

"I AM NOT MORE THAN A THING WHICH THINKS:"
SCATOLOGY AND REPRESENTATION IN THE CANADIAN NOVEL

By

Reinhold Kramer

A Thesis
Submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of

PH.D. in ARTS

Department of English
University of Manitoba
Winnipeg, Manitoba

(c) October 1992



National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file *Votre référence*

Our file *Notre référence*

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-315-81719-4

Canada

ame

Dissertation Abstracts International is arranged by broad, general subject categories. Please select the one subject which most accurately describes the content of your dissertation. Enter the corresponding four-digit code in the spaces provided.

CANADIAN LITERATURE (ENGLISH)

0352

U·M·I

SUBJECT TERM

SUBJECT CODE

Subject Categories

THE HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

Table listing subject categories under 'THE HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES' such as COMMUNICATIONS AND THE ARTS, EDUCATION, LANGUAGE, LITERATURE AND LINGUISTICS, and PSYCHOLOGY.

Table listing subject categories under 'PHILOSOPHY, RELIGION AND THEOLOGY' and 'SOCIAL SCIENCES'.

Table listing subject categories under 'PHILOSOPHY, RELIGION AND THEOLOGY' and 'SOCIAL SCIENCES'.

THE SCIENCES AND ENGINEERING

Table listing subject categories under 'BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES', 'HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES', and 'EARTH SCIENCES'.

Table listing subject categories under 'PHYSICAL SCIENCES', 'PURE SCIENCES', and 'APPLIED SCIENCES'.

Table listing subject categories under 'ENGINEERING' and 'PSYCHOLOGY'.



Nom _____

Dissertation Abstracts International est organisé en catégories de sujets. Veuillez s.v.p. choisir le sujet qui décrit le mieux votre thèse et inscrivez le code numérique approprié dans l'espace réservé ci-dessous.



SUJET

CODE DE SUJET

Catégories par sujets

HUMANITÉS ET SCIENCES SOCIALES

COMMUNICATIONS ET LES ARTS

Architecture	0729
Beaux-arts	0357
Bibliéconomie	0399
Cinéma	0900
Communication verbale	0459
Communications	0708
Danse	0378
Histoire de l'art	0377
Journalisme	0391
Musique	0413
Sciences de l'information	0723
Théâtre	0465

ÉDUCATION

Généralités	515
Administration	0514
Art	0273
Collèges communautaires	0275
Commerce	0688
Économie domestique	0278
Éducation permanente	0516
Éducation préscolaire	0518
Éducation sanitaire	0680
Enseignement agricole	0517
Enseignement bilingue et multiculturel	0282
Enseignement industriel	0521
Enseignement primaire	0524
Enseignement professionnel	0747
Enseignement religieux	0527
Enseignement secondaire	0533
Enseignement spécial	0529
Enseignement supérieur	0745
Évaluation	0288
Finances	0277
Formation des enseignants	0530
Histoire de l'éducation	0520
Langues et littérature	0279

Lecture	0535
Mathématiques	0280
Musique	0522
Orientation et consultation	0519
Philosophie de l'éducation	0998
Physique	0523
Programmes d'études et enseignement	0727
Psychologie	0525
Sciences	0714
Sciences sociales	0534
Sociologie de l'éducation	0340
Technologie	0710

LANGUE, LITTÉRATURE ET LINGUISTIQUE

Langues	
Généralités	0679
Anciennes	0289
Linguistique	0290
Modernes	0291
Littérature	
Généralités	0401
Anciennes	0294
Comparée	0295
Médiévale	0297
Moderne	0298
Africaine	0316
Américaine	0591
Anglaise	0593
Asiatique	0305
Canadienne (Anglaise)	0352
Canadienne (Française)	0355
Germanique	0311
Latino-américaine	0312
Moyen-orientale	0315
Romane	0313
Slave et est-européenne	0314

PHILOSOPHIE, RELIGION ET THÉOLOGIE

Philosophie	0422
Religion	
Généralités	0318
Clergé	0319
Études bibliques	0321
Histoire des religions	0320
Philosophie de la religion	0322
Théologie	0469

SCIENCES SOCIALES

Anthropologie	
Archéologie	0324
Culturelle	0326
Physique	0327
Droit	0398
Économie	
Généralités	0501
Commerce-Affaires	0505
Économie agricole	0503
Économie du travail	0510
Finances	0508
Histoire	0509
Théorie	0511
Études américaines	0323
Études canadiennes	0385
Études féministes	0453
Folklore	0358
Géographie	0366
Gérontologie	0351
Gestion des affaires	
Généralités	0310
Administration	0454
Banques	0770
Comptabilité	0272
Marketing	0338
Histoire	
Histoire générale	0578

Ancienne	0579
Médiévale	0581
Moderne	0582
Histoire des noirs	0328
Africaine	0331
Canadienne	0334
États-Unis	0337
Européenne	0335
Moyen-orientale	0333
Latino-américaine	0336
Asie, Australie et Océanie	0332
Histoire des sciences	0585
Loisirs	0814
Planification urbaine et régionale	0999
Science politique	
Généralités	0615
Administration publique	0617
Droit et relations internationales	0616
Sociologie	
Généralités	0626
Aide et bien-être social	0630
Criminologie et établissements pénitentiaires	0627
Démographie	0938
Études de l'individu et de la famille	0628
Études des relations interethniques et des relations raciales	0631
Structure et développement social	0700
Théorie et méthodes	0344
Travail et relations industrielles	0629
Transports	0709
Travail social	0452

SCIENCES ET INGÉNIERIE

SCIENCES BIOLOGIQUES

Agriculture	
Généralités	0473
Agronomie	0285
Alimentation et technologie alimentaire	0359
Culture	0479
Élevage et alimentation	0475
Exploitation des pâturages	0777
Pathologie animale	0476
Pathologie végétale	0480
Physiologie végétale	0817
Sylviculture et taune	0478
Technologie du bois	0746
Biologie	
Généralités	0306
Anatomie	0287
Biologie (Statistiques)	0308
Biologie moléculaire	0307
Botanique	0309
Cellule	0379
Écologie	0329
Entomologie	0353
Généétique	0369
Limnologie	0793
Microbiologie	0410
Neurologie	0317
Océanographie	0416
Physiologie	0433
Radiation	0821
Science vétérinaire	0778
Zoologie	0472
Biophysique	
Généralités	0786
Médicale	0760

Géologie	0372
Géophysique	0373
Hydrologie	0388
Minéralogie	0411
Océanographie physique	0415
Paléobotanique	0345
Paléocologie	0426
Paléontologie	0418
Paléozoologie	0985
Palynologie	0427

SCIENCES DE LA SANTÉ ET DE L'ENVIRONNEMENT

Économie domestique	0386
Sciences de l'environnement	0768
Sciences de la santé	
Généralités	0566
Administration des hôpitaux	0769
Alimentation et nutrition	0570
Audiologie	0300
Chimiothérapie	0992
Dentisterie	0567
Développement humain	0758
Enseignement	0350
Immunologie	0982
Loisirs	0575
Médecine du travail et thérapie	0354
Médecine et chirurgie	0564
Obstétrique et gynécologie	0380
Ophtalmologie	0381
Orthophonie	0460
Pathologie	0571
Pharmacie	0572
Pharmacologie	0419
Physiothérapie	0382
Radiologie	0574
Santé mentale	0347
Santé publique	0573
Soins infirmiers	0569
Toxicologie	0383

SCIENCES PHYSIQUES

Sciences Pures

Chimie	
Généralités	0485
Biochimie	487
Chimie agricole	0749
Chimie analytique	0486
Chimie minérale	0488
Chimie nucléaire	0738
Chimie organique	0490
Chimie pharmaceutique	0491
Physique	0494
Polymères	0495
Radiation	0754
Mathématiques	0405
Physique	
Généralités	0605
Acoustique	0986
Astronomie et astrophysique	0606
Électromagnétique et électricité	0607
Fluides et plasma	0759
Météorologie	0608
Optique	0752
Particules (Physique nucléaire)	0798
Physique atomique	0748
Physique de l'état solide	0611
Physique moléculaire	0609
Physique nucléaire	0610
Radiation	0756
Statistiques	0463

Sciences Appliquées Et Technologie

Informatique	0984
Ingénierie	
Généralités	0537
Agricole	0539
Automobile	0540

Biomédicale	0541
Chaleur et thermodynamique	0348
Conditionnement (Emballage)	0549
Génie aérospatial	0538
Génie chimique	0542
Génie civil	0543
Génie électronique et électrique	0544
Génie industriel	0546
Génie mécanique	0548
Génie nucléaire	0552
Ingénierie des systèmes	0790
Mécanique navale	0547
Métallurgie	0743
Science des matériaux	0794
Technique du pétrole	0765
Technique minière	0551
Techniques sanitaires et municipales	0554
Technologie hydraulique	0545
Mécanique appliquée	0346
Géotechnologie	0428
Matériaux plastiques (Technologie)	0795
Recherche opérationnelle	0796
Textiles et tissus (Technologie)	0794

PSYCHOLOGIE

Généralités	0621
Personnalité	0625
Psychobiologie	0349
Psychologie clinique	0622
Psychologie du comportement	0384
Psychologie du développement	0620
Psychologie expérimentale	0623
Psychologie industrielle	0624
Psychologie physiologique	0989
Psychologie sociale	0451
Psychométrie	0632



**"I AM NOT MORE THAN A THING WHICH THINKS": SCATOLOGY
AND REPRESENTATION IN THE CANADIAN NOVEL**

BY

REINHOLD KRAMER

A Thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of the University of Manitoba in
partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

© 1992

Permission has been granted to the LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA to
lend or sell copies of this thesis, to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm
this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film, and UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS to
publish an abstract of this thesis.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts
from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

ABSTRACT

"I AM NOT MORE THAN A THING WHICH THINKS":

SCATOLOGY AND REPRESENTATION IN THE CANADIAN NOVEL

The novelistic version of the self is an abstraction (shortened, coded though the technology of the alphabet and past texts) of a potential historical self. If, as Jacques Lacan convincingly suggests, "the subject is decentered in relation to the individual" and relocated in discourse, then literature becomes an important scene for the operation of an unconscious, encoding a set of European and North American social ideals that the novelist, like any other member of the culture, is heir to. The "origins" of a scatological self are generally placed, *mis en abyme*, in a cultural past or on a farm (as in Shakespeare's Dog or The Diviners) from which the self rises to manners and urbanity, before becoming nostalgic for the body or skeptical about civilized values.

Since pollution rites are a culture-specific language, the representation of scatology sets up hierarchies of class, race, and gender--although material signifiers do refer to the world and are never purely rhetorical. The forms of scatology used by Canadian novelists thus raise epistemological problems: scatology alternately undermines and naturalizes political ideologies and religious beliefs depending upon the discursive context. The volatility of scatological and, more broadly, material representations (most evident in the metaphysical significations of religious mimesis) simultaneously destroys the representational guarantees of fictional autobiographies like Davies' What's Bred in the Bone and yet paradoxically guarantees the world of a postmodern text like Ondaatje's Coming Through Slaughter.

**"I AM NOT MORE THAN A THING WHICH THINKS":
SCATOLOGY AND REPRESENTATION IN THE CANADIAN NOVEL**

Contents

Acknowledgements

A Graphic Introduction to the Civilized Self. 3

I. Manners and the Canadian Novel

1. "It Never Was Mine": Bodily Disgust in
Personal and Social Histories. 19
2. Country and Town: "The Size of a Sheep's Dung"
and Other Metaphors. 33
3. Doubling Back: The Rhetorical Recovery of the Body. 41
4. Extreme Skepticism: Parodies of the Civilized Self. 48

**II. The Social Body: Scatology and Ideological Hierarchy
in the Canadian Novel**

5. Immigrants, Foul Ghettos, and Social Climbers:
Marking Fictional Class Structures. 55
6. "This is the British fucking Empire": Race. 76
7. Allegories and Sites of Power: Politics
and Economics. 106
8. Hygiene Guidelines for Virtual Bodies: Science
and Technology. 130
9. Polluted Women. 153
10. "The Hind Parts of God": Materialist
Epistemologies and the Mimesis of Religion. . . . 177

III. Two Studies in Scatology and Literary Genre. 218

11. "When I de small man sometime I used to eat
goat shit": The Base and Written Self in
Fictional Autobiography. 224
12. Postmodern Decomposition: Guaranteeing the World
of an Indeterminate Text. 248

Epilogue: New Detours to the Symbolic. 277

Works Cited. 288

Notes. 308

Acknowledgements

I owe a great debt to David Williams and Robert Kroetsch, whose fictional and scholarly experiments greatly influenced this study, and who allowed me many civil liberties. Thanks also to Judith Weil, Evelyn Hinz, Wolfgang Kloos, David Arnason, and Gerry Friesen for many extremely helpful suggestions and corrections. Most of all I thank my wife, Rita.

This book is dedicated to Madeline, Stephanie, and Michelle--architects of disorder--and to Rita who civilized us all.

Humani nil a me alienum puto

A Graphic Introduction to the Civilized Self

To all who carve their love on a picnic table
 or scratch it on smoked glass panes of a public toilet,
 I send my thanks for each plain and perfect fable
 of how the three pains of the body, surfeit,
 hunger, and chill (or loneliness), create
 a furniture and art of their own easing.
 --Mona Van Duyn, "Open Letter from a Constant Reader"

The body must educate itself.
 --Gamaliel Harding in The New Ancestors

Circa 1555 in Galateo Giovanni Della Casa offered some advice: "it is not a proper habit when, as sometimes happens, one sees something disgusting on the road to turn to one's companions and point it out to them. Even less so should one offer something unpleasant to smell, as some insist on doing, placing it even under a companion's nose saying: 'Now Sir, please smell how this stinks', when instead he should be saying: 'Don't smell this because it stinks'" (Della Casa 5-6). Between the implied reader for whom such an admonition would be necessary and Mordecai Richler's possible self in St. Urbain's Horseman, Jake Hersch, who cannot pick up his own stool, lie several hundred years in which western attitudes toward the body and bodily excretions changed so much that what once evidently aroused sensate curiosity now evokes disgust. Not that either the admonition or the disgust would be impossible in the other century, but the satiric effect of Richler's scene depends upon the reader's momentary, civilized implication in Jake's dilemma.

In 1939 Norbert Elias--rooted in Freud's comments in Civilization and its Discontents about a revised history which would cover the history of bodily repression--surveyed manners books from the Twelfth to Eighteenth Centuries, showing how courtesy and manners arose as a substitute for feudal action (9) during the time when European monarchies became centralized. After the Middle Ages' coercion in regard to manners increased on several fronts, all of which Elias connects to the repression of the appearance of animality: carving tends to move behind the scenes so that the whole animal rarely reaches the table (120), the bedroom is privatized (163), and proscriptions about bodily excretions greatly multiply so that to urinate in public (130), to look into one's used handkerchief (147), or even to speak about certain body parts becomes bad manners. These changes create a different emotional life because they increase bodily separation between people (69), enlarging the sphere of the "civilized" individual. For Elias, the mannered "I" cannot be understood as the result of incipient bacteriology, since the changes predate Pasteur by centuries; nor are manners attributable to inner or familial processes (228, 259). "Nothing in table manners is self-evident, as it were, or the product of a 'natural' feeling of delicacy" (107): the socialization of the child recapitulates a social history (306). "Precisely because the social command not to show oneself exposed or performing natural functions now operates with regards to everyone and

is imprinted in this form on the child, it seems to the adult a command of his own inner self and takes on the form of a more or less automatic self-restraint" (139). The invitation, then, to smell a piece of excrement would "appear, when occurring in adults, as a 'remnant' from childhood" (142).²

Elias's work is difficult to verify, since to put together a history of the body he must rely on textual transmission at a time when the belief that a text can represent the body is under question. Several critiques have been levelled--that Elias ignores other variables like architecture, gender, medicine, technical change (Bullough 444), that manners implicate only the surface not the real historical self (Adams 1015), that writers on manners borrowed extensively from one another, and that manners books are biased towards the court (Siegal 125).³ These commentators indicate that the process is more complex than Elias thought, but do not deny the magnitude of his contribution, in particular his sociological revision of psychoanalysis. Like Michel Foucault's later study of penal architecture and the **disciplines** in public buildings, on the job, and in the home, Elias shows how the cultural authorities "defined and repressed a mass of behavior" that the criminal justice systems ignored (Foucault 1984, 193), but Elias does so without Foucault's (disavowed) nostalgia. Elias calls Foucault's "panopticon" by its more traditional,

if no less political names: socialization, the process of civilization.

Contemporary manners books suggest the continuing validity of this approach. Elias comments on the lack of embarrassment with which Erasmus discusses, in De civilitate morum puerilium, the questions of urinating and farting in public (130). We might compare this to recent guides like The Amy Vanderbilt Complete Book of Etiquette, where the only hint at urination avoids direct reference, enjoining boys to put the toilet seat down when leaving the bathroom (Vanderbilt 30): scatology here looks like (still) the domain of the child, not of the adult. In Charlotte Ford's Book of Modern Manners, which is advertised as willing to address questions that other manners books ignore, the only references to toilet behavior have been transferred a stage further--to dogs. It is the responsibility of the civilized owner to clean up the animal's mess (Ford 482).⁴ Emily Post's Etiquette emphasizes that bathrooms must be left immaculate, but refers mainly to tub, basin (679), and paper on the floor (90). When she does mention the toilet, it is only to say that toilet seats and lids ought to be left down (737). Llewellyn Miller (The Encyclopedia of Etiquette), who does speak of urination--"Only a spoiled child or an irresponsible adult leaves a basin messy, a tub ringed, or a toilet seat splashed" (36)--curiously insists that even the noisiest toilet must be flushed (36), as if it is over-

fastidiousness about liquid noise, not a lack of fastidiousness about urine which postpones flushing. Silence, of course, is even more effective in the creation of a taboo than the aforementioned cues: thus Vanderbilt will not explain the difference between a "'slightly naughty' story" and a "dirty story" because "everyone knows the difference" (746); thus these writers on manners speak of burping and scatological language, but are silent on farting.⁵ Peter Stallybrass and Alon White, following Pierre Bordieu, suggest that in the cultural production of a "new man," the abbreviation of manners into details of dress and bearing puts them "beyond the grasp of consciousness" (Stallybrass 88).

By the time of Miss Manners' Guide to Rearing Perfect Children (1984), it is as if the compulsion of the manners book to exhibit and to speak has finally collided with its own inhibitions. Since the writer on manners must, of course, have good manners, she is under her "own" prohibition and so ought not to mention the bathroom in the formal context of a book. The result is the creation of Miss Manners' (Judith Martin's) ironic voice, taking manners very seriously even as she affects to play with them: "In vain does Miss Manners cry that she doesn't care what people do in the bathroom--she doesn't want to think about it" (52). A series of civilized censorships follow: do not ask where people are going, do not ask how long they will be

gone, do not ask if you can get in soon (52), do not mention the pills or cosmetic devices in a host's bathroom, do not speak through a closed bathroom door (53). To the gentleman who turns the water on so that people will not hear his bathroom sounds and to the lady who wonders if she should ask a guest not to leave a toilet lid up, Miss Manners replies that no gentleman or woman would listen to what goes on behind a bathroom door and that "a true lady does not acknowledge that there is such a thing as a toilet" (54). In this way Judith Martin's irony splits off her own voice from the voices that ask embarrassing questions. The crisis that the self-conscious humour masks is that to justify her book Martin must speak of the scatological body at the same time as she wants to inaugurate silence.

Although Miss Manners might complicate the details of Elias's history, his thesis of a growth in Western civilized repression not only fits manners books, but also the history of the self in a number of post-war Canadian novels. The selves in manners books are created and allegorical, tracing imagined, repressed, and wished histories which both originate new historical events and originate in lived histories. The novelistic version of the self too is an abstraction (shortened, coded through the technology of the alphabet and past texts) of a potential historical self. If, as Jacques Lacan convincingly suggests, "the subject is decentered in relation to the individual" (9) and relocated

in discourse, then literature becomes an important scene for the operation of an unconscious. This conception of the ego as a linguistic construct loses something of Freud's bodily determinism, but it gains what was missing in Freud--a social context mediated by a theory of language. And if the relation between books on manners to actual social practice is debatable, the books at least encode a set of European and North American social ideals that the novelist, like any other member of the culture, is heir to: "The novel. . . has become the zoo of everyday practices since the establishment of modern science" (de Certeau 78). Both manners book and novel often put implicit culture, that mnemonic culture coded through the body, under the eye of consciousness, and I confess that I am one of those readers (identified in Havelock Ellis's Studies in the Psychology of Sex) who want to hear about the hero's digestion and excretion (67).

Robertson Davies lets the reader in on privacies, and yet his hyperbolic abstractions in World of Wonders "outmanner" the manners book: Paul Dempster knows that he ought not to "go" anywhere except at home (32), and that his sodomy thus appears to be invited. The hospital in Audrey Thomas's Mrs. Blood rebroadcasts the privatization taking place in the surrounding culture--urination and the stripping of bloody sheets take place behind curtains (15). In Gabrielle Roy's Where Nests the Water Hen the teachers like Mlle. Coté who

come to the Water Hen introduce hygiene. The Tousignant children learn the symbolization, of animality during a dance in which they stick their buttocks into the air like the water hens, and they also, (to follow Roy's pun) learn all the signs of a mannered body, so that when their mother Luzina questions them, her explicitness about scatological concerns--"'You didn't stick your fingers in your nose?'"--already marks her as a past for the children. Roy approaches the silent nature of manners prohibitions in her narrative style. Instead of reporting a direct reply, she edges the children's voices into that of the narrator: "You didn't even talk about fingers in the nose before nice, pretty Mademoiselle!" (54) Silent on the mimetic level, but spoken on the diegetic, the exclamation retains not only the scientizing force of impersonal address ("On ne parlait pas") as opposed to Luzina's familiar and colloquial "T'as pas mis tes doigts dans le nez?" (87), but also the authority of a narrator who stands above the represented world of the Water Hen. In Part One of this study I will show how this creation of the civilized self takes several forms in the Canadian novel, including personal histories, implied social histories, and images of a rural/urban shift. As the instance from Roy indicates, the "origins" of a scatological self are generally placed, *mise en abîme*, in a past or on a farm, from which the self rises to manners and urbanity, before becoming nostalgic for the body or skeptical about civilized values.

Part Two of my study covers a similar terrain, but from a very different, at times contradictory, perspective. Anthropologist Mary Douglas argues that hygiene, taboos, and pollution rites, whatever their psychological origins or effects, serve to order such cultural systems as cosmology, class hierarchy, and gender relations. The very difficulty about the transcription of the body that Elias encounters suggests the potency of Douglas's model: she follows the linguistic model in which the sign is not directly related to its referent but is conventional and interpretable only within a system. Thus, she explains pollution rites as a culture-specific language. In any speech act "I am, in fact, constantly expressing a plenitude of meanings, some intended, others of which I am unaware" (Holquist xx). This allows us to address the civilizing process not just as a monolith--"the conquest of nature by technology had to include our own bodies" (G. Grant 185)--but as a set of specifications, some of which have been of incalculable value and some of which have not.

Looking at language, we must allow for metonymic expansion and inter-disciplinary leaps. Metonymically the sign "feces" links with "the lower body"--anus, vagina, penis--and thus with "underwear;" as a medico-scientific term, with levels of formality in language; as "manure," with "dirt," but also with "earth," "fertility," and "life;"

as a "by-product," to "digestion" and other industrial processes which create "garbage" and "pollution;" as "waste," to the process of "decay" ending in "dead matter" and "corpse." Clearly significations can be diametrically opposed, so the attempt to find a single meaning apart from the cultural and discursive contexts would be misguided.

