’s inheritance. Both stories focus on the unusual vehicle the murderers have chosen: poisonous exotic animals. In “The Speckled Band,” Dr. Roylott (whose description was quoted above) ushers a poisonous swamp adder into the girl’s room through the ventilator and then calls the trained snake back with a whistle, leaving no trace of the murder weapon. In “The Deptford Horror,” the singing of the specially trained canaries attracts giant Cuban spiders to the victim through the ventilation channels on an old house. Both perpetrators have killed before, although only Dr. Roylott looks the part: Wilson the canary trainer is by contrast described as a harmless fellow,⁴⁸ which draws attention to the only change that Doyle Jr. had made to the plot of its source text: unlike “The Speckled Band,” in “The Deptford Horror” the murderer and his motive are revealed only towards the end. The focus of the story is thus more ambiguous than in the source text, where Dr. Roylott is from the beginning suggested as the murderer, and the puzzle pertains only to the method used. In all other respects “The Deptford Horror” repeats the stages of the plot from the introduction of the case to the interval of uncertainty, to Holmes’s sudden realisation, the

⁴⁷ See, for instance, Hodgson (318-19).

⁴⁸ “But when [. . .] I entered our sitting-room, I found that our spare chair was occupied by a bespectacled middle-aged man. As he rose to his feet, I observed that he was of an exceeding thinness and that his face, which was scholarly and even austere in expression, was seamed with countless wrinkles and of that dull parchment-yellow that comes from years under a tropic sun” (Doyle and Carr 288-89).

rescue of the intended victim, the encounter with the beast and the death of the murderer. The anxiety of authenticity is manifested in the unwillingness of the pasticheur to part from the plot and the organisation of the famous source text. As a consequence, the fantastic murder plot of the source text is rendered generic: after "The Deptford Horror," it is possible to imagine endless variations of the plot featuring a greedy uncle and poisonous animals that leave no traces. The pastiche thus undermines the particular status of "The Speckled Band," introduced by Watson as the most "singular" case (Doyle, *Sherlock Holmes* 137).

One of the formulaic stylistic features of the stories of Doyle Sr. is the proverb or quotation uttered by Holmes at the end, when he is contemplating the "closed" case. This feature is reproduced at the end of "The Deptford Horror".⁴⁹

'It is the wise man who keeps bees,' remarked Sherlock Holmes when he had read the report [about the death of the murderer, Wilson the canary trainer]. 'You know where you are with them and at least they do not attempt to represent themselves as something that they are not.' (Doyle and Carr 310)

On the surface, the comparison seems to be straightforward. Bees, as is well known, are organised and useful animals, and the threat their stings pose is easily avoided.⁵⁰ Canaries, by contrast, are presented in "The Deptford Horror" as pets for the sickly and

⁴⁹ In "The Speckled Band" the proverb is derived from the *Ecclesiastes*: "Violence does, in truth, recoil upon the violent, and the schemer falls into the pit which he digs for another" (Doyle, *Sherlock Holmes* 154; for a discussion of its meaning, see Hodgson 318). However, the proverb does not take place at the very end of the story, but earlier, when Holmes finds the body of Dr. Roylott. The canonical stories ending with proverbs or proverbial thoughts include "The Red-Headed League," "The Case of Identity," "The Boscombe Valley Mystery," "The Engineer's Thumb," "The Crooked Man," "The Resident Patient," "The Three Gables," "The Wisteria Lodge," "The Cardboard Box," and "His Last Bow."

⁵⁰ The reference to bees actually derives from the Holmes "canon." In "His Last Bow" Holmes is shown to have retired from his practice as a consulting detective; he now lives in Devon and keeps bees. Surprising as this change of lifestyle may appear, Holmes explains that observing "the little gangs" of bees gives him similar intellectual pleasure as watching the criminal world of London (Doyle, *Sherlock Holmes* 805).

insomniac, and they possess the dubious talent of imitation which is exploited by Wilson in his terrible scheme. Wilson has taught the canaries to sing like the tropical bird which is prey for the poisonous spider, and by positioning the bird-cage in the room of his niece he ensures that the spiders will find their intended victim.

Does it not seem a bit odd, however, that in the final, weighty sentence of the story, Holmes comments neither on the criminal nor on the primary means of murder (the spiders)? The canaries are, in fact, an addition to the plot of "The Speckled Band" where the murderer needs no mediator to lure the snake to the room of the heiress.⁵¹ However, both the mediatory status and the fact that the canaries are imitators allow them to be read as symbolic of the pasticheur's art. In this second to last story of the collection, the carefully constructed authenticity effect of the pastiche is undermined, and the repressed truth is let out: the stories of *The Exploits of Sherlock Holmes* are, like the songs of the canaries,⁵² mere imitations intended as a pastime (or a soporific!), but they may also have a darker side. The pastiches may deceive with their "mesmeric" repetition (Doyle and Carr 304), but when we keep in mind the elements of Wilson's crime – canaries used as mediators in crimes within a family, over an inheritance – it is possible to detect another sinister plot: pastiches as mediators that bring about a potentially fatal threat to the source texts, the "inheritance" of which they seek to benefit from. Although not criminal in themselves, they are implicated in morally dubious activity. In "The Deptford Horror," the mother and brother of Janet Wilson actually die from a natural cause – heart failure – but the stroke is triggered by the sight of the terrible spiders. In a

⁵¹ In terms of simple intertextual relations, the addition of the canaries can be seen as an attempt to balance between the two source texts, "The Speckled Band," which requires the use of exotic animals as the murder weapon, and "The Black Peter," where the case of "Wilson the notorious canary-trainer" is mentioned.

⁵² No explicit reference is made in the story to the canaries' own song. On entering Wilson's room, Watson remarks: "the little golden-coated singers [. . .] filled the air with their sweet warbling and trilling" (Doyle and Carr 297), but it is not made clear whether the trained birds ever take up their natural song.

similar manner, pastiche can use the flaws of the source text to “attack” it, as critics have pointed out since the nineteenth century.

“The Deptford Horror” in fact refers to a flaw in the source text in a way that resonates with the interpretation of the role of pastiche given here. All the stories of *The Exploits of Sherlock Holmes* end with a quotation from the source texts in which Watson refers to the untold tale that the pasticheurs have just provided for the readers. In “The Deptford Horror” the relation between the “canonical” reference and the pastiche story is more complicated than in the case of the other exploits. While “The Deptford Horror” gets its inspiration from “The Black Peter,” where Watson mentions “the arrest of Wilson the notorious canary-trainer which removed a plague-spot from the East End of London” (*Sherlock Holmes* 539; Doyle and Carr 310), this is not what happens in the pastiche. In “The Deptford Horror” Wilson drowns in the Thames while fleeing from Holmes (307, 310),⁵³ his fate thus mirroring that of Dr. Roylott of “The Speckled Band,” who likewise dies as a consequence of his own evil plot. In order to explain the contradiction, a footnote is added to the quotation from “The Black Peter” in *The Exploits of Sherlock Holmes*, explaining that “[i]n the Wilson case, Holmes did not actually arrest Wilson as Wilson was drowned. This was a typical Watson error in his hurried reference to the case in ‘Black Peter.’” (310, emphasis added) Ironically, for once Arthur Conan Doyle’s Watson ought not to be blamed, since the pasticheur’s choices make his reference retroactively flawed. The pastiche is so reverential that in order to point towards a common problem in the source text (the many gaffes of Doyle Sr.), it has to manufacture an instance of the same problem.

⁵³ Nicholas Meyer’s *The Canary Trainer* similarly diverges from the plot summary given in “The Black Peter”: in Meyer’s novel, the “canary” is a soprano at the Opéra Garnier whom Holmes saves from the famous phantom of the opera. A concoction of Leroux’s *Le Fantôme de l’Opéra* and Doyle’s Holmes stories, the novel does not stay within the mode of stylistic pastiche used in its predecessor *The Seven-Per-Cent Solution*.

The ambiguous and seemingly unmotivated reference to the deceptive canaries at the end thus activates the question of the status and consequences of imitations. The apparent wisdom of the adage – those who imitate instead of being true to themselves are potentially dangerous – draws attention to the difficult position of the pastiches as simultaneously “authentic” and “reproductions,” and to the element of deception and usurpation inherent in “unauthentic” imitations which *The Exploits of Sherlock Holmes* seeks to elbow out of the market. While reading so much into the seemingly realistic details of the story might seem somewhat contrived, it ought to be remembered that in the source text of the pastiche, “The Speckled Band,” the mystery in fact centres on a question of interpretation: what does the dying young woman mean by the enigmatic words “speckled band”? As John A. Hodgson points out, the question of interpretation penetrates the whole story:

Holmes solves the case when he sees through the figuratively innocuous disguises of these accessories to discern their deadly actual uses. We, in turn, in order to discover the deeper, satisfactory resolution of this apparently flawed story, must read its literal clues figuratively, recognizing them as features not of an actual scene, but of a textual one. (317)

In “The Deptford Horror,” a different kind of textual puzzle underlies the apparently straightforward adventures; namely, the puzzle of its complicated, double-edged relationship to the source texts.

When read in this light, other instances can be found in *The Exploits of Sherlock Holmes* in which the carefully crafted authenticity effect of the pastiches is about to backfire. A conflict between father and son, involving a case of forgery, is the topic of “The Two Women” (one of the stories written by Adrian Conan Doyle alone). “The Two Women” is a concoction of three existing stories: “A Scandal in Bohemia,” where the actress Irene Adler threatens the king of Bohemia with a compromising photograph of herself and the monarch; “Charles Augustus Milverton,” in which the eponymous blackmailer meets his end by a bullet fired

by an enigmatic noblewoman, and "The Three Gables," where the mystery revolves around a manuscript that would ruin the life of a cunning international beauty. Ostensibly a story of a conflict between two women, the blackmailer and spy Edith von Lammerain and her helpless victim, the Duchess of Carringford, "The Two Women" in fact focuses on the question of the authenticity of a dead man's signature, which determines the fate of his child. If authentic, the signature reveals the man as a bigamist and destroys the life of his daughter, who is engaged to be married to a man in a high position. Although two of the source stories deal with a written document, the manuscript of a novel ("The Three Gables") and a bundle of love letters ("Charles Augustus Milverton"), the question of the authenticity of the document as well as the setting of the conflict within a family are new developments introduced in the pastiche. Thus the themes of "The Two Women" seem to allude to the dilemma at the heart of *The Exploits of Sherlock Holmes*: how the father's signature should be adopted and repeated? How imitation and authenticity should be balanced?

At the end of "The Two Women," the signature turns out to be forged, which absolves the father and saves the child from disgrace. There is a gap in this solution, however. Holmes discovers that the original signature has been scratched away and replaced by a forged one. He is content with this in some sense superficial observation and does not pursue the quest to find out whose name has been erased from the document. That man's identity is not worth investigating – he has been wiped out, scratched away. In a similar manner, the preface of *The Exploits of Sherlock Holmes* blots out both the real-life model and literary ancestors of Sherlock Holmes and replaces them by the figure of the author, Arthur Conan Doyle, who is affirmed as the only source and origin for both the stories and Holmes himself. Another interesting aspect of the solution to "The Two Women" is that Holmes lets the forger go unpunished at the end, despite the heavy charges of "provocation of forgery, attempted blackmail

and [. . .] espionage" (Doyle and Carr 280).⁵⁴ The story ends ominously with the forger's threat: "We shall meet again, Mr. Sherlock Holmes" (282). The cycle of repetition and recontextualisation expands.

⁵⁴ The solution might be explained by the fact that the forger is a woman, a *femme fatale* of the type of Irene Adler ("A Scandal in Bohemia") and Isadora Klein ("The Three Gables"), two memorable women who challenge Holmes in the "canonical" stories.

3.3 Transgressive Pastiche in A.S. Byatt's *Possession* and D.M. Thomas's *Charlotte*

In recent years, one of the most important contexts for pastiche has been the enthusiastic revival of the Victorian era and its literary conventions. Each year sees the advent of yet more novels evoking the Victorian period or rewriting beloved Victorian classics. These neo-Victorian novels⁵⁵ are set, at least partially, in the nineteenth century, and they evoke the characters, themes, plots or styles associated with nineteenth-century fiction. The neo-Victorian genre offers a natural backdrop for pastiches of Victorian period style or individual authors from that era. By imitating Victorian styles, pasticheurs highlight the inevitable textuality of the past: the nineteenth century can only ever be present through texts, interpretations and rewritings. This does not necessarily mean a commitment to the radical postmodern stance whereby historical reprises can only ever be nostalgic, without relevance to the present and unable truly to recreate the historical past in its real complexity. The question of presenting history "truthfully," while explicitly raised in some neo-Victorian novels, is not their main concern: instead, the genre displays the ways in which Victorian culture figures in the popular imagination today, as well as occasionally challenging the perspectives from which Victorian culture is usually seen. In what follows I shall briefly discuss the contours of the neo-Victorian genre and the role of pastiche in it, and then look more closely at two examples, A.S. Byatt's *Possession: A Romance* and D.M. Thomas's *Charlotte*. Both novels approach the Victorian themes by fictionalising Victorian authors,

⁵⁵ Dana Shiller limits the term "neo-Victorian novel" to denote only those novels set in Victorian times that adopt a postmodern approach to history (538n). My use of the term is therefore more inclusive, also covering fictions which eschew postmodernist concerns. Other terms used for the neo-Victorian novel are retro-Victorian (Gutleben), post-Victorian (a concoction of postmodern and Victorian used by Letisser and Kucich & Sadoff), Victoriana (Kaplan), Victoriography (Kirchknopf) or simply 'Vic Lit' (Arnold; Briscoe).

thereby activating the metafictional potential of pastiche in discussing questions of authorship and originality.

The Neo-Victorian Novel: Textual Mysteries

The neo-Victorian novel is one manifestation of a much more extensive interest in the Victorian era, evident in the prospering heritage industry, period films and television series, fashion and interior design, and popular nonfiction books about Victorian history and science (where Darwin and the forerunners of modern psychology feature prominently). Admitting that there is no single answer to the question of why just the Victorian period has attracted such attention, John Kucich and Dianne F. Sadoff suggest in their introduction to *Victorian Afterlife* that “rewritings of Victorian culture have flourished, we believe, because the postmodern fetishizes notions of cultural emergence, and because the nineteenth century provides multiple eligible sites for theorizing such emergence” (xv). Although neo-Victorian novels are also written elsewhere, the genre is especially prominent in Britain, where the nineteenth century figures today as a culturally rich and expansive era during which many of the elements constituting today’s society, politics and science were laid down.⁵⁶ While the modernists regarded the Victorian era with filial suspicion, the major social and political changes culminating in the latter half of the twentieth century provided, as Cora Kaplan argues,

a psychological as well as cultural distance that rendered the Victorian period harmless in its ability to affect the present, and, as a consequence, ripe for reassessment and renarration, a readiness marked by renewed interest in its ideas, its inventions, its political aspirations and its imaginative literature. (85)

⁵⁶ By contrast, for American writers the inaugural century of the Revolutionary War and of the construction of national identity has served as a similar source of inspiration. *The Sot-Weed Factor* (1960) by John Barth and *Mason & Dixon* (1997) by Thomas Pynchon are examples of novels which use pastiche in a markedly postmodern manner to investigate that formative period of American history.

Jean Rhys's *Wide Sargasso Sea* (1966) and John Fowles's *The French Lieutenant's Woman* (1969) are often mentioned as the first neo-Victorian novels, although the Sherlock Holmes pastiches of Doyle and Carr discussed in the previous chapter serve as a reminder of the longevity of interest in the Victorian period and its fiction. However, the phenomenon took new shape with the much acclaimed novels of Rhys and Fowles which can retrospectively be seen as setting the tone and means of subsequent neo-Victorian novels. Moreover, they interestingly illustrate a shift of approach from a modernist tragic take on a Victorian classic (Rhys) to a postmodern parodic account of the era and its cultural heritage (Fowles). Thus the beginnings of the neo-Victorian genre attest to the continuities and coexistence rather than disruption between modernism and postmodernism. While the neo-Victorian novel can be seen as a postmodern phenomenon, individual works are not necessarily postmodernist in appearance and can even take a critical stance towards postmodern theory.

In connection with the Sherlock Holmes pastiches, I suggested that the generic features of detective fiction make that literary form a particularly apt object for imitation, and the same applies to Victorian fiction as well. Both are popular genres, and both focus on a mystery or puzzle which is unravelled in the narrative. As Ronald R. Thomas points out in "Detection in the Victorian novel," "almost every Victorian novel has at its heart some crime that must be uncovered, some false identity that must be unmasked, some secret that must be revealed, or some clandestine plot that must be exposed" (169). That the secrets often pertain to origins and identities which are ascertained or contested through letters and wills provides a thematically interesting starting-point for pastiches. The foregrounding of textuality at different levels (material and thematic) is therefore an important element in pastiches of Victorian fiction. It is not uncommon that in Victorian fictions, for instance *Bleak House* and *The Aspern Papers*, lost or hidden documents power the whole mystery, but remain mysteries themselves even after they have drastically changed the course of events: the precise contents of Jarndyce's will, Lady Dedlock's

love letters and Aspern's papers are never revealed to the readers. They remain blanks or gaps in the narratives. By contrast, the neo-Victorian novels abound with texts that are generously offered for the readers' scrutiny: manuscripts of fiction and poetry, travel reports, newspaper clippings, letters, notes and so forth. While these texts can be seen as a manifestation of the neo-Victorian obsession with explication, as Christian Gutleben does in "Phallus in Fabula" (164-66), they often have the opposite effect of disturbing the progression of the narrative, as they diverge from the main plot and may offer contradictory information. That so many of the embedded texts are fiction – not documentary or pseudo-documentary writing – emphasises the literariness of neo-Victorian fictions whose conception of the Victorian period is primarily derived from fiction.

Given its emphasis on mysteries that centre on origins, its fascination with textuality and ambiguity, and its aim to recreate or reconstruct Victorian atmosphere through period detail, it is hardly surprising that the neo-Victorian genre has become perhaps the most important context for pastiche fictions in contemporary literature. The terms neo-Victorian (retro-Victorian) and pastiche are sometimes used interchangeably in criticism. For instance, although Christian Gutleben defines pastiche as "pure imitation" and "serious imitation" in *Nostalgic Postmodernism* (8, 9), he nevertheless seems to consider all novels set in the Victorian times as pastiches, regardless of their stylistic proximity to Victorian fiction (e.g., 8, 218). In my opinion, and observing the meaning of pastiche adopted in this study, most neo-Victorian novels are not pastiches, because their overall style is anachronistically modern. The Victorian era serves as a setting for them, but does not penetrate the level of presentation and style.

However, pastiche provides a means for some authors of neo-Victorian fictions to engage through literary history with the period that has such importance in the present cultural imagination, as well as turning the Victorian pastiches to mirror the present. The two novels I am going to analyse in this chapter, Byatt's *Possession* and Thomas's *Charlotte*, juxtapose the Victorian level of

the story (mostly conveyed through pastiches) with a contemporary one. They are an interesting pair for a comparative analysis: *Possession* clearly hails from the tradition inaugurated by Fowles's *The French Lieutenant's Woman* as it enthusiastically engages with a wide array of Victorian literary, social, religious and even scientific concerns, while *Charlotte* repeats and rewrites *Wide Sargasso Sea* by taking *Jane Eyre* (1847), one of the iconic Victorian texts, as its starting-point. Byatt takes up Fowles's use of Victorian poetry as a mirror to the narrative, but instead of quoting from actual Victorian poems she creates her own pastiche versions which engage intricately with the themes of her novel. Thomas's crossing of *Jane Eyre* and *Wide Sargasso Sea* results in a dual story, part pastiche, part contemporary, which tracks the different aspects of its composite female protagonist. What makes the novels of Byatt and Thomas especially relevant examples for the present study is their thematisation of pastiche through metaphors and analogies which explore the contradictory character of this literary form. The compelling styles of the past turn into vehicles for thinking about the possibilities and limitations of creation.

Poetics of Retelling: A.S. Byatt's *Possession: A Romance*

Preoccupied with texts and reading, A.S. Byatt's novel *Possession: A Romance* begins most appropriately with a quest for literary sources and origins: Roland Michell, an unconfident and underpaid research assistant, is skimming over an old copy of Vico's *Principj di Scienza Nuova* in the London Library, searching for the sources of "The Garden of Proserpina," a poem by the eminent Victorian poet Randolph Henry Ash. Roland finds what he is looking for, but, more importantly, he also discovers folded inside the musty volume two passionate letters written by Ash to an unknown lady. This unexpected discovery leads to the disclosure of a whole correspondence and a secret love affair between Ash and his obscure contemporary, the poet Christabel LaMotte. The find completely changes what was known about the poets and their

work. Roland and his colleague, the feminist critic Maud Bailey, search for clues in Victorian characters' poems and letters as well as in the literary criticism written about them. They are driven, possessed "by some violent emotion of curiosity – not greed, curiosity, more fundamental even than sex, the desire for knowledge" (*Possession* 82). In *Possession*, Byatt combines the similarly enticing detective and romance quest plots to evoke for and in her readers the intertwined and mutually necessary intellectual and emotional pleasures of reading as a way of constructing and comprehending the world.

Most of the texts that Maud and Roland are reading as a part of their investigation are included in the novel, thereby creating a double structure in which the readers of *Possession* in fact repeat the quest when they follow it through the first-hand sources. Byatt has created a whole imaginary literary history for *Possession*, complete with personal documents, poetry and scholarship, but the fictive texts are easily recognisable as pastiches and – in some cases – parodies⁵⁷ of actual ones. The life, letters and poems of Randolph Henry Ash resemble in many aspects those of Robert Browning and Alfred Tennyson, with elements from Carlyle's biography and Swinburne's poetry thrown in. Christabel LaMotte is similarly a composite figure. Her name refers to the eponymous heroine of Coleridge's Gothic poem and to the author of the fairy tale *Undine*, Friedrich de la Motte Fouqué,⁵⁸ while the styles and themes of her writing derive in turn from Elizabeth Barrett

⁵⁷ As many critics have noted, the most obviously parodic imitations are those of contemporary criticism, for instance the pompous style of literary biography and excessive sexual imagery of (French) feminism (see, e.g., *Possession* 244-50). Rather than a wholesale rejection of the discourses of contemporary literary criticism, I would see the parodies as indicative of the larger exploration and evaluation of literary theoretical insights in the novel. The fact that the novel very much draws from those theories in a positive sense and does not disguise its sources, is also a relevant context for the parodies.

