Finally, there is the outstanding epilogue by Richard Wortman (Princeton). In general, Wortman sees an inherent contradiction between the concerns of historians, who deal with society as a whole and collective change, and those of literary critics, who prize "the transcendence and finality" of artistic individuality. Examining the "historical" aspect of each essay, Wortman offers pervasive criticism and adds much valuable perspective to the subjects.

One may object that the historian's criteria are not always relevant to the designs of literary history, and that brings us to the central question: what exactly is the purview of this discipline? Morson hopes for a "full institutional model" that would come to guide literary historians. One can see how Wortman's critique would enter the planning of such a project, and so would the opposing (or perhaps complementary) concepts of literature as Structuralist "system" or Bakhtinian "aggregate," an issue related in turn to the question of the multiplicity of literary histories. The complexity is daunting. It will be interesting to see how Anglo-American scholarship reacts to another "Russian experience," the Moscow-Tartu school of cultural semiotics whose remarkable recent work is barely mentioned in the present volume, despite the shared link with Bakhtin. Peckham's thought seems close to that of the Soviet semioticians, and there are points of contact between the approaches of Todd, Greene, and Clark on the one side and those of Lotman, Uspenskii, and Ginzberg on the other. There is common ground for further dialogue and need to think about priorities.
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If Derrida is a live hero in the language revolutions of our day, then Bakhtin is a dead one well on the road to sanctification; his works like the bones of a candidate for sainthood are being sent to all those institutions which worship language and its creations. Necessarily this canonization needs explaining; for secular saints are not institutionally defined and saints, in general, border on heresy since their acts edge towards the sin of despair—they seize upon pain and suffering to serve God because they presume He will not serve Himself.

Bakhtin would have been amused at the emergence of new disciples, but then his concept of amusement is a special one. He opposed Freud and Bergson who saw hostility and the mechanical in humor; for Bakhtin humor was part of a democratizing process in history. Laughter produces a realm in which we are all equal, and that realm, the realm of equality, produces more humor. It is important
to note that this early in the review because Bakhtin's life, despite his good humor, is a serious tale and often a sad one.

As a result of the brutality and repression of Soviet society during Bakhtin's career, he apparently chose to cloak his authorship under the names of friends. Why he did this is not entirely clear: publishing under other's names seemed neither to have protected him nor to have increased the danger to others. The persons whose names he borrowed seemed, as part of his circle, to write and edit the work with him. When people were jailed or exiled to remote places, the work itself appeared irrelevant to the punishments whose real causes, perhaps, stemmed from the religious and "idealist" philosphic interests of the Bakhtin circle, and probably even more from its concern with Marxism.

That Bakhtin's work originated and circulated in such Byzantine shadows, however, has created many problems for translators, intellectual historians, and literary theoreticians. The major achievement of the Clark and Holquist volume, its overcoming of these difficulties, makes it the best single work in English on Bakhtin. Clark and Holquist carefully consider the problems of authorship in order to establish a Bakhtin corpus of work. Though there are still disagreements about which works, or parts of works, is to be identified as Bakhtin's, Clark and Holquist's reasoning will at the very least be the point of departure for future discussion—a discussion already begun in Volume 5 of Papers in Slavic Philology. Here, I. R. Titunik, the translator of Marxism and the Philosophy of Language, and others continue to maintain that Voloshinov wrote the philosophy of language work despite Clark and Holquist's contrary claim. For most readers, even if Clark and Holquist make some mistakes about authorship, their conclusions will suffice until the work of the whole of the Bakhtin circle becomes widely circulated and studied. This is so because their non-restrictive approach explores most of the hypotheses about the works. Clark and Holquist are trying both to be dispassionate and to meet the needs of a diverse set of readers.

For Bakhtin is important to language philosophers, religious thinkers, semioticians, post-Structuralists, Existentialists, and Marxists. Each of these camps looks to Bakhtin for different reasons. The semioticians see in him a founder of the modern science of hermeneutics because his answers to some of the problems which trouble semiotics proved valuable in understanding what happens when a sign is transmitted. These solutions were drawn from modern language philosophy where Wittgenstein and others assert that language is not a private activity. Bakhtin's life work can be understood as an elaboration of that central notion. The motives and sources of his thinking, however, come from his interest in Christianity, idealist thought (Kantian, Hegelian), and Marxism. In addition, Bakhtin's time in exile made him question Soviet oppression from the special standpoint of his libertarian and Christian socialism.

Bakhtin's appeal to a multifarious audience and his apparently contradictory conglomeration of ideas remain one of the stranger phenomena of the first half of this century—strange in the sense of denying conventional expectations. For example, that Soviet society would nurture an opponent who was interested in things philosophic, religious, Marxist, and aesthetic seems improbable. Yet Russian and Soviet civil society has a tradition of nourishing its own ethical opposition. Sometimes this produces bizarre results most clearly seen in Russian satiric literature. Although Bakhtin is interested in this genre and its archaic roots, he does not adopt it and become lost in the anguish of satire, nor does he