At times it will appear that I am addressing what is marginal in a text. According to Derrida, however, it is exactly upon the margins that a text is constituted: his carefully reasoned blindness--"I do not know what is essential and what is accessory in a work" (Derrida 1987, 63)--allows us to notice that every mark in a text can be interpreted as a deictic mark. This does not mean that the part becomes a substitute for the whole, genetically bearing the code for the entire organism, but that each part (and especially the repressed part) can tell us something important about the speech act. That the ejected is often a trope for the marginal in gender, class, and race leads us to a second corollary: we have no choice but to cross disciplines because, for example, scatology has been used as a social register to differentiate classes from one another. In Part Two, then, I investigate the ideological uses to which scatology has been put in the Canadian novel vis-a-vis class, race, politics and economics, science and technology, gender, and religion.⁶

If in Part Two I reduce texts to examples of social systems, I hope that in Part Three (discussing fictional autobiography and postmodernism) I return what is owed to chaos. Benjamin Walker's Encyclopedia of Esoteric Man, a not always reliable but always interesting reference guide, identifies 39 types of solids, liquids, and gases that the body is in the habit of ejecting. These we might call the repressed in Descartes' *reductio*: "To speak accurately I am not more than a thing which thinks, that is to say a mind or a soul, or an understanding, or a reason" (II, 173). Walker's list does not even include inorganic "wastes" like heat and electrical impulses, but, under the rubric of scatology these substances (especially those expelled through the anus or the urethra) take us into a very narrow range of human experience which is further narrowed if we look for scatology as the explicit object of textual discourse.

On the other hand, as satirists and psychoanalysts never tire of noticing, scatology is a biological and therefore psychological universal among primates: "refuse and corpses show me what I permanently thrust aside in order to live. These bodily fluids, this defilement, this shit are what life withstands, hardly and with difficulty, on the part of death" (Kristeva 1982, 3). Although Eric Partridge puzzled over the fact that so much information on the word "shit" for his Dictionary of Slang and Unconventional English

seemed to come from Canadian academics (Partridge, Vol.2, 1269), scatological invective too is hardly parochial: St. Thomas More called the Lutheran heresy a "foule fylthy dunghyll" (quoted in Manuel 136); Washoe, one of the first apes to learn bits of American Sign Language, called a rhesus macaque who threatened her "dirty monkey," improvising upon a sign which she had been taught to apply to soiled objects or feces (Fleming 100). If figurative language "distinguishes us from the beasts" as Augustine claimed in De Doctrina Christiana (3.84), what are we to make of Washoe's trope?

Throughout this study, but especially in Part Three, I want to focus concerns about the materiality and historicity of literary texts (Erich Auerbach, Fredric Jameson, Edward Said, Elizabeth Scarry) as well as about the role of the body in the text (Mikhail Bakhtin, Francis Barker).⁸ In Auerbach's estimation, Tacitus's avoidance of slang when reporting the speech of the common soldier and rebel ringleader Percennius means that Tacitus has transformed the language that would have been spoken into rhetoric (34). Auerbach may be right, but in many quarters (not just among realists and autobiographers) this means that colloquial language laced with bodily references is not rhetorical but a more direct transcription of reality, a notion that Salman Rushdie plays with in Midnight's Children by means of Padma, Saleem Sinai's "dung goddess" and reader who makes the

demands of matter upon word-spinners. In an age of "scratch n' sniff" books on the one hand and deconstruction on the other, it is worth analyzing how "language both absorbs the material world and empties itself of material content. To get 'things' into words will be the project of some, to get 'things' out of words the project of others. Materialist criticism simply observes the ways in which this may be done (as well as the costs in each direction) and avoids collapsing into a generalized state of scepticism each time an instance of emptying, or referential slipperiness, is encountered" (Scarry 1988, xx). Scarry's balanced notion of mimesis is crucial to my study: "A materialist conception of language ordinarily has two companion assumptions: first, that language is capable of registering in its own contours the contours and weight of the material world; second, that language itself may enter, act on, and alter the material world" (1988, xi).⁹

My study will focus mainly on what I hope is a broad selection of post-war English-Canadian novels: by major Canadian novelists and minor, male and female, patriot and ex-patriate; novels from various Canadian regions; a variety of genres from the naturalistic to the experimental, the best-seller to the academic. I include The Collected Works of Billy the Kid: Left Handed Poems since it, like Coming Through Slaughter, uses prose narrative and historical photographs even as it calls the term "novel" into question.

Compared to Nineteenth Century texts, the work of Lawrence and Joyce, Jarry and Beckett, and, after 1960, Canadian writers displays scatology much more visibly and in greater material specificity. Alongside the increased privatization of excretory functions--even nudists insist on private elimination facilities (Kira 107)--we find such an explosion of references to scatology that some have begun to call postmodern culture "excremental" (Kroker 7). Metaphors of reticence and speech (or repression and expression) are notoriously difficult to substantiate, but nevertheless we may remark on the differences between a society which in 1934 banned Such is My Beloved from open library shelves, and a society which in the 1960's eventually gave its blessing to Lady Chatterly's Lover with its hints at anal sexuality.¹⁰ In comparison to almost any post-1960's novel, Francis Brooke's The History of Emily Montague, James De Mille's A Strange Manuscript Found in a Copper Cylinder, and Susanna Moodie's Mark Hurdlestone seem empty of scatology. Brooke mocks the "curled, powdered, perfumed" self in Sir George Clayton (100), but she does it without recourse to scatology, and manners in her novel are primarily used for governing the relations between the sexes. In Mark Hurdlestone, the civilizing process is clearly important in differentiating characters--"the one was all soul, the other a mere animal" (157)--but scatological possibilities like decay are described very generally (76, 79, 168), and Moodie's nearest approach to scatology is in "soiled

mattresses" (185). Judging by Canadian literary productions, Donnacona was not pulling Jacques Cartier's leg: "Donnacona. . . nous a certifié avoir été à la terre du Saguenay, où il y a infini or, rubis et autres richesses, et y sont les hommes blancs comme en France, et accoutrés de draps de laine. Plus, dit avoir vu autres pays, où les gens ne mangent point et n'ont point de fondement. (Cartier 79-80). Some of the differences, to be sure, can be ascribed to genre. There are more scatological references in an autobiographical account like Roughing it in the Bush and many more in Thomas Haliburton's satire. However, if we compare The Clockmaker to Mordecai Richler's work, Martha Ostenso's realism to that of Margaret Laurence, the mythic recurrences in Such is My Beloved or Tay John to those in The River Horsemen, A.E. van Vogt's science fiction to William Gibson's, or even Richler's novels in the 1950's to his later novels, the vast increase in scatological language again seems overwhelming.¹¹

Alice Munro's Ada Morrison, who fashioned her literary persona upon Tennyson's Princess Ida, and whose notion of "classic" literary history is somewhat foreshortened, complains and prophesies: "I never expected to see such a use made of the printed word. . . . Next day they will be telling about how they go to the toilet, why do they leave that out? There isn't any of that in Silas Marner. There isn't in the classic writers" (Lives of Girls and Women

145). More sinisterly in David Pownall's Masterclass, Andrey Zhdanov plays the piano with his bum to parody, he thinks, Shostakovitch's style of music. My purpose is neither to praise the liberties won by modernist or postmodernist art, nor to lament the loss of some innocent form of discourse. To say that "the most proscribed literary forms--like the most persecuted social deviants--must reveal unsettling truths about society that it does not want to hear" (Davis xx) is too simple a notion of social repression. Yet scatology does (as Wolfgang Kayser says of the grotesque) challenge "the principle of art as an imitation of beautiful nature or as its idealization" (30). More damaging to Zhdanov, we shall see in Part Three that scatology offends against mimesis itself.¹² Although I will argue that scatology never completely decomposes mimesis, the authors of manners books may be guarding more than just daintiness. "Whatever causes offence when revealed to men's sight likewise offends when forced upon their hearing. If the conversation requires one to mention some private part of the body, it should be referred to by the way of polite circumlocution. Again if something should come up that might physically upset a listener, for example, if someone should mention vomiting or a latrine or a stench, he should preface it by saying, 'by your leave'" (Erasmus 287). By your leave, then.

PART ONE

MANNERS AND THE CANADIAN NOVEL

1. "It Never Was Mine": Bodily Disgust in Personal and Social Histories

Loathing an item of food, a piece of filth, waste, or dung. The spasms and vomiting that protect me.

--Julia Kristeva

Is it still me? . . . It never was mine.

--Christian Enzensberger

One of the chapters by her husband that Susanna Moodie allowed into Roughing It in the Bush tells the story of the "Ould Dhraoon," a half-pay officer, indeed something of an alter-ego to J.W.D. Moodie except that the dragoon enters pioneer life more whole-heartedly than the author. The dragoon plasters his chimney with a mixture of clay and cow-dung; he writes poems:

And I've made me an illigant pig-sty
Well littered wid straw and wid hay
And it's there, free from noise of the chilther,
I sleep in the heat of the day. (350)

Even if his dialect did not clash so significantly with the voices of the Moodies, especially with the stifling voice in Susanna's poetry, his too-easy familiarity with excrement dissociates him from them--making him quaint at best, at worst a sign for the loss of culture, the loss that Susanna fears in the new country. Although the Moodies despite their insufficient patrimonies were not about to herd swine

in the old country, from the distance of Canada English pigsties hardly seemed defiling. Susanna condemns the dealers in wild lands for misrepresentations; they neglected to mention the "dens of dirt and misery, which would, in many instances be shamed by an English pig-sty" (13). Georges Vigarello suggests that cleanliness in Europe and North America is closely connected to the rise of democratic individualism, because individual cleanliness creates a self-sufficient sphere (225). Christian Enzensberger calls hygiene a way of separating oneself from other people (88) and as a strategic move in the creation of an "isolated, untouchable, homogeneous, structured, unique" individual (32). In De Mille's A Strange Manuscript Found in a Copper Cylinder, Agnew's lack of repugnance for the savages costs him his life. De Mille's closest approaches to scatology are "filth, squalor, and unutterable foulness" (231) and "foul fiends" (234)--vague, embracing terms, the latter more allusive than olfactory--yet the implied scatology nevertheless sharply separates civilized and primitive.

One hundred and twenty-five years later, Alice Munro still represents the history of Rose's identity-formation in Who Do You Think You Are as a repression of scatological functions, of the place in which those functions take place (the bathroom, and, more broadly West Hanratty), and of the person who most often calls attention to scatology (her adoptive mother, Flo, who is pleased "to see people brought

down to earth" 24). In Rose's home the bathroom is next to the kitchen: "They were all familiar with each other's nether voices, not only in their explosive moments but in their intimate sighs and growls and pleas and statements. And they were all most prudish people. So no one ever seemed to hear, or be listening, and no reference was made. The person creating the noises in the bathroom was not connected with the person who walked out" (Who Do You Think You Are 4). The social shift in Europe from communal conveniences to private (Corbin 159, Elias 130-1), concomitant with the notions that the repulsion of the scatological can autonomize the self (Kristeva 82) and that the communal sphere transgresses against the individual (Vigarello 225), are thus replayed in Rose's personal history, both at home (where nether voices are managed by civilized consensus) and in the even more public domain of the school, where the outhouse gives way to a more easily supervised indoor flush toilet. The half-door latrines in public buildings (which Foucault cites as instances of "panopticism") allow a much more benign exposure than that experienced by Munro's women under the old architecture. Del Jordan, in Lives of Girls and Women, too young to understand the degradation of Mary Agnes as rape, nevertheless recognizes, as Rose does, a threat against the private individual in the exposure of Mary Agnes's buttocks, "the most shameful, helpless-looking part of anyone's body" (36).

Though less immediate, similar dangers in the communal sphere are hinted at in Atwood's The Edible Woman. Marian feels embarrassed that Duncan, whom she has just met, might attribute Ainsley's lacy underwear to herself. Duncan refers more boldly to communal scatological transgressions: "The only thing about laundromats. . . is that you're always finding other people's pubic hairs in the washers. Not that I mind particularly" (102). The scatological markings not only separate the main culture (in Marian) from the counter-culture (in Duncan), but also contrast (and here the positions of power are reversed) the tenuousness of female access to the male-dominated sphere of the individual. Since she is a woman, Marian cannot seem to invite transgression against the civilized sphere because any ensuing suffering will likely be hers.

In Laurence's The Stone Angel, Bram Shipley (blowing his nose with his fingers, using language like "puke" 79) is scatologically presented as a less dangerous rural and Western assault on Hagar's town- and Eastern-manufactured sensibility.¹³ Laurence makes Bram explicitly excremental in word-play--"Bramble Shitley" (131)--and in his final illness (172). When Bram relieves himself against the steps of Hagar's father's store, only Bram himself can interpret the event as accidental; Hagar certainly understands it as the displaced aggression which, structurally, it is. Since she is also the novel's consciousness, narration and

"literature" are predicated upon a repressed self. For Morag Gunn in The Diviners the conflict is essentially the same, but Laurence achieves greater complexity in the processes of civilization: Morag, aided by her adoptive father Christie Logan, creates a family romance in which the 'real' father, Colin Gunn, "smells clean, not of manure or of horseshit, even though he is a farmer" (8). Furthermore, although Morag is "delicate-minded" (35), she will not let on. As a result the civilized self in The Diviners is more hypothetical (above all a narrated self) than in The Stone Angel, and therefore more secure, especially because of Morag hides her imagined delicacy, a delicacy which includes her early attempts at writing. In Morag's binary self the terms repressed in her psyche, not just hidden from public scrutiny, are the adoptive parents, who stand under the scatological sign of the real; Christie, the town scavenger, stinks of urine and excrement (6, 205, 248) and his wife Prin, prematurely senile, soon requires a bedpan (208).¹⁴ Laurence's protagonists, even Hagar who is herself incontinent, dissociate themselves from the ill and the aged, who in Laurence's novels helplessly transgress against the privatization of eliminative functions.

Leah Adler in Richler's Son of a Smaller Hero, Maggie Kyle in Hodgins' Invention of the World, and Martin Gare in Ostenso's Wild Geese similarly try to create individual spheres by repressing scatology. Leah isolates herself from

her husband, Wolf, because he offends her sensibilities. He smells his hand after scratching his armpit (61), and uses the word "pisher" (90) in front of guests. Since smell in wolves and other mammals seems to be an extension of the self (differentiating the home territory from other territories), excretion and urination (which often include musk) become "secondary social gestures" (Guthrie 20, 39, 192).¹⁵ Leah's uneasiness with this separates her from animal styles of individuation and fits her aspirations to culture. Maggie cleans her house with lye in attempt to erase the signs of the past inhabitants who threaten to impinge upon her present community, and who thus threaten her attempts to trade her past role as loggers' whore for independence.¹⁶ Near the end of the novel, she rises high enough to get epiphanies and to see Vancouver Island from the air. In a sense she agonizes for the entire island, which is accused of being an uncivilized place because it lacks public washrooms (235).

Martin Gare builds washrooms in the Manitoba Interlake. His father, Caleb, constricts the marginal form of culture Martin aspires to; even once the family has enough money, Caleb will still not allow Martin to build a new house. But the power of the civilizing process is such that it is only diverted, and Martin transfers his energy tangentially, building ornate outhouses instead (Ostenso 110, 127). Ostenso does not simply represent a history of origins (an

escape from the farm and its manure), but paradoxically has the architecture surrounding excrement register the distance from scatological origins.

In contrast to these variations on the civilizing process, those characters who represent uncoalesced personalities, tend not to have privatized their eliminative functions. Mate in Mitchell's The Vanishing Point can pass wind on demand and in a variety of styles, making him "the most sophisticated boy in North America" (317) to Carlyle Sinclair but perhaps not to the reader. The same boy who insists that he bears some part of his mother's insanity leads the boys in their scatological games and claims responsibility even for excrement which is not his own. In Mrs. Blood, Mrs. Maté, "child of nature" (40) farts unselfconsciously, while the title character in Moore's The Luck of Ginger Coffey is arrested for urinating in public, unintentionally focussing the accountability that he, like any proto-individual Trickster, has evaded. Herky, the toilet salesman in Richler's St. Urbain's Horseman, pushes his idea for "a toilet with a mind" (369), a toilet which only releases only as much water as is necessary. Herky grasps something about ecology, but clearly does not understand the civilizing process, which insists upon an exorbitant amount of clean water to overwhelm the scatological evidence. He comes under the satiric sign of the incomplete person, caricature, because Richler does not

allow him to become conscious of his own anal fascinations that are expressed in his photographs of Harrods' toilets: "not many people see the London I'm seeing" (218), he says. Harold Sonny Ladoo creates a whole society of excremental caricatures who continuously transgress against the privatization of the body in Yesterdays. He represents Poonwa's personal origins scatologically: "Never forget boy dat you pee and shit fust touch dis earth in Karan Settlement" (108). Writing in Toronto about a rural Trinidadian past, Ladoo also gives a scatological version of cultural origins, confirming the version rhetorically in the contrast between characters' dialect and the third person narrator's Standard English.

Cultural "origins" are also present in the social constructions of Thomas's Latakia, Hine's The Prince of Darkness and Co., Davies' The Rebel Angels, and Mitchell's The Vanishing Point. Near the beginning of Latakia when Heleni milks facing the goat's rump, the narrator Rachel's desire and nostalgia for Michael's body is nearly parallel to her nostalgia for the Greek peasant life. Thomas, however, sets up a growing disenchantment. Rachel theorizes that for the Greek peasants "the landscape as something to sit and admire, to be 'kept up,' is probably an alien concept;" in a bathing-suit changing shelter, she discovers "shit everywhere and tampax and sodden paper diapers;" when she sees even the spotless Heleni's unconscious role in the

mess, Rachel finally applies an explicit, civilized critique: "[Heleni] lets her little grandson shit under the big tree. . . . And the flies come and land on her food or mine perhaps. Surely she understands the connection" (111). In Herakleion Rachel discovers people who live underground, taking care of toilets: "the guardians of the underworld have become an old man and an old woman sitting in a public lavatory beneath the city. I think I would be afraid to ask them their names" (112-13). Rachel goes even further back than epic cosmography when she arrives in Latakia, the truly alien city marked by a bathroom so filthy that neither Rachel nor Michael will touch it (165-6).

Through Philip Sparrow, who wants to be a warlock (but only in theory), Hine parodies Robert Graves' myth-ritual fixation; both Sparrow and William Bruce, an effete over-civilized poet, have forgotten exactly what it was that Apollonian civilization repressed. Sick and squatting to excrete in the primitive toilet at the bullring, William returns with misgivings to an abject pre-history.¹⁷ Both Hine and Thomas implicitly valorize the civilizing process by presenting a careful loathing of cultural origins. Davies and Mitchell, on the other hand, attempt to symbolically recuperate lost origins. Simon Darcourt recognizes himself in a tarot deck as the Fool whose arse is being sniffed by a dog. Dogs "have to be trained not to do it, but they forget because they have the great gift of

scent, which wise, thinking Man has almost murdered" (The Lyre of Orpheus 287-8). Professor Hitzig in The Rebel Angels insists that civilization depends upon "the voluntary ability to inhibit defecation." Stromwell adds that "When Man ate the fruit from the Tree of Knowledge he became aware of himself as something other than a portion of his surroundings and he dropped his last carefree turd, as he, with wandering steps and slow, from Eden took his solitary way" (177). Mitchell's mythical history is very similar: "she gave Adam a bite or two and right then they clearly knew--they weren't any osprey or rainbow or fungus. . . sure blew the ass off the Garden of Eden" (The Vanishing Point 185). The latter-day Mate's farting takes Carlyle Sinclair back from the existential "vanishing point" to a time before the detonation at the end of innocence. Despite Davies' scatological parody of Miltonic origins, a certain amount of nostalgia surrounds the paradigmatic shift in both novels. Davies' highly-stylized and sympathetically-treated "gypsies," like Mitchell's Mate, retain many scatological signs of the implied past. Mamusia advertises a way to break up a dog-fight--"you "lick the long finger good. . . and you shove your finger up the arse-hole of one dog" (221)--a cure that Uncle Yerko approximates when he kicks Maria in the rear to stop her fight with Mamusia (231). More importantly, Mamusia represents "the voice of the ages" (156) to the novel's scholars because she has retained an ancient filth cure, the bomari, which, depending upon the

need, either rejuvenates or ages violins in a bath of horse manure.¹⁸ Although Davies doubles back against the process that Thomas and Hine imply, the recuperation is mainly compensatory; Davies gives his scatological characters emotional force, predictive ability, and curative powers in order to counter the Cartesian splits in philosophers like John Parlabane; nevertheless, the narrating voices are always civilized academics--in this case Simon Darcourt and Maria Theotoky--who mediate between origins and the civilized self.

This discourse on scatological origins ties the Canadian novel to what might almost be classified as a paradigm shift in other disciplines. Social histories like Barrington Moore Jr.'s Privacy: Studies in Social and Cultural History and Lawrence Wright's Clean and Decent: The Fascinating History of the Bathroom and Water Closet signal a shift in historiographic foci from public to bodily spheres.¹⁹ For Moore and Wright, as for Elias, the progress of civilization is gradually, though unevenly, towards a "clean and decent" body. Moore knows of no society where adults are permitted to defecate in the cooking area (61). Wright implicitly equates the origins of civilization with the latrines at Knossos (7) while advances are associated with demands for cleanliness.²⁰ A popular science account like Theodor Rosebury's Life On Man, looking back further than Wright to

Neolithic privies (95-6), claims that feces is handled with less restraint in less technologically-advanced nations, and that the infant recapitulates the progress of society. Likewise, in an early attempt at sexology, Love in the Machine Age, the shift in primates toward permanent habitations is believed to create a necessity for "a socially inculcated disgust at excrement," while ceremonial handlings of filth among primitive tribes and scatological humour among the civilized are seen as symbolic expressions of "infantile interests" (Dell 87). The Freudian commonplaces behind these filiations are that the child's greatest cultural achievement is instinctual renunciation (BPP 15), which turns out mostly to be the repression of genital and anal functions.

For an anti-philosopher like Georges Bataille, the evolution of repression is already axiomatic: "the human anus secluded itself deep within the flesh, in the crack of the buttocks, and it now forms a projection only in squatting and excretion." The anus therefore has, he claims, "the potential for blossoming;" transferring to the face its explosive energies, it may explode from the pineal eye at the top of the head in "a magnificent but stinking ejaculation" ("The Jesuve" 77).²¹

The limit to such approaches, Mary Douglas argues, is that they depend upon the Nineteenth Century anthropology of Sir James Frazer and Robertson Smith (Douglas 13) for an

evolutionary understanding of scatological rites as survivals from archaic religion. Douglas's critique is important, because a more recent approach like Claude Lévi-Strauss's The Savage Mind reinterprets totemism so that what was once understood as a manifestation of archaic religion becomes a proto-Linnaean system of biological classification. The effect of this reinterpretation of "origins" is to move 'marriage with the animals' and chthonic origins into an ever more distant past. This growing distance perhaps explains why the scatological return to the animal is such a resonant myth for Lévi-Strauss in Tristes Tropiques.²² Douglas reverses Lévi-Strauss's method by showing how modern secular culture transfers the idea of purity from religion to hygiene (11). For Douglas, the body in all cultures is a model for the social structure (115) and there is no reason to treat bodily margins psychologically, as separate from other margins (121). Like Norbert Elias, Douglas makes the crucial connection between the body and the social system. She has been criticized by Julia Kristeva who wonders what the desire is that is required to uphold the social system (67): "why does corporeal waste, menstrual blood and excrement, or everything that is assimilated to them, from nail-parings to decay, represent--like a metaphor that would become incarnate--the objective frailty of the symbolic order?" (70) Nevertheless with Douglas and Elias it becomes possible to see how scatology codifies past and present,

country and town--without being led into a too-literal equation of represented origins and actual origins.

2. Country and Town: "The Size of a Sheep's Dung" and Other Metaphors

On January 1, 1967, the first day of centennial celebrations in Canada, politicians in Ottawa lit a perpetual flame to symbolize the life of the nation and the Winnipeg Free Press carried a picture of the Golden Boy, another palladium, on the cover. Lower on the same page, however, people at the periphery of the country were celebrating another event--the Free Press carried pictures of the burning of the outhouses in Bowsman, Manitoba. United Church minister Jim Liles eulogized them as "good enough for the first 100 years of Canada, but not the second. . . . The time has come to destroy friends who held up their ends through the years. . . . They have provided shelter from stormy blasts." The hinterland both mocked its own past and yet also parodied Canada's dominant culture as Bowsman erased a sign of its marginality (to use the language of Harold Innis's margin/centre tension in Canada's staples economy). In the completion of a \$350,000 sewer project, Bowsman assimilated itself to urban standards of hygiene, but the communal parodic inversion of the Centennial flame marks an artistic production that does not grant Ottawa all of its assumed seriousness. While the new technology diminished the scatological consciousness of one's waste, scatology re-appeared as political satire in in the prairie scatological mockery of an Ontario-centric symbol, as religious satire in the parody of "Rock of Ages,"

and as social satire in the country-town's self-mocking progress to urban centre.