⁵⁸ Most names in *Possession* are allusive: they may refer to literary models (such as Coleridge's Christabel, Browning's Childe Roland or Yggdrasil, the life-giving *ash*-tree in Norse mythology), or to the character's personality (e.g., the motherly Beatrice *Nest*, the predatory Fergus *Wolff*, the self-important Mortimer *Cropper*).

Browning, Emily Dickinson and Christina Rossetti.⁵⁹ The modern critics of Ash and LaMotte hail from the different schools of criticism of the latter half of the twentieth century, ranging from historicist textual criticism to biographism, feminism and poststructuralism. Creating fictive lives and oeuvres out of historical ones makes it possible for Byatt to explore the past and its connections to the present freely (Keen 13-14, 33-34). For her readers, it adds a level of signification not available to the contemporary characters of the novel: we may read the pastiches and the Victorian plot in their rich literary historical context which allows us to interpret them differently from the critics in the novel. In *Possession* multiple interpretative possibilities force the question of the processes and legitimisation of interpretations, as well as the value of the knowledge derived from those processes (see Schor 236).

The unabashed use of pastiche in *Possession* has raised various responses. Critics have diverged in their evaluation of the literary quality of the performance: according to the Browning specialist Danny Karlin, Ash's poems are "a fair pastiche of Browning" and LaMotte's lyrics "very good" ("Prolonging Her Absence," 18), while Cora Kaplan confesses having skipped much of the pastiches in her first reading of the novel (108). In John Mullan's view "the 'Browning' blank verse credited to Ash is ploddingly regular stuff compared to the original" and "in LaMotte's creations Christina Rossetti's fable-mongering is awkwardly blended with Emily Dickinson's staccato stanzas" ("Quote, Unquote" par. 2).⁶⁰ That the range of critical evaluations reflects the general attitudes towards pastiche is not surprising, given the mixed feelings pastiches commonly evoke and the difficulty of

⁵⁹ I should point out that while the characters are composite, the poems and letters attributed to them usually draw from one main source. For instance, the correspondence between Ash and LaMotte is modelled on that between Browning and Barrett, and while LaMotte's short lyrics are akin to those of Emily Dickinson (see chapter 2.1 for an example), the longer poems rather imitate the style of Barrett.

⁶⁰ See also Hadley's résumé of a selection of reviews in *The Fiction of A.S. Byatt* (49-52). Most reviewers she refers to have been impressed by the quality of the pastiches.

comparing pastiches with their source texts and evaluating the simultaneous imitation and alteration of the sources in the pastiches. However, assessing the success of the pastiches in terms of their faithfulness to the source texts is just one aspect; in my view it is perhaps more interesting to look at the functions of the imitations in the novel in which they are embedded.

While the novel's rich textuality and metafiction has led many commentators to label *Possession* as postmodernist, its affiliations to postmodernism are ambiguous at best. Rather than subscribing to the tenets of postmodernist fiction, Byatt is using postmodernist themes and techniques to explore critically the postmodern "truths" about the loss of subjectivity, the radical weakening of historical experience and the inevitable failure of language and of representation to lay claims beyond their own limited realm. The use of pastiche in *Possession* is a good example of this strategy. While the prominent presence of pastiche in the novel inevitably evokes these fundamental postmodern dilemmas, the very boldness and rich detail of the Victorian pastiches makes it hard to dismiss them merely as glib stylistic exercises or manifestations of the postmodern waning of affect. However, instead of staging a straightforward opposition between its Victorian passions and postmodern play, *Possession* appears to aim at the more ambitious goal of combining them.⁶¹ As Margaret Rose has pointed out, Byatt is clearly more interested in mapping connections and possibilities than dwelling on failures and losses (*Parody* 230-31). The omnivorous novel form provides a means for her to explore the affinities between ideas, styles, texts and stories without losing the specificity that makes them interesting and worth serious consideration in the first place. This is also the chief insight of Frederica Potter, the heroine of Byatt's novel tetralogy,⁶² who discovers the technique of lamination, or juxtaposing separate but mutually enriching thoughts, feelings and experiences in a

⁶¹ For *Possession's* ambivalent postmodernism, see Buxton, and for *Possession's* realism, "Habitable Worlds and Literary Voices" by Polvinen.

⁶² *The Virgin in the Garden* (1978), *Still Life* (1985), *Babel Tower* (1996), *The Whistling Woman* (2002).

way which preserves their singularity and prevents them from merging into oppressive totalities (*The Virgin in the Garden* 273-75) – an insight which later becomes the cornerstone of her own novel writing (*Babel Tower* 312, 359-60; see also Schor 236-37). A spatial metaphor for the idea of the novel, Byatt's lamination is not unlike Proust's conception of metaphor as the fundamental element of the novel, and, significantly, both writers have used pastiche as a concrete manifestation of this idea (see chapter 3.1).⁶³ In *Possession* the textual laminations provide a grid for critical and curious consideration of the Victorian and contemporary concerns; a grid which protects the novel from the reverse hazards of simple ideology (whether realist or postmodernist) and of fragmentation due to the lack of focus.

Thus the novel's seemingly postmodern eclecticism is in fact a manner of organising and juxtaposing the various materials in a way which can yield knowledge and insight. One of the most powerful means of suggesting connections and affinities in *Possession* is the retelling and variation of a variety of myths and ideas in different contexts and in different ways. The almost excessive recycling of stories and themes in *Possession* asserts the importance, if not necessity, of repetition and variation for all significant cultural activity. In the pastiche letters, composed in imitation of the love letters of Browning and Barrett, Christabel LaMotte writes: "All old stories [. . .] will bear telling and telling again in different ways. What is required is to keep alive, to polish, the simple clean forms of the tale which *must* be there [. . .]. And yet to add something of yours, of the writer, which makes all these things seem

⁶³ Proust's importance for Byatt's writing is evident in *Still Life*, where chapters of the novel are named after parts of *À la Recherche du temps perdu*. Frederica's visit to Provence is thus explicitly set in the context of the Narrator's holidays in Balbec. Less prominent affinities with Proust can also be detected elsewhere in Byatt's writing, and her predilection for long sentences and complex metaphors is akin to that of Proust. In *Passions of the Mind*, Byatt writes: "[W]hat Proust taught me, in the early 1960s, was that it was possible for a text to be supremely mimetic, 'true to life' in the Balzacian sense, and at the same time to think about form, its own form, its own formation, about perceiving and inventing the world" (15-16). For both writers, pastiche is one of the ways of being mimetic and self-reflexive at the same time.

new and first seen, without having been appropriated for private or personal ends" (*Possession* 350). *Possession* is invested with a vivid sense that there is a gain in retelling, that knowledge can be imparted from the lamination or layering of different versions of the same or analogous narratives. The pastiches of dramatic monologues and mythological epic poems highlight the Victorians' delvings into the mythical and historical past in order to understand themselves, and likewise the Victorian concerns, such as the radical uncertainty ingrained in religious thinking, offer new perspectives in postmodern dilemmas. Although the idea of lamination, as presented in Byatt's Frederica quartet, relates to creation, its application in *Possession* pertains equally to the reading processes evoked in the novel. Imposed layer upon layer, the various texts or versions are neither self-sufficient nor mere manifestations of an overarching idea or myth. In its intricate network references and recycling, *Possession* seems to combine the two different meanings of intertextuality, as understood by J. Hillis Miller: intertextuality as the weaving together of texts and as referring and resonating across a (temporal) gap (125-26). *Possession* forges connections and analogies between different times and texts, but nevertheless insists on their fundamental historical specificity.

Conjurers of Dead Spirits

Discussing his dramatic monologues, Randolph Henry Ash often imagines himself as a resuscitator of dead voices, as in this extract from a letter to Christabel LaMotte: "And I have merely words – and the dead husks of other men's words – but I shall bring it off – you need not believe me yet, but you shall see" (*Possession* 158). The idea of the poet as a medium is significant for the poetics of pastiche in *Possession*. It places imaginative identification at the core of artistic activity and highlights the precariousness of this feat: the element of disbelief is ever present in the reception of a literary work, especially in the case of pastiche which relies on the effect of simultaneous presence and absence of its source.

Byatt had already employed the theme of spiritualism in "Precipice-Encurled" (1987), a short story touching upon Robert Browning's later years in Italy, and after *Possession* she developed it into the main topic of another neo-Victorian novella, *The Conjugal Angel* (in *Angels and Insects*, 1991). Arising from the Victorians' keen interest in death and the afterlife, spiritualism in Byatt's works also has more specific literary historical sources, such as Tennyson's extensive lamentation for Arthur Hallam in "In Memoriam A.H.H.," Henry James's highly ambiguous depiction of the interconnections between the nineteenth-century American women's movement and spiritualism in *The Bostonians* (1885-86), and Elizabeth Barrett-Browning's fascination with spiritualism which annoyed her husband. The conflict between the Brownings functions as the historical background for a scene in *Possession* in which Randolph Henry Ash attends a séance where he hopes to meet Christabel LaMotte and to find out what has happened to their illegitimate child whom he believes to have died. The scene is told thrice – first in a scholarly note by Professor Blackadder, then by Ash in a letter and finally by the medium of the séance, Hella Lees, in her memoirs (299, 390-91, 393-98) – in order to highlight the difficulty of knowing what really happened in the past despite multiple documentary evidence. In *Possession* the theme of spiritualism offers a highly suggestive and complex means to explore the intertwined questions of power and knowledge in and through art.

Robert Browning's experiences with spiritualism gave rise to a long satirical poem, "Mr Sludge, 'The Medium'" (in *Dramatis Personae*, 1864) which derides his contemporaries' naïve credulity in the supernatural but at the same time goes on to explore the conditions of truthfulness and the ability of literature to express truths. An extract from the poem stands as an epigraph to *Possession*, challenging the readers to consider the novel's claims as regards "possessing" the past through the conventions of historical romance. The speaker of Browning's dramatic monologue, Mr Sludge, had been caught in the act of cheating in the middle of a séance and has to explain his actions to his patron. While Sludge

finally pleads guilty, he nevertheless tries to justify his actions by contesting the distinction between falsehood and truth in art, science and religion. In the extract which is a part of the novel's epigraph, Sludge argues that his manipulations are no different from the imaginative freedom of poets, hence contaminating art with the negative associations of illusion and fraud:

But why do I mount to poets? Take plain prose –
 Dealers in common sense, set these at work,
 What can they do without their helpful lies?
 Each states the law and fact and face o' the thing
 Just as he'd have them, finds what he thinks fit,
 Is blind to what missuits him, just records
 What makes his case out, quite ignores the rest.
 It's a History of the world, the Lizard Age,
 The Early Indians, the Old Country War,
 Jerome Napoleon, whatsoever you please,
 All as the author wants it. Such a scribe
 You pay and praise for putting life in stones,
 Fire into fog, making the past your world.
 There's plenty of 'How did you contrive to grasp
 The thread which led you through this labyrinth?
 How build such solid fabric out of air?
 How on so slight foundation found this tale,
 Biography, narrative?' or, in other words,
 'How many lies did it require to make
 The portly truth you here present us with?' (244; lines 1443-62)

Isobel Armstrong, *Possession's* dedicatee, has pointed out that in this poem Browning seems to investigate and parody some of his own views about art and poetry (2-3).⁶⁴ The poem reads like a negative *ars poetica*: instead of asserting the poet's principles, it radically questions them by perturbing art's relationship with truth. "The working of the imagination becomes a matter of slick manipulation, a shoddy knack which merely serves the function of

⁶⁴ In Byatt's "Precipice-Encurled," the narrator describes Browning's poetical method as follows: "It was his covert principle to give true opinions to great liars, and to that other fraudulent resuscitator of dead souls, and filler of mobile gloves, David Sludge the Medium, he had given a vision of the minutiae of intelligence which was near enough his own" (193).

'brightening up' the world, and 'brightening up' carries with it the associations of surface-gilding, artificial veneer, synthetic restoration" (Armstrong 6). The controversial medium thus expresses the poet's fundamental fear: what if art has no special status and meaning; what if art is mere illusion and embellishment. As I pointed out earlier, the same question troubles the Narrator of *À la Recherche du temps perdu* after he has read the pastiche excerpt from the *Journal* of the Goncourt brothers. While Browning uses spiritualism as a kind of a critical touchstone of artistic activity, Proust, Byatt and other writers have employed pastiche for a similar purpose, using the marginal, disparaged form to expose and explore the relativity of the underpinnings of art, its truthfulness to reality and experience and its originality.

In addition to functioning as the novel's thought-provoking motto, "Mr Sludge, 'The Medium'" also provides the source of one of the most extensive and most important pastiche poems in *Possession*, Randolph Henry Ash's "Mummy Possest." The diverse associations of Browning's long poem, its ambiguity, questioning and parody make it a particularly rich and evocative source for pastiche. Byatt has retained the confessional mode of the poem as well as its metrical form (iambic pentameter with non-rhyming stanzas of varying length), and even the significant changes of the gender and the social status of the speaker arise from the setting of the original. In his dramatic monologues Browning carefully crafted an idiosyncratic language expressive of the character and his background. Hence Sludge's Americanisms, coarse interjections and blunderings, which reveal his lack of education. By contrast, the speaker of Byatt's (or Ash's) poem is a genteel woman, the medium Sybilla Silt, who is initiating her parlourmaid Geraldine⁶⁵ in spiritualistic rites. The style of "Mummy Possest" is therefore more subtle and insinuating than that of "Mr. Sludge," which

⁶⁵ Again the name is significant: Geraldine is the witch who casts a spell upon Christabel in Coleridge's poem and turns Christabel's father against her. In *Possession* she appears as the associate of the medium who exerts influence over Christabel LaMotte and tragically broadens the gap between the now estranged lovers LaMotte and Ash.

consequently makes it appear less obviously parodic than its model. Moreover, Byatt has inverted the power relation between the speaker and his addressee: Sybilla Silt represents an authoritative voice and is in control of the situation. “I have called you here to teach you certain things[,]” (406) she says, and while she means Geraldine, the line can also be seen addressing the readers of *Possession*, since the poem reads like a *mise en abyme* for the poetics of the whole novel.⁶⁶

In “Mummy Possest” Byatt simultaneously repeats and reverses Browning’s negative poetics. While the name of David Sludge associates the Biblical king and poet with dirt, Sybilla Silt combines the dirty, earthy association with an ancient tradition of female prophets and seers who could affect the fates of great men and nations. To some of her contemporaries, Sybilla is indeed the bearer of messages from the beyond, while others would see her practice as nothing more than a parlour game or deliberate misleading of sensitive minds. Like Sludge, Silt admits the use of trickery, but, as she explains to the unwilling Geraldine, it is only to enhance the artistic effect. “We fabricate to demonstrate their [the spirits’] Truth,” (407) she assures her:

Our small deceptions are a form of Art
Which has its simple and high degree
As women know, who lavish on wax dolls
The skills and the desires that large-souled men
Save up for marble Cherubs, or who sew
On lowly cushions thickets of bright flowers
Which done in oil were marvelled at on walls
Of ducal halls or city galleries.
You call these spirit *mises en scène* a lie.
I call it artfulness, or simply Art,

⁶⁶ “Mummy Possest” is one of the few pastiches that function as individual chapters in *Possession*. Most of the poetry pastiches appear as epigraphs to chapters, thereby commenting on the contents of the chapter in advance. Often the Victorian pastiches offer a somewhat ironic perspective on the contemporary characters’ actions. Although it does not prelude a chapter, “Mummy Possest” too has its equivalent in the contemporary story in the satiric episode where Professor Blackadder unwillingly ventriloquises Market Forces in a moronic talk show (399-404).

A Tale, a Story, that may hide a Truth
As wonder-tales do, even in the Best Book. (408-09)

The toning down of the source text's negative parody makes room for a serious exploration of women's condition and their limited possibilities for independent artistic and intellectual activity in Victorian society, which is one of the central themes of the novel. The poem's fictional author, R.H. Ash, enjoys and enacts his role as a major poet of the age and becomes a canonical figure after his death, while Christabel LaMotte is largely unknown to her contemporaries and is only discovered by a small group of feminist scholars as a consequence of the late twentieth-century project of challenging the patriarchal literary canons. The fact that many of LaMotte's poems are pastiches of Emily Dickinson highlights the precariousness of literary afterlife, since Dickinson published merely a handful of poems during her lifetime, and it was only in the 1950s that the publication of unedited versions of her poems significantly changed the then prevalent conception of nineteenth-century poetry. Moreover, in the novel's fictive world Ash's celebrated poem about Sybilla Silt draws attention to the absence of another artistic representation of the medium Hella Lees, on whom Sybilla Silt is based. This is the painting titled "A Spirit-Wreath and Fair Spirit-Hands at a Séance of Hella Lees" by Blanche Glover, LaMotte's companion and former lover, who is in many ways Ash's complete opposite, an unappreciated and almost completely forgotten artist whose works have been lost or destroyed. Glover had chosen the masculine "high degree" of art but eventually pays a high price for it: she finally commits suicide for reasons both professional and personal (306-09). Through the fictional and real examples of Blanche Glover, Randolph Henry Ash and Emily Dickinson *Possession* draws attention to the fact that the lost tradition is doubly lost since the original art works are neither directly available to us, nor can they have any cumulative effect to art through subsequent reworkings, for instance, pastiches.

This deprivation poses the question of whether originality – as an important element contributing to the work's subsistence –

in fact implies maximal repeatability; whether those works remain which allow or even call for multiple rewritings and versions. Here again we encounter the paradox at the heart of pastiche: it reproduces the stylistic effects of a work, the singularity of which depends on its distinctive style, and hence thwarts its claims to uniqueness. Although this contradiction would seem to justify postmodern nihilism, *Possession's* poetics of lamination suggests that it is possible to separate different aspects of the paradox and consider them individually while accepting their mutual incompatibility. Thus its *ars poetica* is not in fact at odds either with the radical scepticism of Browning's poem or with postmodern uncertainty; it encompasses them within a more wide-ranging conception of literature as a form of thought which can deal with logic-defying complexity and confusing emotions.

This inclusive conception of literature inevitably leads to a plurality of interpretations which is apparent for instance in the fictive and real responses to the feminist aspects of "Mummy Possesst" and the novel whose themes it reflects. The poem's manipulative speaker and the reference in the title to John Donne's "Love's Alchymie" – "Hope not for minde in women; at their best / Sweetnesse and wit, they're but *Mummy*, possesst" (29) – leads the feminist critics of the novel to regard Ash's poem as anti-feminist (*Possession* 42, 299) despite its subversive ambiguity. Thus *Possession* seems to comment on the likewise reductive reception of one of its source texts, James's *The Bostonians*, which investigates feminism and spirituality in a highly complex manner. The difficulties in accommodating political agendas with literary ambiguity are also apparent in the critical responses to *Possession* itself. Cora Kaplan (110) and Christian Gutleben (*Nostalgic Postmodernism* 82-84) have for example noted what they diagnose as the conservative or "punishing" feminism of *Possession*, evident in the satirical pastiches of contemporary feminist criticism where everything is seen either as patriarchal repression or as fluid feminine *jouissance*. However, their criticism discloses a predilection for a clear

political agenda which is alien to Byatt's writing.⁶⁷ It seems that she has, like her character R.H. Ash, "almost a disgust at the too-apparent meaning" (*P* 167), as it leaves no room for imagination and doubt, the vehicles of creative enquiry.

If "Mr Sludge, 'The Medium'" reads as an inverse *ars poetica*, revealing the poet's doubts and uncertainty, in "Mummy Possest" the denunciation of the solidity of artistic truths can be interpreted as a positive invitation to think of literature in another way. Rewriting the original poem in the form of a pastiche is an ironic coup where the antagonistic relationship of illusion and truth is rendered meaningless. Where Browning used the medium as the artist's double, in *Possession* the medium speaks for the pasticheur's art: "Draw in the influence fearlessly," Sybilla encourages the unwilling Geraldine (410) – and all the sceptics who disdain pastiche. By drawing an analogy between spiritualism and pastiche and extending it to the "serious" art of writing dramatic monologues and the (re)creation of the literary work in the act of reading (e.g., 104,

⁶⁷ Interestingly, both Gutleben and Kaplan criticise Byatt for "suppressing homoeroticism" in her novel on the grounds of the unhappy outcome of the LaMotte-Glover affair and the unexpected union, at the end, of the voluptuous bisexual Leonora Stern with the stiff Professor Blackadder. For instance, in Kaplan's view "Byatt's negative depiction of Blanche [Glover] as neurotic constitutes a silent refutation of the generative or artistically productive possibilities of woman-to-woman love documented and celebrated by historians of sexuality" (109). In her criticism, Kaplan in fact commits the same mistake as the feminist critics of *Possession* who reduce LaMotte's poetry to her lesbian sexuality (e.g., *Possession* 139). The determination to read *Possession* as hostile to homosexuality is, moreover, based on a deliberate misreading: Leonora Stern is not a lesbian, as Gutleben and Kaplan claim, but an adventurous bisexual who has been twice married (to a man). Her love affair with Professor Blackadder is in fact a humorous reversal of the fairy tale convention where the prince rescues the princess imprisoned in a tower: Leonora manages to drag Blackadder away from his dark den in the cellar of the British Museum to enjoy the sensuous pleasures of life. In my view, one cannot read the relationships of *Possession* simply from today's politically conscious perspective: like so many other elements in the novel, they are deeply ingrained in cultural and literary history and need to be interpreted in relation to it. One should consider, for instance, the demonic aspects of lesbianism in many of *Possession's* intertexts (e.g., Rossetti's "The Goblin Market," Coleridge's "Christabel" and James's *The Bostonians*), not merely the corrective interpretations and celebrations of sexuality of today's social historians.

167-68), Byatt is searching for means to express the inexplicable transitions and shifts which characterise creative activity.