Wild Geese and Yesterdays imply that the civilizing process can be coded through the categories of "country" and "town," with "country" mediating scatological origins and "town" the negation of those origins. The scatological role of the country can be seen in the disingenuous metaphors of Haliburton, who has Sam Slick scrape the bottom of a pot until he gets to "a sight of little forced meat balls, of the size of sheep's dung" (56). A more naive scatological denigration occurs when in The Apprenticeship of Duddy Kravitz Max Kravitz insists that the country means "ants and mosquitoes and skunks and--if you've got the appetite--bull-pies all over" (307). The narrator of World of Wonders compares poorly done snow in a theatre to turkey diarrhoea, a particularly telling simile given the cultural contrast between tenor and vehicle. The manure-spreader that Madmother Thomas drags all over the island in The Invention of the World signifies the disillusionment that she projects, while Henry Burke's project to demythologize Lily Hayworth in the same novel is rooted in his rural past--raising "shitty chickens." He transports the scatological terms from that past for his critique: "she wasn't so goddam Queen-like, I tell you, with her skirt hoisted up around her waist taking a crap out behind a tree" (178).²³

Throughout the symbolic structure of Wild Geese, "manure" repeatedly stands for the farm, both substantially as fertilizer and etymologically as the hand-labour at that time involved in the fertilizing process.²⁴ Other early references to the manuring process in The Clockmaker, Roughing It in the Bush, and The History of Emily Montague generally show a respect for labour and an unconsciousness of manure as a scatological danger.²⁵ By the time of Ostenso, manure has become more problematic. Judith Gare's individuating impulse in Wild Geese involves leaving her farm origins for the town; that departure is already implicit when she moves her cow to the extremity of the pen where it is "a little prettier" (22). This scatological relativity (like the relativity signalled by her brother Martin's outhouses) is touching, despite the obvious potential for satire, because Ostenso is not quite ready to give in to the perceived effeminacy of the town; thus she doubles language in her description of the animal who is at times a surrogate for Judith: "The cow's flanks were satiny, her tail clotted with manure" (22). In fact, the technological lag between country and town, town and city (in the shift towards flush toilets) elsewhere allows characters from the peripheries to claim a superiority in breadth of experience: "I have cleaned out chamber pots to get my education" (Lives of Girls and Women 66). Yet it is the consciousness of Lynd Archer, the city woman in Wild Geese, which structures the frame that surrounds the

shifting narrative points of view, and Ostenso eventually has Judith leave fertilizer and labour, which have been too closely associated with Caleb's control over Judith's individual sphere.

The social negation of country origins is more explicit and satirized in Buckler's The Mountain and the Valley, where David Canaan's impulse, like Maggie Kyle's, is to rise. David is ashamed of the old outhouse when showing it to his town visitor, Toby Richmond, and defends Toby's prudishness about urinating in company against Chris's jokes.²⁶ Instead, David creates a hypothetical civilized self and redirects the jokes against the outhouse: "'Take a coarse sight, and curb your trajectory.' He spoke as if he were really a visitor in the place, denying any part of its crudity except as the basis for a joke" (139). In this he goes one better on Toby's euphemizing: he scientizes language, a technique compatible with the abstracted artist-self that he, as a recipient of Emerson's romantic individualism, is heir to.²⁷ Jud Spinney, not fully conscious of what he is doing, attacks David's individual artistic sphere by using a crude sexual comment to undercut David's princely role in the school operetta. David afterward responds in kind, but only mentally: "he'd just take him by the collar and turn him around and kick his ass and walk away" (83). Both the demythologizing moment and the response to the demythologizing moment are signalled by

the lower bodily level, but in the "civilized" response, nothing is actually said. More importantly, Buckler signals David's attempt to arrange ideal scenes and his inability to accept the critiques that occur once art is presented to the community.²⁸

Like Buckler, Ethel Wilson and Margaret Atwood retain the country/town pattern of the civilizing process without idealizing the town. Wilson's protagonist in Swamp Angel, Maggie Lloyd, leaves her husband and Vancouver, and goes to a fishing camp near Kamloops to regain her body. This is stressed mostly by her swimming, but also by the toilet arrangements: "'the privies is back behind the cabins'" (34). Maggie's archaeological search (too many symbols destroy reality, she thinks 79) uncovers not only a less sophisticated language, but also a more primitive life in which "her avatar tells her that she is one with her brothers the seal and the porpoise" (99). The coding does not mean that Wilson herself is nostalgic for the country: "Maggie's, avatar had better warn her that she is not really a seal or a porpoise" (99). Neither does Wilson commit to the town: Nell Severance, city woman and symbolist, makes too few concessions when she cancels her visit to the lodge where Maggie lives because it has "no plumbing, just privies" (128).

Atwood too uses the code without trusting it. In Bodily Harm, Elva prescribes a filth-cure, urination, to ease the

swelling caused by stepping on a sea-urchin, but the later scatology, associated with the primitive conditions in the Third-World prison, is still horrifying. In Cat's Eye Elaine Risley is fascinated with flush toilets when she first gets to the city. Atwood represents a gradation between the country where there are not even any outhouses, the intermediate motels which have outhouses or "smelly" toilets (29), and their cheap home in the city which has a toilet with a ring around the bowl (33). The idealizing process in the literature that Elaine reads constitutes an important aspect of the civilizing process for her: "nothing in these stories is anything like my life. There are no tents, no highways, no peeing in the bushes, no lakes, no motels. There is no war. The children are always clean" (30). Elaine's past has taught her to associate Eaton's Catalogues with outhouses, but Grace Smeath floats the genre by teaching Elaine proper reverence for consumer goods (56), a civilized economy that Atwood satirizes.

Although we are dealing with fictional personal and social histories, neither the rejection of the country in scatological images nor its nostalgic recuperation should be surprising. Canadian social historians emphasize the shift in the North American population from rural to urban (Woodcock 299, Clement 160), the decline in primary sector employment, especially of agricultural workers (Clement 76-7), and a significant post-1960's growth in non-farming

country dwellers (Woodcock 314). The biographies of many of the novelists prominent in this chapter suggest personal involvement in this social history. Most--Hodgins (Merville, B.C.), Buckler (Dalhousie West, N.S.), Laurence (Neepawa, Man.), Munro (Wingham, Ont.), O'Hagan (Yellowhead Lake area), Ostenso (small towns in Norway, Minnesota, North Dakota, and Maitoba), Davies (Thamesville, Ont.), Ladoo (McBean, Trinidad)--grew up in the country or in small towns and moved (usually for education or employment) to larger centres. Even those like Thomas (Binghampton, N.Y.), Roy (St. Boniface), and Atwood (Ottawa), who did not grow up in small towns nevertheless did move to larger centres like Vancouver (Thomas), Montreal and Quebec City (Roy) or spent significant portions of their lives in country areas--Atwood in northern Ontario and Quebec, Roy near Altamont. Finally, a significant number returned, some temporarily, some permanently, to smaller communities like the ones that they left. Buckler returned to the Annapolis Valley; Munro to Clinton, Ont.; Ostenso to Gull Lake, Minn.; O'Hagan to Jasper and to an island near Howe Sound, B.C.; and Laurence went to Lakefield, Ont.. Atwood (in Alliston Ont. for seven years) and Thomas (on Galiano Island) took up "country" living while some bought summer homes: Laurence on the Otonabee River, Richler at Lake Memphremagog, Roy in Petite-Rivière-St-Francois, and Wilson in Kamloops. It is also important to note that characters like Lind Archer in Wild Geese, Elaine in Cat's Eye, Rose in Who Do You Think You

Are, Del Jordan (by implication) in Lives of Girls and Women, Mlle. Côté in Where Nests the Water Hen, Morag Gunn in The Diviners, and Dunstan Ramsay in the Deptford trilogy all re-enact some aspect of their maker's movement from country to town.²⁹

3. Doubling Back: the Rhetorical Recovery of the Body

People don't get any better as their language gets more sophisticated.

--Rachel in Latakia

The sequence, anus-to-finger-to mouth, has proved to be commoner than. . . people like to believe.

--Theodor Rosebury

In a third move, the novelist returns the character to her origins or, comparable to Michael McKeon's "epistemological double reversal," the novelist negates even town civilization in a scatological critique that often parodies the civilizing process.³⁰ The extreme form of the autonomous, civilized self, nascent in Cat's Eye and The Mountain and the Valley, threatens to abstract itself entirely from its origins and, therefore, from the body. Atwood satirizes the clean and proper body when she has Ainsley in The Edible Woman mock the dental students who check their mouths for cavities every time they go to the bathroom (9-10). Later in the novel, Atwood parodies the belief that not washing indicates insanity (183); parody calls into question the tendency of the civilizing process to appear "natural."

More often, scatology is allowed to break in upon the rising individual, and the doubling back to origins that occur in the biographies of many of these novelists may explain why. In The Mountain and the Valley David Canaan's

father accuses him in scatological language of getting too "high": "Don't you want killin' . . . you goddam snot" (165). There is also a curious bodily reticence; David and his father cannot even urinate in one another's presence. On the other hand, David processes bodily intimacy, the greatest of his many taboos, and betrays Bess, joking about her "piss" in front of others (187). Through David's role in the pig-killing scene, Buckler sets up a series of attempts to exit from the scene of the body. When someone comments about David's attempt to leave the barn, he returns, with a vengeance to the site, and is the first one at the frightened pig's dung-covered hind legs. In David's self-conscious and processed civilization, there are no innocent lacerations of the body as there seem to be for the other men. His drive is to transcend the filthy pig, his own bleeding hand, the bodies and roles of the other men, even his own limitations, but during his parodic attempt at transcendence on a barn beam, he falls.³¹ He falls back into the body, because after this he is never free from pain. David's town-driven sensibility, which only doubles back to origins with violence, is not identical with Buckler's. We see hints of this in the more pastoral, almost nostalgic versions of scatology when a more omniscient narrator than the one usual in David's consciousness reports, late in the narrative, on David and Toby urinating and laughing together: "It was the way two boys laugh who have both been uncomfortable in someone's parlour, though neither's fidget

is realized by the other until they are outside and one of them grimaces back at the house and exhales a prodigiously drawn-out fart" (255). Because the return to bodily origins is not inevitably tragic in The Mountain and the Valley, the transgression against David's individual sphere seems self-induced.

Other novelists too allow scatology to transgress against the rising individual. The communal and the scatological combine in Mrs. Blood to attack Dr. Biswas's "ethical idealism": "he began to resent his wife's pale skin and the baby's diarrhoea" (24). In The Stone Angel, despite Bram's attack on her persona, Hagar doubles back by presenting the scatological body nostalgically. This is understandable given that Bram is also the unacknowledged object of her desire; what is more problematic is Laurence's nostalgia, which at times confirms Bram's rather naive theory of representation: "never gave a damn for living horses. . . . But when you seen them put onto paper where they couldn't drop manure, then its dandy, eh?" (83) Laurence's project for the self in The Stone Angel involves breaking through the entrainments of an over-civilized body, but Bram's disingenuous realist privileging of thing over representation is limited by Laurence's naturalization of the biblical text, so that she calls down skepticism upon both origins and the civilizing process. In The Diviners, Laurence gradually splits Morag in half. On one side is Skinner Tonnerre, who reduces women

via scatological obscenity (68) and who dismisses the family romance of Piper Gunn and the Red River Settlement as "crap" (72), a demythologization that Morag repeats when she calls the Gunn crest, motto, and war cry "a load of old manure" (162). On the other is Brooke Skeleton, whose small bathroom (197) suggests over-civilization. The attack comes simultaneously against the sphere of the individual and against the town, so that Morag cannot relax until she arrives at Margaret Laurence's renewed country home. The Diviners gradually effaces Brooke as Morag acknowledges the scatological kin: Skinner, Prin, and, above all, Christie.

As the references to the Red River settlement suggest, the doubling back in Morag's personal history opens out into social history. Laurence counters romantic versions of the past with scatological revisions. She includes an "outdoor privy" (95) in Morag's imagination of pioneer life; as well, because of gender identifications, Laurence cannot completely discount Catherine Parr Traill's enactment of the hardy pioneer, so she searches for repressed voices which qualify the enacted myth.³² Laurence finds the scatological and the morbid in Traill's symptoms of the Water Hemlock: "vomitting, colic, staggering and unconsciousness and finally frightful convulsions which end in death" (The Diviners 404).

Munro, Davies, and Richler too double over the civilizing process, recalling characters to their origins. While the

avoidance of the school outhouse seems to be necessary for Rose in Who Do You Think You Are to avoid the aggressive boys who assault Franny McGill, Munro eventually broadens the repression of the scatological toward the Freudian dynamic of civilization and discontent; the school gets indoor plumbing, and Rose, somewhat hypocritically, laments that "there never was another honey-dumper" (37).³³ Rose appropriates the scatological bluntness of Flo as a psychological defense (155), and indeed wishes for the old home. Davies's What's Bred in the Bone involves Francis Cornish in a less ambiguous and more insistent recuperation of what is excluded from the social system. As Munro does with Franny, Davies codes the excluded scatology through the near-idiot child, Francis I (called "The Looner"). The attempts to protect the "second" Francis Cornish (from scatological details are characteristically successful: "He was not yet such a close reasoner as to suspect that if Bella-Mae were thus burdened with the common needs of life, his parents might also share them" (75). But his *bildungsroman* includes a scatological education into the senses: "he. . . learned the stench that rises when a hot shoe is placed on the horse's [manure- and tobacco-covered] hoof" (108).³⁴ Mordecai Richler, whose biography in contrast to Buckler, Laurence, Munro, and Davies is much more urban, does not double back in the way that they do, but he does use Joshua Shapiro in Joshua Then and Now as a mediator between an under-civilized past (Joshua's father Reuben,

whom Richler treats nostalgically,) and over-civilized Outremont, where Bertha says "I only go at home" (24) and where the toilet-seat covers are covered: "shaggy white rugs everywhere. . . . Do they walk on toilets in Outremont?" (21).

The doubling back also occurs in the East/West coding of the scatological image. This less common coding is layered over country and town in novels such as Howard O'Hagan's The School-Marm Tree. There, a Dutch painter in the Yellowhead attains some eastern success through his paintings of western outhouses. O'Hagan parodies the desire to rise in the reaction of the townspeople--"the showing of outhouses, they felt, was unjust when most of the people in town had bathrooms with modern appurtenances" (38). Outhouse and bathroom here measure O'Hagan's reaction against the ideological hold that the East has over the western town and over a woman like Selva.³⁵ The town, at its own insistence, becomes a poor version of the East while the trailhands, especially Clay Mulloy, dream West. The Eastern bathroom apparently hides the body, and the dynamics of hidden sexuality in Branchflower and Wrogg, cynic and naif, are connected to this affectation. Selva's initial desires for the East (she wants Branchflower or Wrogg) are given parodic form in Rosie, who says that "it's all right if you're a man to pick your nose with your thumb, but it's not good manners to use your finger" (106, 123). Like the writers of manners

books in wanting to rationalize custom, Rosie unintentionally reduces shifts in manners to arbitrariness, encoding O'Hagan's skepticism about the value of the civilizing process.³⁶

4. Extreme Skepticism: Parodies of the Civilized Self

Once the civilizing process and the skeptical doubling back on that structure become commonplace, they invite an extreme skepticism which can trust neither the civilizing process nor the recuperation of origins. Such a skepticism is implicit in the scatologizing of the modernist city-wasteland (Joshua Then and Now 51, 55),³⁷ and explicit in Noah Adler's Twentieth Century parody of "The Passionate Shepherd to His Love": "Let it be said of us that we made no plans. . . . We'll fart when we have visitors and drop rocks on passing cars" (104). The literary parody here mocks both pastoral hopes and the civilizing repressions because the bodily relaxation in the lack of civility³⁸ shades into Noah's uncivilized cruelty to Miriam. In Yesterdays, Harold Sonny Ladoo neither valorizes the intense scatology of a cultural past nor the rising self, while Leon Rooke attempts (during his doubling back) to approach extreme skepticism in Shakespeare's Dog by parodying the civilized self: Rooke "originates" man in dog and represents Shakespeare's cultural ambitions alongside Shakespeare's dog's desire to rise from among the "dung-eaters" (52). When the dog Hooker contrasts Queen Elizabeth's civilized toilet (courtesy of John Harrington) against her bear-baiting, Rooke doubles back on civilized pretensions. The monarch has not gotten better or less violent just because her conveniences have become more

sophisticated. The shift from medieval rulers who, if necessary, gave audience in the W.C. (Pudney 99-100), to the private modern bathroom thus unaugurates a purely surface civilizing. The same style of satire occurs during Hooker's philosophizing on the tell-tale excrement after he has illicitly poached and consumed a deer: "I covered the dump over with a frantic scrambling of dirt. It's not mine, I wanted to say." The other dogs join his protestations of innocence, and Hooker wonders, "was this, too, part of our nature and birthright or had we picked it up as one of many--fleas, mange, phobia--in the Two Foot's curse?" (57) Hooker is safer than he thinks because humans have been educated to repudiate excrement and not to inspect it (at least in public) too closely. A traditional function of the scatological image, according to Bakhtin and Kristeva, is to erase the division between man and beast (Bakhtin 1984, 226; Kristeva 1982, 12). The most common function of this erasure is to lower man and return him to his origins. The deformations of Shakespeare's name--"Shakespizzle" (72) and Anne Hathaway's coinage "Shakeshitter" (95)--deform the classicist approach to authorship, and ally Shakespeare to the intimate descriptions of Hooker at stoole; certainly the dog's life of sensation, smell, and defecation determines literary history in Shakespeare's Dog because Shakespeare's move to London occurs only when the Regarders threaten Hooker's life.

Through Hooker, a dog who narrates, Rooke intends the parody to destabilize humanist certainties. Not so much a play on Richard Hooker as a near-anagram for Rooke, Hooker attains a sympathetic and humane persona that might surprise Charlotte Ford; he philosophizes about scatology and he refuses to urinate on a grave. And he feels grand when he finds that he can walk on his hind legs: "to the left, then to the right, then over a muckhill" (150)--but is unsure what to do with his tail. To this parodic skepticism, however, we must add that the increasing ability of people to identify with animals may be connected to the civilizing process (Mennell 315).³⁹ The beast fable always contains within it an inevitable tendency towards anthropomorphism (Ziolkowski 11), so that it confirms the human persona even despite the experimentation, the degradation of epic structure, and the identification with the slave that it allows (Ziolkowski 12-14). Hooker's written persona may confirm the civilizing process at the same time as Rooke parodies it.

Timothy Findley's parodic history, Famous Last Words, and Harold Sonny Ladoo's parodic autobiography, Yesterdays, are less reassuring when they address the same problem: the crisis of where to place civilized values. Findley's Duke of Windsor desires to escape his civilized persona and, among other things, "fart out loud" (245). On the other hand, in order to discredit Rudolph Hess with insanity, the

British must get around the civilized boundary-markers that show up in loathing and vomit; the British teach him not to throw up at fishheads, to "become" a cat. Findley's satirizes the civilized, written persona through Hugh Selwyn Mauberly and yet presents the transgression against the civilizing process as also inhumane. George Bowering's parody of Canadian social history in Burning Water is much the same in this. Bowering cannot locate civilized values in the over-disciplined Vancouver who eventually "[goes] to war with his body" (207), nor do the scatological breaks in discipline--Vancouver vomits after his primitivist desire to eat Cook's body--signal anything better. In Famous Last Words, however, the need to resolve the crisis is more insistent. Mauberly's narration certainly cannot breach the problem: "The tension in the rooms became so great that one of the dogs threw up, while the other lifted its leg against a Louis Quinze table (luckily an imitation)" (107). Scatology jars hilariously against Mauberly's bracketted over-valuation of the art-object, which, after all, is only a **sign** for the civilized preservation of tradition, and is not civility itself. Findley identifies the "present" narrator, Quinn, with Hugh Selwyn Mauberly in their fastidiousness, but there is no simple lionization of Mauberly (who has adopted the simplistic Fascist equation in which clean = good)⁴⁰ or of social realist terms (in which dirt is human and therefore good). Quinn and Mauberly are seen ambivalently: their horror of scatology is clearly

represented as an ordering function (which makes them capable of society, of writing), and yet that fastidiousness is also represented as a refusal to see Dachau (for Quinn), and the dark side of the attractive male (for Mauberly).

Choonilal, in Yesterdays, alternates between overvaluation--"Me son so educated dat when he talk, I does only feel to shit man" (34)--and undervaluation of his son's ability to rise above village life: "It look like English does flow from you ass. But all de book you read Poonwa, and all dat education you have in you ass in notten" (76). Although at times Ladoo seems to set up an attack on European rationalism in Poonwa's use of Descartes (29) (an attack that comes from the scatological position that England has defined for the Trinidadian), the insistent reduction of all worlds to the scatological and to the animal-erotic destabilizes a potential anti-colonialist norm. Poonwa attempts a material philosophy, but it degenerates, almost immediately, into misogyny, cliché, and childish scatological verse:

The philosophy of Poonwa.
 A treatise on God and other matters.
 Philosophy and the philosopher's stones (Women excluded).
 What goes in must come out (Related to pregnancy and such matters).
 Philosophy and the philosophers' stones (Women excluded).
 The philosophy of a philosopher's hole (Women included).
 Once there was a girl
 with two cracks in her hole
 she pissed in a bowl
 until she grew old. (42)

As we will see in Chapter 8, this destabilization of perspective is connected to the technological aspects of the civilizing process in William Gibson's Neuromancer and Leonard Cohen's Beautiful Losers. In the latter, F. dies "wiping his ass with a curtain" (40) and the narrator echoes the primitivist impulses of his mentor: "I salute my monsterhood. I urinate everywhere on the linoleum" (67). The problem of extreme decivilization is over-corrected and "solved" by the technological sensorium: the narrator goes into a total fast, so that he no longer fouls his shack with excrement (246), and finally turns into a movie of Ray Charles. Cohen's evasiveness is calculated to undermine any confidence in a solution to the binaries of scatological origins and the civilized self.

Apparent in these Canadian literary versions of the rising civilized self and of the doubling back process, but most clear in extreme skepticism is how self-consciously Canadian novelists approach the process. Peter Stallybrass and Alon White in The Politics and Poetics of Transgression assume that a central self or central authority is always undesirable. They, like Bakhtin whom they seek to revise, demonize the civilizing process, although they do not follow Bakhtin in his belief that carnival (a type of doubling back) automatically undermines internal and external authorities: "often it is a powerful ritual or symbolic practice whereby the dominant squanders its symbolic capital

so as to get in touch with the fields of desire which it denied itself as the price paid for its political power" (201). For Stallybrass and White, the bourgeoisie are again and again ready to be surprised by information about bodily repressions and the social scatology that constitutes the self, but St. Urbain's Jake Hersch is quite conscious of the ideological implications of his disgust:

There's a simple solution. Wrap the stool quickly in your underwear, lean back and heave it into the bushes. **Yes yes, Jake agreed, but how do I pick it up?** It's yours, isn't it? Your very own bodily waste. Disgust for it is bourgeois. Yes, yes, but how do I pick it up? Sunshine soldier! Social democrat! Middlebrow! Unable to face life fully. Everything is holy, Jake. Holy holy. **Yes, but how do I pick it up?** (171)

The self-identification of the "social democrat" in this resistance to the scatological can hardly be a "festival of the political unconscious" (Stallybrass 201). Richler does not double back over the history of manners, but he does indicate that scatology is connected to a social rhetoric. It is to this rhetoric that we now turn.

PART TWO

THE SOCIAL BODY:

SCATOLOGY AND IDEOLOGICAL HIERARCHY IN THE CANADIAN NOVEL

5. Immigrants, Foul Ghettos, and Social Climbers:
Marking Fictional Class Structures

We imagine much more fitly an Artificer upon his close stoole or his wife, then a great judge, reverend for his carriage and regardfull for his sufficiencie.

--Montaigne (Florio translation)

He found a great deal of enjoyment (such as would tally with the natural coarseness of many classes of society, though not of his) in anal jokes and exhibitions.

--Sigmund Freud. From the History of an Infantile Neurosis

I'm glad to be near the garage mechanic, and enjoy the distance that separates us. . . . Remarkable how any comparison always favors me! Thank God for dirt.

--Christian Enzensberger

Stallybrass and White, like Elias, show that the civilizing process creates a number of class markers through the definition of manners. Elias argues that particular manners were considered good in medieval times because they belonged to a certain social class, and not that a social class was considered honorable because it obeyed particular manners injunctions.⁴¹ The feudal sense of difference is still instructive in a democratic society because while class-difference loses some political valence, it certainly does not disappear from the symbolic realm. While Douglas

notes how standards of purity and taboo function to organize societies which are without modern political and technological differentiation, and how caste systems function on the metaphor of the body (123), she also notes that even in secular societies marginalized people continue to function under the signs of scatological impurity.⁴² Stallybrass and White map out a particularly convincing example of this when they reread Freud to show how maternal abjection is coded among his patients through the social order of the maid, how there is no simply 'personal' abject (Stallybrass 153).⁴³ Washoe, the chimpanzee, signed "dirty" when she was forced back into a cage among other monkeys after having been allowed to roam about human dwellings--a "downgrading of her status from human to animal" (Linden 9) and a rather poignant social echo of the expanding sphere of the bourgeois individual.

If we consider the represented society made up of characters from Canadian novels, it quickly becomes clear that scatology marks a dialectic between broadly-imagined upper and lower classes. At the same time as signifying origins in a past or in the country, the scatological image also marks the lower class, while a concern for cleanliness marks many attempts, both among characters and among authors, to situate themselves in an upper class. As in the rhetoric of the civilizing process, we sometimes see a scatological doubling back, when an author or character

tries to regain something that has been lost in the class shift.

Depending upon the researcher's standards, Canadian classes can be divided in terms of "income, ownership of property, level of education, degree of occupational skill, or position of responsibility and power;" in terms of "popular evaluation of occupations. . . or the opinions and judgements of some members of a community about the class position or class reputation of other members of the community" (Porter 9); and in terms of the social relations of production (Clement 143).⁴⁴ Novelistic discourse about class, however, tends towards more simple dialectical maps, and this may be why Porter wrongly claims, in his seminal study The Vertical Mosaic, that class is not a theme in Canadian literature (Porter 6). An early novel like Moodie's Mark Hurdlestone conveys the external markings of class in its consistent emphasis on the **forms** of speech, courtesy, and physiognomy (24, 301). In the Twentieth Century novel, this confidence in and ensuing skepticism about surface markings is partially transferred to the scatological image, and the lower class is consistently represented in scatological terms. Morley Callaghan's Marxist priest, Father Stephen Dowling in Such is My Beloved, is especially moved by "the smell of bodies" in the confined space of the confessional (77) because the scatological sign of materiality confirms, he thinks, his

lower-class ideology in the Catholic church. The tramps in Fifth Business (46), the lower-class Baptists in Lives of Girls and Women (177), Lora's impoverished past (111, 114) and Third-world humanity (125, 128) in Atwood's Bodily Harm, the poorer part of town in Cat's Eye (332) and in The Edible Woman (281), the Newfoundland fisherman in The Story of Bobby O'Malley (85), the gypsy-foot whores in Michael Ondaatje's Coming Through Slaughter (119), and Annie Oakley, the lowest-ranking soldier in Famous Last Words (41, 56), are all represented scatologically. Although Del Jordan approaches a limited nostalgia in Lives of Girls and Women--thinking that she is approaching nature and approaching her own body among Garnet French and the Baptists--Munro negates this nostalgia by making Del's break from Garnet necessary. Despite the association of filth and humanity in Not Wanted on the Voyage⁴⁵ Annie Oakley's scatology in Famous Last Words is sinister; he is also a killing-machine. The novel's post-war rule is that 'the higher the rank, the more civilized.' The main post-war characters--Private Oakley, Sergeant Rudecki, Lieutenant Quinn, Captain Freyberg--almost stand as an evolutionary line.

Both A.M. Klein's and Mordecai Richler's Jewish ghettos are marked by the scatological. In The Second Scroll the Casablanca ghetto is "thick with offal and slime" and with "signs of a donkey's passage" (62). Although the novel constantly works to subvert the sense of sight (and its

implied idolatry), narrator and author very readily accept the evidence and symbolization of smell (64). The Montreal ghetto in Son of a Smaller Hero is full of "garbage and decaying fruit," "horse manure," "odours" (15),⁴⁶ and the Adler family business is scrap collecting. Rubbish collection was often entrusted to the poor as a form of "social welfare," and contributed to the excrementalizing of them (Corbin 117, 143-4). Richler explicitly sets the classes against one another when Noah Adler crosses class lines to enter, uncomfortably, Miriam Hall's Anglo-Saxon world: "She must be very well-educated, he thought, rich. He wanted badly to say something that would fit. Finally, he asked for the toilet" (45). Once in the bathroom, Noah recognizes its cleanliness as the material opposite to the ghetto: green enamel, many taps, green tiles, initialled towels, sunken bathtub, and half-concealed pink toilet paper. The young and credulous Noah is at first awed; this, apparently, is what a ghetto boy can aspire to.

Of course, by making Miriam's bathroom the main index for class difference, just as Libby Gursky's bathroom is in Solomon Gursky Was Here (23), Richler treats Miriam's world in the terms set by the dominant class. This scatological and deterministic reduction functions in Noah too, eventually allowing him to escape from the feigned scatology of the Halls' social set (194) and to return to the "real" scene of the body, the ghetto. Dominant classes and races

can use the civilized self and these perceived differences in cleanliness as social controls. To destroy lice, Mengele gasses an entire block of Jewish women's cells (St. Urbain's Horseman 163); in an unnerving echo of this, Joey's head is shaved to destroy lice when he enters a Canadian juvenile detention centre (112). When Duddy Kravitz tries to rise from the ghetto, he meets the power of the cleanliness discourse in Irwin Shubert; Irwin prevents Duddy from socializing with a higher class by pretending that Duddy filled a wine bottle with urine as a mean trick. (The Apprenticeship of Duddy Kravitz 70). Irwin manipulates the appearance of the scatological to keep Duddy in his place. Even Herky in St. Urbain's Horseman is typed by his association with the scatological, although in his case Richler is the nemesis. Harijan and untouchable because his occupation has to do with toilets, he lives among the "lower" class of literary characters designated as satiric butts.

What we see of Noah, Duddy, and Herky confirms Douglas's contention that pollution occurs very often at the boundaries of social or cosmic structures, and when people are placed in ill-defined positions (Douglas 113, 133). The class position of the immigrant in the Canadian novel also confirms this. In David Williams' Eye of the Father, Magnus Vangdal emigrates to America. He finds, however, against the grain of the democratic myth, that he "can't be

comfortable anywhere but the bottom" (35), and he remains in a self-initiated and societally-confirmed anal role throughout the novel. The immigrant in Brian Moore's The Luck of Ginger Coffey is more forcibly scatologized. Before the Canadian employer hires Ginger, he says, "What a PR man knows about the wurrkings of a newspaper could be written twice over on the back of a tomtit's arse. . . . So you'd best start at the bottom" (51). Ginger descends even lower and works for a diaper service, having to choose between actual excrement--thanking women for soiled diapers (129)--or something worse: playing "personal bumboy to old Cleery" (198). This type of scatological image qualifies, to some degree, George Grant's claim that North American optimism has been long maintained by the immigrant who found opportunity and freedom here (G. Grant 193); on the other hand, the comic form of many of these immigrant novels suggests that rising to another class is possible even when particular immigrant characters do not succeed.

Since the lower class is marked by its scatology, once a character attempts to rise in class, he must find a way of denying any scatological role. In a magazine article, "Canadians Old and New," Grove placed a great deal of importance on manners of bodily cleanliness in the process of assimilation: "I have known any number of Ruthenians, Russians, Poles--as I have known some English people--who never dreamed that a head is not the proper recreation

ground for minute inhabitants. I have never known any who did not at once try to rid themselves of them when they became aware that I, or anybody, objected to their sojourn there" (3, 55). Grove argues that immigrants are not less clean than Canadians, but then takes them as the image of disease, saying that Canadians are to blame if immigrant settlements remain as a "foreign body within the tissue of the commonwealth" (55). When Philip Branden experiences status inconsistency, losing his inheritance and having to leave Europe in Grove's A Search for America, he pretends to jettison his aristocratic ideology with a comment on royal digestion--"upon what meat does this our Caesar feed?" (57)-- in favor of a democratic ideology that he thinks is more appropriate to his adopted place.

However, Philip's circumspection about the body and his ready classicism prefigures that he will merely transfer hereditary economic markers over to the intellectual sphere and the moral sphere of clean and proper bodies (as Grove himself did).⁴⁷ Philip aspires "to neatness and cleanliness" (139).⁴⁸ Via taboo, Philip separates the moral classes at the restaurant into those who laugh when Jim spits into an obnoxious, unsuspecting customer's soup and those who do not laugh (62). For a time Philip wants to remake himself as Frank, at ease in the new world: "He did not recoil from the common drinking-cup or the general washing-room in public places" (74). This remaking is, however, immediately

stalled by Philip's discovery of Frank's graft. The cross-purposes of a societal attack on the immigrant's ill-defined position and the immigrant's simultaneous scatologizing of the lower class in his own attempt to rise can be seen in the contest between Philip and the cooks. Philip carefully distinguishes between cooking and his so much superior job of waiting on tables; the cooks pretend to acknowledge the distinction, but acknowledge it only in parody: "the kitchen-personnel. . . . called me 'the baron' there, addressed me as 'Sir Phil,' and in high-sounding phrases spoke to me mostly of things and parts of the body that will not bear print" (64). The cooks direct obscenity against Philip and against his style of language, while Philip maintains his own "clean" and well-mannered sphere by reporting the obscenity and attributing it to them, but not reporting it verbatim. To fit his special situation, Philip coordinates the Old World romance of the younger son with the more American "progressive" narrative of the industrious apprentice: if he maintains his clean and proper sphere he will someday be recognized as the aristocrat he really is.⁴⁹

Because of his wealth, Jake Hersch in St. Urbain's Horseman emigrates the opposite way, eastward and upward, moving from Montreal's Jewish ghetto to the suburbs of London. This is what McKeon labels a "progressive" narrative: "Princes, the founts of honor, create knights; industrious apprentices internalize princely absolutism and

create themselves" (McKeon 246). Since he is a social democrat, he enters the bourgeoisie without a mythology to tell him how he got there. His status insecurity manifests itself most obviously in the scene at Ormsby-Fletcher's house, when he cannot pick up his stool. His inhibitions are partially a function of his colonial status. Even though he is an intellectual superior, he is nevertheless Ormsby-Fletcher's social inferior according to the British scale.

As with the immigrant, the ill-defined position of the mentally and physically handicapped helps to relegate them to scatology: Gabriel in The Story of Bobby O'Malley, the Dukes' mongoloid son in A Jest of God, Franny in Who Do You Think You Are, Francis I in What's Bred in the Bone, and Buddy Bolden in Coming Through Slaughter. In Findley's Not Wanted on the Voyage Dr. Noyes monitors the toilets and then scolds Emma for losing control of her sphinctre: "What can you expect from someone whose sister was an ape?" (205-6) The selective use of Darwin marks Noyes as a Nineteenth Century anthropologist who still believes in hierarchies of cultures. Dr. Noyes' sign of the pre-civilized is, of course, an element in Findley's polemic against Noyes, so that the transgression against the handicapped girl identifies the abuse of power in Noyes' maintenance of a social hierarchy. Richler uses the same moral rhetoric in The Apprenticeship of Duddy Kravitz. To make Duddy

repentant about his role in Virgil's accident, Yvette informs him that quadriplegics "can't control their bowels and they don't know when they're urinating" (246). Richler signifies Duddy's rejection of a moral conscience when Duddy loses his fear of the urinal attached to Virgil's bed (277). In Not Wanted on the Voyage, the scatological marginalizing of the handicapped is performed by an externally-presented melodramatic villain and Findley to some extent repeats the same authoritarian structure that he mocks.⁵⁰ By setting The Apprenticeship of Duddy Kravitz in Duddy's consciousness Richler complicates civility and class, because the same consciousness that is responsible for the novel's sphere of language is also responsible for the marginalizing of the epileptic become quadriplegic. As Yvette's comment implies, the "real" (not just represented) lack of muscle control moves the quadriplegic's excretion and urination into a public sphere--thus bringing the residual classifying power of the civilizing process arbitrarily to bear upon the handicapped "transgression." Given such symbolizations, the empowerment offered to a paraplegic by a wheel-chair accessible washroom is more than simply utilitarian. Both the crippled Michael Riches and his wife Meg, are signalled as victims very early in The Telling of Lies by the proximity of the flushing of a toilet to Meg's voice (33). The flushing surreptitiously indicates that Meg must intrude upon Michael's private sphere because of his infirmity.

Against the drift of such symbolization, the will to maintain a clean private sphere coordinates with the will to attain or maintain class status. For First Samuels in The New Ancestors, the initial step towards revolution means refusing to assist his father in the collection of night soil (Godfrey 230). In Such is My Beloved Mr. Robison will not "soil his hands by appearing in the police courts" (38), and he is also careful to avoid the dirty rooms of the prostitutes. In The Edible Woman, Peter understands quite well the relationship between not only manners and class, but between scatology, manners, and the representation of class: "Unintentional bad manners was something Peter couldn't stand to be accused of, and I knew it. It put him in the class of people in the deodorant ads" (87). Approaching the town dump in The Stone Angel, Hagar Shipley and Lottie Drieser are "like dainty-nosed czarinas finding themselves in sudden astonishing proximity to beggars with weeping sores" (26). Many years later, Hagar is told that Arlene (Lottie's daughter) would "never marry a Shitley" (174). While Callaghan, Atwood, and Laurence in these instances satirize the simplistic class conceptions of their characters, the insistent attempts of their protagonists (Stephen Dowling, Hagar Shipley, and Marian McAlpin respectively) to escape the sphere of the body nevertheless give a certain importance to the clean and private sphere. In Joshua Then and Now, Jack Trimble tells the story of his father. Wounded in World War I, his father loses one lung

while the other fills with green slime. Much later, he also loses his position as a barber because his coughing slime out makes the customers feel bad: "My father, far too polite to upset a rich customer, finally drowns in his own snot" (366). Jack knows that to rise in class he must efface such a past and avoid the scatological. This he does, but the return of the repressed haunts such social determination and constitutes his created self: "you are looking at the man who was going to get his dirty fingernails under Jane Mitchell's skirt" (367).

More often the desire to create a clean sphere occurs through language and authorship. Likely in order to create a civilized sphere which is not alienated from the body, Findley has his narrator in The Telling of Lies, Vanessa Van Horne, become prudish before swearing (140), but not before actual bodily excretions (130). Robertson Davies makes a claim for a compensatory understanding of obscenity by quoting what the old painter Northcote said to William Hazlitt: "The common people sought for refinement as a treat; people in high life were fond of grossness and ribaldry as a relief to their overstrained affectation of gentility" ("In Pursuit of Pornography" 275). Whatever the theoretical value of such a statement, one need not ponder long to realize the problem with which it would confront the writer: to whom, then, should the writer's voice be directed? Davies' solution in The Lyre of Orpheus is to

find voices which can exploit the relief involved in "grossness and ribaldry" without leaving the propriety of the upper class:

"Libretto--well, Schnak has a word for it."

"Shit?"

"Of the most rejectable and excrementitious order."

The latinate, academized cushion not only identifies that a professor, Penelope Raven, is speaking, but also indicates a strict linguistic hierarchy between professor and student (Schnak). Against Barbara Godard's conception of Davies' dialogism, this passage indicates how a many-voiced form and the bodily lower level can support authoritative languages, especially since the professor is allowed the last, rhetorically the strongest, position.⁵¹

Davies follows Stephen Leacock (whom Davies admired), stabilizing European academe against the challenges of American popular culture. Leacock, in My Discovery of England, apparently sets out to satirize Britain, but then continually mocks the New World from the perspective of the Old. The North American persona is defined by his modern interest in London's system of "sewerage" (32) rather than in the British Museum, in Oxford's lack of sanitation (77) rather than in the Humanities. The persona's lack of circumspection gives his class position away; this is modified in Davies, where the Anglicanized professoriate subsumes all of experience. Despite jokes which hint at the anal-retentive possession of knowledge, the professors (who

are not just the objects but also the originators of those jokes)⁵² consistently mediate between the languages of upper and lower classes. This is especially clear in the nightwatchman Wally Crottel's constant interruptions of his lawyer, Mervyn Gwilt. Although Crottel and Gwilt unite in attempt to sue for the possession of the Parlabane novel, the scatological 'plain speech' of the masses in Wally repeatedly erodes the over-determined authority of Gwilt's legal Latin: "You said it was, like, Latin, **De Mortos** or something. 'Don't crap on your folks' you said it meant" (159).⁵³ While Crottel and Gwilt separate low and high languages, the professors are allowed to combine both rhetorical levels, attacking the authority of Gwilt's Latin, but not from Crottel's position. They speak of Gwilt's "admirable **argumentum ad excrementum taurorum**" (162), expanding the upper sphere to include scatology rather than contracting the circumference of their own authority as Leacock does when he rails against slang (My Discovery of England 184).

The complexity of Davies' simultaneous recuperation and rejection of scatology means that the privatization of the body may result, as Francis Barker claims in a brilliant but flawed argument, from the discursive practices of a particular social group.⁵⁴ Davies also uses an academic mediation to structure the representations of Maria and Mamusia in their respective upper and lower worlds--the

daughter in the penthouse and the mother in the basement. The basement is scatological, with "Yerko's pungent farting" (35). The metaphors, however, move from fart and "midden" to "foul rag and bone shop" (76). The Yeatsian allusion, not available to Mamusia or Yerko but a function of the narrating professorial voice, keeps a strict separation between the classes (no matter how central Mamusia is to the recovery of the past).⁵⁵ A parallel authorial stance qualifies Duddy Kravitz's attack on the intelligentsia: "What a pack of crap artists! Writing and reading books that make fun of people like me" (242). To the extent that reception theorists like Wolfgang Iser and Georges Poulet are correct when they show how the reader identifies with the narrated consciousness, the scatology is directed at the intelligentsia; but, to the extent that the reader recognizes authorial and readerly self-reflexiveness, the scatological attack never disturbs the sphere of sophistication. Since Richler has written a novel making fun of people like Duddy, and since the reader is reading such a novel, reader and author conspire against Duddy.

One of the satisfactions of those apprentices whose apotheosis stalls is to see scatology turned against the clean and proper sphere of the more powerful classes. This doubling back, which Duddy cannot engineer for those who laugh at him, occurs in Eye of the Father, where Hilda, forcibly barred from polite circles in a Saskatchewan town,

laughs to see her social superior and nemesis, Mrs. Pederson, squatting and wiping her rear with brome grass (105). If the rich were for a long time unique in having bathrooms (Corbin 175), then one way of mocking status is to represent a return to older excretory habits in them.⁵⁶ In The Mountain and the Valley, David (only momentarily) identifies with the farmers (and even with the one who, as a boy, mocked David's theatrical aspirations) when David imagines Jud Spinney's cow emptying her bowels on the rate collector (295). Richler's Harry Stein claims, in court, that there was no anal penetration of Ingrid Loebner: "I'm not an establishment type. I was nobody's fag at Eton" (St. Urbain's Horseman 410). The subsequent fluttering of Judge Beal's hands suggests that despite the cruelty of Harry's eroticism and despite the appropriateness of Beal's sentencing of Harry, Harry has struck at least a class nerve.

Because Del's mother in Lives of Girls and Women, Addie Morrison, finds only high-minded intellectual domination in Dr. Comber and his wife, she temporarily shifts her own ideals: "What good is it if you read Plato and never clean your toilet? asked my mother, reverting to the values of Jubilee" (62). According to Bakhtin, grotesque realism posits a body that is not private or egotistical, but whereby the people challenge the bourgeois ego (19). Thus the Thirteenth Century "Ass's Will"--a poem which bequeaths

the ass's head to the Pope, the ears to the cardinals, the voice to the choir and the feces to the peasants--seems to contain a social critique (Bakhtin 351). However, while a social critique is intended by Del's mother against the Combers, it cannot attack the class structure in any immediate way since the association of the scatological image with Addie primarily confirms her own position in a lower class. Indeed Addie's claims to a superior breadth of experience eventually end in her own unconscious subordination to a hardly exclusive upper class: "No flush toilets in that town. 'I have cleaned out chamber pots to get my education!' she would say, and not mind who was listening. But a nice class of people used them. Bank clerks. The CNR telegraph operator. The teacher, Miss Rush" (66). Harry's social critique, scatological throughout St. Urbain's Horseman, is even less effectual.

By having a cruel misogynist attack the class structure, Richler ensures that mimetically the scatology always belongs to the lower class. Stallybrass and White attack Bakhtin on precisely this ground, claiming that carnival often "demonizes the weaker, not the stronger social groups. . . in a process of abjection" (19). Corbin similarly argues that "the scatology of Shrovetide Carnival, the derision directed at hygienic consciousness, and the streams of abuse might be interpreted as acceptance of an allotted role in society" (Corbin 214-15). Yet this conception of

how scatology can freeze a class hierarchy may overstate the case. A more balanced assessment would follow Natalie Zemon Davis's explanation of the effects of Misrule festivities: for many French urban magistrates, Misrule was a safety valve, "deflecting attention from social reality," but because festive life perpetuates certain community values, Davis adds that it also functioned rhetorically to "decipher king and state" (Davis 97). Since Addie by rejecting the Combers' discussion group rejects an apprenticeship in a male-oriented and Eurocentric syllabus, her ideals at this point track those of Munro, giving Addie in moral power what she lacks in social or intellectual acuteness. If Addie is the object of satire, at least doctors and those measures of princeliness, bank clerks, are measured by her scatological standards.⁵⁷

Not surprisingly, attempts to devalue an upper class far outnumber the attempts to double back to a lower class. In comparison with doubling back to the country or to a past, the taboos surrounding class positions are more powerful, even though both class and the civilizing process are coded through similar scatological images. For Davies' professors and for Munro's Addie, the doubling back is clearly only a tactical move, allowing a skeptical critique of class structure, but never reaching the point where the character renounces class gains. Similarly, Bernard Gursky uses "a Jackson Pollock," one of Bernard's daughter's "fershtinkena

aquisitions" to put job applicants in their places, asking them if they think the painting is good. Once they commit themselves, he pounces: "'It's hanging upside down. Now what can I get you?' Mr. Harvard Tuchus-Face MBA" (116). Uneducated and from a lower class, Bernard's impulse is to turn the world upside down, but not so much so as to do without an artwork that signifies sophistication. Neither does Richler completely reverse the world. Moses Berger, the writer, is not taken in by Bernard's ruse, but like Davies' professors, mediates upper and lower.

"We always remain within the sphere of those who have succeeded, whose life has some social value" (Lejeune 199). Although Lejeune means that autobiographies "are the place where a collective identity is elaborated, reproduced, and transformed, the patterns of life appropriate to the ruling classes" (198), there is no reason to exclude fiction from this assessment. Laurence has Christie, a character at the bottom of Manawaka's social order, articulate a theory of unconscious community: "Garbage belongs to all. Communal property, as you might say" (The Diviners 46). At this level, that which is jettisoned from the social order is actually what implies the denied unity of that order. But even though Christie has the intuitions of a Leveller, narratively he helps to support Morag's persona at the end of the novel. Morag will certainly not make her home in Manawaka (nor did Laurence in Neepawa) much less return to

poverty, but, in order to create an authorial persona able to mediate the range of culture from town garbageman to English professor, Morag needs, among other things, the authority of the lower class. A guarantor of many academic enterprises (de Certeau 3), the "common man" also underwrites the narrative enterprises of Morag Gunn and Margaret Laurence.⁵⁸ To acknowledge this is not to deny class boundaries, but simply to make explicit the rhetorical uses to which marginality, and in particular scatological marginality, can be put. Munro's Rose, after all, uses scatology to "queen it over" (23) people who would have liked to have been poor.