Pastiche as Transgression

“Mummy Possest” holds a special place among the various pastiches of *Possession*. It is one of the most extensive of them and the only one that has its intertext inserted in the novel. Moreover, as it suggests an analogy between the art of the medium and that of the pasticheur, it offers a way of thinking about pastiche as a practice which transgresses the boundaries of the ordinary and which may, in that transition, impart valuable insights. At the same time, the analogy draws attention to the fact that pastiching is not innocent activity: it involves manipulation and the creation of illusions. Through the novel’s dense and intricate network of parallels and connections, spiritualism and pastiche are related to a wealth of other transgressive practices which form the novel’s metaphorical structure.

The most important myth of transcendence evoked in *Possession* is the medieval Breton legend of Melusina (or Mélusine), a fairy who marries a mortal man but whose true identity is revealed with the result that she is transformed into a monstrous serpent and forced to renounce her human existence. This legend is the source and inspiration of Christabel LaMotte’s ambitious verse epic (*Possession* 289-298) and the subject matter of many letters between Ash and LaMotte. Another Breton legend, the story of the sorceress Queen Dahud and the underwater city of Is provides the topic for another LaMotte poem (133-35) as well as a recurring metaphor for the separate realms of men and women. In addition, *Possession* contains several references to and rewritings of the ancient stories of Proserpina and Psyche – who transgress for romantic love like Melusina – and to the Christian legend of the raising of Lazarus, prompted by the loving pleas of his sisters Mary and Martha. The idea of crossing a fundamental or forbidden border, or moving from one kind of existence into another

and back again recurs in the LaMotte fairy tale pastiches (most notably in "The Threshold," 150-56), in the discussions about the poetics of dramatic monologue and the contemporary characters' academic interest in transgression and liminality. Love and the desire for knowledge are the main forces instigating transgression in these cases. What is gained in transgression may be of the utmost importance and value to the transgressor, but there is usually a high price to pay for it. Transgression curiously involves both the breaking of norms and their reinstitution; what may seem like a revolutionary act in fact reinforces the established order, for instance, the distinction between humans and non-humans in the myth of Melusina. While this might seem like a depressing outcome, *Possession's* examples show how the challenging of borders is a meaningful and valuable act in itself and how it may impart crucial insights into existing conditions and their limitations. By juxtaposing multiple cases of transgression, *Possession* demonstrates how, despite the seeming disjunctions between different historical times or different systems of belief, the element of transgression has a special significance in all cultural activity.

In *Possession* transgression is not confined solely to the mythical and historical past. As the novel's satire is primarily targeted at the contemporary characters and values, the most comical and macabre examples of transgression take place in the present. These include Professor Blackadder's heroic ventriloquy of the values of the Market Forces (399-404), the ghastly disentanglement of Randolph Henry Ash's remains (492-96) and the material resurrection of Christabel LaMotte's Richmond cottage, named "Bethany" after Lazarus's home village. The late twentieth-century owners of the cottage have restored the building so meticulously that its very historicity has suffered, as Maud and Roland observe:

'It's a good restoration job,' said Maud. 'It makes you feel funny. A simulacrum.'

'Like a fibre glass copy of the sphinx.'

'Exactly. You can just see a very Victorian fireplace in there. I can't tell if it's an original or a vamped-up one from a demolition lot.'

They looked at the bland or blind face of Bethany.

'It would have been sootier. It would have looked older. When it was younger.'

'A postmodern quotation – ' (210-11)

Echoing Fredric Jameson's conception of pastiche as "blind" and tampering with our sense of history, this passage humorously acknowledges the novel's postmodern allegiances and the difficulties of recreating the past, which may be lost in the process.⁶⁸ The disturbing hollowness and inauthenticity of the house's outwards appearance contrasts ironically with use of house as a metaphor for the self in the Victorian pastiche poem which forms an epigraph to the chapter depicting Maud and Roland's visit to "Bethany." Written in imitation of the succinct verse of Emily Dickinson, the epigraph reads as a metaphoric depiction of the life in the household of Christabel LaMotte and her companion, the painter Blance Glover:

What is a House? So strong – so square
Making a Warmth inside the Winds
We walk with lowered eyelids there
And silent go – behind the blinds

Yet hearts may tap like loaded bombs
Yet brains may shrill in carpet-hush
And windows fly from silent rooms
And walls break outwards – with a rush – (210)

The cottage which is today a mere shell without substance, an ironic symbol of the postmodern loss of the self, is here depicted as a fortress (so strong – so square) about to burst with the eruption of emotion (the heart) and intellectual (the brains) activity. The context of the novel offers a double interpretation for the poem: it can be seen as an image of the lives of the two Victorian lady artists, unremarkable if seen from the outside, yet full of passion on the inside, or it can be read as a depiction of the rising conflict between LaMotte and Glover. In both cases, the semi-

⁶⁸ For a similar interpretation of the scene, see Rose (*Parody* 230-31).

metaphorical house of the opening lines contrasts with the quiet, lifeless shell of the cottage today. The contrast between the two houses draws attention to the difference between the façadal pastiche highlighted in postmodern theories and the layered use of literary pastiche in *Possession*.

The imagery of spiritualism and resurrection, activated in various contexts in the novel, culminates in "Mummy Possest," in which the theme of spiritualism is reinforced by multiple layers of intertextuality and which as a whole reads as a metaphor for the pasticheur's art. The fact that the fictitious feminist critics misinterpret the poem because of its misogynist title, indirectly activates another allusion to the writings of John Donne.⁶⁹ Like so many pastiches, "Mummy Possest" is presented as a fragment: it ends in the middle of a line and bears the postscript "*caetera desunt*," or 'the rest is missing'. The same Latin phrase occurs in two of Donne's poems, "Resurrection, Imperfect" (1608) and "To the Countesse of Bedford, Begun in France but never perfected" (1611-12).⁷⁰ The pastiche, the source text and the two intertexts alluded to are all connected by two central themes: that of resurrection (whether it be spiritualist or Christian) and that of the limits of art and representation (the "imperfection" referred to in both of Donne's titles and in the phrase *caetera desunt*). In "Resurrection, Imperfect" Donne meditates upon one of the archetypes of transgression in Western culture, the resurrection of Christ. Donne describes the events of Easter Sunday in alchemical terms as the transmutation of the dead body into gold and further into a magical tincture which is "[o]f power to make even sinfull flesh like his" (354).

⁶⁹ The poetry of John Donne echoes throughout the Victorian love story in *Possession*: for instance, when Ash writes his love letters to LaMotte, he has a volume of Donne open in front of him (193). For the connections between *Possession* and Donne, see Maureen Sabine's article "'Thou art the best of mee': A.S. Byatt's *Possession* and The Literary Possession of Donne" and Byatt's own article in *The Cambridge Companion to John Donne*. Sabine concentrates on the more general affinities and comments only passingly on "Mummy Possest" (138).

⁷⁰ I thank Dr. Maria Salenius for drawing my attention to the poem addressed to the Countess of Bedford as well as for enlightening discussions on the trickier aspects of Donne's poetry.

for pastiche are deliberately ironic. Together with spiritualism, it belongs to the "smaller degree of art," but the significance of the pastiche sections in *Possession* imply that pastiche is an indispensable artistic means for the purposes of this novel.

The idea of pastiche as transgression is constructed in the novel through layers of connections and analogies. Although it is never articulated directly, this conceptualisation offers a nuanced and imaginative perspective on the dynamics of this literary form. Read in the light of Sybilla Silt's confession in "Mummy Possest," pastiche seems transgressive because it departs from the rules of literary creation seen as a form of "high" art. Yet it is also transgressive from the point of view of the source text, since it calls the source text up as a model, but differs from its paradigm. By going beyond the boundaries of the expected and beyond those of the given model, pastiche establishes the distinctions it breaches: by producing a likeness, it nevertheless flouts the original. As many of Byatt's stories of transgression (such as the resurrections of Lazarus and Christ) illustrate, transgression is firmly grounded on the idea of return or that of repetition. But repetition never produces exactly the same, the resurrected Lazarus is a different man from the one who died, and likewise a pastiche is different – perhaps more knowing, more cunning – than the text which it repeats.

In the various stories of transgression in *Possession*, the borders are crossed and deeds are committed for love, longing and curiosity – or often a combination of the three. All these desires are present in the kind of pastiche practised by Byatt: it is obviously based on a continuing fascination with the source texts, a longing towards a time differently riddled with uncertainty from our own and curiosity about the power of literature to make things visible and real. In her collection of essays, *On Histories and Stories*, Byatt explains that "writing Victorian words in Victorian contexts, in a Victorian order, and in Victorian relations of one word to the next was the only way I could think of to show one could hear the Victorian dead" (46-47). For Byatt, the only way to represent the Victorians is to transgress the temporal and cultural

gap between them and the present in an act of pastiche. This is not innocent activity, as she takes pains to point out. The “mummy” in the title of one of the most prominent embedded pastiches of the novel illustrates the multiplicity of interpretative choices. Does it refer to a dead body of texts, a corpus to be resurrected (and possessed in the act)? Or is the pasticheur the mummy, possessed by the voices of the past? The historical associations of the term, evoked by the context of Donne’s poetry, include the mummy medicine, a medicinal substance made out of powdered mummified bodies and used for various medical purposes both internally and externally. Thus “Mummy Possesst” could also be seen as an ironic poetic rendering of Jameson’s idea of pastiche as the cannibalisation of dead voices.

Pastiche is one aspect of Byatt’s aesthetics of “self-conscious realism” which is sensitive to the problems of representation, but does not jump to the conclusion that literature cannot therefore reach the world outside itself. The transgressions of pastiche are thus ultimately positive in the context of *Possession*. For a more ambiguous and deliberately disconcerting example of the use of pastiche in a neo-Victorian novel, we may turn to Thomas’s *Charlotte*, in which the transgressiveness of the literary form is associated with the breaking of social and ethical norms.

Perverse Pastiche: D.M. Thomas’s *Charlotte*

Charlotte begins with maybe the most famous utterance in *Jane Eyre* – “Reader, I married him” (9; Brontë 2: 279; ch. 38) – but what follows is not an idyllic tale of the happy marriage between Jane Eyre and her master, Mr Rochester. Thomas’s novel presents its readers with a gruesome story of an unfulfilled union. Alternating between direct quotation and modifying pastiche, the narrative of *Charlotte* gradually estranges itself from the romantic convention informing its model, where the female character’s development culminates and terminates in marriage which also marks the end of the novel. In *Charlotte*, Jane confesses that her previous

narrative in *Jane Eyre* was an embellished version which she now intends to replace with “reality” (52). Like the novels of Dibdin and Meyer discussed in the previous chapter, *Charlotte* is a corrective pastiche that presents an alternative ending to the classic source text. It soon becomes evident that the new narrative does not stay within the Victorian decorum. *Charlotte* reveals that Rochester still desires his former wife, the passionate and dominating Bertha Mason, who perished in the fire at Thornfield Hall, and is unable to consummate his marriage with the meek and pure Jane. When Jane finally challenges him on his reluctance, Rochester leaves home in a fit of anger and gets killed in a riding accident. The miserable Jane then learns about the perverse sexual games between Rochester, Bertha and Bertha’s keeper Grace Poole. Desperate, humiliated and bankrupt, Jane flees to the island of Martinique, where she meets and falls in love with Robert Rochester, the forsaken Creole son of Rochester and Bertha. The happy union between Robert and Jane is, however, cut short: Jane dies of an exotic fever while expecting Robert’s child. This narrative is juxtaposed in the novel with that of a contemporary heroine, a Brontë scholar whose fate resembles that of Jane Eyre in crucial respects. I shall discuss the relation between the two narrative levels later in this chapter.

In *Charlotte*, as in *Jane Eyre*, Jane tells her own story to the imagined audience of sympathetic readers. The pastiche in *Charlotte*, however, breaks with the Victorian decorum in its obsession with sexuality and violent perversions. Moreover, although the text is recognisable as stylistic imitation of *Jane Eyre*, it seems somewhat banal and dull compared to the passionate, detailed prose of the source text. For instance, the independent and obstinate Jane who on many occasions proved a worthy opponent to Rochester has turned into a meek Victorian wife who timidly submits to her husband. “Do you think I can stay to become nothing to you?” Jane exclaims to Rochester in *Jane Eyre*,

Do you think I am an automaton? – a machine without feelings? and can bear to have my morsel of bread snatched from my lips, and my drop of living water dashed from my cup? Do you think, because I am

poor, obscure, plain, and little, I am soulless and heartless? – You think wrong! – I have as much soul as you, – and as much heart!” (Brontë 2: 17)

Nothing of this eloquence, fervour and rage remains in the newly-wed Mrs Rochester who in *Charlotte* lets her deceitful and selfish husband bully her over trifles. A jealous argument over Jane’s innocent letter to her friends ends with Jane offering to tear up the letter and pleading timidly: “I love you so much” (Thomas 34). With high ideals and wild passions substituted by sexual humiliation and perversions, and the vivid prose flattened almost to clichés, the pastiche sequel offers a deliberately banal version of its source text. Transgressive in its immorality and obsessive focus on violence and sex, the Victorian narrative of *Charlotte* also tests the limits of pastiche and those of its readers’ credulity. It is worth bearing in mind Genette’s reminder of how even a poorly executed pastiche is nevertheless a pastiche if it manages to fulfil the pastiche contract. Here the contractual elements are strong – the narrative of *Jane Eyre* is even explicitly defined as pastiche (180) – but so are the incongruities between the provocative but banal imitation and its source text.⁷² The particular effect of the *Jane Eyre* pastiche is thus based on a tension between maximal provocation and the need to hold on to the pastiche status which is, as I shall point out later on, essential to the theme of authorship in the whole novel. Contrary to the high literary pastiches of Proust and Byatt, Thomas’s pastiche has to be bad (in the sense of inferior to its source text) in order to succeed. Therein lies one of the paradoxes that govern the whole novel.

Since pastiche so often functions as a medium of literary criticism, one could interpret the flattening effect of *Charlotte* as a critique of the now outmoded values of its source text, except that the blatant discrepancies between the pastiche and its model make

⁷² Once again the critical evaluations of the quality of the pastiche vary to a great extent. Bran Nicol (80) calls the pastiche a “faultless piece of mimicry” while in Gutleben’s view “[t]he realistic illusion is broken, the reader’s suspension of disbelief is rendered impossible, the text does not pretend to be an authentic Victorian diary anymore, it signals postmodern-wise its artefact as a playful reconstruction” (*Nostalgic Postmodernism* 178).

it miss the assumed target by a mile: while the sentimental ending of *Jane Eyre* might quite easily yield to the kind of satiric distortion employed in *Charlotte*, the whole novel resists such simplistic treatment and turns the critical point against the ridiculing pastiche itself. Through its rewriting of the Victorian classic, Thomas's pastiche in effect engages with the present neo-Victorian trend and its ideological preoccupations rather than with the original novel in its historical context. Sexual secrets and perversions, and redemption from oppressive social norms and restrictions have remained characteristic elements of the neo-Victorian genre ever since *Wide Sargasso Sea* and *The French Lieutenant's Woman*. They are perhaps the most prominent ways in which contemporary fictions probe, criticise and rewrite Victorian values and morality and their remnants in the present culture. By taking these elements to absurd extremes, the pastiche in *Charlotte* draws attention to the perverse interest in the sexual lives of the Victorians and to the now almost compulsory inclusion or imposition of postcolonial issues in Victorian narratives. By turning the loving English husband into an impotent pervert and allowing Jane to find happiness with the savagely mistreated but nevertheless noble Creole, *Charlotte* ridicules conventional redemptive postcolonialism and the tendency, in corrective rewritings, to castigate the Victorian classics in the light of their now blatant racial injustice.⁷³ Its iconoclastic treatment of the source text forces the readers to pay attention to how pastiches and rewritings construct their models through interpretation. The elements of interpretation and evaluation are further reinforced in the contemporary narrative of *Charlotte* in which the heroine Miranda Stevenson lectures on aspects of Charlotte Brontë's personality. She sees aspects of Brontë in the different characters of *Jane Eyre* – an interpretation that follows the now canonical feminist autobiographical account of Sandra M. Gilbert and Susan Gubar in *The Madwoman in the Attic*.⁷⁴ While this understanding of the autobiographical background of

⁷³ Cf. Gutleben, *Nostalgic Postmodernism* (179-84).

⁷⁴ Gilbert and Gubar have suggestively entitled their Brontë chapter as "The Spectral Selves of Charlotte Brontë" (336-71).

Jane Eyre is central to the identity plays in *Charlotte*, the fact that Miranda's profession and her feminist ideas are severely ridiculed extends the iconoclastic tone to the contemporary level of the story and to the status of *Jane Eyre* as a central work in feminist literary criticism and its corrective canons. The pastiche in *Charlotte* together with its mirroring contemporary story engage with the critical responses and creative rewritings of *Jane Eyre*, hence rendering the source text of less importance than the influential traditions it has inspired and inaugurated. Informed by the tradition of rewriting *Jane Eyre*, the deliberately banal pastiche in *Charlotte* illustrates how the overwritten text no longer belongs to any original instance. Biographical research into the secluded family life of the Brontës, psychoanalytical interpretations of *Jane Eyre* and feminist and postcolonial readings – all of which are present in *Charlotte* – have by now become inseparable elements of the novel *Jane Eyre*.⁷⁵

This kind of treatment of the Victorian classic is prone to evoke an emotional response. While many readers would recognise it as postmodern irony, the excessive sexual perversions together with the suppression of the proto-feminist heroine are likely to arouse feelings of annoyance, maybe even disgust and anger. *Charlotte* disallows the kind of emphatic reading strategy invited by *Jane Eyre* and may thus thwart the readers' expectations.⁷⁶

⁷⁵ See also Kirchknopf (68-69), who reads *Charlotte* as reflecting the process of rewriting through its involvement with *Wide Sargasso Sea*.

⁷⁶ As I pointed out in chapter 2.3, paratexts (titles, subtitles) and illustrations play an important role in the signalling of the pastiche contract. It is therefore interesting to observe the different expectation horizons activated by the front cover pictures of the two editions of *Charlotte*. The historical painting used in the cover of the first edition (hardback, 2000) resembles the covers of Penguin and Oxford classics, thereby suggesting a positive and serious engagement with (literary) history. The phrase printed on the cover – “The last journey of Jane Eyre” – makes it explicit that the novel rewrites a beloved classic, the heroine of which the painting (“Dublin Bay” by Sir William Orpen) is supposed to depict. By contrast, the second edition (paperback, 2001) features a semi-pornographic photograph of a topless black woman standing on a beach. Her head has been cropped off, and the viewer's attention is drawn to her voluptuous breasts and the curves of her hips. (The same photo is reprinted on the back cover of the hardback edition, as well as in the novel, at the juncture of the Victorian pastiche and the contempo-

Unlike most neo-Victorian novels, it prevents a nostalgic approach to the Victorian past; if there is a site of nostalgia in *Charlotte*, it resides in the diary of Miranda's ageing father, who is looking back at his youth in the 1950s (incidentally decade of Thomas's coming of age as well).

Sex, Lies and Audiotape

Following the pastiche's double strategy of identification and differentiation, the embedded contemporary story in *Charlotte* repeats or varies many aspects of the pastiche but at the same time differs from it in its detailed, at times poetically flowing prose and its more profound characterisation of the protagonist. The contemporary narrative continues, as it were, the pastiche story, but with a different protagonist, Miranda Stevenson, a Brontë scholar who is attending a feminist conference on Martinique in the last summer of the millennium. Instead of listening to her colleagues' presentations she spends most of her time driving around the countryside and having occasional sex with the local men: "Idly as I dreamed-along through the brilliant colours I wondered if I had time to fuck all the men on this island. It would be a way of passing the time, a pleasant alternative to collecting postcards or ethnic dolls" (99). The modern promiscuous heroine who is also a pathological liar seems to have little in common with the decent and firmly honest Jane of the pastiche, yet their stories overlap on many occasions. This overlapping is suggested by the ambiguous reference when the contemporary story begins in chapter six of the novel: although the time change from the mid-Victorian to the contemporary is obvious, both from the semi-pornographic photograph marking the transition between the narrative levels and from the contents of the first paragraph, the unspecified pronouns 'I' and 'we' still seem to refer to Jane and her travel com-

rary narrative.) In the second edition, the novel's historic/Victorian associations cannot be deduced from the cover design.

panion from the preceding pastiche instead of Miranda and her colleague (or her double since the 'we' could here equally well designate Miranda and Charlotte Brontë) (81). On Martinique Miranda poses as Charlotte Brontë (81) and offers a version of the plot of *Jane Eyre* as her own life story (85). Her sexual adventures with the Martiniquans lead to a pregnancy which symbolically carries on that of Jane. The illicit pregnancy provides Miranda with a means to get rid of her conventional husband David and to return, in a regressive move, to live in her childhood home with her widowed father Ben.⁷⁷ There she reassumes an incestuous relationship with the ailing old man, sometimes impersonating her mother Emma, who was apparently driven to suicide by mental instability and insatiable sexual desires. The rejection of the society's conventional values is shown to facilitate Miranda's trajectory from a second-rate academic to a writer of fiction.

That perverted sexuality and artistic creativity are linked is evident in a scene where Miranda is having occasional sex with a Martiniquan fieldworker while creating a diary entry on a dictaphone.⁷⁸ Although the subject matter of the poetic, freely associating recording pertains to her experiences at a local tourist attraction, she is dictating it in her dead mother's Cornish dialect, not in her own voice. This blending of personas is further complicated when she afterwards introduces herself to her lover as "Charlotte" and imagines her mother in terms that are reminiscent of the mad exotic Bertha Mason, or Antoinette as she is called in Rhys's *Wide Sargasso Sea*: "I wasn't just seeing all the greens and mauves and golds, I was seeing my mother in all her bewitchedness and her misery. All her flamboyance, the way my father couldn't keep his

⁷⁷ As in *Possession*, here too the characters' names reflect their position or fate through references to literature. Ben is implicitly associated with Prospero, Miranda's father in *The Tempest*, and R.L. Stevenson's *Treasure Island* – yet another Victorian *Bildungsroman* – takes place on a fictitious island in the West Indies.