6. "This is the British fucking Empire": Race

The body. . . will always exist in relation to some text: that is a given. The only question is, "Which text?"

--Elaine Scarry

Societies create boundaries (and the concomitant dangers of "pollution") also along racial lines. The citations in the previous chapter from Klein, Richler, and Ladoo just as clearly mark racial difference, and often it is impossible to separate race from class in either history or literature. John Porter, in The Vertical Mosaic, notes congruencies between class and race divisions in Canada; more recently, Peter Pineo's and Porter's research indicates that the effects of ethnic status on job status have diminished, leading them to hypothesize that the "vertical mosaic" is connected to periods of greatest immigration (390-91).⁵⁹ Despite the scatologizing of David Williams' Magnus Vangdal and Brian Moore's Ginger Coffey (Norwegian and Irish immigrants respectively), the scatological image in the novel generally follows the lead set by the Canadian government's cultural policies, which, until very recently, encouraged emigration from Western and sometimes Central Europe while severely limiting emigration by non-Caucasian nationalities.⁶⁰ Particularly resonant cases of immigrant discrimination include the 1914 expulsion of the Komagata Maru and the Sikhs from Vancouver harbor, the head tax on Chinese immigrants, and the internment of Japanese citizens

during World War II. Before 1953 the Immigration Act included a clause on "climatic unsuitability," a cover for the barring of immigration by colored peoples (Hughes and Kallen 228). According to Howard Palmer our immigration record is not as far removed from the American one despite the Canadian government's sponsorship of multiculturalism. Only in 1953 was the Fair Employment Practices Act passed, so that it became illegal to discriminate in hiring on the basis of race, national origin, color, or religion. Bill S-5, the first bill against hate literature, was passed by the Senate in 1967 but died in the House of Commons. C-3, a watered-down version of the same bill was finally passed in 1969 (Rosenberg 196). Not until the 1960's, and perhaps only because of economic prosperity (Craig 12), did multiculturalism become fashionable (Woodcock 352) in some quarters with the Pearson administration's introduction of bilingualism and biculturalism. Native culture was also suppressed and then sought along much the same timetable.

Thus, while Brian Moore quite naturally focuses on the pollution attributed to his fellow Irishmen in The Luck of Ginger Coffey, he also represents scatology among the Algonkians in Black Robe, at some distance from autobiography. For Williams the racial code is even more insistent because it initially seems to supersede autobiography: in Williams' first novel, The Burning Wood, the scatological images gather mainly around the native; in

his second novel, The River Horsemen, they are shared between the native and the Ukrainian immigrant; and only in his third novel, Eye of the Father, do the images reach into Williams' personal Norwegian genealogy via Magnus Vangdal.

Like the lower classes, marginalized immigrant and indigenous races become figures for the origins of the civilized self. Kristeva argues that the first constitution of the object is as 'abject.' This holds true not only in psychoanalysis (Kristeva), ethnography (Douglas), and sociology--Canadians tend to rank visible minorities in the lower echelons of the economic system, sometimes despite social reality (Ramcharan 90)--but also in imaginative literature, where the structures of the European civilizing process are brought to bear upon the writer's fictionalization of his own culture. In The Canadian Jewish Who's Who that Duddy Kravitz publishes in the course of St. Urbain's Horseman, Governor-General Vincent Massey calls Jews "'a fruitful and fertilizing stream' in Canadian life." Duddy interprets this to mean that Jews are "horse manure" (153), but it is not clear whether the double meaning is Massey's or Duddy's. Jake Hersch projects his son Sammy's loss of Jewish culture as an inability to say Kaddish during Jake's imagined funeral; instead, Sammy learns other idioms: "I say, what shall we do with the old fart's ashes?" (285). The voice begins as a parody of British upper-class language and ends by disposing of Jake in scatological terms.

However, in order to undermine the Germanic rhetoric of cleanliness which contributed to the Holocaust,⁶¹ a milder version of which informed Canadian immigration policy,⁶² Richler elsewhere gives scatology a positive valence. The degrading conditions in the German concentration camp--where drinking water was next to the latrine, where the same water was used for drinking and washing away excrement--signify the scatologizing and subsequent genocide of the Jew in German racial policy. The excremental nightmare becomes far preferable to the monstrous cleanliness of Mengele, who had all the women in a cell-block gassed in order to get rid of lice. Because of the Nazis' demonization of the Jew in images of uncleanness, Richler must find some way of reversing the traditional association of excrement with degradation (an association that Jake, like other satirists, relies on) without smoothing over Nazi prison conditions. Richler mediates these competing values in St. Urbain's Horseman by splitting scatology between Harry Stein and Jake Hersch. Jake's persistent scatological concerns--"Look out, Yankel, any minute now the shit hits the fan" (359)--carry a worry about his children in a racist society quite unlike the self-interested anal eroticism of Harry.

Similar concerns about race, the body, and border crossings appear throughout Richler's two later novels. In Joshua Then and Now a Jewish artist-protagonist again finds his way, by means of inter-racial marriage, into a United

Empire Loyalist family, but the racial binaries are shifted from German/Jewish to English-Canadian/Jewish. Searching his ancestral past, Joshua discovers that his grandfather came from "some shitty little village in Poland" and crusaded against Yiddish names like Bishinsky and Pfeffershnitt: "You crazy Jews, this is the British fucking Empire and you can't call yourself by such horseshit names here. You there, you are now called 'Bishop'" (289). The immigrant masters the discourse of "Anglo-conformity" (Palmer 83), enunciating its unspoken prejudices.⁶³ The grandfather's intended conformity, however, is not quite enough to subdue his colloquial and scatological language; Richler thus degrades the empire because of its association with its newest subject.

By having Joshua join the satiric William Lyon Mackenzie King Society, Richler connects the horrifying but distant territory of the Holocaust to a less dangerous but more immediate Canadian territory. Mackenzie King pretended fairness to the Jews but referred to them as junk collectors and advocated racial restrictions which would spur assimilation by preventing the formation of foreign ghettos (Mackenzie King Toronto Mail and Empire Sept. 25, 1897, quoted in Rosenberg 226). King's post-World War II immigration policies were geared towards nationalities that could be easily assimilated (Palmer 89).⁶⁴ During World War II in Solomon Gursky Was Here Sir Hyman Kaplansky, the

Jewish Raven, tricks his English Passover guests into eating matzoh filled with ritual blood (509) to embody their complicity with the Nazis.

Richler's anti-semitic customs official and White Anglo-saxon Methodist Bert Smith stands for the old Empire, but his scatological denigration of the Jew identifies a repression, satirically exaggerated, at the centre of Canadian culture. "He had a strict upbringing. When he wet his bed, his father clipped a clothespin to his penis" (84).

Richler approaches the myth of cultural adoption in Joshua Then and Now through Joshua's marriage to Pauline, but parodies it through the relationship of the two fathers.⁶⁵ The senator, Joshua's father-in-law, is thrilled when his association with Joshua's father, Reuben, leads to outdoor urination: "'I pissed outside,' the senator told [Pauline], excited, 'out in the field there'" (298). What the lower-class Jew provides for the loyalist senator is a body. The satirist's revenge against the scatologizing of his culture is to entertain the logical conclusion: the Anglo-Saxon cannot dispel his bodily waste without the assistance of the degraded race. This conclusion is, of course, available to Anglo-Saxon writers as well. In Atwood's Bodily Harm, Jake, who bears a number of similarities to Jake Hersch in St. Urbain's Horseman, responds to Rennie's comment that he has a poker in his anus: "That's not a poker, it's a backbone. . . . I got it

from pretending to be a goy" (73).

Representations of Third-world race--Atwood's Bodily Harm, David Godfrey's The New Ancestors, and Harold Ladoo's Yesterdays--put the black, like the Jew, in a scatological position. Although intertribal repressions appear after the independence of Lost Coast (Gold Coast was the colonial name of Ghana) in The New Ancestors, the main lines of power in all three novels are North/South--white colonial oppression and black suffering. Despite the white man Michael Burdener's sympathetic intentions in The New Ancestors, he must stand in as **pharmakos** for all colonial powers and put up with his mother-in-law's scatological abuse of him. In an ecstatic trance, "she makes an obscene gesture, as though she is a man painfully pissing" (64); the gesture is not entirely symbolic (as Michael believes) since there are hints that white educators forced her to change her elimination patterns (73). Michael's effort at racial reconciliation becomes tragic, and that tragedy is signalled very early by scatology: "the blacks do stink differently, don't let a liberal tell you other, for once the scientists and the Smethwicks agree" (17).⁶⁶ This "material" differentiation between races proleptically dooms Ama Awotchwi's and Michael's interracial marriage--a personalized white man's burden--before the reader even knows much about the two characters.

Much later, Michael (under the pseudonym Burr) discovers a primitive sense of joint ancestry, imaginatively recovering "Olduvai Gorge" (133). The mode of the recovered community is geographic and historical (in the proto-civilization along the Niger River), but also scatological, when Burdener wipes himself with pages from his notebook and no longer wants "to let his body slip off after the diseased, mucoused shit" (347) which he left in the Niger. The use of the civilizing process in this late and scatological recourse to origins ultimately subordinates racial experience by implying a basic civilized parallelism between cultures, but it does not mitigate Michael's or Ama's personal tragedies.

For Ladoo, the colonial attack on non-white cultures is more insidious and the process less amenable to symbolic reconciliation. Like Richler, Ladoo inflates the racial self-critique by placing the people of Yesterdays' Carib Island entirely under the rubric of scatology: "De only future in dis island, is drinkin rum and playing de ass" (26). However one takes Ladoo's mimetic perception of Trinidad, this attack on the racial self coheres with the self-image that the West Indian tends to receive in Toronto, Ladoo's adopted home: according to Raymond Breton's study of the perception of discrimination against minority groups in Toronto, West Indians consistently report far higher levels of discrimination than other ethnic groups. Ladoo's

difficulty in getting a job consistent with his educational attainment--he worked as a short-order cook after graduating from university--graphically particularizes Breton's study. But balancing the scatological version of Trinidad is Tailor's information about the English who colonized Carib: Tailor appalls Choonilal by telling him that the English do not like to take baths and that they wipe their bums with paper. Choonilal has no confidence in Indian or Negro doctors, but it is the English doctor who apparently cannot be trusted,⁶⁷ who slips his fingers up Basdai's "two holes" (65).

Ladoo's use of scatology maintains, in Choonilal's son Poonwa, an extreme skepticism about even his own marginal race. Because of the Canadian teacher's whip, Poonwa hides in the only safe place, the toilet. He begins to eat in the toilet, breaking his parents' Hindu dietary laws, and continues this practice later in the home of his employer. When his parents build a house, Poonwa ensures that a modern toilet will be part of the layout. As in Leonard Cohen's Beautiful Losers where F.'s vision of the "Bhagavad-Santa" generates a response of "you soil everything" (60), Ladoo intentionally soils Trinidadian Hindu culture. Mary Douglas cites studies which claim that in India a strong ritualization of defilement can co-exist with blindness to actual filth (Douglas 124). This is essential to Ladoo's satire in Yesterdays, where Choonilal's sacramental attempts

to mollify the Aryan gods via his toilet manners include, unconsciously, the intrusion of the anal into all levels of his being and language.⁶⁸ The racial-colonial critique is corroded by the insistent association of excremental imagery with Hindu culture once it is put under the gaze of western versions of the civilizing process. Poonwa's inability to make even ritual scatological distinctions, make his Hindu status even more parodic. In Poonwa the scatological image does not mediate between cultures, since Ladoo has him simply reverse the signifiers of colonialism in his planned Hindu mission to Canada: "How come dey make de Indians Christians? Well de same way Poonwa goin to beat dey ass and make dem learn Hindi" (67). The studied naivety, especially in a character who has long been forced to compromise his culture, means that Ladoo concedes moral superiority neither to the colonist nor to the racial margin.⁶⁹

The most pervasive representation of race by means of scatology in the Canadian novel occurs in the image of the native. Terry Goldie has shown, in Fear and Temptation: The Image of the Indigene in Canadian, Australian and New Zealand Literatures, how the indigene functions in white semiosis at the poles of denial and embrace. This is most clear in the representation of sexuality, but it also holds for scatology: the native functions to restore origins or the lost body to white culture, but that restoration

generally takes place under the auspices of the white sign-maker (Goldie 24-5, 77, 119-20). Scatologizing which is peripheral to a novel's dominant concerns demonstrates how associating the native with scatology has become a "second nature." John Richardson in 1832 described what goes on outside the garrison: the Ottawa "occupied themselves by the firelight in parting the long black matted hair and maintaining a destructive warfare against the pigmy inhabitants of that dark region" (144). This "warfare" parodies the British/Indian wars in the larger narrative, but parodies it in such a way as to displace North American content onto African signs (the pigmy), and to interweave the markers of civilized cleanliness with colonial warfare, so that the natives are **agents**, not subjects, of colonial enterprise. What the natives do to maintain civilized cleanliness thus justifies what the British (making the analogical leap) do in their own "dark regions." In Where Nests the Water Hen, Luzina fears catching lice from the Indians (40), and is upset that the "grimy" and "dirty" natives will not support her civilized desire to open a school (92), while in Atwood's The Edible Woman, the disgusted Millie believes that menstruating native women use moss instead of sanitary napkins. The representational traditions of "reek" and "vermin," which appeared most famously in Pratt's Brébeuf and His Brethren, still signify pre-literate cultures, even though both Roy and Atwood satirize the beliefs of their characters, attributing the

beliefs to the false superiority created by "common knowledge." Farley Mowat, a less sophisticated writer than Pratt but one with better first-hand knowledge, offers new and less culturally-biased versions of common sense: in his autobiographical People of the Deer he has diarrhoea only as long as he refuses to eat the native Ihalmuit diet.

The **type** of scatology associated with the native reveals the white literary use to which the native is put. Atwood's peripheral native women refuse male-dominated consumer culture in their flow of blood. In Peter Such's Riverrun and Rudy Wiebe's The Temptations of Big Bear, blood signals not just gender, but also genre. The mimetic emphasis on blood codes the cultural past through elegy. This departs from early works like Wacousta, where the natives taunt the inhabitants of the garrison at Detroit with blood (117, 120, 132), and then make them bleed. Blood in Wacousta is most important in the description of murdered British soldiers like Harry Donellan--"the scalpless crown completely saturated in its own clotted blood and oozing brains" (32); Such and Wiebe, though more sympathetic to the native point of view, are not thereby more "native" in structuring their work. Despite archeological precision, Such's account of the Beothuk is complicated by elegy, in which blood signals death and pathos. Thus the bloody representations of the dying stag (59) and caribou (75) function mainly as European tropes for the extinguished

tribe, indeed almost in the romance convention of the wounded hart, (which operated at a more conscious level in Wacousta)⁷⁰ and cannot function according to native traditions of the hunt in which animal blood stands for power and plenty.⁷¹

Such does attempt to evoke alternate interpretations when he describes Waunathoake's birth--"the cord still throbbed with life" (76)--but generally he sticks to elegy. He shades blood (43, 62, 82), into other forms of elegaic scatology. Wothamisit's and Demasduit's cough and spit are eventually tinged with blood (43, 112, 114), Demasduit weeps (90),⁷² Osnahanut vomits from hunger (65, 69), and his "fearsweat" has a cultural meaning: "if all the people die, there will be no one to remember our spirits" (128). During her captivity, Demasduit, "remembering the forgotten uses of her body" leaves the house to get near the gardener's "sweatsmell" and "the reek of the nearby outhouse" (108). Here, even without blood, vomit, or "fearsweat," the scatology is elegiac, mediating loss and only allowing for pathetically limited forms of bodily return. Still, near the end of the novel, Such does reach a moment when the native body does not fit generic patterns. The last Beothuk, Shawnadithit, makes an image of the governor of Newfoundland with her teeth; the spittle that we see has no edge of blood (which would be superfluous by this time), and tells the reader nothing generic about how we should

interpret Shawnadithit's absolute historical isolation in a boundless display-case. Does the last bearer of the culture carry the whole structure on her back, or, since the culture is collapsed into a single lore, is there no longer any measure?

Natives, again like Richler's Jews, often become alternatives to white European repression of the body. This happens very violently and inconclusively in The Temptations of Big Bear. John Delaney's obscenities and blasphemy project onto the native what Delaney dare not acknowledge within the frame of his Orange culture. He speaks to the uncomprehending native woman of "pawing through the wounds and private pricks of Jesus" (232) and of the "most absolute pure frozen Christ shit" (233). In the Freudian model of the self, the movement outside of "civilization" discloses a repressed scatology, in this case of Aylmer, Ontario.⁷³ Inevitably, some of the projection is Wiebe's. Like Such, Wiebe attempts to get at how alien native culture is to European understanding. The use of scatology becomes a mimetic technique whereby cultural difference can be presented in an anthropologically correct and immediate way through taste and smell (which are seemingly outside of language): "has he ever tried to swallow buffalo liver steaming from the carcass, and sprinkled with gall for taste?" (36); "slowly the smell gathered of horses and sweat and buffalo grease" (40). Other writers use similar

techniques. Moore's Algonkins smell so strongly that Father Laforgue is revolted (Black Robe 39-40) and keeps his distance, until he gets lost in the forest and one of the Algonkins finds him (75). Laurence's Métis have a strong sweat smell which is intended to be positive (The Diviners 338, 423).

Adding to these circumstantial signs, Wiebe attempts to portray modes of being that are prior to European standards of civilization by representing his Cree as unconscious of scatology. Big Bear toes aside excrement (50), buffalo chips are used for fire (87), and Horsechild picks his nose to eat the mucous (94). Nevertheless, Wiebe's desire for anthropological accuracy balances uneasily against the Christian epigraph under which he sets his entire narrative, the Pauline attempt in Acts 17 to convince the Athenians that the unknown god they worship is actually Jahweh. By making Big Bear into a precursor of Christianity and in giving the most power to his words, particularly about the 'Great Spirit,' Wiebe lets the alien body go in favor of Paul's assimilative tendency.⁷⁴ Big Bear's fear--"He had not thought The Only One would permit such **blackness** to be found in him; opening endlessly" (150, my italics)--seems curiously identical to an existential (disembodied and post-Christian) fear.

The difficulty of using scatology to represent another culture is perhaps most evident when Big Bear dreams of the

pink liquid (blood and milk) flowing from a cow after the last buffalo hunt. Blood and the "last" hunt combine to signal elegy, but the slicing off of the buffalo's teats to add milk to the flow creates a strange, generically indeterminate effect, an effect which one suspects cannot be translated across cultures. The bodily sign of death--the mingling of blood and milk in the cut teat--cannot be fully elegaic, either in the writer's context of Twentieth Century Canadian society when such an act must seem barbaric, or in Big Bear's tribal culture where the sign must take a form of nostalgia for the hunt (and the pink liquid), **not** for the dead cow or anything that she represents. In this latter case the anthropological narrative's mimesis moves tangentially to Big Bear's tragedy. Wiebe's failure to fully process this Plains custom as elegy is an important failure, since it sets anthropological accuracy against literary coherence, and highlights the difficulties attending the mimesis of race.

Wiebe recognizes these difficulties in the person of Kitty McLean. Kitty romanticizes native life (272, 276-7), yet she also adopts Cree attitudes towards the body, saying that the only way to kill a louse is to crack it between the teeth (291). But in this presentation of Kitty, Wiebe seems to claim a mastery over native attitudes, a mastery that he later disavows when Kitty becomes the figure for the author-translator of native thought systems. In her despair at

properly translating Big Bear's voice during his trial, she begins to think that she is menstruating: "She thought in a revelation it was the monthly **blackness** seeping through her and momentarily she would feel dampness, she was certain she felt it, once, and when she could look at herself there would be the dark worm crawling between the blackish hair inside her leg out of that unstoppable entrance into herself, she could never squat now as she had as a child and not feel herself opened uncloseably" (384, my italics). Kitty's comparison is not metaphor so much as bodily **condition** or habit--as the conditional mode suggests. As the internal representative of the author-translator, it is appropriate that she uses Wiebe's Christianizing language--"revelation," "worm"--even as she despairs of the ability of Christian figures to make typological sense of Big Bear's story: she can no longer read languages as parallel allegories of one another. This is one of the most evocative moments in Wiebe's writing because it transgresses against his Christian figural use of Big Bear. Kitty is one of those women who "can wreck the infinite" (Céline quoted in Kristeva 159). Unclean, if we invoke the terms of Old Testament law, she is one whose flow of blood (not just the parallelism of existential doubt) allies her with Big Bear. And, as a bronzed woman, bleeding, she is alien from the white male author even if she belongs to his elegaic conventions.

Excremental scatology too can be elegaic. The sailor's buggery of a dying Indian in Bowering's Burning Water (121) and the representation of the Tonnerres in The Diviners depend on similar conventions. Lazarus Tonnerre's death is intimated by his retching the very first time that Morag meets him (140). This is continued in Morag's vomiting at the deaths of Piquette and her children (159), and finds its completion in the dying Jules' unwillingness to go to the hospital: "The president of the Royal Bank can keep it. It's all shit to me" (445).

However, despite the signs of elegy in tribal destruction, the force of Laurence's satire in Jules' comment appends a comic alternative onto tragic scatology. When Pique plans to return to the ancestral reservation, Laurence confirms the native body through the pettiness of Morag's concern about the outdoor toilets on the reserve. Pique, the modern-day Métis, in this way becomes the persona who, much more than Morag, can mediate the past, the country, and the body for the text-bound reader, the persona through whom Laurence acts out the adoption of the native.

Like Laurence's natives, W.O. Mitchell's natives in The Vanishing Point satirize and then modify the Protestant body: "so that's the whole situation with civilization," Archie Nicotine concludes, "a lot of people--a lot of germs--a lot of shit" (39). Mitchell's mimesis has its romantic side--the native children are public and

unselfconscious about eliminative functions (114)--but it too contains a potential tragedy in the undifferentiated and self-injuring tricks of "Weesackashack," looking for "scabs from his rear end--eating them because he mistook them for food" (13).⁷⁵ If, as Goldie argues, Mitchell uses natives mainly to address white concerns, at least he does so by using the cultural mechanism provided by the Cree trickster, Wisahkecahk: the natives' subversion of Reverend Dingle's sentiment when they substitute "bullshit" for "thank-you" is rooted in the traditional culture-mocking techniques of the Trickster.⁷⁶ According to Douglas, observational bias entails that scatology seems to jump out from another culture under observation (97). In particular, she suggests that the Amerindian trickster cycle is not as scatological as Norman O. Brown's reading of ethnography makes it seem.⁷⁷ The difficulty with Douglas's suggestion is that she does not make allowance for Amerindian suppression of their own stories (in order to avoid being made into a scatological object by the dominant Caucasian culture), for obscenity standards in publications prior to the 1960's, or for something as mundane as the history of reservation housing--by 1987 in Canada, for example, only 10% of dwellings on reservations had running water and sewage disposal compared to 98% of the occupied dwellings in the rest of the country (Clatworthy and Stevens). Archie Nicotine's mockery of urban washroom architecture thus has a social basis. Furthermore, Amerindian writers represent the Trickster in

much the same manner as Mitchell does.⁷⁸ Mitchell does not naturalize scatology as an inbred native predilection, but presents it satirically as a function of white roles: "that nurse she'll just stuff Fyfe Minimal Subsistence Biscuits up my red ass you see" (239).