⁷⁸ The foregrounding of perversity in the novel is an aspect of its satire, but it also has a more serious meaning. *Charlotte* works against a conception of safe, ordinary, "bourgeois" sexuality which is presented in the novel as a restrictive force. By contrast, incest, sadomasochism and promiscuity allow the free, unconstrained flow of sexuality that can lead to a positive change in a character's life.

eyes from the mysteries beyond the hem of her skirt; and hearing her voice, seductive or raging, behind closed doors. At the same time, I was feeling his white stuff trickling down" (Thomas 98-99). In the last sentence the pronoun "he" refers to Miranda's lover, but again the ambiguity of the reference allows for another interpretation. The slip transgresses the boundaries between two narrative levels – Miranda's present sexual adventure and the history of her parents' marriage – and merges the identities of Miranda's father and one of the possible fathers of her illegitimate child, just as Miranda's imitation of her mother obscures the distinction between the two women. If the sexual antics of the pastiche were already rather extreme, Miranda's narrative nevertheless outdoes them in its provocative culmination in the incestuous relationship between the daughter and father.

However disturbing this conclusion might be, it appears logical in the light of the novel's character analogies, suggested in the many parallels and the overlapping of references. If, as Miranda claims, Charlotte Brontë's life functions as a model for the novel *Jane Eyre*, so *Jane Eyre* and its promiscuous rewriting in the pastiche provide the pattern for Miranda's life. Charlotte Brontë, *Jane Eyre* and Miranda Stevenson all blend into one passionate and creative woman – the eponymic Charlotte – who suffers from the limits imposed on her by her culture and situation in life. This blending is evident for instance in the way in which Miranda alternately imagines her life in terms of those of Jane and Charlotte (e.g., 85, 140-41). Her conference paper is based on the now conventional feminist interpretation according to which Charlotte Brontë had to split herself between the central characters of her novel in order to sustain the Victorian decorum that could not approve in a single character the combination of Jane's pure idealism, Bertha's raging madness and Rochester's masculinity. This splitting of identity produces in *Charlotte* still further chains of character correspondences. The mad, self-destructive and sexually powerful women of the novel include Charlotte Brontë's suppressed darker self Bertha Mason and Miranda's suicidal mother Emma, while the Reverend Brontë (Charlotte's fa-

ther), Edward Rochester and Miranda's father Ben represent sexually powerful, authoritative father figures who can offer security to their troubled daughters and/or lovers. In the world of *Charlotte*, identity is thus constructed through subsequent and simultaneous identifications which lead to almost dizzying repetition. Over and over again, the same desires and conflicts are dramatised and the same roles are taken, although often with ironic variations. Where the reconciliation between conflicting forces in *Jane Eyre* was achieved at the cost of sacrificing Bertha and by substituting the real object of desire – the father – with a patronising lover, as Thomas's novel suggests through its references to feminist criticism, *Charlotte* can be seen as resurrecting Bertha in Miranda's impersonation of her mother and fulfilling the suppressed and sublimated desire of the Victorian narrative by uniting the daughter and the father in an incestuous relationship.

In *Nostalgic Postmodernism* Gutleben criticises what he sees as the commercial exploitation of *Jane Eyre* in *Charlotte*, suggesting that "Thomas's ideological purpose could very well have been carried out using an anonymous Victorian character" (183). By contrast, I would argue that it is precisely through the classic novel and its protagonist that Thomas's ideological "purpose" is realised. Had he used a fictional character, the transgressive element of the novel would have remained hypothetical: precisely the fact that he is (mis)using an iconic text with a long critical tradition gives the novel a special resonance. His dual text – pastiche and its contemporary variation – not only offers a perspective on Charlotte Brontë and her novel; he is also commenting on the characteristics of the neo-Victorian genre (in which the novels of the Brontës figure as prominent models), and, moreover, presenting a conception of authorship which draws its inspiration from the raw and disturbing impulses underlying the romantic tale in Charlotte Brontë's novel.

Incestuous Pastiche

The title of Thomas's novel explicitly invokes the figure of the author, thus indicating its main theme. The use of Charlotte Brontë's Christian name lays the stress on the private, intimate side of her life and the relationship of her personal experiences to the semi-autobiographical *Jane Eyre*. Like *Jane Eyre*, *Charlotte* too traces the protagonist's (or protagonists' – Jane's and Miranda's) progress into authorship, following a convention of the *Bildungsroman* genre in which the novel we are reading turns out to be, at the end, the work (or the projected work) of the main character. Both the Victorian and contemporary narratives of *Charlotte* abide by this tradition, despite some ironic transformations. Thomas's Jane never attains the stable, enduring status of a wife and mother, which would put a definitive end to her development and justify its narration. Consequently her memoir – the "real" version of her life after her marriage to Rochester – is left unfinished. The death of the Victorian author's proxy is hardly innocent of Barthesian connotations in a postmodern novel such as *Charlotte*, but Thomas does not deny the importance of authorship. Rather he is replenishing an older conception of a feeling, suffering author, who draws from her own lived experience, with contemporary ideas about the necessity of imitation and repetition. This conception is epitomised in Miranda's path to authorship, which is depicted in a deliberately ambiguous and satiric manner. In Ben's diary, which is also included in the novel, we learn that Miranda is planning to compose sequels to classic Victorian novels by female authors:

She has an idea for creating alternative endings to nineteenth-century novels – to bring out the repressed issues. She thinks *Jane Eyre*, *Pride & Prejudice*, and perhaps *Mill on the Floss*. [. . .] She says it will help her to make a start, because she won't have to invent an entirely new plot. I encourage her in her ambitions. She's bloody bright, I tell her, and I'm proud of her. Her mother would be proud of her too. (174-75)

However, in the course of the novel it becomes apparent that instead of writing sequels to Victorian classics Miranda is turning

one classic into her own life story. Gradually it is revealed to the readers that the Victorian narrative is a pastiche written by Miranda, and although it is never made explicit, it seems that the novel as a whole – including the sections purporting to be from her father’s diary – should be taken as her work.⁷⁹ The fact that Miranda’s authorship to a large extent consists of pastiching an actual source text further thwarts the traditional authorship narrative of the *Bildungsroman*. Miranda’s compound identity and eclectic work do not celebrate the birth of a distinguished voice; instead they parodically invert that ideal. Her initials M.S. – as in the abbreviation for manuscript – indicate the processual, non-finalised quality of both her life and writings.

Miranda’s authorship is then grounded on two mutually dependent factors: the imitation of a canonical literary work and partial identification with its author. Her position ironically evokes Harold Bloom’s famous reformulation of the traditional master-disciple system in *The Anxiety of Influence*. Bloom envisions literary history as a struggle between powerful poets and their successors who are trying to come to terms with their anxiety of influence by creatively misinterpreting their predecessors, hence turning the restrictive influence into a personal triumph. Although Miranda’s travesty of *Jane Eyre* could be seen as a case in point of Bloomian misreading, the irony arises from the fact that Bloom only acknowledges the existence and importance of male writers and remains silent on influential female models and revisionary literary daughters. However, the irony turns into a form of acquiescence: as a misreading of Bloom’s patriarchal theory, Thomas’s novel in fact fulfils its prediction and thus proves not only its validity but

⁷⁹ When Miranda asks Ben about his relationship to Jean Rhys (“Did you fuck her, Daddy?”), Ben answers: “You’ll have to wait for my journals. Edit them when I’m gone” (Thomas 176). It is not revealed whether the journal we are reading is Miranda’s invention (in which case she would also “pastiche” her father) or the “real” version edited by her. At any rate, we get the impression that the editor’s role is not altogether agreeable to Miranda. In a disturbing sleepwalking scene she shouts to Ben: “You ask me to edit your fucking journals! You expect me to go through all that horror! You’re a fucking rapist, a mind-rapist!” (177).

also its inbuilt, irrefutable superiority (see Orr 68-73). The main difference in Bloom's conception of authorship and Thomas's version of it is one of emphasis: while Bloom stresses the antagonistic element and the gradual process of overcoming the influence, Thomas's novel indulges in the initial submission and identification. Thus, when for Bloom deliberate submission to a predecessor represents ultimate failure in artistic pursuits (e.g., 141), for Miranda composing pastiches of Charlotte Brontë turns out to be a liberating experience as it releases her from the repressive, boring life of the bourgeois academic and offers an outlet for her creativity.

Despite the different emphases, there is one particular point in which Bloom's ideas about authorship and Miranda's passage to authorship concur. *Charlotte* takes its cue from the "perverse-ness" of poetic misprision which Bloom associates with the Freudian family romance and "the enchantment of incest" (96). As I pointed out earlier, in *Charlotte* this theme has its roots in psychoanalytic interpretations which seek to explain Charlotte Brontë's life by analysing it in the light of the disturbing undercurrents of her novels. In her conference presentation, Miranda suggests that Charlotte Brontë's creativity in part stems from her unconventional intimacy with her father, "her first husband" (Thomas 138), and likewise Jane Eyre completes her *Bildung* and commences her "autobiography" only after she marries Rochester, the surrogate father in *Jane Eyre*.

Both powerful, invigorating and destructive, the desire that draws daughters to their fathers and *vice versa* fascinates and inspires Miranda. The other necessary impulse for her authorship however comes from the mother's side. As a writer she adopts as her model and "textual mother" Charlotte Brontë and Brontë's autobiographical novel *Jane Eyre*, while as a daughter she both impersonates her biological mother Emma and relives her promiscuity and madness. Miranda seeks to substitute the powerful, mad mother by imitating her. Thus *Charlotte* introduces what could be called a family model of authorship in which creativity stems from

a fusion of intimate sexual and textual relationships between a writer and her biological and literary parents.

As I pointed out before, the excessive sexuality and perverse provocations serve as vehicles of satire of the conventions and values of the neo-Victorian novel, and in this sense, *Charlotte* recreates a well-worn type of burlesque whose target is debased through sexual terms. However, the provocations also have an affirmative purpose, as they stress the necessity for a creative artist to transgress restrictive moral and aesthetic norms. Thomas is, like Bloom, a neo-Romantic, but of a different species: he is, as Bran Nicol puts it, "at his most powerful and original when bound to a precursor text; paradoxically, that is, he becomes most 'himself' as a writer when he is being someone else" (80, see also 8). Rather than completely dismissing the conventional notion of authorship and its grounding in the personal experiences of the author, *Charlotte* revises it in a particularly poignant manner. The fundamental principle of the *Bildungsroman*, the connection between identity formation and authorship, is left intact, but the emphasis is on the spurious and non-definitive quality of the process of self-narration. Authorship in *Charlotte* is grounded on uncontrollable desires and form-giving models – and on the self-conscious play upon these demarcations.

Pastiche thus plays a major role in the problematisation of authorship in *Charlotte*. In addition, the novel offers a new, disturbing interpretation of the fundamental double-edgedness of pastiche. In the fictive world of *Charlotte*, the Jane Eyre pastiche was originally written by Miranda to deceive Ben, who is an ardent collector of Victoriana.⁸⁰ By emphasising the affinity between forgery and pastiche, *Charlotte* casts an aspect of immorality on pastiche. Moreover, the intertwining of the sexual and the textual throughout the novel and the role of the pastiche/forgery in the relationship between Miranda and Ben draw a parallel between

⁸⁰ Since Ben firmly believes in the authenticity of the obviously fake manuscript, one must ask how sensible the rest of his notions are. In *Charlotte*, the characters are constantly shown in a contradictory light, which emphasises the uncertainty or impossibility of truly knowing someone.

pastiche and incest, a suffocating intimacy between near kindred. Thomas is not the only writer to use this analogy: in *La Degré supreme de la tendresse*, Marienskié draws a parallel between transgressive sexuality (incest, phantasies and acts of castration) and pastiche as a literary form. Castigated by society (in the case of incest) or the literary institution (in the case of "immoral" pastiche), these acts involve the possibility of destructive power. In pastiche, the source text to some extent subjugates its imitation, but the pasticheur's guilty pleasure in playing with the words of the source text may also lead to its destruction, as when the pastiche in *Charlotte* turns the Victorian classic into a pale imitation and finally does away with its protagonist. Yet, in *Charlotte* incest does not stand for straightforward abuse: it is a complex and provocative metaphor for the muddled origins of creativity which is exemplified in the ambiguous practice of pastiche.

While the idea of pastiche as a kind of textual incest appears to reinforce the strongest and most conservative prejudices against pastiche, its bold exaggeration in fact flouts them. Thomas's novel underlines the essential ambiguity of pastiche and refuses to settle its paradoxes. Moreover, the incestuous Victorian pastiche ironically stages the neo-Victorian novel's obsession with the sexual and textual lives of the Victorians and hints at the hidden motives behind the flourishing heritage industry.

Conclusion: The Fates and Futures of Pastiche

In *Les Fruits d'or* (1963), Natalie Sarraute describes with uncanny accuracy and irony the fluctuations of a literary debate about the merits and flaws of the novel within the novel, the fictitious *Les Fruits d'or*. Towards the end of the novel, the issue of imitation emerges: "According to you, it would be quite possible for a pasticheur to be a greater genius... Well, it just happens, that's not true. Because it's dead, a copy is necessarily dead... No spontaneous, new sensations, no direct contact with an untouched, unknown substance... Academism is that. You know that perfectly" (*Golden Fruits* 143).¹ These disconnected sentences commend a simplifying, evaluative notion of pastiche that I have sought to challenge in this study, first by investigating the different conceptions and theories of pastiche and their background assumptions, then by arguing for what I believe to be a tenable and productive notion of pastiche and finally by offering analyses that illustrate the multiplicity of this double-edged practice. This is the first study that brings these approaches – historical, conceptual and practical considerations – together to investigate the phenomenon of literary pastiche.

In part one, I traced the trajectories of pastiche from the etymological dish to a term of art criticism and literary discourse. The emergence of the term is conditioned by the process of individualisation which made uniqueness of style an aesthetic norm and influenced the legislation protecting the moral rights and copyrights of authors. Acknowledged and hence legal, pastiche nevertheless meddles with the very aspects that are protected by authors' rights: the right of attribution (which it complicates with double signature) and the right of integrity (since it repeats, adapts

¹ "A vous entendre, il serait tout à fait possible qu'un pasticheur ait plus de génie... Eh bien non, justement. Parce que c'est mort, vous le savez, c'est fortement mort, une copie... Pas de sensation spontanée, neuve, pas de contact direct avec une substance intacte, inconnue... L'académisme, c'est ça. Vous le savez parfaitement" (*Les Fruits d'or* 128). I have slightly modified Maria Jolas's English translation.

and imitates substantial parts of the source text and might even replace the source text).

The discontinuities and gaps in the history of the concept – such as the disappearance from the critical discourse of the influential account by Roger de Piles or the rapid and rather sudden emergence of the concept of postmodern pastiche – have obliterated from view the historical dimension of the concept. My historical investigation attested that despite such disjunctions, it is possible to perceive a succession of themes and emphases which have relevance for today's conceptions and theories. Contrary to the powerful claims of contemporary theory that seek to assert pastiche as a postmodern phenomenon, I have stressed the importance of the history of the concept, not merely as a genealogy, but also as a relevant source for insightful analyses of pastiche from angles that remain beyond the scope of current criticism.

The historical investigation also revealed a consequential distinction between French and Anglophone critical traditions: the former tends to be textualist and literary in its orientation, concentrating on the relationship between the pastiche and its source text, whereas the latter is strongly influenced by contemporary cultural politics, juxtaposing instances of pastiche from different arts and seeing pastiche as a form of *bricolage*. This division corresponds to a division in the meaning of the term pastiche, to which I offered the terminological solution of calling the hybrid form *compilation pastiche* and stylistic imitation *stylistic pastiche*. However, I also pointed out the problems pertaining to the former conception which is finally indistinguishable from many other forms of intertextuality and appropriation. I called attention to how, in analyses of postmodern hybrid novels, the term pastiche is evoked to add theoretical credence, but its more precise significance to the works being scrutinised remains unspecified. Moreover, the temporal limitation of compilation pastiche to the postmodern period proved problematic. While more restricted in meaning, stylistic pastiche was shown to have the advantage of corresponding to a historical tradition of pastiches that are called pastiches and that can be distinguished from other, related intertextual practices.

I wish to reiterate here, however, that both literary forms – eclectic intertextuality (compilation pastiche) and stylistic pastiche – are worthwhile objects of investigation; my criticism extends only to what I perceive as less successful uses of the concept. As the theoretical discussion has already moved on from postmodern concerns, it is possible and necessary to assess the significance of those concerns in a historical perspective.

In part two, I juxtaposed some examples and analyses of compilation pastiche and stylistic pastiche to illustrate their differences but also pointed out the difficulty of maintaining strict distinctions in terms of individual literary works. The specificity of pastiche lies in its often striking closeness with the source text whose style it adopts and performs in a new context, creating a deliberately transparent illusion of sameness. I used the concepts of *pastiche contract* and *double signature* in the analysis of the pastiche status of an imitation: how it communicates its imitative status to the readers and how it complicates the apparently straightforward division into originals and imitations. Drawing attention to its inescapable double-edgedness, I illustrated how pastiche manifests the impossibility of repetition at various levels and hence also of originality as opposed to instances of repetition and derivation. Returning to Jonathan Culler's idea of literature as a system that constantly tests its own limits, I looked at how writers have used pastiche as a test laboratory to investigate ideas about the value and potential of literature.

The analyses of pastiche fictions in part three elucidated some of the central aspects of pastiche as a literary form. First of all, they showed how pastiche can serve as a connector or mediator between different contexts. Proust's pastiches were analysed as instances of a writer investigating the affinities between his own understanding of the expressive possibilities of literature and those of another writer. In Proust's poetics, pastiche is thus akin to metaphor or double vision: the ability to see the interconnect-edness of two seemingly different things. Similarly, in Byatt's *Possession*, the motifs of spiritualism and resurrection function as analogies to pastiche, which has the power to revive past styles.

My interpretation of the chain of associations in Byatt's novel concentrated on the transgressive aspect of pastiche or the curious logic by which pastiche reinforces the very boundaries – aesthetic, temporal, ideological – it breaks. All the works analysed in part three, Byatt's novel in particular, attest to the value and indeed necessity of repetition and retelling as cultural functions.

Moreover, the pastiches of Byatt and the Goncourt pastiche of *Le Temps retrouvé* are instances of pastiche being used to create the realistic effect of access to the past, although this access is rendered problematic by the obvious and deliberately highlighted mediatedness of the stylistic imitations. The juxtaposition of the Narrator's and Edmond de Goncourt's versions of the Verdurin circle questions the notion of truthful representation as correspondence to reality and exemplifies instead how each writer has a truth of his own arising from his particular vision and its artistic expression. Byatt, by contrast, points out the difficulty in trying to establish whether the pasticheur possesses the styles she is imitating or whether the past possesses her.

A somewhat different example of the use of pastiche in historical contextualisation was found in Dibdin's and Meyer's Sherlock Holmes pastiches, where coupling the famous detective with historical characters from the late Victorian era functions as a way of recontextualising the source texts. The emphasis of these pastiches is not on the representation of history; the historical figures and details are used to reflect on the contradictory or puzzling traits of the original Sherlock Holmes stories. The novels of Dibdin and Meyer show how stylistic imitation can be a powerful means of rewriting a literary classic or a canon. Likewise, Thomas's *Charlotte* illustrates how in a pastiche the canonical source text is presented through the history of its reception, including critical interpretations and other rewritings which form and change the source text's meanings, and the homages by Heaney and Day Lewis, discussed in part II, were show to construct a web of associations between artists and authors from different contexts.

Finally, an important notion for the pastiches analysed is that of authorship and its conditions, especially the need to ascertain authenticity and the need to assess the value of the authorial style imitated. Proust's false diamonds and his Narrator's ruminations on the significance of literature (and thus on whether he should become an author on his own right); the idolisation of Arthur Conan Doyle and his hero Sherlock Holmes in the preface of *The Exploits of Sherlock Holmes* and the subtexts of the seemingly ordinary stories; Miranda's unconventional *Bildung* into becoming an author in *Charlotte*; the probing of the conditions of authorship for Victorian women and their mirroring in Roland's tentative career as a poet in *Possession* all illustrate the continuing importance of negotiating the role of the author as a creator and craftsman/craftswoman of texts. Such texts cannot be reduced to mere cases of anxiety of influence; although the feeling of late-coming is a real concern in them, their double-edgedness thwarts such simplistic interpretations.

In the quotation from *Les Fruits d'or* at the beginning, the speaker's attitude is fixed and fixing: pastiche is *by nature* devoid of spontaneity and incapable of creating new sensations. I have in this study argued against such essentialist conceptions by investigating the multiple usages and functions of pastiche. Although closeness with the source text is its condition, the study of pastiche as a literary form should not be limited to the tracing of the similarities between the imitation and its model. It is also worth asking, how pastiches are published and marketed, how they function in the context in which they appear, what conceptions, feelings and prejudices they evoke in the readers, why reactions to and evaluations of pastiche are often so confused or slighting. Only in such broad perspective does the significance of pastiche as a cultural form become apparent.

The strong association between pastiche with postmodernism in Anglophone literary criticism and theory might seem to indicate that the term is now past its heyday. There are, however, strong indications that this is not the case. The increasing popularity of the neo-Victorian genre, seminars and colloquies devoted to pas-

tiche in universities and research institutes and the publication in recent years of works such as Richard Dyer's study on the emotional impact of pastiches (2007), Paul Aron's *Histoire du pastiche* (2008) and the first English translation of Proust's *L'Affaire Lemoine* (2008) – just to mention a few examples – suggest that interest in this literary form is by contrast on the rise. The loosening of the postmodern paradigm has allowed for the exploration of new perspectives on pastiche. This activity has made pastiche visible and increasingly available to both writers and audiences who might not have been familiar with it previously. Pastiche has, during the twentieth century, gradually become established as one of the key terms – alongside parody, allusion and rewriting – to describe the ways in which literature functions by recycling and recontextualising previous texts. Its particular focus on style and its many ways of representing and reinterpreting previous discourses make it a highly ambivalent form of expression that can, precisely because of its strangeness, make us more sensitive to the oddities of some of the received notions on which our cultural practices and institutions are based.

Appendix

On the Meanings of the Term ‘Pastiche’ and Its Variants in Different European Languages

It is my contention that the present difficulty in understanding and interpreting the cultural products that go by the name of pastiche results in part from its particular historical status in the English language. Coming from the Finnish culture where pastiche – *pastissi* – means primarily the imitation of style, I was at first puzzled at the much more inclusive and curiously vacillating use of the term in the writings of Fredric Jameson, whose notion of pastiche first attracted my attention as an undergraduate student. Later, as I read more widely on the subject, I began to realise that there seems to be a semantic boundary in how pastiche is understood in English and other European languages. In English, it is primarily associated with eclecticism and compilation, while elsewhere it is used to denote the imitation of style or manner. At present, this difference is rapidly disappearing because of the worldwide dominance of the English-speaking cultures. In the current situation, native English speakers may not be aware of the different meanings of the term and the influence of the French conception of pastiche on other European languages.¹

In order to determine the extent of this semantic difference, I did a little survey of the meanings given to pastiche in different

¹ The unawareness of the semantic differences is also indicative of the limited distribution of academic studies across language barriers. As I have noted earlier in this study, the French and English-language criticism on pastiche constitute two separate realms that are only partly in communication with each other. Mary Orr has observed a similar phenomenon in the field of intertextuality studies. Reviewing the distribution of studies of intertextuality in various languages, Orr notes “how critical (in many senses) is the availability of key texts, and, if in translation, that they follow rapidly on the heels of their language of first publication. Where a theorist, or his/her whole corpus, is not translated, material simply disappears from reading lists, bibliographies and, more important, cultural and critical circulation” (8), and adds that “no card-carrying cultural critic, especially in a global twenty-first-century culture, can be resolutely monolingual” (11).

European languages. The results are by no means intended as definitive research; indeed, many of the observations and suggestions below come with the caveat “to my knowledge” and are open to comment and criticism. I have neither the professional skills nor the means to conduct a historical survey of the term’s distribution in European languages, although I think that such a project would be highly interesting.

The general dictionaries which I consulted for the purposes of this little study, do not reflect the many meanings and contexts that individual language users have given to the term, but they do offer a sufficiently general outlook on what is considered to be the primary meaning of the term in each language. With a few exceptions, these dictionaries focus on contemporary language; unfortunately only a few give any indication of when the term *pastiche* was adopted by the language in question. However, most of them confirm French as the language from which the term was borrowed, although the Italian *pasticcio* is mentioned as the term’s etymological origin. As I point out in more detail in chapter 1.2, the first known occurrence of *pastiche* (the Frenchified form of *pasticcio*) is in 1699 in Roger de Piles’s treatise *Abregé de la vie des Peintres*.² This work, together with the article on *pastiche* in the great Enlightenment project *Encyclopédie*, was widely distributed in Europe and undoubtedly contributed to the adoption of the term in other European languages in the French and not the original Italian form.

Moving on to the actual definitions, it is interesting to observe how the same ideas and expressions recur in the dictionaries of various languages. I shall begin my selective lexical tour from Northern Europe. According to *Nationalencyklopedi*, the term *pastich* was first used in Swedish in 1832, and is now defined as “an artistic work which has consciously borrowed means of expres-

² Although Piles’s work is sometimes dated as early as 1677, the *Dictionnaire historique de la langue française* erroneously gives 1719 as the year when the term was first used in French. The derived terms – the verb *pasticher* and the nouns *pasticheur*, *-euse*; *pasticherie* – were established, according to the *Dictionnaire historique*, only in the mid-nineteenth century.

sion used (by an artist) in an earlier period.”³ The online version of the Danish *Ordbog over det danske sprog* suggests that the literary meaning is now the primary one: “Pastiche [. . .] a copy or an imitation of (the style of) an older art work (painting, composition, literary work); now [used] esp. of a literary work where the writer (for artistic purposes) seeks to imitate in a straightforward manner a previous discourse.”⁴ *Den danske ordbog* puts it more simply: pastiche means “the imitation of the style of a bygone period or a certain artist.”⁵ The example it gives – “a successful pastiche of the detailed prose of the Victorian period”⁶ – acknowledges the cultural influence of Britain, but the understanding of the meaning of the term differs from that in English. In Germany, a translation of Piles’s chapter on pastiche appeared in *Grosses vollständiges Universal-Lexicon* (1740), and while the definition was copied from the French source, the editors of the dictionary had nevertheless decided to place it under the (misspelt) Italian heading *pastici*. According to the present-day *Duden*, pastiche means “imitation of the style and ideas of an author.”⁷

In Finnish, the general dictionaries associate *pastissi* primarily with the visual arts, defining it as the imitation of the style of another artist or another period (*Kielitoimiston sanakirja*; Turtia). *Eesti keele sõnaraamat* is more inclusive in its definition of the Estonian variant, *pastišš*: “A work of art, literature, or music which consciously imitates the style of another period or another author.”⁸ Polish dictionaries define *pastisz* as a work of art, music or literature which deliberately imitates the style or manner of another art-

³ “[. . .] konstnärligt verk som medvetet lånat uttrycksmedel typiska för (konstnär under) tidigare epok.” For a more elaborate definition of pastiche in Swedish, see Petherick.

⁴ “Pastiche [. . .] kopi ell. efterligning af (stilen i) et ældre kunstværk (maleri, musikstykke, litteraturværk); nu spec. om skønlitterært arbejde, hvori forfatteren (i kunstnerisk hensigt) tilstræber en direkte efterligning af forældet sprog.”

⁵ “[. . .] efterligning af en svunden epokes el. en bestemt kunstners stil[.]”

⁶ “[. . .] en vellykket pastiche på viktoriatidens omstændelige prosa[.]”

⁷ “Nachahmung des Stils u. der Ideen eines Autors.”

⁸ “[T]eise ajastu v autori stiili teadlikult jäljendav kunsti-, kirjandus- v muusikateos.”

ist, school or epoch (*Słownik języka polskiego; Uniwersalny słownik języka polskiego*) or, in more detail, as “[. . .] a work which is the result of stylisation, that is, of the deliberate imitation of an artist, school or period, but which is not intended as a counterfeit’: Pastiche is used playfully, or as a literary-critical means by which a foreign style penetrates a work”⁹ (*Praktyczny słownik współczesnej polszczyzny*). This definition distinguishes pastiche from other forms of stylisation which alter or falsify the style of the original and assigns it a jocular and literary-critical function. In Russian, the term pastiche never took root except in the musical sense of composite opera (see also p. 66 of this study). The current edition of the French *Le Robert* defines pastiche as “a literary or artistic work in which the author has imitated or forged the manner, the style of a master” and, following de Piles, as the “imitation of style, manner of a writer, an artist, a school (without being a copy of a particular work).”¹⁰ In Portuguese, pastiche denotes an artwork or a literary work that imitates the style of another artist or writer (*Grande dicionário da língua portuguesa*). The word’s semantic scope is the most extensive in Italian: in addition to the culinary and artistic meanings, it denotes a mess, as in the title of Carlo Emilio Gadda’s novel *Quer pasticciaccio brutto de via Merulana* (1980, translated into English as *That Awful Mess on the Via Merulana*) (see Battaglia).¹¹ However, the academic studies of pastiche in Italian use the French form pastiche rather than the Italian original (e.g., *Le lettere rubate: studi sul Pastiche letterario; Mildonian*).

These brief examples taken from general dictionaries display a variety of emphases: pastiche is characterised as borrowing,

⁹ “[. . .] dzieło sztuki powstałe w wyniku stylizacji, świadomego naśladowania stylu jakiegoś twórcy, szkoły lub epoki, lecz nie mające charakteru fałszerstwa’: Pastsz uprawiany jest w celach żartobliwych lub jako forma krytycznoliterackiej penetracji cudzego stylu.” I am grateful to Leena Kaakinen for her kind and meticulous assistance with Polish-language sources, but take full responsibility for any mistakes in my translations.

¹⁰ “Œuvre littéraire ou artistique dans laquelle l’auteur a imité, contrefait la manière, le style d’un maître[.]” “Imitation du style, de la manière d’un écrivain, d’un artiste, d’une école (sans qu’il y ait copie d’une œuvre particulière).”

¹¹ The title also alludes to the artistic sense of the term.

copying, rendering (*tilstræbe*), or – most frequently – as imitation. The object of pastiche is defined as the style, manner or means of expression, and while the German and Estonian definitions also include imitation of ideas or thoughts, the *Duden* definition suggests that style and ideas form an inseparable unity. The definitions of pastiche in various languages imply that the model is specific both in the sense of being a limited entity and in the sense that it can be identified. Indeed, despite their different emphases, the definitions seem fairly consistent: pastiche is seen as an artistic work which uses stylistic means that are characteristic of another artist or of an earlier period. Interestingly, none of the contemporary definitions refers to eclecticism suggested by the etymology.¹² On the whole, one can agree with Wido Hempel, who calls *pastiche* a “special term for a literary genre that can be described in other terms, but for which there is neither a synonym in French nor a direct equivalent in other languages,”¹³ and who maintains that the French meaning is the one in which the word is adopted – as a loanword – into other languages (171).

English, however, is another story. According to *The Oxford English Dictionary*, the term *pasticcio* was first used in English in John Savage’s 1706 translation of Roger de Piles’s *Abregé de la vie des Peintres*,¹⁴ and, judging by the examples recorded by the editors of *OED*, the term seems to have gained some currency by the latter half of the eighteenth century. As to the French form of the word, the quotations in *OED* suggest that it came into use much later, in the latter half of the nineteenth century. This is not entirely accurate: for instance, *The Artist’s Repository and Drawing Magazine* (five volumes between 1784-94) includes the following definition: “PASTICHE; this is an Italian term, applied to pictures painted by one master in the manner of another master, counter-

¹² Many dictionaries have a separate entry for the music term *pasticcio* (the eclectic opera).

¹³ “[. . .] der Spezialterminus für ein literarisches Genre, das wohl mit anderen Worten umschrieben werden kann, aber zu dem es weder im Französischen ein Synonym noch in anderen Sprachen eine unmittelbare Entsprechung gibt.”

¹⁴ See note 24, p. 38.

feiting not only the style of drawing, but also the colouring, handling, &c. Vide IMITATOR" (3: 119, emphases original). Thus the two forms of the term, *pasticcio* and *pastiche*, were in use in English in the eighteenth century, and, moreover, both were used of stylistic imitations.

The online *OED* has separate entries for the two terms, although their meanings overlap.¹⁵ I have below quoted in full the definitions given for both terms, together with the date of the first given occurrence of each sense (emphases are original):

pasticcio, n.

1. a. *Music.* An opera or other work consisting of a medley of pieces from different compositions or by different composers. (1742)
 - b. A work of art or architecture imitating an antique or older style; *esp.* one incorporating elements taken or copied from antique or classical works; this style in art or architecture. (1706)
 - c. A confused mixture, a hotchpotch; a mess. (1785)
-
2. An Italian pie usually containing a mixture of meat and pasta. (1772)

pastiche

A. noun

1. a. A novel, poem, painting, etc., incorporating several different styles, or made up of parts drawn from a variety of sources. (1866)
 - b. A musical composition incorporating different styles; a medley. (1934)
-
2. a. A work, *esp.* of literature, created in the style *of* someone or something else; a work that humorously exaggerates or parodies a particular style. (1873)
 - b. The technique of incorporating distinctive elements of other works or styles in a literary composition, design, etc. (1892)

B. adjective

1. Composed as an imitation or parody of a particular style or artist. (1871)

¹⁵ Draft revision Dec. 2008 (*pasticcio*); draft revision Mar. 2008 (*pastiche*).

2. Exhibiting or incorporating an amalgam of different styles. (1949)

The definitions seem to fall into two categories: in the first, *pastiche* means combining stylistic elements or parts from several sources (*pasticcio*: 1.a; *pastiche* A1.a, A1.b, A2.b, B2), in the second, it imitates or parodies a recognisable style (*pasticcio* 1.b; *pastiche* A2.a, B1). Unlike the other European languages quoted above, present-day English has preserved the original medley sense of the term. It seems that the Italian form *pasticcio* and its music-related meaning (composite opera) were already rooted in English when the term was re-imported, this time from French.¹⁶ The French and Italian forms of the term appear to have been used interchangeably of the two different kinds of artistic procedure, resulting in the variety of definitions in today's *OED*.

An additional reason why *pastiche* (in the widespread French sense of stylistic imitation) never became properly established in English was pointed out by Octave Delepierre in 1872, when he wrote that in English *pastiche* and *parody* are not distinguished from each other (250). In English, the term *parody* has traditionally been extended to stylistic imitations. For instance, Nathan Bailey's *A New Universal Etymological English Dictionary*¹⁷ from 1755 includes, under the term *parody*, the practice of

poetical pleasantry, consisting in applying the verses of some person, by way of ridicule, to another, or in turning a serious work into burlesque, by endeavouring, as near as can be, to observe the same words, rhimes, and cadences. It is in general a kind of writing, in which the words of an author, or his thoughts, are taken, and by a slight change adapted to some new purpose.

Similarly, the present online edition of *OED* explains *parody* as "a literary composition modelled on and imitating another work."

¹⁶ Georg Friedrich Handel, a famous composer also known for his *pasticci*, active in London 1712-59, may have contributed to the establishment of the music term in English through his works.

¹⁷ Neither Bailey nor Johnson's *A Dictionary of the English Language* (also published in 1755) records the terms *pastiche* or *pasticcio*.

Indeed, when discussing Proust's pastiches, English-speaking critics often refer to them as parodies (e.g., Hutcheon, *A Theory of Parody* 96; Slater 509); likewise, George D. Painter added the subtitle "a Proustian parody" to his translation of André Maurois's *Le Côté de Chelsea*. The two senses of pastiche together with its synonymous use with parody have undoubtedly contributed to the rather confusing usage of the term in contemporary English-language theory and criticism, in which its meaning seems to vacillate more than in writings on pastiche in other languages (which are not totally devoid of semantic confusions either). The relative proximity of the English term to the older sense (medley) also explains why English critics have been particularly keen on highlighting the Italian etymology of the term (cf. Hoesterey's preference for 'cento pastiche').

Rather than advocating a European standard for the meaning of pastiche, I would like to reiterate the point I have made earlier in this study: when using the term pastiche one should indicate the sense in which one is using it. As a critical concept, pastiche belongs to and draws from different historical and cultural contexts, and this variety is one of the reasons why it is such an interesting and powerful concept. However, its ambiguity cuts both ways: unless critics are aware of its history and background, there is a risk that the discussion of pastiche might begin to resemble one of the term's primary Italian meanings – a mess or a muddle.

Works cited

- Abondolo, Daniel. *A Poetics Handbook: Verbal Art in the European Tradition*. Richmond: Curzon, 2001.
- "Abregé de la vie de M. de Piles." Piles, *Abregé* n. pag.
- Ackroyd, Peter. *Chatterton*. 1987. Harmondsworth: Abacus, 1988.
- . *The Last Testament of Oscar Wilde*. 1983. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1993.
- Albalat, Antoine. *La Formation du Style par l'assimilation des Auteurs*. 3rd ed. Paris: Armand Colin, 1903.
- Albertsen, Leif Ludwig. "Der Begriff des Pastiche." *Orbis Litterarum* 26 (1971): 1-8.
- Allem, Maurice. "La Parodie et le pastiche." *La Muse française: Revue de la poésie* 6 (1927): 197-213.
- Alter, Jean. "Figures of Social and Semiotic Dissent." *A New History of French Literature*. Ed. Denis Hollier. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1989. 303-09.
- Aristotle. *Poetics*. Trans. and ed. Stephen Halliwell. *Aristotle, Poetics; Longinus, On the Sublime; Demetrius, On Style*. Loeb Classical Lib. 199. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1995. 1-141.
- Armstrong, Isobel. "Browning's *Mr. Sludge, 'The Medium.'*" *Victorian Poetry* 2 (1964): 1-9.
- Arnold, Sue. "A Triumph of Vic Lit." Rev. of *Observations*, by Jane Harris, *Salmon Fishing in the Yemen*, by Paul Torday, and *Wolf of the Plains*, by Conn Iggulden. *Guardian* 17 Feb 2007. 2 May 2009 <<http://www.guardian.co.uk/books/2007/feb/17/featuresreviews.guardianreview1>>
- Aron, Paul. "Formes et fonctions du parostiche dans la presse française du XIX^e siècle." Dousteyssier-Khoze and Place-Verghnes 255-73.
- . *Histoire du pastiche: Le pastiche littéraire français, de la Renaissance à nos jours*. Les Littéraires. Paris: PUF, 2008.
- , ed. *Du pastiche, de la parodie et de quelques notions connexes*. Quebec: Nota bene, 2004.
- Aron, Paul, and Jacques Espagnon. *Répertoire des pastiches et parodies littéraires des XIX^e et XX^e siècles*. Paris: PUPS 2009.
- The Artist's Repository and Drawing Magazine, Exhibiting the Principles of the Polite Arts in Their Various Branches*. 5 vols. London: C. Taylor, 1784-94.
- Artusi, Pellegrino. *Scienza in cucina e l'arte di mangiar bene*. 1891. Torino: Giulio Einaudi, 1970.
- Austen, Jane. *Emma*. 1815. Ed. Fiona Strafford. Penguin Classics. London: Penguin, 1996.
- Austen, Jane, and Another Lady. *Sanditon*. London: Peter Davies, 1975.

- Austin, James F. *The Politics of Pastiche from Proust to French Film*. Diss. Yale U, 2003.
- Bailey, Nathan. *A New Universal Etymological English Dictionary*. Rev. Joseph Nicol Scott. London: n.p., 1755.
- Bakhtin, M.M. "Discourse in the Novel." *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Univ. of Texas P Slavic Ser 1. Ed. Michael Holquist. Trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin: Texas UP, 1981. 259-422.
- . *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. Theory and Hist. of Lit. 8. Trans. Caryl Emerson. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1984.
- Bal, Mieke. *Travelling Concepts in the Humanities. A Rough Guide*. Green College Lectures. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 2002.
- Balcon, Jill. Introduction. *The Complete Poems of C. Day Lewis*. By C. Day Lewis. London: Sinclair-Stevenson, 1992. xi-xxi.
- Barthes, Roland. "La Crise de la vérité." Interview with Jean Jacques Brochier. *Magazine littéraire* 108 (1976). 12 May 2009 <<http://www.scribd.com/doc/6545079/Roland-Barthes-La-Crise-de-La-verite>>
- . *Writing Degree Zero*. 1953. Trans. Annette Lavers and Colin Smith. New York: Hill and Wang, 1984.
- Battaglia, Salvatore. *Grande dizionario della lingua italiana*. Vol. 12. Torino: Unione Tipografico-Editrice Torinese, 1984.
- Bellaunay, Henri. *Petite anthologie imaginaire de la poésie française*. 1992. Paris: Le Livre de poche, 2000.
- Belsey, Catherine. *Critical Practice*. 1980. New Accents. London: Methuen, 1987.
- Ben-Porat, Ziva. "Parody's Revenge, or the (Im)possibility of postmodernist claims concerning parody and pastiche." *Mildonian* 417-23.
- Bénabou, Marcel. "Réécritures oulipiennes: plagiat, parodie ou pastiche?" Aron, *Du Pastiche* 177-88.
- Bennett, Andrew. *The Author*. The New Critical Idiom. London: Routledge, 2005.
- Bennington, Geoffrey. *Jacques Derrida*. Religion and Postmodernism. Chicago: Chicago UP, 1993.
- Bertens, Hans, and Douwe Fokkema, eds. *International Postmodernism: Theory and Literary Practice*. A Compar. Hist. of Lits in European Langs 11. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1997.
- Bertrand, André. *Le Droit d'auteur et les droits voisins*. Paris: Masson, 1991.
- Bilous, Daniel. "Intertexte/Pastiche: l'intermimotexte." *Texte* 2 (1983): 135-60.
- . "Recrire l'intertexte: La Bruyère, pasticheur de Montaigne." *Cahiers de littérature du XVII^e siècle* 4 (1982): 101-20.

- . "Sur la mimécriture: essai de typologie." Aron, *Du pastiche* 103-36.
- Bisenius-Benin, Carole. "La Contrainte de l'hétéroparodie dans la poétique oulipienne et post-oulipienne." Dousteysier-Khoze and Place-Verghnes 301-12.
- Bloom, Clive. *Bestsellers: Popular Fiction Since 1900*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002.
- Bloom, Harold. *The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry*. 1973. London: Oxford UP, 1975.
- Bödeker, Hans Erich. "Concept – Meaning – Discourse: Begriffsgeschichte reconsidered." *History of Concepts: Comparative Perspectives*. Ed. Iain Hampsher-Monk, Karin Tilmans and Frank van Vree. Amsterdam: Amsterdam UP, 1998. 51-64.
- Bouillaguet, Annick. *L'Écriture imitative: pastiche, parodie, collage*. Série Littérature. Paris: Nathan, 1996.
- . *Proust lecteur de Balzac et de Flaubert: L'imitation cryptée*. Littérature de notre siècle 15. Paris: Honoré Champion, 2000.
- Bourgeacq, Jacques. "Le Pastiche: pédagogie de la langue et de la littérature." *French Review* 71 (1997): 11-21.
- Bouverot, Danielle. "De la Rhétorique aux arts: le mot style entre 1750 et 1850." *Rhétorique et discours critiques* 161-174.
- Bradbury, Malcolm. "The Novel as Pastiche: Angus Wilson and Modern Fiction." *No, Not Bloomsbury*. London: André Deutsch, 1987. 219-43.
- Braendlin, Bonnie. "Alice Walker's The Temple of My Familiar as Pastiche." *American Literature* 68 (1996): 47-67.
- Brett, Simon, ed. *The Faber Book of Parodies*. London: Faber and Faber, 1984.
- Briscoe, Joanna. "Dear God, It Was a Gobaloon!" Rev. of *Observations*, by Jane Harris. *Guardian* 15 Apr 2006. 2 May 2009 <<http://www.guardian.co.uk/books/2006/apr/15/featuresreviews.guardianreview22>>
- Brisson, Marie. "Pastiche, parodie, lecture: notes sur la question des genres vue à travers l'apport lectorial." *Dire la parodie. Colloque de Cerisy*. Ed. Clive Thomson and Alain Pagés. Amer. Univ. Studies II: Romance Lang. and Lit. 91. New York: Peter Lang, 1989. 73-88.
- Broich, Ulrich. "Intertextuality." Bertens and Fokkema 249-55.
- Bromwich, David. "Parody, Pastiche, and Allusion." *Lyric Poetry: Beyond New Criticism*. Ed. Chaviva Hošek and Patricia Parker. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1985. 328-44.
- Brontë, Charlotte. *Jane Eyre*. 1847. Everyman's Library 10. London: Everyman's Library, 1991.
- Brotherus, Elina. *The New Painting*. Ed. Sheyi Antony Bankale. London: Next Level and Creative Scape, 2005.
- . Personal interview. 14 Jan 2006.