Mitchell's Stoneys also use the trickster's scatological skepticism against their own traditional culture: "We don't buy that Bony Spectre bullshit any more" (29). This self-reflexivity recognizes native traditions of satire and avoids making the native a nostalgic symbol of superseded belief. Rudy Wiebe also has Big Bear deconstruct his culture by means of scatology. Instead of recounting a vision quest, Big Bear gives a satiric and punning version of how he acquired his name: "I was so eager to get out my mother had no time to spread the clean hide. . . and I fell with my nose in something the bear had left behind. Since then I have always had something big with bears" (206). Wiebe represents a dialogism within native culture so that the native does not just perform the function of primitive credulity for a "sophisticated" white culture.

Leonard Cohen, George Bowering, and David Williams all use parodic scatology to carefully differentiate the narrated native from the historical native. In Beautiful Losers Cohen's unnamed tribe becomes a trope for death: "A_____ is the word for corpse" (5). The Freudian equation of the corpse with feces--the entire body as waste

material--prefigures Cohen's primitivist connection of the excremental with the pre-Conquest Iroquois (54-5). Cohen's purposes for such a connection appear to be double. On the one hand, F.'s project is a figural recovery of what he thinks is a pre-Enlightenment body; he, and Cohen too I would argue, thereby have the natives agonize for a repressed white culture: "the Company of Jesus had their way with them. Lots of semen in the forest, I'll bet" (16). This theory is enacted in Black Robe where Father Laforgue spills his semen in the forest while watching Annuka and Daniel in coitus (56). On the other hand, this repression simultaneously identifies the history of white masculine abuse of the native. Edith's bum becomes the focus of the white town's desire in Beautiful Losers (28), and her victimhood is signalled in much the same way that Richler signals his victims; before her rape, she urinates in fear: "It was a sound so majestic and simple, a holy symbol of frailty" (64).

The difference between Cohen's sense of native frailty and Such's or Wiebe's sense, is that Cohen's tribe is purely hypothetical. The overemphasis on native scatology thus becomes self-conscious artifice and invites skepticism about narrative structure and ideology in a way that anthropological accuracy does not. This happens in Burning Water as well. The distance between the ideologies of the First Indian and the Second Indian is marked by scatological

abuse (240), but instead of just using them to signal a pre-Enlightenment body, Bowering has them mimic English scatological language: the First Indian's "first ceremonial English words," learned from the *Discovery's* crew, are "Aeh shitt!" (128) Most importantly, these words, like the rest of the narrative, breaks out of historical voices and documented events. George Vancouver "discovers" the Northwest Passage when his ships rise and fly over the Rockies. During this anachronistic passage, Lieutenant Puget says, "Those superstitious heathen would be fouling their breeches, if they had the decency to be wearing any" (134). The complex parodic structure--a parody of Eighteenth Century language set inside a parody of a Twentieth Century airplane ride--does not allow the attribution of uncivilized scatology to the Indian to be a "natural" mimesis of Eighteenth Century attitudes. The Indians also speak in Twentieth Century clichés, including scatological clichés:

"I suppose you get a lot of rain in these parts," suggested Vancouver.
 "Not so much in the summer, said the chief. "In the winter it rains all the time, but we always say that at least you don't have to shovel it."
 "I could think of a good use for a shovel right now," whispered the first Indian.

History recedes infinitely before the Twentieth Century novelist, and the scatological native becomes a doubly hypothetical proposition.

The first two novels of David Williams show a progression

from the use of the native as a figure for the lost white body towards the more skeptical position. For Joshua Cardiff in The Burning Wood the native acts as a scatological counter to the bodily repressions of white fundamentalist religion. The associations are metonymic when Joshua uses the toilet as an excuse to leave the Bible Camp and follow his Cree friend Thomas to the reservation; the type of transference in which Joshua engages is more evident in his metaphors:

An Indian man stood at the foot of the driveway and, facing the house, urinated in the snow. He took his unrelieved time about it, sending up a great cloud of steam above his head, catching the last of the sunlight, so that he began to resemble the picture of an angel alighting in an old illustrated Bible. Joshua was relieved because his mother was in the kitchen at the time, peeling potatoes. He kept Janie forcibly away from the picture window. (41)

Despite the religious adoption in Joshua's language, his historical intent is to keep his blood family from his imagined scatological kin. While Williams' rewriting of Rudy Wiebe's Old-Testament Indians doubles native scatology onto Christian spiritualizing in an attempt to naturalize the latter, Joshua's "relief" is only emotional at this point. The use of the Cree as a generalized trope for the body is perhaps inevitable, given the opening scene of the novel where Joshua imagines himself as "David in the cave at Engedi, approaching now so carefully, carefully, to cut the skirt of the sleeping king's robe" (1). In the original text, Saul was not sleeping, but excreting. When culture and acculturized text (the King James Bible) veil the body,

one response is to turn to a culture where bodily functions are more apparent.

In his next novel, The River Horsemen, Williams incorporates a whole range of Plains Cree culture in his characters Fine-day (the shaman in the novel who, historically, survived the Northwest Rebellion of 1885), and Many-birds (the trickster Wisahkecahk, the key causitive agent in Cree mythology according to Jennifer Brown, 120).⁷⁹ With revivalist preacher Jack Cann and a Ukrainian boy, Nick Sobchuk, the two natives paddle a canoe up-river to Saskatoon during the Depression, parodying not only Huckleberry Finn but also Wisahkecahk's mythic canoe-journey during which he helped to restore the world after a great flood (Nelson in J. Brown 46). The ex-convict Many-birds forces Jack to readopt the lost body of Christianity, but this is strictly inadvertent. Many-birds is antinomian and somewhat sinister:

Never have got outa the pen alive if I worried. Keep your mind a blank. Every day drain it dry.

Then I feel something else about to drain. . . .

"Water to water, I say, "dust to dust."

It's what the priest said over Billy Left-hand after he got outa the hole. Throat cut the same day. In the dining hall.

At the last minute I think to stick out my cup. My friends all sit, blinking like owls.

"What's wrong with you birds? None of you ever laugh?"

I put the cup to my lips, swallow fast. Hot. . . .

At once I know a way to beat that fucker, bald Head Moon. Outshine him myself.

The cool air licks at my crack. Between my legs I see the old man grin at last.

"Hey, old man, I think you should kill yourself. That would be the funniest thing. Here, it's easy. So easy a

guy like you could do it. Let me show you."

I flip over the rail, headfirst. I hear them all gasp just before I start to fall.

Upsidedown I grin at a starry sky. Old Bone, I think, your light is put out. You won't dare to show your face again.

Then I land, like a cat, in mud to my knees. (148)

Many-birds' scatological parody here mocks Fine-day, the shaman who has had an initiatory dream of dismemberment, death, and rebirth. Earlier, and therefore doubly the wrong end round in the shaman's narrative, Williams had Many-birds satirize the shaman's birth experience: "'You was born out d'wrong end, old man'" (70). Parody does not attempt to get the culture "right," even though it does still reserve a special status for the sign-maker. Williams thus, like Mitchell, imitates the self-injuring scatological jokes and cultural skepticism of Wisahkecahk.

One of the difficulties with the representation of marginality and race (especially of an oral culture) is that the scatological image can only be coded through the civilizing process and its proxy, writing. This means that with our alphabet it is impossible to be both anthropologically "correct" and still avoid the taint of racism. Williams partially avoids this through parody, but Brian Moore has greater difficulty. Although the natives in Black Robe consistently turn the scatological image against the Normans, they are still bearers of the image, scatological and 'low.' On the other hand, when Moore has Annuka vomit after bludgeoning her captor to death, this

represents a fairly recent decorum about the treatment of enemies that may be historically inaccurate, but he does so to make her sympathetic. The imaginative effect of the scatologizing of marginal races seems to be that while the author maintains a civilized persona (as writer), he also embraces the marginal position, so that the repressed culture and its trope (the scatological body) become another basis for a revised aesthetic. As with class, the effect is partly an increasing rhetorical identification with the 'low.'

As with class, the rhetoric of racial marginality creates status ambiguity for those at the margins who wield the alphabet. Michael Greenstein notes how Jewish writers maintain the marginality of the Diaspora against Zionist institutions (Greenstein 12). Greenstein's deconstructive reading, however, does not address the writer's class position. If, as has often been argued, "literature is elite-oriented" (Craig 19), we may be witnessing the broadly based production of new elites along ideological and intellectual, not racial or class, lines. As mediator between "lower" and "upper" levels of language, the writer retains the rhetorical advantage offered by the position of the marginal by identifying his persona (Jake, Joshua) in some way with a lower class (by means of genealogy or by having him mock authority). To call Klein "marginal" (Greenstein 5), is inaccurate, unless "marginal" refers to

the way in which most verbally inventive authors need time to acquire a fit audience. Jewish class positions have generally been higher than other non-Anglo racial groups (Marchak 31, Porter 80, 85), and Richler (sometimes defensively) plays out this role of 'marginal yet not marginal' through the reactions of Jake and Joshua to the scatological body.⁸⁰

The class solution, in which the writer mediates between "upper" and "lower," cannot always work in the topos of race. Greenstein notes how Richler uses "the coprophile" to debase Jews who have conveniently forgotten their origins (Greenstein 157), but we must add that Richler also has other criteria when he divides his Jews into those who do not deserve to be defiled (Jake Hersch) and those who do (Harry Stein). Both Jake and Harry acknowledge their racial past, but Harry, a cruel man, is punished legally and symbolically (when Jake shuns him). In this Richler expresses, as all writers do, a more specified version of the power that shares out society. As well, Richler's alternation between Yiddish and English can solve the writer's status ambiguity by combining a marginal and a dominant language (just as Tomson Highway does with Cree, Ojibway, and English), politically, the birth of Israel in 1948 has complicated the question of marginality for Richler and Klein.⁸¹ The paradox already existed for A.M. Klein in the 1950's as Terence Craig has argued (126), even when

Israel was still a marginal proposition, and presents itself in The Second Scroll through the narrator's attempts to find a Jewish epic poet. The political incarnation of racial power in Klein and Richler is met with uneasiness: neither actually scatologizes the Jewish state since they identify with its racial basis, but both mistrust the position of power from which all states operate (having suffered a version of that power at French- and English-Canadian hands).⁸²

Klein's distrust for the material representation of culture ensures that the literary form which the celebration of culture and race once took, the epic, will not answer to the search even though Klein personally allied himself with the Zionist cause.⁸³ The circumspect "Poet of Tiberias" replaces the epic poet or novelist, and writes only aphorisms. Two of the seven reported poems rely upon scatology:

Pity emetic and the enema, Terror (83)

and

On the clearing of the swamps at Esdraelon

The little arrows pierced; we fevered; we pissed black.
Anopheles, his hosts! (83)

In the first poem the chiastic play on Aristotle's metaphor creates a neo-classical but scatological and abbreviated aesthetic. Although the collected works of the Tiberias poet have been read as a burlesque of Imagist doctrine (Spiro 222), they only sound satirical if we determine ahead

of time that scatology is inevitably satiric. Spiro notes that part of Klein's purpose in the first poem is mimetic--"to produce an elementary image of terror, some of the physical effects of which are vomiting and diarrhoea" (222)--and admits that in the latter poem the satire is less apparent (224). In the latter, the scene is the epic reconstruction of Palestine, but, by means of scatology and aphorism, Klein retains the position of marginality vis-a-vis epic literature and, by means of renal malaria, vis-a-vis nature. Although Klein elsewhere certainly mocks Imagist prescriptions,⁸⁴ in The Second Scroll he arrives at Imagist techniques because of a distrust for the grand traditions of epic which synthesize disparate strands into one culture. It is therefore easier to feel sympathy for Klein's Zionism than for the cultural visions of Pound or Eliot, particularly at a time (June 16, 1992) when Canadian Immigration Minister Bernard Valcourt has tabled a bill which includes the fingerprinting of refugees and would force some specialists (like doctors) to locate in designated rural areas for at least two years.

Richler also distrusts the solidification of race into nationhood. Duddy's acquiring of land is too literal, not quite what his *Zeyda*, raised on the yearning poetry of the diaspora, had in mind. Although the relation between Canadian land and Zionist hopes is not altogether clear in the novel, by the time Duddy possesses the land in stylized

primate manner--pissing his name into the snow--he has clearly compromised himself with power. Richler, Klein, and even those writers who attempt to synthesize cultures hesitate at what Theodor Adorno calls "the premature reconciliation in art and criticism of unreconciled social conflicts" (Fekete 56). This hesitation, born of the experience of racism and not evident to the same degree in the representation of class, occurs especially when writers recognize the beginnings of new empires.

7. Allegories and Sites of Power: Politics and Economics

We have a saying which is 'the mind, Emperor of the body,' though we now, like you, have driven out all emperors and imperialists.

--Ling Huo in The New Ancestors

i

Klein, caught between the desire to affirm a political structure and the reluctance to do so, is certainly not alone in using scatology to address the tensions in a political structure. For many writers resistance is less complex, but in any case, national or party or economic abstractions are embodied allegorically by means of scatology. Barbara Foley convincingly argues that even the most resistant texts are to some degree mimetic.⁸⁵ While we might hesitate to attribute ontological priority to either world or text (Shell 1), the technology of writing is of course symbolic--'other-speak' in the broadest sense--needing things against which to send sonic or post-sonic echoes. This basic symbolism ensures, according to Fredric Jameson, that any attempt to distinguish between socio-political texts and those that are not is "a symptom and a reinforcement of the reification and privatization of contemporary life" (Jameson 1981, 20). Even if the movement towards the civilized self (which we have seen is not always negative) takes part in that privatization, Jameson is nevertheless right in his claim, especially since he, like Foucault, theoretically links the body to what can never be

outside of the collective--the text; the body is that which gives us a particular concern in histories and texts (Jameson 1981, 31). Allegory connects the privatized meaning of any narrative with the polity. We have seen in Part One that the impulse towards privatization is paradoxically but inevitably enacted in the public sphere through personal and social histories.⁸⁶

There are two opposing versions of how power can be registered on the site of the body. The mimesis of World War I repeatedly involves scatology (The New Ancestors 84, The Diviners 90, Two Solitudes 309, Fifth Business 70) as a mimetic marker, a way of substantiating the narrative's "reality." On the other hand, Atwood parodies the analogy of politics and the body in The Edible Woman. Ainsley connects Quebec laxative surveys to a collective Quebecois guilt-complex and to the Quebec language-problem (21-3). Jameson could no doubt show how these two extremes of realist detail and parodic negation convey political meanings, but for the moment I am more interested in a conscious allegory whereby Canadian novelists register political concerns in the body. Despite the negation of political allegory in The Edible Woman, in The Handmaid's Tale the lock-less bathroom doors (58) in Gilead are Foucauldian symptoms of totalitarian control. Because the bathroom retains its signification of privacy, it becomes the site of minor insurrections against the collective. The

handmaids purposely clog the toilet with wads of paper (122), write anti-authoritarian graffiti in the cubicles, and one handmaid begins her escape in the bathroom: "Moira was our fantasy. . . [the Aunts'] power had a flaw to it. They could be shanghaied in toilets" (125). Offred extrapolates from the toilet into politics: "There is something reassuring about the toilets. Bodily functions at least remain democratic" (235). The natives in Black Robe follow a similar line of reasoning against European ascendancy: "Normans shit and eat and bleed and die just like other men" (109). The body, which scatologically registers Offred's sympathy with other victims of Gilead when she retches during the Salvaging (259), is that by which Atwood means to register the past politics of Puritan New England, contemporary politics in Iran, and her fears about the future; but the body is also that through which she imagines the democratization of power.

As in The Handmaid's Tale, there are in Godfrey's The New Ancestors no simply personal bodies--all register power. Pobe-Biney describes his prison term: "They only let us empty our chamber-pots once a day, if we infracted nothing" (192).⁸⁷ Michael Burdener speaks about his wife, Ama Awotchwi, who was a "dirty woman" for President Kruman: "There was no other word for it really than the white word, the urinal word, fucking. . . . 'What is my body,' you said when that latrine-cleaner Samuels offered a chance of your

father's freedom" (141-2). Michael interprets Kruman's erotic domination scatologically, degrading Kruman, but, although Michael means also to degrade Samuels by mentioning Samuels' former job, that job registers an earlier victimhood: avoidance of latrine-cleaning was Samuels' personal stake in political change. A pre-revolutionary incident in which he refused to clean the outhouse pail of Hastings Awotchwi (Ama's father) allegorizes Lost Coast's socialist revolution which, in turn, is an allegory for the bloodless rebellion against British rule that took place in Ghana ("Gold Coast") during the late 1940's. Hastings, from a managerial class,⁸⁸ could not at that time quite put himself into Samuels' shoes, and he said to the boy, "You must not be sullen so" (232).

Later Samuels, working as an enforcer for Kruman's regime, cannot quite put himself into the shoes of the students who challenge the new government (and the new managerial class) with "END TRIBALISM NOW" (180), a slogan which echoes the slogan that former President Kwame Nkrumah used just after the 1949 founding of his Convention Peoples' Party and long before he attained power in 1957: "Self-government Now."⁸⁹ Samuels unconsciously echoes Hastings' imperative by playing with deterministic mutations of the banner's words, until political power is mystified in eternal verities: "End Rain Now! . . . End Rain & Sea. Now. Double Quick-Quick"(180). In sentence mood, play, and

deterministic cynicism, these words parallel Samels' reworked memory of "being God and watching Hastings Awotchwi, in his Senior Service Whites, address that nightsoil pail, 'Do not be sullen so, pail. Do not be sullen, soil sullen, sullied soil, shit sullen, sullied, sullen soiled, shit" (233). By means of this language and structure Godfrey allegorizes his earlier, more general comments on Ghana: "What is happening here, in a word as Marx would say, is the transition of a Western-type parliamentary system into a single-party communistic state. As far as Realpolitik goes. . . the shift is essentially theoretical" (Man Deserves Man 187). Through bodily impingements, especially on and by Samuels and Kruman, Godfrey allegorizes both the sources and betrayals of Nkrumah's slowly-adopted pan-African "socialism."⁹⁰ The incredible optimism, even utopianism, that Godfrey found among Ghanaians in Man Deserves Man (189) is ventriloquized in the novel as an outside voice, coming from the Chinese diplomat Ling Huo: "We have a saying which is, 'The mind, Emperor of the body,' though we now, like you, have driven out all emperors and imperialists" (42). The saying holds true neither in the novel's personal sphere nor, as the Maoist Huo's inability to manage the metaphor shows, in the political sphere from which Huo gets his language.

Despite appearances and despite historicist critics' near-equation of modernism and imperialism, Godfrey's bodily

determinism is not intended to paralyze with pessimism the West African drive toward independence. Gamaliel Harding fears that his son, whom he has long repressed, has joined the Kulungugu killer boys: "They would shit in a church, such children" (281). The implied post-colonial fantasy is parallel to the sodomy in the Anglican church during Yesterdays; despite his initial "moderate" position, 'El Amaliel' (Gamaliel's 'altered' ego in Mali) conspires in the torture of Rusk, the American spy. During the hallucinatory interrogation, El Amaliel transfers Rusk's neo-colonial dynamic from the erotic to the scatologic, just as Burdener did Kruman's: "your very balls are constipated with inklings of conquest. . . a woman is nothing to you, how can you fire your thirteen mile guns into her" (358). Godfrey's refusal to fully identify the narrative with either the post-colonial government or with neo-colonialism is ultimately in keeping with his vision of himself as one who, having worked for CUSO, can mediate between Canadians and the abstractions of statistics about the Third World (Godfrey, "Doomsday Idealism" 416).

Other novelists too register neo-colonialism in the body. In Bodily Harm, the West Indian characters believe that there is "nothing like a Revolution to make the States piss money" (277) and vandalism against the public washrooms used by tourists is the meagre (though unnerving) response to North-South economic inequities. In Under the Volcano that

monarchical representative, the Consul, goes to a toilet which he describes as "this final grey Consulate, this Franklin Island of the soul" (336). There he reads a travel brochure containing unintentional puns--"SEAT OF THE HISTORY OF THE THE CONQUEST: VISIT TLAXCALA!" (336)--setting up an uncalculable homology between the British post-colonial diplomat and the Spanish conquest of Mexico. For the Consul, who has lost his public status, the symbols of imperial office are only displayed ironically in the toilet. A Mexican para-military group of neo-fascists mistake his identity and importance, eventually murdering him as a political threat but in the same manner as they previously murdered an indigenous Indian peasant, the **pelado**, and throwing the Consul into the **barranca** which doubles as a garbage dump and "gigantic jakes" (174). In Lowry's ironic representation of both colonial and post-colonial Mexican authority, then, it is repeatedly the **pelado** who is degraded and destroyed under occupation. The history of the Conquest has frightening consequences in that public place, the private body, self-government again notwithstanding. The Consul sees himself as King Maximilian, the well-meaning and eventually broken proxy of French imperialism in Nineteenth Century Mexico. If the puppet monarch ineffectually challenged the French who propped him on the throne, was he an imperialist or did he become one of the conquered?

For white Canadians, post-colonial experience is vastly

different from Third-World urgency because of settlement patterns, which permitted continuing European control of the Canadian government through the BNA Act. The "scatological" difference between Klein's Moroccan ghetto and Richler's "Canada" is perhaps instructive: "There is no water in the mellah. The mellah's alleys are its cloaca" (The Second Scroll 65). Water is first used for drinking, then for washing hands, then for dishes, then for clothes, then for flushing, while Richler's Herky speaks of four gallons of fresh water per toilet flush. Despite the two different levels of bodily comfort, the racial scatology that we have seen in Chapter 6 occasionally addresses Canadian politics overtly. Bakhtin recognizes scatology as a dethroning gesture (Bakhtin 1984, 372-3),⁹¹ and, even if British monarchical power in Canada is now largely ceremonial, in The River Horsemen we see exactly this dethroning (coded through western populism) when Nick Jr. exposes his penis during the British anthem. Nick Sr. ingeniously defends his son as an imitator of Edward VIII: "The former king give up his throne that way didn't he?" (111). Similarly, when Ginger Coffey, unsure where he is in the darkness, urinates in the Royal Family Hotel, the act has an uncrowning effect no matter how "accidental" Ginger claims that it was. In both novels the characters pay a price for undressing even a figurehead emperor, but these latter-day confusions of the king's "two bodies" underwrite a democratic mythology, and are particularly effective in attacking nostalgic throwbacks

to aristocratic ideology which mask a moral or racial philosophy under the guise of a political philosophy.⁹² Following the tradition of Seventeenth Century progressive narrative, Williams and Moore use scatology to undermine the belief that "honor" in the external social system corresponds to a moral order.⁹³

Dethroning applies to Prime Ministers as well. In Two Solitudes Tallard says, "The French are Frencher than France and the English are more British than England ever dared to be. And then you go to Ottawa and you see the P.M. with his ear on the ground and his backside hoisted in the air" (48). Despite Robert Borden's "democratic" hope to be the populist leader of two divided camps, Tallard's scatological cartooning expresses exactly Bakhtin's populist response to political authority.

ii

What Bakhtin downplayed, unfortunately, was money. "The site of popular uncrownings, the fair, is also the marketplace. . . . Where Bakhtin emphasized the dirt of the fair and the bodily lower stratum, the pedlar displays soap, mirrors and items of dental care, commodities of beautification (particularly for women) of a cosmetic nature. . . . If the fair displayed the grotesque body, it also displayed the 'fair'" (Stallybrass 30, 39). This revision of Bakhtin is crucial in order to see that in

novels like The Edible Woman the disappearance of the national domination of the body does not mean the disappearance of power. The power of the nation over the body's fortunes has often been superseded by the economic power of multinational corporation.⁹⁴ Atwood exposes what Stewart Ewen (after an analysis of the self-critique implied in Listerine ads) calls a "commodity self" (Ewen 47).⁹⁵ Marian's identification with and refusal to eat animals coordinates her role as female victim with her culturally approved anorexia.