- Brown, Stephen G. "Desire on Ice: The Menace of Albertine's Mimicry in *La Prisonnière*." *College Literature* 32.2 (2005): 43-61.
- Browning, Robert. *Selected Poetry*. Ed. Daniel Karlin. London: Penguin, 1989.
- Brunet, Fernand. "De la Parodie et du pastiche. À propos de quelques ouvrages récents." *La Minerve française* 1 Nov 1919: 130-38.
- Brunn, Alain, ed. *L'Auteur*. Lettres. Paris: Flammarion, 2001.
- Burke, Seán. "Reconstructing the Author." Introd. of *Authorship: From Plato to the Postmodern. A Reader*. Ed. Seán Burke. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 2000. xv-xxx.
- Burrow, J.A. *Medieval Writers and Their Work: Middle English Literature 1100-1500*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2008.
- Busse, Kristina, and Karen Hellekson. "Work in Progress." Introduction of *Fan Fiction and Fan Communities in the Age of the Internet: New Essays*. Ed. Karen Helleksen and Kristina Busse. Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 2006. 5-40.
- Buxton, Jackie. "'What's Love Got To Do With It?': Postmodernism and Possession." *Essays on the Fiction of A.S. Byatt: Imagining the Real*. Ed. Alexa Alfer and Michael J. Noble. Contributions to the Study of World Lit. 110. Westport, CT: Greenwood, 2001. 89-104.
- Byatt, A.S. *Angels and Insects*. 1992. London: Vintage, 1995.
- . *Babel Tower*. 1996. London: Vintage 2003.
- . *The Djinn and the Nightingale's Eye: Five Fairy Stories*. 1994. New York: Vintage, 1998.
- . "Feeling Thought: Donne and the Embodied Mind." *The Cambridge Companion to John Donne*. Ed. Achsah Guibbory. Cambridge UP, 2006. 247-57.
- . *On Histories and Stories: Selected Essays*. 2000. London: Vintage, 2001.
- . *Passions of the Mind: Selected Writings*. 1991. New York: Vintage, 1993.
- . *Possession: A Romance*. 1990. London: Vintage, 1991.
- . "Precipice-Encurled." *Sugar and Other Stories*. London: Chatto & Windus, 1987. 185-214.
- . *The Virgin in the Garden*. 1978. London: Vintage, 2003.
- Calinescu, Matei. "Rewriting." Bertens and Fokkema 243-48.
- Cano, Catherine. Rev. of *Proust lecteur de Balzac et de Flaubert: L'imitation cryptée*, by Annick Bouillaguet. *Nineteenth-Century French Studies* 32 (2003-04): 161-64.
- Carroll, Noël. "The Concept of Postmodernism from a Philosophical Point of View." Bertens and Fokkema 89-102.
- Chatman, Seymour. *The Later Style of Henry James*. Lang. and Style Ser. 2. Oxford: Basil Blackwell 1972.

- . "Parody and Style." *Poetics Today* 22 (2001): 25-39.
- Chesterman, Andrew. *Memes of Translation: The Spread of Ideas in Translation Theory*. John Benjamins Translation Library 22. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2000.
- Cobley, Evelyn. *The Temptations of Faust: The Logic of Fascism and Postmodern Archeologies*. Toronto: Toronto UP, 2002.
- Code de la propriété intellectuelle. 15 Apr. 2008. <http://www.legifrance.gouv.fr/affichCodeArticle.do;jsessionid=680638FC2840EE0551C0869DE7784E88.tpdjo02v_3?idArticle=LEGIARTI000006278917&cidTexte=LEGITEXT000006069414&dateTexte=20080415>
- Compagnon, Antoine. *Le Démon de la théorie: Littérature et sens commun*. 1998. Paris: Seuil, 2001.
- Compère, Daniel. "L'Entre-voix." *Jules Verne*. Spec. issue of *La Revue des lettres modernes* 6 (1992): 135-41.
- . "Je suis l'autre: pastiche et écriture." *L'Autre du roman et de la fiction*. Études romanesques 4. Ed. Jean Bessière. Paris: Centre du Roman (Univ. de Picardie Jules Verne)-Lettres modernes, 1996. 99-109.
- Connor, Steven. *Postmodernist Culture: An Introduction to Theories of the Contemporary*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Blackwell, 1997.
- Copyright, Designs and Patent Act 1988. 26 Feb 2009. <http://www.opsi.gov.uk/acts/acts1988/UKpga_19880048_en_1.htm>
- Copyright Law of the United States. 19 Feb 2010. <<http://www.copyright.gov/title17/circ92.pdf>>
- Coste, Didier. "Rewriting, Literariness, Literary History." *La Revue LISA* 2.5 (2004): 8-25. 4 Mar 2009 <http://www.unicaen.fr/mrsh/lisa/publications/006/02-5_008coste.pdf>
- Cuddon, J.A. *A Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory*. 4th edition. Rev. C.E. Preston. Oxford: Blackwell, 1998.
- Culler, Jonathan. *Literary Theory: A Very Short Introduction*. 1997. Very Short Introductions. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2000.
- Den danske ordbog*. 6 vols. Det Danske Sprog- og Litteraturselskab-Gyldendal, 2003-05.
- Day Lewis, Cecil. *An Italian Visit*. London: Jonathan Cape, 1953.
- De Waal, Ronald Burt. *The International Sherlock Holmes*. Hamden: Archon Books, 1980.
- Deffoux, Leon. *Le Pastiche littéraire. Des origines à nos jours*. Bibliothèque des chercheurs et des curieux. Paris: Delagrave, 1932.
- Deffoux, Leon, and Pierre Dufay, eds. *Anthologie du pastiche*. 2 vols. Paris: G. Crès, 1926.
- Delepierre, Octave. *Supercherries littéraires, pastiches, suppositions d'auteur, dans les lettres et dans les arts*. Londres: N. Trübner, 1872.

- Deleuze, Gilles. "Plato and the Simulacrum." Trans. Rosalind Krauss. *October* 27 (1983): 45-56.
- Dentith, Simon. *Parody*. 2000. The New Critical Idiom. London: Routledge, 2005.
- Derrida, Jacques. "Countersignature." Trans. Mairéad Hanrahan. *Paragraph* 27.2 (2004): 7-42.
- . "Signature event context." 1972. Trans. Samuel Weber and Jeffrey Mehlman. *Limited Inc.* Evanston: Northwestern UP, 1995. 1-21.
- Dezalliers d'Argenville, Antoine-Joseph. *Abrégé de la vie des plus fameux peintres, avec leurs portraits gravés en taille-douce, les indications de leurs principaux ouvrages, quelques réflexions sur leurs caractères, et la manière de connoître les desseins des grands maîtres*. 3 vols. Paris: De Bure, 1745-52.
- Dibdin, Michael. *The Last Sherlock Holmes Story*. 1978. New York: Vintage-Black Lizard, 1996.
- Dickinson, Emily. *The Poems of Emily Dickinson*. Ed. Thomas H. Johnson. 3 vols. Cambridge, MA: Belknap P, 1955.
- Dictionary of Modern Critical Terms*. Ed. Roger Fowler. Rev. Ed. London: Routledge, 1990.
- Dictionnaire historique de la langue française*. Ed. Alain Rey et al. 2 vols. Paris: Le Robert, 1992.
- Diderot, Denis. *Denis Diderot on Art II: The Salon of 1767*. Trans. John Goodman. New Haven: Yale UP, 1995.
- . *Œuvres complètes XVI: Salon de 1767. Salon de 1769*. Ed. Else Marie Bukdahl, Michel Delon and Annette Lorenceau. Paris: Hermann, 1990.
- Diderot, Denis, and Jean le Rond D'Alembert, ed. *Encyclopédie, ou dictionnaire raisonné des sciences, des arts et des métiers*. University of Chicago: ARTFL Encyclopédie Projet (Winter 2008 Edition). Ed. Robert Morrissey. 19 Feb 2010 <<http://encyclopedia.uchicago.edu>>
- Donne, John. *The Complete Poetry of John Donne*. Ed. John T. Shawcross. New York: Anchor Books-Doubleday & Company, 1967.
- Dousteyssier-Khoze, Catherine, and Floriane Place-Verghnes, eds. *Poétiques de la parodie et du pastiche de 1850 à nos jours*. Mod. French Identities 55. Oxford: Peter Lang, 2006.
- Doyle, Adrian Conan, and John Dickson Carr. *The Exploits of Sherlock Holmes*. 1952. New York: Gramercy Books, 1999.
- Doyle, Arthur Conan. *The Field Bazaar: A Sherlock Holmes Pastiche*. Summit (NJ): The Pamphlet House, 1947.
- . *Sherlock Holmes: The Complete Illustrated Short Stories*. 1985. London: Chancellor, 2000.
- . *A Study in Scarlet*. Penguin Classics. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 2001.

- Du Bos, Abbé [Jean Babtiste Dubos]. *Critical Reflections on Poetry and Painting*. Trans. Thomas Nugent from the 5th French ed. London: John Nourse, 1748.
- . *Reflexions critiques sur la poesie et sur la peinture*. 4th ed. 2 vols. Paris: Pierre-Jean Mariette, 1740.
- Duden: das große Wörterbuch des deutschen Sprache*. 2nd ed. 8 vols. Mannheim: Dudenverlag, 1994.
- Duraille, Marguerite [Patrick Rambaud]. *Mururoa mon amour*. Paris: JC Lat-tès, 1996.
- Duvall, John N. "Troping History: Modernist Residue in Fredric Jameson's Pastiche and Linda Hutcheon's Parody." *Style* 33 (1999): 372-90.
- Dyer, Richard. "The Notion of Pastiche." *The Aesthetics of Popular Art*. Ed. Jostein Gripsrud. Kulturstudier 19. Kristiansand: Høyskoleforlaget, 2001. 77-89.
- . *Pastiche*. London: Routledge, 2007.
- Eco, Umberto. "Innovation and Repetition: Between Modern and Post-modern Aesthetics." 1985. *Dædalus* 134.4 (2005): 191-207.
- . *Postscript to the Name of the Rose*. Trans. William Weaver. San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1984.
- Eesti keele sõnaraamat* [Dictionary of the Estonian Language]. Ed. Tiiu Ereht. Tallinn: Eesti keele sihtasutus, 1999.
- Faulks, Sebastian. *Pistache: A Collection of Clever, Funny and Surprising Parodies, Pastiches and Air-Shots, Inspired by The Write Stuff on Britain's Radio 4*. London: Hutchinson, 2006.
- Febvre, Lucien, and Henri-Jean Martin. *L'Apparition du livre*. 1958. Bibliothèque de l'Évolution de l'Humanité 33. Paris: Albin Michel, 1999.
- Fielding, Henry. *The Adventures of Joseph Andrews*. The World's Classics 334. London: Oxford UP, 1928.
- Finn, Michael R. *Proust, the Body and Literary Form*. Cambridge Studies in French. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1999.
- Finney, Brian. "Briony's Stand Against Oblivion: The Making of Fiction in Ian McEwan's *Atonement*." *Journal of Modern Literature* 27.3 (2004): 68-82.
- Finnish National Gallery: The Art Collections. 6 Mar 2009 < <http://kokoelmat.fng.fi/wandora/w?action=gen&lang=en> >
- Foster, Hal. "(Post)Modern Polemics." 1985. *Recordings: Art, Spectacle, Cultural Politics*. Seattle: Bay P, 1989. 121-37.
- Foster, John Burt. "Parody, Pastiche, and Periodization: Nabokov/Jameson." *Cycnos* 12 (1995): 109-16.
- Foucault, Michel. "Qu'est-ce qu'un auteur?" *Bulletin de la Société française de philosophie* 63 (1969): 73-104.

- Fowler, Alastair. *Kinds of Literature: An Introduction to the Theory of Genres and Modes*. 1982. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1985.
- Fry, Stephen. *The Ode Less Travelled: Unlocking the Poet Within*. 2005. London: Arrow Books, 2007.
- Gautier, Pierre-Yves. *Propriété littéraire et artistique*. Collection Droit fondamental-Droit civil. Paris: PUF, 1991.
- Genette, Gérard. *Fiction and Diction*. 1991. Trans. Catherine Porter. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1993.
- . *Palimpsestes: La Littérature au second degré*. 1982. Paris: Seuil, 1992.
- . *Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree*. Trans. Channa Newman and Claude Doubinsky. Stages 8. Lincoln: Nebraska UP, 1997.
- Gide, André. *Journals, 1889-1913*. Trans. Justin O'Brien. Chicago: U of Illinois P, 2000.
- Gilbert, Sandra M., and Susan Gubar. *The Madwoman in the Attic: The Woman Writer and the Nineteenth-Century Literary Imagination*. 1979. New Haven: Yale UP, 1984.
- Godard, Barbara. "Theorizing Feminist Discourse/Translation." *Translation, History and Culture*. Ed. Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere. London: Pinter, 1990. 87-96.
- Golopentia-Eretescu, Sanda. "Parodie, pastiche et textualité." *Groupar* 117-33.
- The Good German*. Dir. Steven Soderbergh. Warner Bros, 2006.
- Goodman, Nelson. *Ways of Worldmaking*. Harvester Studies in Philosophy. Hassocks: Harvester P, 1978.
- Gourmont, Remy de. *Le Problème du style*. 1902. Paris: Mercure de France, 1916.
- Gowers Review of Intellectual Property*. Nov 2006. HM Treasury. 12 Mar 2009 <http://www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/d/pbr06_gowers_report_755.pdf>
- Le Grand Robert de la langue française*. 12th ed. 6 vols. Paris: Dictionnaires Le Robert, 2001.
- Grande dicionário de lingua portuguesa*. Ed. António de Moraes Silva. 12 vols. Lisboa: 1954.
- Greaney, Michael. *Contemporary Fiction and the Uses of Theory: The Novel from Structuralism to Postmodernism*. Basingstoke: Macmillan Palgrave, 2006.
- Groom, Nick. *The Forger's Shadow: How Forgery Changed the Course of Literature*. London: Picador, 2002.
- Grosses vollständiges Universal-Lexicon aller Wissenschaften und Künste*. 50 vols. Leipzig: Johann Heinrich Zedler, 1740.
- Groupar, ed. *Le Singe à la porte: vers une théorie de la parodie*. Proc. of Colloque on parody, Oct 1981. Queens U. (Can.). New York: Peter Lang, 1984.

- Gutleben, Christian. *Nostalgic Postmodernism: The Victorian Tradition and the Contemporary British Novel*. Postmodern Studies 31. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2001.
- . "Phallus in Fabula: The Shameless Abuse of Victorian Intertextuality in Contemporary British Fiction." *Symbolism* 151-67.
- Haarmann, Pirkko-Liisa. *Tekijänoikeus ja lähioikeudet* [Intellectual Property Rights]. 3rd ed. Helsinki: Talentum, 2005.
- Hadley, Louisa. *The Fiction of A.S. Byatt: A Reader's Guide to Essential Criticism*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.
- Halliwell, Stephen. *The Aesthetics of Mimesis: Ancient Texts and Modern Problems*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2002.
- Hamm, J.-J. "Parodie, pastiche: de l'écriture à la lecture." *Groupar* 105-16.
- Harvey, David. *The Condition of Postmodernity: An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1989.
- Hassan, Ihab. *The Postmodern Turn: Essays in Postmodern Theory and Culture*. N.p.: Ohio State UP, 1987.
- Heaney, Seamus. *Electric Light*. London: Faber and Faber, 2001.
- Hellegouarc'h, Pascale. *Les Conditions de production et d'édition du pastiche littéraire au XX^e siècle (1908-1989)*. 2 vols. Diss. Université de la Sorbonne Nouvelle (Paris III), 1992.
- . "Écriture mimétique: essai de définition et situation au XX^e siècle." *Pastiches, collages et autres réécritures* 100-18.
- . "L'Intertextualité, espace transversal: mémoire, culture et imitation." *Qu'est-ce qu'un espace littéraire?* Ed. Xavier Garnier and Pierre Zoberman. L'Imaginaire du texte. Saint-Denis: PUV 2006. 65-77.
- Hempel, Wido. "Parodie, Travestie und Pastiche: zur Geschichte von Wort und Sache." *Germanisch-romanische Monatsschrift, Neue Folge* 15 (1965): 150-76.
- Herschberg Pierrot, Anne. *Le Style en mouvement. Littérature et art*. Belin Sup-Lettres. Paris: Belin, 2005.
- Hesse, Carla. "Enlightenment Epistemology and the Laws of Authorship in Revolutionary France, 1777-1793." *Law and the Order of Culture*. Spec. issue of *Representations* 30 (1990): 109-37.
- Hodgson, John A. "The Recoil of 'The Speckled Band': Detective Story and Detective Discourse." *Poetics Today* 13 (1992): 309-324.
- Hodgson, Terry. *The Batsford Dictionary of Drama*. London: B.T. Batsford, 1988.
- Hoesterey, Ingeborg. *Pastiche: Cultural Memory in Art, Film, Literature*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 2001.
- . "Postmodern Pastiche: A Critical Aesthetic." *The Centennial Review* 39 (1995): 493-510.
- Hollier, Denis. "Pastiche." *La Grande encyclopédie*. Vol. 15. Paris: Larousse, 1975. 9167-69.

- Horace. *Satires, Epistles, Ars Poetica*. Trans. H.R. Fairclough. Loeb Classical Lib. 194. London: Heinemann, 1961.
- Hugo, Victor. Préface. *Cromwell*. 1827. Paris: Garnier-Flammarion, 1968. 61-109.
- . "Preface to Cromwell." *Prefaces and Prologues to Famous Works*. Harvard Classics, The Five-Foot Shelf of Books 39. New York: P. F. Collier, 1910. 354-408.
- Hunter, Jim. *Tom Stoppard: Rosencrantz and Guildenstern Are Dead, Jumpers, Travesties, Arcadia*. Faber Critical Guides. London: Faber and Faber, 2000.
- Hutcheon, Linda. *The Politics of Postmodernism*. 1989. London: Routledge, 1999.
- . Rev. of *Pastiche: Cultural Memory in Art, Film, Literature*, by Ingeborg Hoesterey. *Comparative Literature Studies* 42 (2005): 323-26.
- . *A Theory of Parody: The Teachings of Twentieth-Century Art Forms*. London: Methuen, 1985.
- Hutchinson, Peter. *Games Authors Play*. London: Methuen, 1983.
- Huttunen, Tomi. *Imazhinist Mariengof: Dendi. Montazh. Ciniki* [Mariengof of the Imaginist: Dandy, Montage, Cynics]. Diss. U of Helsinki, 2007.
- Ikonen, Teemu. *Imitaation rajoilla: täydentävä kirjoitus Denis Diderot'n tuotannossa* [At the Limits of Imitation: Supplementary Writing in Diderot's Work]. Diss. U. of Helsinki, 2000. 9 May 2008 <<http://ethesis.helsinki.fi/julkaisut/hum/taite/vk/ikonen/imitaati.pdf>>
- Imbert, Patrick. "Pastiche, lecture, ideologie." *Lectures et lecteurs de l'écrit moderne*. Ed. Stéphane Sarkany. Travaux du groupe de recherches international "1900." Ottawa: Carleton U, 1982. 132-151.
- Intellectual Property Code. Trans. of Code de la propriété intellectuelle. Collection of Laws for Electronic Access, WIPO. 6 May 2009 <http://www.wipo.int/clea/en/text_html.jsp?lang=en&id=1610>
- Jaidev. *The Culture of Pastiche: Existential Aestheticism in the Contemporary Hindi Novel*. Shimla: Indian Institute of Advanced Study, 1993.
- Jameson, Fredric. *Marxism and Form: Twentieth-Century Dialectical Theories of Literature*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1971.
- . "Postmodernism and Consumer Society." *The Anti-Aesthetic: Essays on Postmodern Culture*. Ed. Hal Foster. Port Townsend: Bay P, 1983. 111-25.
- . "Postmodernism, or the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism." *New Left Review* 146 (1984): 53-92.
- . *Postmodernism, or the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*. 1991. London: Verso, 1993.

- Jaucourt, Louis de [D.J.]. "Pastiche." *L'Encyclopédie ou dictionnaire raisonné des sciences, des arts et des métiers*. Ed. Denis Diderot and Jean le Rond d'Alembert. Vol. 12. Neufchastel: Samuel Faulche, 1765. 155-56.
- Jeandillou, Jean-François. *Esthétique de la mystification: Tactique et stratégie littéraires*. Paris: Minuit, 1994.
- . "L'Inflexion des voix chères." *Poétique* 125 (2001): 63-74.
- . *Supercheries littéraires: La Vie et l'œuvre des auteurs supposés*. Paris: Us-her, 1989.
- . "Le Tribunal des lettres: Nodier et *Les Questions de littérature lé-gale*." *Revue d'histoire littéraire de la France* 99.1 (1999): 57-74.
- Jencks, Charles. *What Is Post-Modernism?* 2nd ed. London: Academy Editions-St. Martin's P, 1987.
- Johnson, Samuel. *A Dictionary of the English Language*. 3rd ed. London: W. Strahan, 1765.
- Jump, John D. *Burlesque*. Critical Idiom 22. Methuen: London, 1972.
- Kaplan, Cora. *Victoriana: Histories, Fictions, Criticism*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 2007.
- Karlin, Daniel [Danny]. "D.J. Taylor's Victorian Mystery: The Problems of Performing Pastiche." Rev. of *Kept*, by D.J. Taylor. *Times Online* 8 Feb 2006. 28 Feb 2010 <http://entertainment.timesonline.co.uk/tol/arts_and_entertainment/the_tls/tls_selec-tions/fiction/article2305653.ece>
- . "Prolonging Her Absence." Rev. of *The Wimbledon Poisoner*, by Nigel Williams, *The Other Occupant*, by Peter Benson, and *Possession*, by A.S. Byatt. *London Review of Books* 8 Mar. 1990: 17-18.
- Karrer, Wolfgang. "Author's Postscript." Thomson 34-35.
- . "Joyce's 'Oxen of the Sun' Chapter: Parody or Pastiche?" *James Joyce*. Spec. issue of *Focus: Papers in English Literary and Cultural Studies* 3 (2002): 68-80.
- . *Parodie, Travestie, Pastiche*. Uni-Taschenbücher 581. Information und Synthese. München: Wilhelm Fink, 1977.
- . "Parody, Travesty, and Pastiche qua Communication Processes." Trans. Anthony Wall. Thomson 3-33.
- Keen, Suzanne. *Romances of the Archive in Contemporary British Fiction*. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 2001.
- Keller, James R. *V for Vendetta as Cultural Pastiche: A Critical Study of the Graphic Novel and Film*. Jefferson (NC) and London: McFarland, 2008.
- Kemp, Simon. *Defective Inspectors: Crime Fiction Pastiche in Late-Twentieth-Century French Literature*. Legenda. London: Mod. Humanities Re-search Assn–Maney Publishing, 2006.