As Bryan Turner argues, diet, which was originally intended as a brake on desire, has presently come to signal the enhancement of desire: "the internal management of desire by diet was transferred to an external presentation of the body through scientific gymnastics and cosmetics" (Turner 3). In The Edible Woman the commodity self, created in part by diet, becomes more and more parodic as Marian gradually narrows the list of foods that she can stomach. As well, fashion and consumer packaging can be seen as interchangeable forms of hygiene (Enzensberger 90, 94), and when Ainsley overdoes Marian's make-up, everyone again approves. Marian, however, feels "distaste" when she notices that "her mouth had left a greasy print on the rim of the glass" (255). In this way Atwood forces the "commodity self" or consumer body, which seems clean in the media simulacrum, to appear scatological as well, as if it

involves a new kind of unclean secretion. Atwood thus uses the civilizing process--Marian noticing a form of pollution and feeling revulsion--to attack the "commodity self," which was created, in part, by similar civilized disgust.⁹⁶ This doubleness has consequences for the interpretation of the novel. Whereas early on Clara looks very like a parody (of the back-to-the-farm element in the 1960's counter-culture, unable to keep her house clean and her children from excreting in untoward places), she slowly becomes an alternative to the overly cosmetic culture of Marian and Peter.⁹⁷ But at the end of the novel Atwood cannot stabilize her satire against the economic system of getting and spending. Marian finally eats again. At the very moment that she rejects the commodity self she again becomes a consumer.

Once the body is no longer "with the king," the sources of power's impingements on the body become more abstract and difficult to identify (Barker 12). As Foucault argues, the last three hundred years have seen a large-scale dispersal of power into bodily details. A telling case occurs at the end of Beautiful Losers. Cohen seems aware that his repressive hypothesis in regards to the Jesuits is already out of date in the age of subliminal seduction, but he nevertheless rents the ending to the Jesuits as if they were still the narrative's antagonists. Whatever historical repression the Jesuits stood for has long been written over

by the incitement to speak about the erotic and the anal.⁹⁸ The leasing out of our biology to the corporations (Kroker Technology 79) is the real present imitated in Beautiful Losers, a present which gets effaced when Cohen (too late in history) attacks the old corporation, the Jesuits. The field of play for F. and then for the narrator is the technological sensorium; the field of coercion is that of the Jesuits. Even though Cohen teases out the effects of present technology just as often as he teases out the clichés of print, he only hints at the way in which F.'s anal climax is produced by the dictates of the pornography industry.

William Gibson is more explicit about how corporations design their messages on the body; in his futuristic dystopias, corporations (mostly Japanese) control the bio-tech trade in body parts.⁹⁹ A character like Turner, who retains archaic (that is, Twentieth Century) individualist attitudes, vomits to see how the human body is co-opted when a Sense-Net executive recovers company property--the eyes of the dead star Jane Hamilton (Count Zero 94). Business, at best, creates new virtual environments for the disencumbered mind; at worst it repeats (on a different level) the early Twentieth Century assembly line in front of a computer terminal. Much like Williams and Moore, Gibson gives the new king a body. In Neuromancer Henry Dorsett Case, who had always believed that the real powers were more or less than

people, invades the computer cores of the Tessier-Ashpool Corporation and is surprised at "the soiled humanity" of Ashpool's room (203), much as Marly is in Count Zero when she arrives, years later, in the same place and senses the same thing--"a darkness that smelled old and sadly human, a smell like a long-abandoned locker room" (195).

Atwood works more subliminally in The Edible Woman, where a man who claims to be doing an underwear survey makes obscene suggestions to women. Technically he appears to be a parasite on an otherwise "legitimate" function of consumer culture, but Atwood purposely confuses consumer culture with "private" transgressions against woman. As Bakhtin claims, stupidity and misprision often point out the flaws in a discourse; Atwood pretends to be unable to negotiate between social tensions (a traditional function of the novel)--and she therefore indicts not just a particular perversity, but an entire economic system's victimization of women.

Both Gibson and Atwood reposition "things" at the centre of what more and more threatens to become an abstract economic sign. Again we are in the realm of allegory, but now, dealing with economics, we can easily see that it is not only the novelist who allegorizes. Reading Duddy Kravitz, we might (rightly) conclude that through Hugh Thomas Calder's "shameful little experiments with money" in the urinal (194), Richler means to allegorize avaritia in medieval fashion.¹⁰⁰ But money, Freud insists, is an

allegory with feces as its referent, feces being the original form of exchange. The child has no money of its own, except what is given, and during toilet training feces becomes the first material thing which it is in the child's power to give or to hold (On the Transformations of the Instinct as Exemplified in Anal Eroticism 131).¹⁰¹ Money's significance, psychoanalysts claim, depends upon the value with which the child regards its feces (N. Brown 293).¹⁰² Calder, putting \$100 bills in the urinal and then guessing who has pulled them out, reveals a deep ambivalence about the self-made, or rather money-made, man--which he believes he is.

Freud's identification has serious difficulties: psychoanalysis fails to engage its own reliance on paid therapy with its "discovery" of the money-filth complex (Schell 196f), Freud unambiguously uses the economic metaphor elsewhere in an honorific way (Heinzelman 9), and other forms of material exchange (toy-sharing and food-sharing, for example) may predate toilet training.¹⁰³ Nevertheless, Freud isolates an important image-pattern in Western literature; like language, currency and credit exchange systems are undoubtedly allegories, at least allegories for labour, production, or land.¹⁰⁴ In Mark Hurdlestone patrimonies (entirely divorced from labour) are necessary and honored, and money appears not as a sublimation of feces but of eternal life into social

status.¹⁰⁵ Even so, Hurdlestone handles his gold as a material thing, to be occasionally fondled. Grove's Hannan, in order to get in with Philip Branden (and steal his money), calls Howard's bankroll "filthy trash" (A Search for America 115). If early Canadian novels hint at the money-complex, post-World War II novelists make conscious use of it specifically to embody and devalue money or commodities. Hagar Shipley compares her constipation to being "locked like a bank vault with no key" (The Stone Angel 191). In Black Robe, the natives define the French so that French mercantilism is equivalent with scatology in identifying the self: "They are the shits who love furs" (66). Ozias Froats and Mamusia in The Rebel Angels both pay money for feces, Froats to his test group (109) and Mamusia for her bomari (155). The humour of Davies' satire against the town-hall crusader Murray Brown depends upon Freud's logic. Brown wants to stop the university from spending money on Froats' experiments (in which feces is analyzed in order to somatotype individuals); despite the scatological associations of his name and namesake, Brown is unconscious of the Freudian meaning of sublimated money. Ladoo reverses the terms but not the equation in Yesterdays. When Choonilal and Tailor argue about the latrine, the real issue is whether or not Choonilal will mortgage the house for Poonwa's Hindu mission to Canada (5). When Poonwa demands the money, Choonilal feels the need to defecate (32). In The Story of Bobby O'Malley Agnes's purchase of a white

marble headstone for her husband, Ted (184), effaces the real man in an expensive revision of his character. Ted himself had called the toilet his headstone (184), but the commodified burial practices which deny the body of his death also deny his scatological individuality.

More than other Canadian novelists, Richler develops this reverse allegory, in which exchange value is purposefully reduced to scatology. Herky in St. Urbain's Horseman criticizes the restaurant merchants who see toilets as non-productive units.¹⁰⁶ In Duddy Kravitz Jerry Dingleman corners the market on Mr. MacPherson's classroom merit cards. The system of exchange that MacPherson hopes to create--an accumulation of time off from school in exchange for good behaviour--is subverted in the bathroom (8). There the boys gamble for the merit cards and the cards lose their symbolic function as indulgences, becoming pure (and manipulatable) capital, which attaches itself arbitrarily to the winner of 'nearest-to-the-wall;' the site of this transformation ensures that "good," "high," and "neat," (MacPherson's moral code) is degraded and revealed, by means of the boys' instincts, as a materialist system. However, although Richler's economy approaches the symbolism of Freud, the boys evidently have no difficulty leap-frogging over Freud's intermediary (and literalistic) step of precious metals (coins) to the more abstracted representation of paper money.

Historically the shifts from specie to fiduciary systems do not occur easily since the newer systems always provoke questions about the relationship between the monetary sign and its substantial referent,¹⁰⁷ but the boys immediately recognize the power of authority to provisionally abstract itself from its delegated symbols. The boys--Dingleman, then Duddy--who subvert MacPherson, finding new markets outside of MacPherson's feudal arrangements, graduate to larger economic systems where they authorize credit and expenditure. Duddy learns from his father's material and circumstantial worship of Dingleman, the "Boy Wonder": "he's got a whang that could choke a horse. I know, we had a leak together once" (60). The sidelong glance that mythicizes, coordinates capitalist successes with virility. By the end of the novel Duddy has entered his father's material romance and Max gives his blessing by mythologizing Duddy (315), the newer boy wonder.

iii

But the ascription of bodies to political, corporate, and monetary authorities or, conversely, to the people who suffer under these powers can be very ambiguous. While the racism associated with nationalism may explain Richler's resistance to economic nationalism, the satire against Duddy co-exists uneasily with Richler's public support of Canada-U.S. Free Trade. Materialist criticism freezes capital, but capital's injunction is to keep moving (Baudrillard 1980,

106). Baudrillard describes a circuit in which desire and the unconscious are "the trash heap of the political economy and the psychic metaphor of capital" (1980, 94). The "repressed" portion of the self (money, anal eroticism, or a conflation of the two) enters a novel and is dismissed (or not) by the novelist as immoral; that "repressed" portion can loop back to confirm not its dismissal but its own continued presence. For example, Duddy and the boys initially appear as desires (to manipulate capital, not to pledge allegiance to entrenched authority) and a system (capitalism) that Mr. MacPherson has repressed. But, what Dingleman/Duddy signifies is that MacPherson's system of feudal responsibility always was driven by capital and not by moral right: MacPherson could command the price of a day off because he controlled the boys' time in school. The effect is something like the doubts arising about the Renaissance aristocracy after the sale of honors (McKeon 151). If Richler satirizes the capitalist, capital and Duddy "keep moving" as Richler's picaresque novels allegorically insist upon a free market. In Richler's later novels (where the image of the rich artist unconsciously represents the businessman), the self-made character constantly reappears and, as in The Apprenticeship of Duddy Kravitz, repeatedly provides a human face and body for capitalism. In Count Zero and Neuromancer although the corporations are reduced to individual bodies by means of scatology, the "cyber-space cowboys" (as they are known)

confirm the individualist myths that informed American capitalism.¹⁰⁸

The perhaps insoluble problem may be that the body is consistently imagined by novelists to contain an integrity above political and economic considerations. In what Octavio Paz calls the shift from the old "economy of things" to the new "economy of signs" (not so new if we keep in mind Plato's Gorgias) bodily reference is never secure--not for the novelist, not for the critic. In Two Solitudes Marius identifies the working men as those who sweat and stink. The man with the most positive reaction to Marius's anti-conscription speech is the one who also stinks the most. This too-ready identification of labour with a scatological sign appears to be MacLennan's, not just Marius's, since it appears again in a different context (115).

More unconsciously, The Collected Works of Billy the Kid conveys a specific and recent historical allegory. Ondaatje means to address the problem of beginning orders, for which the American frontier is the mimetic surrogate, and he creates an initial differentiation between Billy and the animal: "The windows looked out onto fields and plants grew at the door, me killing them gradually with my urine. . . . I saw no human and heard no human voice, learned to squat the best way when shitting, used leaves for wiping, never ate flesh or touched another animal's flesh, never entered his boundary" (17). This disingenuous version of Billy

almost implies that he can be read as a Paleolithic artist antedating American frontier politics. Ondaatje sets the systematically urinating Billy's destructive human nature against other natures in the Freudian terms of repression and civilization, but more specifically, since the book was written during the time when the American frontier was displaced onto Southeast Asia, Billy's minimal defoliant unintentionally echoes the billions of tons of defoliant (Agents Orange, Blue, and White) that American planes dropped on Vietnam while ensuring a free market. An Americanist mimesis of the frontier can perhaps not avoid some inertia of the usual symbolic codes of the Western--which often links a free market in weapons with the rugged individual. Even a theriomorphic moment in Coming Through Slaughter is not exempt from political gestures. Buddy Bolden seems to put his destructive rage to order on pause when he mimics the way a dog urinates and scuffs dirt over the spot. But this is more than a "little sensa humour" (90). In imitating the dog's "system" (90), Buddy does not change order for pre-order; he exchanges one kind of order for another, beginning again with a very simple sign-system--the primate excretory marking code which is territorial and proto-political, indeed is "hound civilization" (90) as Buddy, intending to be ironic, remarks.

Ondaatje wants to display individual artistic activity as

subversive of political structure. In Running in the Family the schoolboys must write lines in Sinhalese: "We must not urinate again on Father Barnabus' tires" (83). Freedom, on the other hand, consists in writing rude expressions; this links the boys to the graffiti poets of the Fifth Century B.C. who wrote on the despot king's rock fortress, and to the campus graffiti during Sri Lanka's 1971 Marxist Insurgency (84). Scatology thus signals a folk voice of political protest, one of the terms whereby Ondaatje, like his fellow Ceylonese poet Lakdasa Wikkramasinha in "Don't talk to me about Matisse" (85) posts himself far from modernist complicity in imperialism. Given the graffiti politics in Running in the Family, it is not astonishing that when Ondaatje deals with the artist's lust for destruction (in The Collected Works of Billy the Kid) he should want to prevent the reader from taking the driven artist as a political symptom. Indeed, the picaresque hero (Duddy, Billy), ordinarily represented as an individual will (I would add body) in contest with the force of authority (McKeon 97), becomes highly ambiguous once we recognize that he can embody the **collective** will (and body) of a powerful society.

This also provides offer an interesting gloss on Haliburton's Tory humour. The competition between the traditional Nova Scotia fishing/shipbuilding economy against the new capitalist economy of steam and steel (Naylor

297-302) is ignored in Sam Slick's "ciphering," as Slick brings the railroad down to practical matter by filling out the allegory of debt: "the Nova Scotians. . . have been running back so fast lately, that they have tumbled over a bank or two. . . . A bear always goes down a tree starn foremost. He is a cunning critter; he know 'taint safe to carry a heavy load over his head. . . . I wish the Bluenosers would find as good an excuse in their rumps for running backwards as he has. But the bear 'ciphers;' he knows how many pounds his hams weigh, and he 'calculates' if he carried them up in the air, they might be top heavy for him" (The Clockmaker 25). Slick at this point moves to actual calculations in favor of the railroad, but the initial naturalizing tendency in the analogy deflects assessments of who loses and who gains by railroad construction. More broadly, the naturalizing of bank interest calculations ("all natur' ciphers" 26) contains just enough of the bear's "starn" to make the banks and their economic policies seem homely, but not enough scatology to degrade the economic system. If, as has been suggested, Haliburton is the Victorian heir to Swift,¹⁰⁹ Haliburton is much more circumspect and stable in his satire than Swift, with a greater sense of propriety when it comes to business and capital. Swift's excessive scatology challenges the polity in a way that Haliburton does not.¹¹⁰

Nataie Davis argues for a comprehensive process in which

transgression confirms authority in its role, blows off steam from the political system, and yet momentarily licenses (thereby prefiguring) alternatives to the system.¹¹¹ Depending upon how we read the emphasis, Duddy, Billy, and Sam Slick can seem like transgressors or the ventriloquized voices of the free market newly naturalized. The power of scatological rhetoric and quite reasonable expectations about mimesis make circumspection about bodily reference rare. This lack resonates in the positivism of a work like Not Wanted on the Voyage where Findley writes as if the body were an entirely unproblematic signifier of political resistance. However, although Findley ignores the historical Ezra Pound's economic ideas in Famous Last Words, he also undermines Pound's mastery over Twentieth Century poetics by questioning the Imagist aesthetics wherein the "thing" is emperor. Pound says that he wants to drown like Li Po chasing after the image of the moon (or a young lady's behind) in a pond, and originates his attack on Mauberly in the body: "at least I am not impeccable: stiff from spats to collar. And I don't wear gloves when I undo my flies. And I am not a flit" (81). The Imagist poet acts as if a visual sign of unfashionability were enough to excuse his actions, as if his presence in his own body could excuse the suffering of others, as if even the poet's willingness to suffer in his own body because of his words could excuse the suffering caused by his propaganda campaign on behalf of Mussolini's fascist government.¹¹² On a "tour of Ezra's

mind" Mauberly encounters "mounted heads and horns and hooves without bodies" (80), an indication that Pound has not fully judged the physical implications of his radio speeches. For once, though not for long, the aesthete comes off rather well in the allegory of body and power.

8. Hygiene Guidelines for Virtual Bodies: Science and Technology

With regard to the meanness, or even the filthiness of particulars, for which (as Pliny observes) an apology is requisite, such subjects are no less worthy of admission into natural history than the most magnificent and costly; nor do they at all pollute natural history, for the sun enters alike the palace and the privy, and is not thereby polluted. . . . For what is deserving of existence is deserving of knowledge. . . . Nay, as the finest odors are sometimes produced from putrid matter (such as musk and civet), so does valuable light emanate from mean and sordid instances. But we have already said too much. . .

--Francis Bacon, Novum Organum

Under the microscope. . . . we look at earwax, or snot, or dirt from our toes, checking first to see that there's no one around. . . . Our curiosity is supposed to have limits, though these have never been defined exactly.

--Elaine Risley in Cat's Eye

My repeated recourse to social allegories and the unspoken limits of ideological structures could make scientific reasoning about scatology an extended footnote to rhetoric. Stallybrass and White turn science into simple ideology, discounting, for example, Nineteenth Century miasmatic theories of disease as purely social signifiers; such is not my intention even though works like John Bourke's Scatological Rites of All Nations in its encyclopedia of primitive scatomanancy confirmed racial and

colonial hierarchies, even though I have already emphasized that disgust for scatology long antedates Pasteur,¹¹³ and even though washing has been used in Canada to lacerate offenders against the code: a shower bath, perhaps for its "educative" possibilities, was in fact used as a punishment in Kingston Penitentiary between 1855-9, but was discontinued after Samuel Moore in Auburn State Prison died of it in December 1858. Nevertheless, we cannot discount the way that many novels--however "ideological" and inseparable from a preceding social discourse they be--refer in some way to the world. One of the weaknesses of political, especially utopian readings of "the material bodily lower stratum" is that the author's scientific understanding may be sacrificed to rhetorical clarity.

In Cat's Eye, Elaine mocks both the women who fear dirty toilet seats (253) and the discourse which once encircled polio with a broad range of possible contaminants, making it "something you breathed in or ate, or picked up from dirty money other people had touched" (8). She, like Stallybrass and White, lives under the confidence that bacteriology begets. When Susanna Moodie, writing 130 years earlier, had Juliet Whitmore go bravely among the infectious poor (Mark Hurdlestone 153-4), the episode may not have been as condescending as it now appears. In Roughing It in the Bush, where the format of travel narrative obviates the need to flourish a heroine's selflessness, Moodie reported that

the sewers in Montreal were opened in order to purify the place and to stop the cholera. Ernst Platner, a late Eighteenth Century authority claimed that dirt could obstruct the pores and hold back excremental humours (Corbin 71). Analogies between body and world (relying on such biochemistry) likely led to the opening of the sewers, but Moodie did not trust the theory and instead connected sewage with the cholera, claiming that the opening "loaded the air with intolerable effluvia" (51). Although the miasmatic theory that Moodie (and Melville and De Mille) got from early Nineteenth Century science proved just as wrong,¹¹⁴ the stakes--a 60% death rate among the infected, 4,000 cholera deaths in Montreal and 3,800 in Quebec City between June and September of 1832--make it difficult to dismiss her association of poverty, odor, and disease as the social distinctions of one who imagined herself as a gentlewoman. Moreover, the popular intuition that cholera was connected with odor and effluvia was confirmed (though not in the way expected) in 1849 when John Snow mapped the disease in London. He noted the contamination of the water supply with raw sewage, had the Broad Street pump changed, and saw the epidemic wane. The reinterpretation of cholera as a water-borne disease (Marks 191-207), however, did not gain widespread acceptance until after Moodie's death.¹¹⁵

Stallybrass and White are correct to argue that "the mapping of [London] in terms of dirt and cleanliness tended

to repeat the discourse of colonial anthropology" (130),¹¹⁶ but they assume that the ideology of sanitation can be separated from the referent of cholera. Referring to cholera from the distance of Twentieth Century antisepsis, they speak as if the disease were constructed by discourse, and as if the ego structured in language bore no relation to any body. The actual situation was quite complex. Cholera was both the effect of class difference, since poorer quarters were less sanitary, and a contributing cause of class antagonism, since cholera confirmed the upper classes in their avoidance of the "dirty" poor, while many of the poor blamed an upper class conspiracy for the high incidence of lower class infection (McGrew 62, Heine 64-75). Moodie's body was under more danger from the collective than ours are, and, seen from that perspective, her attempt in Mark Hurdlestone to mediate between upper and lower classes at the point of disease does not seem quite as high-handed.

Even if Moodie had known of Snow's findings, miasmatic theory arguably has a physiological basis. Stallybrass and White treat the sanitary reformer E. Chadwick's claim--"all smell is, if it be intense, immediate disease" (quoted in Stallybrass and White 139)--on the level of class differentiation, but smell is a cue that allows vertebrates to recognize spoiled food. The tendency to generalize and group smells may be better approached as something that must be painstakingly unlearned in a social context--as a

construction of the primate ego, not just of a "bourgeois" ego.¹¹⁷ This is not, by any means, to reassert a version of medical materialism by assuming that there are hidden hygienic reasons which explain social or religious purification rites.¹¹⁸ Ama Awotchwi, in The New Ancestors, rejects her earlier westernized self, that "total-foolishness girl. . . . seeking scientific remedies at Kingsway or U.T.C. for her bowel disorders, her menstrual disorders" (156). In Joshua Then and Now, Joshua notices a certain Hebrew anxiety in his father's explanation of sex: "There seems to be an awful lot of washing up involved, Daddy" (68). But if Godfrey implicates science in imperialism, and if Richler qualifies Maimonides, the Twelfth Century Spanish rabbi who argued that every aspect of Pentateuchal law had a hidden medical reason, Godfrey is also an apologist for western technology and Richler also ridicules discourses which forget the medical referent: Aunt Ida, newly literate in psychology, explains that Uncle Benjy's cancer is psychosomatic (The Apprenticeship of Duddy Kravitz 236). Once we analyze the different ways in which novelists on the edge of science undermine or confirm the categories of hygiene, it is important to remember that hygiene, when it orders fictions, makes a double reference to what is known about a real, permeable body (which can easily be put in danger), and to a rhetoric which maintains vested social or religious interests.

Scientific hygiene can be a key term in the hierarchical organization of past and present. One form of this is in the use of the filth cure to signify the pre-scientific. Western education about what is clean and what is not lets the **bomari** in The Rebel Angels signify the 'primitive' for the reader as well as for the novel's academics. Likewise, during a trip to the fictional Caribbean island of St. Antoine, the narrator of Bodily Harm is given a surprising remedy for sea-urchin swelling--urination on the infected foot (192). Harold Ladoo, representing a very different Caribbean society from Atwood's, nevertheless reports a filth cure for Balraj's and Rama's scorpion bites. Nanna feeds the two boys roasted scorpion, they urinate in his hands, and he rubs the urine onto their hands and even into their mouths while reciting mantras from the Hindu scriptures (No Pain Like This Body 50-1). Ladoo's reference to the filth cure is most instructive because it signifies the past in a complex of ways. Since Ladoo writes about his native Trinidad (the fictional "Carib Island") from the distance of Canada and a Canadian university education, the past is partly biographical. Ladoo's representation of homeopathic magic (a scorpion as an antidote to a scorpion bite) and sympathetic magic (the destruction of a scorpion to gain power over the scorpion venom in the boys' bodies) sets Trinidad beneath an implied Western rationality. The biographical allegory is thus also cultural, since the two forms of magic are the most prominent ones displayed as

signs of the primitive in the implied cultural genealogy of Sir James Frazer's The Golden Bough. Ladoo does not connect his description to any science of homeopathic inoculation, but gestures back to a naive medical tradition which maintains that "the main principle of any 'physick'" is "its nasty taste or smell"--the use of filth to drive out filth--a tradition which extends back into the Middle Ages (Rawcliffe 212) and which occasionally reappears in advertisements, such as those for Buckley's cough mixture and for Listerine.¹¹ Ladoo's interplay of magic, Hinduism, and filth cure suggest a composite past controlled by a skeptical authorial voice. In the case of Bodily Harm, the mimesis has some referential basis, because urine has been and still can be used as an antiseptic providing it is fresh (Rosebury 178, Anthony Smith 448), but the readers of Bodily Harm, The Rebel Angels, and No Pain Like This Body are made to feel as if a disappearing past is being recovered for the post-scientific self. In each of the three novels the filth cure makes the past radically other vis-a-vis the "scientific" present, whether that other is treated ironically (Ladoo), as folk wisdom (Atwood), or as desirable arcana (Davies).