- Kielitoimiston sanakirja* [The New Dictionary of Modern Finnish]. 3 vols. Kotimaisten kielten tutkimuskeskuksen julkaisuja 140. Helsinki: Kotimaisten kielten tutkimuskeskus, 2006.
- Kirchknopf, Andrea. "(Re)workings of Nineteenth-Century Fiction: Definitions, Terminology, Contexts." *Neo-Victorian Studies* 1.1 (2008): 53-80. 18 May 2009 <http://www.neovictorianstudies.com/past_issues/2008/NVS%201-1%20A-Kirchknopf.pdf>
- Kivistö, Sari. *Creating Anti-Eloquence: Epistolae obscurorum virorum and the Humanist Polemics on Style*. Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum 118. Helsinki: The Finnish Society of Sciences and Letters, 2002.
- Knight, Stephen. *Form and Ideology in Crime Fiction*. London: Macmillan, 1980.
- Korkut, Nil. *Kinds of Parody from the Medieval to the Postmodern*. European University Studies. Series XIV: Anglo-Saxon Language and Literature. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 2009.
- Kucich, John, and Dianne F. Sadoff, eds. *Victorian Afterlife: Postmodern Culture Rewrites the Nineteenth Century*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 2000.
- Kudelin, Alexander. "Statut du pastiche dans les littératures médiévales du Moyen-Orient." *Mildonian* 57-63.
- Kukkonen, Pirjo. "Nostalgian semiosis: keveyden ja painon dialogia." [The Semiosis of Nostalgia: The Dialogue Between Lightness and Weight.] *Nostalgia: kirjoituksia kaipuusta, ikävästä ja muistista*. [Nostalgia: Writings on Longing, Melancholy and Memory.] Eds. Riikka Rossi and Katja Seutu. SKS:n toimituksia 1137. SKS: Helsinki, 2007. 13-50.
- La Bruyère, Jean de. *Les Caractères de Theophraste traduits du grec avec Les Caractères ou les mœurs de ce siècle*. 5th ed. Paris: Estienne Michaillet, 1690.
- . *Characters*. Trans. Henri van Laun. The Oxford Lib. of French Classics. London: Oxford UP, 1963.
- Laurette, Pierre. "À l'Ombre du pastiche. La Réécriture: Automatisation et contingence." *Texte 2* (1983): 113-34.
- Leclerc, Gérard. *Le Sceau de l'œuvre*. Paris: Seuil, 1998.
- Lefevère, André. *Translation, Rewriting, and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*. London: Routledge, 1992.
- Lehtinen, Marja. "Kirjallisuuden käsite ja kirjallisuusinstituutioiden eriytyminen." [The Concept of Literature and the Differentiation of Literary Institutions.] *Suomen kirjallisuushistoria 1: Hurskaista lauluista ilostelevaan romaaniin*. [The History of Finnish Literature 1.] Ed. Yrjö Varpio and Liisi Huhtala. SKS:n toimituksia 724:1. Helsinki: SKS, 1999. 196-203.
- Lejeune, Philippe. *On Autobiography*. Trans. Katherine Leary. *Theory and Hist. of Lit.* 52. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1989.

- . *Le Pacte autobiographique. Nouvelle édition augmentée*. Points Essais. Paris: Seuil, 1996.
- Letisser, Georges. "Dickens and Post-Victorian Fiction." *Refracting the Canon in Contemporary British Literature and Film*. Ed. Susana Onega and Christian Gutleben. Postmodern Studies 35. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2004. 111-28.
- Le lettere rubate: studi sul Pastiche letterario*. Napoli: Istituto Universitario Orientale, 1983.
- Lévi-Strauss, Claude. *The Savage Mind*. 1962. Trans. anon. The Nature of Human Culture Ser. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1996.
- Lewalski, Barbara Kiefer. *Writing Women in Jacobean England*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1993.
- Lodge, David. *Thinks...* London: Secker & Warburg, 2001.
- London, Bette. *Writing Double: Women's Literary Partnerships*. Reading Women Writing. Ed. Shari Benstock and Celeste Schenck. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1999.
- Longinus. *On the Sublime*. Trans. W.H. Fyfe and Donald Russell. Aristotle 143-307.
- Macey, David. *The Penguin Dictionary of Critical Theory*. 2000. London: Penguin, 2001.
- Machacek, Gregory. "Allusion." *PMLA* 122 (2007): 522-36.
- Malraux, André. *Les Voix du silence*. La Galerie de la Pléiade. Paris: NRF, 1951.
- Mandell, Charlotte. Interview with Chad W. Post. "Best Translated Book 2008 Longlist: The Lemoine Affair by Marcel Proust." *Three Percent: A Resource for International Literature at the University of Rochester* 15 Dec 2008. 16 Mar 2009 <<http://www.rochester.edu/College/translation/threepersent/index.php?id=1509>>
- Marienské, Héléna. *La Degré supreme de la tendresse: roman en pastiches*. N.p.: Héloïse d'Ormesson, 2008.
- Marmontel, Jean-François. *Éléments de littérature*. 1787. 3 vols. Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1892.
- Maurois, André. *Chelsea Way*. Trans. Hamish Miles. London: Elkin Matthews & Marrot, 1930.
- . *The Chelsea Way, or Marcel in England. A Proustian Parody*. Trans. George D. Painter. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1966.
- . "Chelsean puolella." Trans. Arthur Långfors. *Sininen kirja* 2/1929: 43-50.
- . *Le Côté de Chelsea*. 1929. Paris: Gallimard, 1932.
- . *Fragments d'un journal de vacances*. Une Chapitre de ma vie 9. Paris: Émile Hazan, 1929.
- McCutcheon, Jani. "The New Defence of Parody and Satire Under Australian Copyright Law." *Intellectual Property Quarterly* 2/2008, 163-92.

- McEwan, Ian. *Atonement*. 2001. London: Vintage, 2002.
- McGowan, John. *Postmodernism and Its Critics*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1991.
- Mehtonen, Päivi. *Poetria nova: johdatus keskiajan runousoppiin* [Poetria Nova: Introduction to Medieval Poetics]. Tietolipas 192. Helsinki: SKS, 2003.
- Meyer, Nicholas. *The Canary Trainer: From the Memoirs of John H. Watson, M.D.* New York: W.W. Norton, 1993.
- . "Seven-Per-Cent at Thirty: Memories and Reflections." *Baker Street Journal* 54.2 (2004): 26-30. 17 May 2009 <http://www.bakerstreetjournal.com/images/Meyer_-_Seven_Percent_at_30.pdf>
- . *The Seven-Per-Cent Solution: Being a Reprint of the Reminiscences of John H. Watson, M.D.* 1974. New York: Ballantine Books, 1976.
- Michel, Christian. "Manière, goût, faire, style: les mutations du vocabulaire de la critique d'art en France au XVIII^e siècle." *Rhétorique et discours critiques* 153-59.
- Mildonian, Paola, ed. *Parodia, pastiche, mimetismo*. Proc. of a conference of comparative literature held in Venice 13-15 Oct 1993. Roma: Bulzoni, 1997.
- Miller, J. Hillis. "The Ghost Effect: Intertextuality in Realist Fiction." *Symbolism* 125-49.
- Milly, Jean. Introduction. Proust, *L'Affaire Lemoine* 13-53.
- . "Le Pastiche Goncourt dans Le Temps retrouvé." *Revue d'histoire littéraire de la France* 71 (1971): 815-835.
- . "Les Pastiches de Proust: structures et correspondances." *Le Français moderne* 35 (1967): 33-52, 125-41.
- . *Proust et le style*. 2nd edition. Genève: Slatkine Reprints, 1991.
- Montaigne, Michel de. *Œuvres complètes*. Ed. Albert Thibaudet and Maurice Rat. Bibliothèque de la Pléiade. Paris: Gallimard, 1961.
- Moore, Frank Ledlie and Mary Varchaver. *Dictionary of the Performing Arts*. Chicago: Contemporary Books, 1996.
- Morrisette, Bruce. *The Great Rimbaud Forgery: The Affair of La Chasse spirituelle with Unpublished Documents and an Anthology of Rimbaldian Pastiches*. Saint Louis: Washington U Studies, 1956.
- Mortier, Roland. "Pour une histoire du Pastiche littéraire au XVIII^e siècle." *Beiträge zur französischen Aufklärung und zur spanischen Literatur: Festgabe für Werner Krauss zum 70. Geburtstag*. Ed. Werner Bahner. Schriften des Institute für romanische Sprachen und Kultur 7. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1971. 203-17.
- Morton, A.Q. *Literary Detection: How to Prove Authorship and Fraud in Literature and Documents*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1978.
- Mullan, John. *Anonymity: A Secret History of English Literature*. London: Faber and Faber, 2007.

- . "Quote, Unquote." *Guardian* 1 Nov. 2002. 2 May 2009 <<http://www.guardian.co.uk/books/2002/nov/02/asbyatt>>
- Nadel, Ira B. "Writing *Tom Stoppard*." *Journal of Modern Literature* 27.3 (2004): 19-29.
- Nationalencyklopedi: Ordbok*. Nationalencyklopedin 2008. 3 Nov 2008 <<http://www.ne.se/>>
- Nicol, Bran. *D.M. Thomas. Writers and Their Work*. Horndon: Northcote, 2004.
- Nodier, Charles. *Questions de littérature légale. Du plagiat, de la supposition d'auteurs, des supercheries qui ont rapport aux livres*. 2nd ed. Paris: Crapelet, 1828.
- Ogden, J. Alexander. "The Impossible Peasant Voice in Russian Culture: Stylization and Mimicry." *Slavic Review* 64 (2005): 517-37.
- OED [The Oxford English Dictionary Online]*. Oxford UP. 15 Jan 2009 <<http://dictionary.oed.com/entrance.dtl>>
- Ordbog over det danske sprog*. Det danske sprog- og litteraturselskab. 5 May 2009 <<http://ordnet.dk/ods/>>
- Orr, Mary. *Intertextuality: Debates and Contexts*. 2003. Cambridge: Polity, 2005.
- Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Online ed. Oxford UP, 2008. 18 May 2009 <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/38744>>
- Pabst, Walter, and Ludwig Schrader, eds. *L'Affaire Lemoine von Marcel Proust. Kommentare und Interpretation*. Berlin: Erich Schmidt, 1972.
- Painter, George D. Introduction. Maurois, *The Chelsea Way* 1-9.
- Partridge, Eric. *Origins: A Short Etymological Dictionary of Modern English*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1958.
- Pastiches, collages et autres réécritures*. Joint spec. issue of *Formules: revue des littératures à contraintes* 5 and *TEM* 13 (2001).
- Patterson, Rebecca. *Emily Dickinson's Imagery*. Ed. Margaret H. Freeman. Amherst: U of Massachusetts P, 1979.
- Petherick, Karin. *Stilimitation i tre av Hjalmar Bergmans romaner: en undersökning av den roll pastisch, parodi och citat spelar i Knutsmässos marknad, En döds memoarer och Herr von Hancken*. *Studia litterarum Upsaliensia* 6. Stockholm: Läromedelsförlagen, 1971.
- Piles, Roger de. *Abregé de la vie des Peintres, avec des reflexions sur leurs Ouvrages, Et un Traité du Peintre parfait; De la connoissance des Deseins; De l'utilité des Estampes*. 2nd ed. Paris: Jacques Estienne, 1715.
- . *The Art of Painting, and the Lives of the Painters: Containing, A Compleat Treatise of Painting, Designing, and the Use of Prints: With Reflections on the Works of the Most Celebrated Painters, and of the Several Schools of*

- Europe, As Well Ancient As Modern*. Trans. anon [John Savage?]. London: J. Nutt, 1706.
- . *Conversations sur la Connaissance de la peinture et sur le jugement qu'on doit faire des Tableaux, où par occasion il est parlé de la vie de Rubens et de quelques uns de ses plus beaux Ouvrages*. Paris: Nicolas Langlois, 1677.
- Plato. *Sophist*. In *Theaetetus. Sophist*. Trans. Harold North Fowler. Loeb Classical Lib. London and Cambridge, MA: Heinemann-Harvard UP, 1961.
- Pleasantville*. Dir. Gary Ross. New Line Cinema, 1998.
- Polvinen, Merja. "Habitable Worlds and Literary Voices: A.S. Byatt's *Possession* as Self-Conscious Realism." *Helsinki English Studies* 3 (2004). 10 May 2009 <http://www.eng.helsinki.fi/projects-and-events/hes/Literature/habitable_worlds1.htm>
- . *Reading the Texture of Reality: Chaos Theory, Literature and the Humanist Perspective*. English Department Studies 6. Diss. U of Helsinki, 2008.
- Pope, Alexander. *An Essay on Criticism. English Critical Essays: Sixteenth, Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries*. Ed. Edmund D. Jones. London: Oxford UP 1943. 245-66.
- Porter, Agnes P. "Proust's Final Montesquiou Pastiche." Larkin B. Price 124-46.
- . "The Treatment of Time in Proust's Pastiches." *The French Review* 47 (1974): 129-43.
- Porter, Robert. "Habermas in *Pleasantville*: Cinema as Political Critique." *Contemporary Political Theory* 6 (2007): 405-18.
- Praktyczny słownik współczesnej polszczyzny* [Practical Dictionary of Contemporary Polish]. Vol. 28. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Kurpisz, 2000.
- Price, Curtis. "Pastiche." *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*. Ed. Stanley Sadie. 2nd ed. Vol. 19. London: Macmillan, 2001. 213-16.
- Price, Larkin B., ed. *Marcel Proust: A Critical Panorama*. Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1973.
- Proust, Marcel. *L'Affaire Lemoine. Pastiches*. Ed. Jean Milly. Genève: Slatkine, 1994.
- . *À la Recherche du temps perdu*. Ed. Jean-Yves Tadié et al. 4 vols. Bibliothèque de la Pléiade. Paris: Gallimard, 1987-89.
- . *By Way of Sainte-Beuve*. Trans. Sylvia Townsend Warner. London: Hogarth P, 1984.
- . *Contre-Sainte Beuve. Précédé de Pastiches et mélanges et suivi de Essais et articles*. Ed. Pierre Clarac and Yves Sandre. Bibliothèque de la Pléiade. Paris: Gallimard, 1971.
- . *Correspondance 8: 1908*. Ed. Philip Kolb. Paris: Plon, 1981.
- . *Correspondance 9: 1909*. Ed. Philip Kolb. Paris: Plon, 1982.
- . *Correspondance 18: 1919*. Ed. Philip Kolb. Paris: Plon, 1990.

- . "Enquête sur le renouvellement du style." Proust, *Contre Sainte-Beuve* 341.
- . "Les Goncourt devant leurs cadets: M. Marcel Proust." Proust, *Contre Sainte-Beuve* 641-43.
- . *In Search of Lost Time*. Trans. C.K. Scott Moncrieff and Terence Kilmartin. Rev. D.J. Enright. 6 vols. New York: Modern Library, 1993.
- . *The Lemoine Affair*. Trans. Charlotte Mandell. The Art of the Novella. New York: Melville House Publishing, 2008.
- . *Pastiches et mélanges*. Proust, *Contre Sainte-Beuve* 1-194.
- . "Pastiches non publiés par Proust." Proust, *Contre Sainte-Beuve* 195-207.
- . "À propos du 'style' de Flaubert." Proust, *Contre Sainte-Beuve* 586-600.
- Puttfarcken, Thomas. *Roger de Piles' Theory of Art*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1985.
- Queneau, Raymond. *Exercices de style*. Ed. Nicolas Saulais. FolioPlus classiques. Paris: Gallimard, 2007.
- Raimond, Jean. "'À la Manière de...': pastiche et parodie en Angleterre à l'époque romantique." *Études anglaises* 53 (2000): 48-57.
- Rancière, Jacques. *La Parole muette. Essai sur les contradictions de la littérature*. 1998. Paris: Hachette, 2008.
- Randall, Marilyn. "Appropriate(d) Discourse: Plagiarism and Decolonization." *New Literary History* 22 (1991): 525-41.
- Rastier, François. "Le Problème du style pour la sémantique du texte." *Qu'est-ce le style?* Ed. Georges Molinié and Pierre Cahné. Paris: PUF, 1994. 263-82.
- Reboux, Paul [Paul-Henri Amillet]. Préface. Georges-Armand Masson, *À la Façon de...* Paris: Pierre Ducray, 1950. 7-24.
- Reboux, Paul, and Charles Muller. *À la Manière de... Première et deuxième série*. Paris: Bernard Grasset, 1925.
- . *À la Manière de... Troisième série*. Paris: Bernard Grasset, 1925.
- Régnier, Henri de. *Le Bon plaisir*. Paris: Société du Mercure de France, 1902.
- Rhétorique et discours critiques: Échanges entre langue et métalangues*. Proc. of a colloque held at the École Normale Supérieure, 13-14 Mar 1987. Paris: Presse de l'École Normale Supérieure, 1989.
- Rimmon-Kenan, Shlomith. "The Paradoxical Status of Repetition." *Poetics Today* 1.4 (1980): 151-59.
- Ringrose, Christopher. "A Journey Backwards: History Through Style in Children's Fiction." *Children's Literature in Education* 38 (2007): 207-18.

- Le Robert* [Dictionnaire alphabétique et analogique de la langue française]. Ed. Paul Robert. 6 vols. Paris: Société du nouveau littré, 1962.
- Rogers, Pat. "Theories of style." *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism*. Ed. H.B. Nisbet and Claude Rawson. Vol. 4 (The Eighteenth Century). Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1997. 365-80.
- Rooy, C.A. van. *Studies in Classical Satire and Related Literary Theory*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1965.
- Rose, Margaret. *Parody: Ancient, Modern, Post-Modern*. 1993. Lit., Culture, Theory 5. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2000.
- . "Post-Modern Pastiche." *British Journal of Aesthetics* 31 (1991): 26-38.
- Rosenbaum, S.P., ed. *A Concordance to the Poems of Emily Dickinson*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1964.
- Ross, Stephanie. "Style in Art." *The Oxford Handbook of Aesthetics*. Ed. Jerrold Levinson. Oxford UP, 2003. 228-44.
- Roure, Marquis de [Auguste-François-Scipion de Grimoard de Beauvoir du Roure de Beaumont-Brison]. *Reflexions sur le style original*. Paris: Didot, 1828.
- Rubow, Paul V. *Saga og Pastiche. Bidrag til dansk Prosaehistorie*. København: Levin & Munksgaard, 1923.
- Ruthven, K.K. *Faking Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2001.
- Ryan, Judith. "The Problem of Pastiche: Patrick Süskind's *Das Parfum*." *The German Quarterly* 63 (1990): 396-403.
- Ryan, Marie-Laure. "Transfictionality Across Media." *Theorizing Narrativity*. Eds. John Pier and José Ángel García Landa. Narratologia: Contributions to Narrative Theory 12. Eds. Fotis Jannidis, John Pier and Wolf Schmid. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2008. 385-417.
- Saariluoma, Liisa. "Eksaktius, tiedonintressi ja kirjallisuudentutkimuksen käsitteet." [Exactness, *Erkenntnisinteresse* and Concepts for Literary Study.] *Kirjallisuuden tutkimuksen ja opetuksen funktiot*. [Functions of Literary Research and Teaching.] Ed. Liisa Saariluoma. Kirjallisuudentutkijain seuran vuosikirja 44. Helsinki: SKS (1990), 111-30.
- . "'Siteeraamisen' funktiot Thomas Mannin 'montaasiromaanissa' *Tohtori Faustus*." [Functions of "citation" in Thomas Mann's "montage novel" *Doktor Faustus*.] *Interteksti ja konteksti*. [Intertext and Context.] Ed. Liisa Saariluoma and Marja-Leena Hakkarainen. Suomalaisen kirjallisuuden seuran toimituksia 701. Helsinki: SKS (1998), 51-81.
- Sabine, Maureen. "'Thou Art the Best of Mee': A.S. Byatt's *Possession* and the Literary Possession of Donne." *John Donne Journal* 14 (1995): 127-48.
- Sainte-Beuve, C.-A. *Port-Royal*. 15th ed. Vol 2. Paris: Hachette, 1888.

- Sammells, Neil. "Earning Liberties: *Travesties* and *The Importance of Being Earnest*." *Modern Drama* 29 (1986): 376-87.
- Sarraute, Natalie. *Les Fruits d'or*. 1963. Folio. Paris: Gallimard, 2001.
- . *Golden Fruits*. Trans. Maria Jolas. New York: G. Brazillier, 1964.
- Saunders, David. *Authorship and Copyright*. London: Routledge, 1992.
- Sayce, R.A. "The Goncourt Pastiche in *Le Temps retrouvé*." Larkin B. Price 102-23.
- Sayers, Dorothy L. *Gaudy Night*. 1936. New York: HarperPaperbacks, 1995.
- Schneider, Michel. *Voleurs de mots: essai sur le plagiat, la psychanalyse et la pensée*. Connaissance de l'inconscient. Paris: Gallimard, 1985.
- Schor, Hilary M. "Sorting, Morphing, and Mourning: A.S. Byatt Ghostwrites Victorian Fiction." Kucich and Sadoff 234-51.
- Shiller, Dana. "The Redemptive Past in the Neo-Victorian Novel." *Studies in the Novel* 29 (1997): 538-60.
- Sigelman, Lee, and William Jacoby. "The Not-So-Simple Art of Imitation: Pastiche, Literary Style, and Raymond Chandler." *Computers and the Humanities* 30 (1996): 11-28.
- Sinclair, Iain. Introduction. Doyle, *A Study in Scarlet* vii-xxi.
- Slater, Maya. "Proust's Parodies as Weapons of Criticism." *Neophilologus* 63 (1979): 509-20.
- Słownik języka polskiego* [Dictionary of the Polish Language]. Vol 6. Warszawa: Polska adademia nauk, 1964.
- Smith, Edgar W. "By Way of Introduction." Doyle, *The Field Bazaar* 7-9.
- Somers, Harold, and Fiona Tweedie. "Authorship Attribution and Pastiche." *Computers and the Humanities* 37 (2003): 407-29.
- Stoppard, Tom. *Travesties*. London: Faber and Faber, 1975.
- Symbolism: An International Annual of Critical Aesthetics*. Ed. Rüdiger Ahrens. Vol 5. New York: AMS, 2005.
- Swift, Jonathan. *The Works of Jonathan Swift, D.D.* Vol 1. London: Bell and Daldy, 1870.
- Taubin, Amy. "Degraded Dupes: Steven Soderbergh." *Sight and Sound* 17.3 (2007): 26-29.
- Taylor, D.J. *Kept: A Victorian Mystery*. 2006. London: Vintage, 2007.
- Thomas, D.M. *Charlotte*. 2000. London: Duckbacks, 2001.
- Thomas, Ronald R. "Detection in the Victorian Novel." *The Cambridge Companion to the Victorian Novel*. Ed. Deirdre David. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2001. 169-91.
- Thomson, Clive, ed. *Essays on Parody*. Toronto: Victoria U, 1986.
- . "Parody/Genre/Ideology." Groupar 95-103.
- Tomashevsky, Boris. "Tematika". *Teorija literatury*. Poetika. Moskva: Aspekt Press, 1996. 176-259.

- . "Thématique." Trans. Tzvetan Todorov. *Théorie de la littérature: Textes des Formalistes russes réunis, présentés et traduits par Tzvetan Todorov*. Paris: Seuil, 1965. 263-307.
- Turtia, Kaarina. *Sivistyssanat* [Dictionary of Foreign Words]. Helsinki: Ota-va, 2001.
- Ullman, B.L. "Satura and Satire." *Classical Philology* 8 (1913): 172-94.
- Uniwersalny słownik języka polskiego* [Universal Dictionary of the Polish Language]. Vol. 3. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo naukowe PWN, 2003.
- U.S. Copyright Law. 3 Mar 2009 < <http://www.copyright.gov/title17/> >.
- Walkley, A.B. *Pastiche and Prejudice*. London: William Heinemann, 1921.
- Wellek, René. *A History of Modern Criticism: 1750-1950*. Vol. 1 (The Later Eighteenth Century). New Haven: Yale UP, 1955.
- Widdowson, Peter. *Literature*. New Critical Idiom. London: Routledge, 1999.
- Wilde, Oscar. *The Importance of Being Earnest*. Ed. Richard Allen Cave. London: Penguin, 2000.
- Wilson, Angus. *Anglo-Saxon Attitudes*. 1956. New York: New York Rev. Books, 2005.
- Young, Edward. *Conjectures of Original Composition*. 1759. *The Works of Edward Young*. Vol. 3. London: J. Dodsley, 1798. 173-213.
- Zandré, Domenico. *Cultural Non-Conformity in Early Modern Florence*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004.
- Zeglin Brand, Peggy. "Pastiche." *Encyclopedia of Aesthetics*. Ed. Michael Kelly. Vol. 3. New York: Oxford UP, 1998. 444-45.
- Zinman, Toby. "Travesties, Night and Day, The Real Thing." *The Cambridge Companion to Tom Stoppard*. Ed. Katherine E. Kelly. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2001. 120-35.

Index

- Abondolo, David 221
 Ackroyd, Peter *Chatterton* 30n, 210
 The Last Testament of Oscar Wilde
 167-69, 208
 Adorno, Theodor 106-107
 Akakia-Viala 183
 Albalat, Antoine 61-62, 67, 73
 Albertsen, Leif Ludwig 81-82, 98,
 110, 118
 d'Alembert, Jean Le Rond 23, 44
 Allem, Maurice 68, 70, 74-75, 211
 Allen, Woody 201n
 Amis, Martin 64, 186, 248
 Another Lady 177, 225, 238; *see also*
 Austen, Jane (Sanditon)
 Aristotle 20-21
 Aron, Paul 14, 25, 36n, 90, 100, 190,
 240n, 346
 Armstrong, Isobel 315
 Auden, W.H. 195, 239, 242-43
 Austen, Jane 206, 226 *Emma* 212
 Sanditon 177, 225, 238, 240-41
 Austin, James 6n, 61, 72, 73n, 223,
 242n
- Bailey, Nathan 353
 Bajoria, Paul 145
 Bakhtin, Mikhail 76-79, 100
 Bal, Mieke 133
 Balzac, Guez de 57
 Balzac, Honoré de 92-93, 181, 208,
 211, 223, 257, 261
 Baragnon, Louis-Numa 73
 Barrett-Browning, Elizabeth 309,
 310n, 312, 314
 Barth, John 98n
 Barthes, Roland 32, 108, 245, 270,
 336
 Bassano, Jacopo 41
 Bataille, Nicholas 183
 Battaglia, Salvatore 34
- Baudelaire, Charles 146
 Baudrillard, Jean 104, 184
 Beaumarchais, Pierre-Augustin
 Caron de 26
 Beckett, Samuel 64
 Beerbohm, Max 66
 Bell, Joseph 294n
 Bellaunay, Henri 63, 240-41, 243
 Ben-Porat, Ziva 141
 Bennett, Andrew 26n, 27
 Bennington, Geoffrey 229
 Benveniste, Émile 89
 Berlin, Irving 123
 Bertolucci, Bernardo 108
 Bilous, Daniel 73n, 100-01, 157, 227,
 252
 Bloom, Clive 279
 Bloom, Harold 82-84, 161, 242, 337-
 39
 Boileau, Nicolas 21, 57
 Bourgeacq, Jacques 64
 Bradbury, Malcolm 138
 Brisson, Marie 87-88
 Broich, Ulrich 190
 Brodsky, Joseph 195, 239, 243
 Bromwich, David 86
 Brontë, Charlotte 328, 330-36, 338
 Brotherus, Elina 199-200
 Browning, Robert 309-10, 312, 314-
 17, 319-20
 Brunet, Fernand 68-69, 74n
 Brunetière, Ferdinand 68
 Brunn, Alain 32
 Brunot, Ferdinand 40n
 Burke, Séan 32
 Butor, Michel 118
 Byatt, A.S. 169, 187, 329 *Angels and*
 Insects 255n, 314 *The Djinn and*
 the Nightingale's Eye 219 *On His-*
 tories and Stories 216, 239, 326
 Possession 16, 117, 119, 163, 165-

Double-Edged Imitation

- 66, 169-70, 181, 219, 254, 304,
307-327, 343-44 "Precipice-
Encurled" 314, 315n
- Calinescu, Matei 159
Camus, Albert 108
Cantor, Steven 203
Carr, John Dickson 16, 254, 278,
293, 295, 306; *see also* *Doyle*,
Adrian Conan
Carroll, Noël 201
Casanova, Francesco-Giuseppe 49-
52, 55, 121
Cervantes, Miguel de 142
Chabon, Michael 156
Chandler, Raymond 177, 238
Chatman, Seymour 158
Chatterton, Thomas 210
Compagnon, Antoine 158
Compère, Daniel 18n, 84-86, 99,
178n, 230
Connolly, Cyril 218
Coste, Didier 160
Crossley-Holland, Kevin 145
Cuddon, J. A. 171
Culler, Jonathan 10, 343
Curtis, Jean-Louis 63
- Day Lewis, Cecil 242-44
Debussy, Claude 190
Deffoux, Leon 69-70, 73, 115
Delepierre, Octave 59, 67, 153, 353
Deleuze, Gilles 184
Dentith, Simon 143, 150, 189-90
Derrida, Jacques 103, 228
Dezalliers d'Argenville, Antoine-
Joseph 43-44, 47
Dibdin, Michael 16, 253, 328, 344
The Dying of the Light 255n *The*
Last Sherlock Holmes Story 188,
278, 282, 290-93, 295
Dickens, Charles *as the object of pastiche*
30n, 251n *Bleak House* 306 *Little*
Dorrit 78
Dickinson, Emily 164-67, 187, 310,
318, 323
- Diderot, Denis 28, 55-56, 58, 76, 82
Encyclopédie 23, 44 *Salon de 1767*
48-53, 121
Döblin, Alexander 178
Doctorow, E.L. 108-10, 170
Donne, John 319, 324-25, 327
Doyle, Adrian Conan 16, 254, 278,
293-95, 297, 301; *see also* *Carr*,
John Dickson
Doyle, Arthur Conan 209, 279-81 *as*
the object of pastiche 180-81, 253,
278, 282-98, 300, 302, 345 *The*
Field Bazaar 280n *A Study in*
Scarlet 277
Dreyfus, Robert 71, 274-75
Du Bos, Abbé 22, 42-43, 45, 47-48,
106
Dufay, Pierre 69-70
Duraille, Marguerite *see* *Rimbaud*, *Pa-*
trick
Duras, Marguerite 30n, 210
Duvall, John N. 201
Dyer, Richard 11, 50-51, 88, 112,
119, 121-24, 134-37, 153, 157,
191, 204, 208, 211, 217, 219-20,
244, 266, 346
- Echenoz, Jean 118
Eco, Umberto 89, 123, 224
Eliot, T.S. 142
Espagnon, Jacques 14, 240n
- Faguet, Émile 72, 257, 260n
Faulks, Sebastian 186
Fernandez, Ramon 72
Fielding, Henry 185
Finn, Michael R. 268n, 273
Flaubert, Gustave 102, 181 *as the ob-*
ject of pastiche 93, 214, 257, 268
Foster, Hal 50, 111-12, 197
Foster, John Burt 110
Foucault, Michel 32, 245
Fowler, Alastair 193
Fowles, John 306, 308
Freud, Sigmund 11, 338 *as the object of*
pastiche 255n *as a fictional character*
278, 287-88, 292

- Friedrich, Caspar David 146, 199-200
 Frost, Robert 239n, 242
- Gadda, Carlo Emilio 350
 Gandon, Yves 87
 Garner, Alan
 Gautier, Pierre-Yves 30
 Gautier, Theophile 65
 Genette, Gérard 5n, 13, 23, 63, 68, 80, 88n, 90, 95-100, 120, 156, 159, 177, 205, -06, 210-12, 213n, 214, 217, 220-21, 228, 252, 256, 268, 329
 Gershwin, George 123
 Gide, André 168
 Gilbert, Sandra M. 242, 330
 Giordano, Luca 46
 Giradoux, Jean 257
 Gluck, Cristoph Willibald Ritter von 35
 Godard, Barbara 244
 Golopentia-Eretescu, Sanda 89, 95, 187-88
 Goncourt, the brothers *see* *Goncourt, Edmond de*
 Goncourt, Edmond de 71 *as the object of pastiche* 16, 30n, 226n, 247, 263-67, 271-72, 316, 344
 Goncourt, Jules de 264
 Gourmont, Remy de 25, 61n, 67, 74
 Gowers, Andrew 30-31
 Greaney, Michael 247-48
 Gregh, Fernand 243, 257
 Gubar, Susan 242, 330
 Gutleben, Christian 50, 100, 307, 319, 320n, 335
- Halliwell, Stephen 25
 Hamm, J.-J. 89, 95
 Handel, George Frideric 35, 353
 Hardy, Thomas 242
 Harvey, David 103-04
 Hassan, Ihab 6
 Haydn, Joseph 35
 Heaney, Seamus 195, 239, 243-44
- Hempel, Wido 13, 25, 40n, 61, 80-81, 351
 Herschberg Pierrot, Anne 223
 Hillis Miller, J. 313
 Hitchcock, Alfred 201n
 Hodgson, John A. 301
 Hoesterey, Ingeborg 18n, 36, 115-18, 134-36, 138, 140-41, 146, 149-51, 171, 197, 216, 354
 Hollier, Denis 64, 91n
 Homer 23
 Horace 20, 22, 74, 194
 Hugo, Victor 32, 240
 Hutcheon, Linda 94, 113-14, 116n, 121, 130, 132, 141, 145, 150n, 152, 187, 193
 Hutchinson, Peter 86
 Huysmans, Joris-Karl 146
- Idt, Geneviève 193
- Jackson, Frank 248-49
 Jacoby, William 238
 Jaidev 112, 238
 Jakobson, Roman 89, 91
 James, Henry *as the object of pastiche* 156, 158, 249 *The Aspern Papers* 306 *The Bostonians* 314, 319
 Jameson, Fredric 6, 18n, 50, 71-72, 89, 100, 103-14, 117-19, 126-27, 132-33, 138, 141, 143-46, 152, 170, 184, 188, 197, 216, 221, 246, 323, 327, 347
 Jaucourt, Louis de 45-48, 50-51, 53, 58, 106
 Jeandillou, Jean-François 34n, 87, 101, 157, 176
 Jencks, Charles 114
 Joyce, James 66, 140, 143, 150, 210 *as a fictional character* 147-49
 Johnson, Samuel 20
 Jolson, Al 123
- Kaplan, Cora 305, 310, 319, 320n
 Karlin, Danny 310
 Karrer, Wolfgang 88n, 89, 93-94, 176
 Kasdan, Lawrence 108

Double-Edged Imitation

- Kemp, Simon 18n, 118-19
Kierkegaard, Søren 183
Klauder, Charles 143n
Kristeva, Julia 140
Kucich, John 305
Kudelin, Alexander 25
- La Bruyère, Jean de 1-5, 7, 9-12, 14, 55, 162-63, 169, 187, 208, 226-27, 250, 252 *as the object of pastiche* 57
Laurette, Pierre 38, 101
Le Loir, Nicholas 46
Leclerc, Gérard 85, 99, 228, 279
Lefevère, André 159
Lehto, Leevi 181
Lejeune, Philippe 99, 205-06
Lemoine, Henri 91, 158, 257, 260, 268, 270
Levertov, Denise 172
Lodge, David 64, 179, 191, 248-50
Longinus (the anon. author of *On the Sublime*) 20
Lotman, Yury 89, 95
Lyotard, Jean-François 103-04
- Macey, David 140
Machacek, Gregory 171-72
Mallarmé, Stéphane 65, 217
Malraux, André 82n
Mandell, Charlotte 180-81
Mann, Sally 203-04
Mann, Thomas 106-07, 178
Mariengof, Anatolii 178
Marienské, Hélène 71, 215, 340
Marmontel, Jean-François 3, 5, 53-56, 58, 126, 153, 223
Marot, Clément 52
Masson, Georges-Armand 87, 259
Maupassant, Guy de 30n, 250-51
Maurois, André 77n, 182, 191, 226n, 230-32, 235, 245-46, 268, 270-71, 354
McEwan, Ian 217
Meyer, Nicholas 16, 30n, 226n, 247
The Canary Trainer 278, 300n
The Seven-Per-Cent Solution 278, 284-89
The West-End Horror 278
- Michelet, Jules 257
Miles, Hamish 230n
Milly, Jean 90-93, 252, 261, 265
Moncrieff, Scott 182
Montaigne, Michel de 1-5, 7, 9, 10, 12, 14, 55, 162-63, 187, 208, 226, 250, 252
Morricone, Ennio 220
Mortier, Roland 27, 61, 187
Mozart, Wolfgang Amadeus 35
Mullan, John 26, 55n
Muller, Charles 30n, 61, 63, 65, 69, 98, 154, 177, 180, 251, 257
- Nadel, Ira B. 149-52
Nagel, Thomas 64, 248
Nicol, Bran 329n, 339
Noailles, Anna de 243
Nodier, Charles 30n, 56-59, 87, 153
Nørgaard, Bjørn 138
- Ogden, Alexander J. 77
Orlandini, Giuseppe Maria 35
Orr, Mary 161, 347n
- Painter, George D. 182, 191, 230n, 354
Parker, Robert B. 177, 238
Pascal, Blaise 57
Paton Walsh, Jill 177
Perec, Georges 118, 215
Perrault, Charles 22
Perrin, Michel 87
Pessoa, Fernando 183
Piles, Roger de 13, 35-44, 46-48, 50-51, 53, 55-56, 62, 71, 80, 127, 138n, 152-53, 167, 184, 237-38, 342, 348-51
Plato 184
Poe, Edgar Allan 277
Pope, Alexander 21-22, 185
Pound, Ezra 178
Poussin, Nicolas 44, 46
Price, Curtis 35

- Proust, Marcel 16, 61-62, 71-74, 84, 92-93, 98, 101, 159, 177, 186, 190, 214, 223-24, 243, 252-54, 256-76, 312, 316, 329, 343, 345-46, 354 *as the object of pastiche* 77n, 182, 191, 214n, 226n, 230-36, 245-47 *L’Affaire Lemoine* (see also *Pastiches et mélanges*) 65, 71-72, 90-91, 123, 154, 158, 180, 208, 232, 242n *Albertine disparue* 226n, 230 *L’Amour de Swann* 264 *Contre Sainte-Beuve* 253, 256 *Du Côté de chez Swann* 231, 261 *Le Côté de Guermantes* 231 *À l’Ombre de jeunes filles en fleurs* 60n, 232, 264n *La Prisonnière* 212, 264 *Sodome et Gomorrhe* 264 *Pastiches et mélanges* 69, 208, 256, 274 *Jean Santeuil* 256 *Le Temps retrouvé* 79, 247, 254, 263-67, 271, 344
- Pynchon, Thomas 305n
- Rabelais, François 57, 179n
- Rimbaud, Patrick 30n, 210
- Randall, Marilyn 236-37
- Raphael 47
- Reboux, Paul 30n, 61, 63, 65-66, 69, 73, 90, 98, 154-55, 177, 180, 243, 251, 256-59, 262
- Régnier, Henri de 16, 180, 186, 257, 268-71
- Renan, Ernest 72, 73n, 257
- Reni, Guido 46
- Rhys, Jean 306, 333 *as a fictional character* 337n
- Riffaterre, Michael 91
- Rimbaud, Arthur 183
- Rimmon-Kenan, Shlomith 222
- Ringrose, Christopher 144-45, 147, 151
- Ripley, Alexandra 224
- Robbe-Grillet, Alain 102, 118, 214n
- Romano, Giulio 47
- Rose, Margaret 97, 104n, 114, 119, 126, 197, 311
- Ross, Gary 202
- Ross, Herbert 278
- Roure, Marquis de 57-59, 63, 68, 126, 153, 158, 223, 236
- Rousseau, Jean-Jacques 58
- Rowling, J. K. 186
- Rubow, Paul V. 75-76, 78, 93, 118, 153, 157
- Rushdie, Salman 64
- Ruskin, John 72, 168, 180
- Ruthven, K.K. 209, 241, 279
- Ryan, Judith 146-47, 151, 199
- Ryan, Marie-Laure 224n
- Sadoff, Dianne F. 305
- Sage, Lorna 136
- Sainte-Beuve, C.-A. 59, 73, 153, 221 *as the object of pastiche* 72, 257
- Saint-Simon, Duke of 257
- Sammells, Neil 148-49, 151
- Sarraute, Natalie 341
- Sarto, Andre del 47
- Saunders, David 28
- Sayce, R. A. 265
- Sayers, Dorothy L. 185, 177
- Scarron, Paul 96, 185
- Schneider, Michel 83-85
- Schoenberg, Arnold 106
- Scipione Maffei, Francesco 34
- Sevigné, Madame de 57-58
- Shakespeare, William 142, 149-50, 199, 240
- Shklovsky, Victor 76
- Sigelman, Lee 238
- Simon, Claude 119
- Sirk, Douglas 122
- Smith, Edgar W. 280n
- Soderbergh, Steven 202
- St Bonaventure 21
- Stein, Gertrude 221
- Stoppard, Tom 147-151, 167, 192
- Stravinsky, Igor 106
- Süskind, Patrick 146-147, 151, 199
- Swift, Jonathan 186
- Taine, Hippolyte 16, 72, 274-75
- Taubin, Amy 202n
- Taylor, D.J. 216

Double-Edged Imitation

- Teniers, David (Younger) 41-43, 46n
Tennyson, Alfred 309, 314
Thomas, D.M. 16, 83, 177, 188, 224,
254, 255n, 304, 307-08, 327-40
Thomas, Dylan 242
Thomas, Ronald R. 306
Thomson, Clive 193
Thomson, June 282, 293
Todorov, Tzvetan 77
Tolstoy, Leo 180-81
Tomashevsky, Boris 76-77
Tynyanov, Yury 76-78
- Verlaine, Paul 65, 213n, 217
Veronese, Paolo 41
Vinci, Leonardo 35
Virgil 52
Vivaldi, Antonio 35
Voiture, Vincent 57
Voltaire 57-58, 60
- Walkley, A.B. 70, 73, 86n, 159, 196n
Welsh, Irvine 64
- Wilde Oscar 150 *as the object of pastiche*
167-68, 208 *The Ballad of Reading*
Gaol 167 *De Profundis* 167 *The*
Importance of Being Earnest 148-
49, 167 *The Soul of Man under So-*
cialism 168
Wilkomirski, Benjamin 255n
Williams, Raymond 144
Wilson, Angus 98n, 138
Wolf, Christa 156
Wordsworth, William 116n, 172
Woolf, Virginia 142
Wouwermans, Philips 49, 51
- Yeats, W.B. 242-43
Young, Edward 31, 126
- Zeglin Brand, Peggy 170
Zeno, Apostolo 35
Zinman, Toby 150-51