In order to challenge "scientific" hygiene, Elizabeth Smart and Wayne Johnston have it appear less subliminally in their work. Smart straightforwardly connects bacteria with life: "For a moment, there, things eased up inside me, as

if the boil would could might sometime somehow burst, and the passionate artful truthful poison get out into the timely compost heap in time, in time to contribute its germs" (The Assumption of Rogues and Rascals 113).¹²⁰ Johnston too defends bacteria in a marvelous satire preceding Bobby O'Malley's stage kiss with Mary Hart. The director, Sister Haymond, wants to counterpoint St. Joseph's (Bobby's) kiss on the Virgin Mary's (Mary's) cheek with "the somewhat less chaste kiss" that the two children imitating "the restrained, respectful passion of the modern Catholic family" (110) will perform--but Bobby's mother, Agnes, is still uneasy:

My mother. . . was the only person in Kellies who opposed even the chaste kiss. "My concerns, I assure you, are purely hygienic," she said. She had long believed that people were contagious, "not just when they're sick, but all the time." She said the body was a breeding-ground; it was a little-known fact that each of us carries around inside us at least one of every kind of disease-causing germ known to man. "Our germs can't hurt us," she said. "Disease occurs when people start exchanging germs." She said we had to keep a proper distance between ourselves and others. We must imagine ourselves encased in a sterile bubble, and let no-one come inside it. "Remember the bubble, remember the bubble," my mother liked to say. "If someone comes too close, step back." What about married couples and families, I wondered. My mother said that, by the grace of God, a man and a woman became "immune" to one another at marriage. "I'm immune to your father, and he's immune to me." It worked with children, too. "We're immune to you, and you're immune to us. Isn't that wonderful?"

The problem with Mary Hart, my father said, was that her germs were bigger than mine. Her germs were "bully germs" that had been lifting weights and jumping rope since birth. My mother denied this, saying that Mary's germs were not bigger, "just more numerous." (112-13).

While Agnes is Catholic, in the nosological recuperation of the doctrine of original sin her discourse parallels Cotton

Mather's description of microscopic life, except that Johnston (non-Mosaically) suppresses the diseases of the father:

The egges of these Insects (and why not the living Insects too!) may insinuate themselves by the Air, and with our Ailments, yea thro' the Pores of our skin; and soon gett into the Juices of our Bodies. They may be convey'd into our Fluids, with the Nourishment which we received, even before we were born; and may ly dormant until the Vessels are grown more capable of bringing them into their Figure and Vigour for Operations. Thus may Diseases be convey'd from the Parents unto their Children, before they are born into the world. . . . And Vast numbers of these Animals keeping together, may at once make such Invasions, as to render Diseases **Epidemical**; which those particularly are, that are called, **Pestilential**. (Mather, The Angel of Bethesda quoted in Limon 78)

Johnston uses hyperbole ("contagious. . . all the time," "one of every kind of disease-causing germ," "let no-one come inside") as a solvent to weaken the scientific referent of such discourse, and he has Agnes's husband use anthropomorphic language to reveal the bias with which she inflects the microbiological level.¹²¹ But the most devastating image is that of "the bubble." In both its precise reference--the sterile environments manufactured for immunodeficient children¹²²--and its broader hint at existential discourse, the image sets hygiene and isolation (under the sign of religion) against scatology and community (under the sign of secularism). The existential horror in The Story of Bobby O'Malley is that the family members do become effectively "immune" to one another. Johnston's angst is precisely opposite to Moodie's fear of the cholera.

Whereas Moodie represented the fear of disease through contact, Johnston fears the social and religious appropriation of a scientific discourse which would use scatology to naturalize "proper distance."

The attack on scientific hygiene is often paradoxically associated with an ecological impulse.¹²³ Wiebe in The Temptations of Big Bear intends Cree scatology to represent an unrepressed bodily intimacy; he implicitly recommends repression of the "black belcher" (138), the locomotive which signifies the waste-creating and ecologically imbalanced intrusion of white civilization. This effect is heightened when Big Bear mistakes a distant train for a line of buffalo.¹²⁴ Mitchell's Stoney Cree in The Vanishing Point are also depicted as scatological and thus "natural," while white civilization is reluctant to acknowledge excretion even as it follows Enzensberger's market pattern, turning the world into a waste (Enzensberger 98). Mitchell's civilization defecates grandly at one remove via industrial waste, but inhibits defecation on a personal level in the native and the child--the Fyfe Minimal Subsistence Cookie, an oatmeal cookie made to prevent starvation among the Cree constipates them (91); Carlyle Sinclair's Aunt Pearl is overly zealous in toilet training him.

Mitchell's rhetoric discourages large-scale industry but encourages the relaxation of personal hygiene. The logic of this split signification depends heavily on Freud. Industry

is understood as displaced bodily function, and yet at the same time Mitchell substitutes cathexis for a lament about the objectification of nature in the American "will to technique" (G. Grant 183-4). Mitchell emphasizes the oil field's "stink of hydrogen sulfide" (28) and Dr. Sanders offers a psychoanalysis: "Your anal erotic Aunt Pearl--responsible for the whole mechanistic mess we're in. . . . sent us all to play in the technological toy room--she's still burning her string you know--in that great bathroom in the sky. . . . if only she'd toilet-train the hydro and pulp and gas and oil and the little automobile boys--before they do it all over the whole wild green broadloom" (243-4). What would the cathexis of an entire industry look like? On the personal level, Mitchell confirms Dr. Sanders' interpretation of Aunt Pearl's white stool as a sign of the overcivilized anal erotic. Aunt Pearl is a fictionalization of the hypothetical character in Freud's Character and Anal Eroticism (1908), and Mitchell seems directly indebted to Freud's An Evidential Dream (1913), in which the analysand defies an aunt who wants her to be a nun. Aunt Pearl is the exact image of this Aunt-Superior--orderly, possessive, repressed--and both belong to the folklore of the maiden aunt. Granted that Mitchell is not working in a narrowly realist mode, his use of scatological symbolism is, however, deceptive, particularly in the matters of constipating oatmeal cookies and white stool. Oatmeal is fibrous and thus would aid, not prevent, excretion. As well,

psychosomatic conditions cannot turn stools white; a blockage in the outlet of bile (which contains the pigment stercobilin) into the small intestine, or an excess of fat are required.¹²⁵ In Mitchell's case, "what is known" is unconsciously (not ironically) sacrificed to the symbolic and humorous effects of white constipation. Although Mitchell uses language adeptly, his elisions from a real body limit his ecological assessment.

Those novelists--Gibson, Cohen, perhaps Bowering--who engage the technological sensorium, generally share Johnston's and Mitchell's fear of disembodiment. They do not focus primarily on hygiene, but use scatology as a counterweight against technological advances which threaten more than hygiene to turn the body into a virtual body, and older versions of the real into simulacra. Gibson's Henry Case spends most of his time beside (but for all real purposes inside) a "cyber-space" computer deck. This deck projects "his disembodied consciousness into the consensual hallucination that was the matrix" (5) and, in creating a computer simulation of the world, invites new responses to biology: "Sometimes he resented having to leave the deck to use the chemical toilet" (59). In order to stay in the matrix and in his "virtual" body for more than eight hours, Case hooks up a "Texas Catheter" (168). "It is difficult to deny at least a parallel between [a] 'hard' technocratic version of society and the ascetic effort that was demanded.

. . of the most highly developed industrial societies in order to make them competitive" (Lyotard 12).

Although Gibson does not equate humanity with scatological functions--the Artificial Intelligence Wintermute creates a "man," Corto, who eats, sleeps, and masturbates, but who stares into space during his spare time--scatology nevertheless becomes a basic constituent which still allies Gibson's characters with past times. Human affect is signalled by the scatological--a sympathetic bartender's tooth decay (Neuromancer 3), Turner's nausea upon receiving raw computer data (Count Zero 23), Jones' grime under his fingernails (216). Against Virek's transcendental and disembodied search for the fountain of youth, Bobby Newmark's experience of simulation engenders an abject but more human version of the self. Virek comes very near to the condition which McLuhan calls "angelism." "At the speed of light. . . everybody is discarnate, a nervous system without a body" (Letters 515). "Electronic media literally translated us into angels. On the phone 'we are there' and 'they are here,' and so with radio and T.V." (Letters 422). Virek's here-and-thereness is convincing but false because he appears in holographic images. On the other hand, Bobby's mother's wholesale entry into her simstim soap operas--she even drools a little during good shows (33)--sets up new social relations and self-perceptions for Bobby: "He still harbored creepy feelings

that some of the characters she talked about were relatives of his, rich and beautiful aunts and uncles who might turn up one day if only he weren't such a little shit" (34). The illusory corporeality of the elevated actors in the new media are directly linked to the abject version of the self. This historicizes Kristeva's "abject mother": since Bobby's mother had "jacked that shit straight through the pregnancy" (34), she is not only the biological and psychological inscription that Kristeva theorizes, but also a **technological** inscription of the abject.¹²⁶

Scott Bukatman has suggested that Gibson is complicit with technological advance, that by making the virtual world of the computer phenomenal Gibson gives these microscopic sites a deceptive corporeality and that science fiction deceptively compensates for the loss of human agency in a technological society. David Porush conversely argues that science fiction's techno-inoculation serves as a way for the writer to preserve a core of humanity within new simulacra (171). Certainly Gibson addresses a world in which 'all that is the case' may be technologically simulated. Marly comes to such a conclusion in Count Zero: "the sinister thing about a simstim construct, really, was that it carried the suggestion that **any** environment might be unreal" (139). Towards the end of Neuromancer, Case lands on a beach where the dead live again and considers his state: "Hot urine soaked his jeans, dribbled on the sand. . . . You needed

this world built for you, this beach. To die" (234). Although Case on the beach becomes a figure for the civilized man deprived of his technological productions, we discover that even the beach has been simulated by the artificial intelligence, *Neuromancer*. In Gibson's sufficiently advanced technology, scatology too is condemned to the virtual and the problem of "angelism" is heightened in *Neuromancer*, where Case splits into two selves. Gibson does not exempt literature from his definition of simulation: "I think that a number of reviewers have mistaken my sense of realism, of the commercial surfaces of characters' lives, for some deep and genuine attempt to understand technology" (quoted in Gunn, 117). The question of simulation is thus transposed from bodily realism to the level of the artwork. The characters in *Count Zero* discover in the end that the Cornell boxes sold anonymously to art dealers throughout the narrative are the productions of an artificial intelligence which puts together human waste in an evocative art of garbage: "They send me new things, but I prefer the old things" (226). In a marvelous ventriloquism of agency, the computer itself wants to support Porush's humanist thesis.

It is much less clear whether Leonard Cohen prefers the old things, because although *Beautiful Losers* evokes a pre-scientific cosmos and scatologizes the disembodied aspects of modern popular culture, his ethnographic collection masks

a profound skepticism about recuperation. "Are the stars tiny after all? Who will put us to sleep? Should I save my fingernails? Is matter holy? I want the barber to bury my hair" (6)--the accumulation of questions and desires does not mean that the narrator is serious about saving his bodily ejecta from the malignity of sympathetic magic, but that all times and beliefs have become a playground for the present.¹²⁷ Of course the present too is a playground for the present. Of going to a movie, the narrator says, "I have to take my eyes out for a pee. . . I've leaked all over the kitchen from all my holes, movie will stuff pores with white splinters and stop my invasion of the world, missed movies will kill me tonight" (68). Cohen predicts what Arthur Kroker calls "the phase of designer bodies" when F. and the other boys ritually remove the narrator's wart in the school bathroom and in the name of science (110), and when F. includes "the sphinctre kit" as part of the Charles Axis programme for F.'s human creations. In each of these instances, the scatological supplement to the implied technology (or "technification" of the body in the latter two examples) seems to subvert F.'s will "to stop bravely at the surface" (4). Nevertheless, with the present as with the past, the overdetermined satire means that the will to play supersedes most embodiments and most orientations of past "magic" to present "science."¹²⁸

All Cohen's characters in Beautiful Losers are

relentlessly scatological. However, in the fear of the technological appropriation of biology¹²⁹ (which is not really evident in Cohen) the image of the disembodied scientist becomes important. This figure appears everywhere in Gibson's work, from the artificial intelligence which recreates Corto and which manifests itself in the holographic image of another scientist, Finn, to the cyberspace cowboy who does the practical work of science while avoiding the bathroom. The figure also shows up in Cat's Eye, although Atwood's realist conventions refer more to present society. Elaine's brother, Stephen, gets a chemistry set which makes "horrible smells" (109), but even though he also gets carsick (his only weakness) and urinates words into the ground that are "like his real writing" (72), he progressively rejects the realm of the scatological. His early Baconian project to measure and extend the limits of what is known comes to refer to astronomy, not to his youthful magnification of earwax. Elaine, but not Stephen, understands his scatological nicknames for teachers as a reversion to his true self (233). During the plane hijacking which eventually kills him, Stephen hopes that there will be no pants-wetting among the passengers.

This rationalist persona is not, of course, merely a construction of Stephen's, but belongs to the cultural fund of clichés as Cordelia's joke on Elaine indicates: if the person who catches fishes for a living is called a fisher,

what should a collector of bugs (Elaine's father) be called? When Elaine answers as expected, Cordelia says, "He's an entomologist, stupid. You should be ashamed. You should have your mouth washed out with soap" (144). The joke satirizes the dignity that the Greek suffix confers upon scientific and other selected academic occupations. The novel's epigraph furthermore makes Stephen into a parody of British theoretical physicist Stephen Hawking, who in the popular press appears as the disembodied and over-cerebral scientist, naturalizing the topos of body/mind conflict in the image of the quadriplegic, and invigorating the topos with the moral force of the marginalized person.¹³⁰ Stephen Risley's--actually Stephen Hawking's--astronomy pushes Elaine into the virtual; when he describes the stars as echoes, she feels as if her body is dissolving (110). But Atwood intends the image of Stephen writing "the whole solar system, three times over, in pee" (72) to have another effect: framing the impulse to name and investigate the supramundane as a biological situation which belies the disembodied conclusions. Against the trend towards cybernetic models of the human, which "subsume the messiness of the human observer's role into a system of positive math" (Porush 375), Atwood's mimesis reduces the scientific impulse until it is not so different from Elaine's hard education in the laws of hygiene, especially as they apply to gender.

Not entirely separate from the figure of the scientist is that of the doctor. Lennie Kravitz, Richler's budding doctor, does not become "another Pasteur" (The Apprenticeship of Duddy Kravitz 173), but a back-door abortionist. Lowry's Dr. Vigil makes vast claims on his office front for the extent of his knowledge. "[The Consul, passed Dr. Vigil's windows on the far side: Dr Arturo Diaz Vigil, Medico Cirujano y Partero, Facultad de Mexico, de la Escuela Medico Militar, Enfermedades de Ninos, Indisposiciones nerviosas - and how politely all this differed from the notices one encountered in the mingitorios! - Consultas de 12 a 2 y 4 a 7. A slight overstatement, he thought" (69). Even though Lowry contrasts the doctor with the urinal, the Consul's sensitivity towards exaggeration undermines the public printed discourse of the doctor, even if only in regards to hours. Bowering's Dr. Menzies in Burning Water is both scientist and physician. George Vancouver wants to urinate on Menzies' precious ferns (46) even though the cartographer (Vancouver) and the scientist have both done fundamentally the same thing in North America. In this implied power struggle between European political and European scientific ends, the scientist comes out less tainted, but the effect is merely local as elsewhere Bowering's Amerindians collapse romantic poetry and scatological implications into technological activity. Reasoning from the absence of women on the ship, the "second Indian" arrives, deductively, at an

explanation of European scientific and explorative advance as a male activity: "Maybe when men fuck men all the time they learn the lore that takes them great distances on wingèd homes filled with useful objects made of iron" (148). This bit of social logic is of course not meant to be taken seriously, but it does tie the bearers of technology in with anal sexuality. Gibson's and Atwood's scientists, the doctors of Richler, Lowry, and Bowering are created unable to escape the scatological significations of the body.

If via the image of the scientist we loop back to The Rebel Angels and to Davies' desire to gain access to primitive arcana via the filth cure, we notice that this desire is articulated through Ozias Froats, a biologist who analyzes people's feces and who therefore belongs to both the modern (and respectable) typology of the scientist as measurer, and to the older (satirical) typology that Bakhtin elucidates of the doctor or alchemist as scatophagus holding up a bottle of urine (Bakhtin 1984, 179). Medical science followed the contributors to the Hippocratic anthology in the belief that urine and feces could symptomize struggles within the body (Bakhtin 1984, 357; McGrew 104). The analysis of urine began to be applied to specific diseases in the second half of the Eighteenth Century with, for example, Matthew Dobson's important discovery in 1776 that the residue of diabetic urine smelled and (in what we might call a curious learned intersection of measurement and

scatophagy) tasted like sugar (McGrew 74). While Davies satirizes Froats' personality, he does not satirize Froats' alchemical science. In devising the "lost" letter that connects Paracelsus and Rabelais, Davies ignores Rabelais' attacks on alchemy. Rabelais' alchemists claim to cure seventy-eight kinds of illnesses with turds (Pantagruel 3:464) and Queen Quintessence sits on the close-stool by proxy (3:654). For Rabelais as for Swift excrement functioned to demythologize science. During Gulliver's voyage to Laputa he visits the grand Academy of Lagado, a parody of the Royal Society, and sees one particular researcher who is a parody of Baconian investigation into mean particulars: "His Employment from his first coming into the Academy, was an operation to reduce human Excrement to its original Food, by separating the several Parts, removing the Tincture which it receives from the Gall, making the Odour exhale, and scumming off the saliva. He had a weekly Allowance from the Society, of a Vessel filled with human Ordure, about the Bigness of a Bristol Barrel" (Swift 1965, 173). Davies may well have had in mind another Swiftian version of this tradition from "A Discourse Concerning the Mechanical Operation of the Spirit, Etc." in mind: "Certain Fortune-tellers in Northern America, who have a Way of reading a Man's Destiny, by peeping in his Breech" (Swift 1939, 186). But Davies never gets too precise or too satirical about the nature of Froats' excremental operations. For Davies scatology's evocation of

past time moves it outside of science or the critique of science into a perception in which dung is lyrical.¹³¹

Similar authorial impulses suspend Froats uncomfortably between science and popular images of science. As a measurer of excrement, Froats succeeds the Sixteenth Century scientist S. Santorius, who measured ingestion and excretion and whose emphasis on quantitative measurements are part of the tradition that led to William Harvey's discovery of the circulation of blood.¹³² As a student of somatotyping, however, Froats follows the popular but discredited work of W.H. Sheldon, whose constitutional psychology has proved so far to be a dead end. Davies does not appear conscious that Sheldon's ambitious correlations between body type and personality were not found by subsequent researchers, and Davies' "science" has fooled even the ablest of critics. Elizabeth Harvey, for example, treats somatotyping as an established technique, and repeats Davies' uncorroborated assertion that penicillin began as filth therapy (Harvey 93). Other authorities give far different accounts: "Body type and personality type correlate about 0.80 in Sheldon's work; however, such high correlations were not found by others" (Peyser 1037). "Both ancient medical texts and folk traditions recommend the use of molds, especially in wound dressings, but there is no known connection between these folk practices and the modern discovery of penicillin, which is strictly a Twentieth Century achievement" (McGrew 247).

Like Hugh MacLennan in Voices in Time, Davies unwittingly takes somatotyping more seriously than it deserves. Patricia Monk, who more carefully acknowledges the weaknesses of constitutional psychology (97), defends in detail Davies' uses of and departures from Sheldonian orthodoxy. Although the referent in somatotyping fails, Monk shows how Davies uses it to address the relations between the body and the soul.

"It is not dangerous, as in a medicinable drug, whether in an old tale or report, be it thus or thus, so or so" (Montaigne 73); nevertheless, while literary references to the body convey psychic and social structures, the referents outside the text cannot be discounted. The artist must submit to the rigour of what is known, argues Émile Zola (D. Grant 40) and, if it seems anachronistic (especially where fantasy and postmodernism come under discussion) to cite realist jealousy of the scientific method (D. Grant 31), the reader, if not always the artist, is constantly involved in measuring the text against "what is known." Even a ludic departure from the history of science like Burning Water depends for its rhetorical effect on its status as departure. Even an unconscious departure like The Rebel Angels cannot be understood except as departure.

9. Polluted Women

The Lord said to Moses, "Say to the people of Israel, If a woman conceives, and bears a male child, then she shall be unclean seven days; as at the time of her menstruation, she shall be unclean. And on the eighth day the flesh of his foreskin shall be circumcised. Then she shall continue for thirty-three days in the blood of her purifying; she shall not touch any hallowed thing, nor come into the sanctuary, until the days of her purifying are completed. But if she bears a female child, then she shall be unclean two weeks, as in her menstruation; and she shall continue in the blood of her purifying for sixty-six days."

--Leviticus 12:1-5

"When a woman has a discharge of blood which is her regular discharge from her body, she shall be in her impurity for seven days, and whoever touches her shall be unclean until the evening. And everything upon which she sits shall be unclean. And whoever touches her bed shall wash his clothes, and bathe himself in water, and be unclean until the evening. And whoever touches anything upon which she sits shall wash his clothes, and bathe himself in water, and be unclean until the evening; whether it is the bed or anything upon which she sits, when he touches it he shall be unclean until the evening. And if any man lies with her, and her impurity is on him, he shall be unclean seven days; and every bed on which he lies shall be unclean."

-- Leviticus 15:19-24

i

If hygiene and the disgust for dirt have referents outside of social rhetoric, they have nevertheless

repeatedly been used as social controls--perhaps most notably (as the work of Atwood indicates) to demand of women a clean and proper body. During a gender analysis of reader-oriented literary theories, Patrocinio Schweickart wonders, "where does the text get its power to draw us into its designs?" (27) Schweickart's answer is that the individuating impulse of a male protagonist arouses, even in the female reader, an authentic desire for "autonomous selfhood" (28). The limits of this explanation become clear when applied to consistently ironic texts, but Schweickart provides a crucial link between gender theories and the scatology. Schweickart's "autonomous" self becomes not a simply a figure of the enfranchised woman, but bears the trace of all civilized values, and she refuses to jettison those symbolic and real values even while criticizing the patriarchal symbolic order under which they were constituted.¹³³ One of those values--language--is, according to Elaine Showalter, "the site of a covert struggle for gender meanings," and the acquisition of language constitutes gender under what Jacques Lacan calls 'the Name of the Father' (Showalter, "Rise" 1, 3). By 'the Name of the Father' Lacan means those structures in language which implicitly prohibit and permit certain actions; these prohibitions not only maintain a patriarchal system, however, but make possible the civilized self, as feminist analysts have suggested: the Name of the Father "confirms in the child its attempts to situate itself in reality" (C.

Burke 110). The problem, therefore, is not simply that the traditional representation of the civilized self has been formed under the sign of the male. The general constitution of the civilized self against the scatological symbolism of origins also holds true for the female self--as the novels of Thomas, Laurence, Roy, and Atwood have already shown in Part One. The problem is that many novelists (both male and female) have tended to represent women at the discursive extremes--as either over-civilized or polluted by the scatological.

Where does this split discourse come from? One of the ruses of power is that those who are privileged demand a greater cleanliness from social subordinates (Elias 137) even as, perhaps because, those subordinates are imagined to be dirtier. It is thus impossible to understand gender as "difference" without some recourse to the institutionalization of male /female hierarchies (Showalter "Rise" 4). Secondly, the traditional use of women as exchange commodity has made virginity and other forms of cleanliness an important part of market value, even while the bodily and abject images generated by childbirth add a psychological pressure that increases the woman's association with "pre-civilized" pollution (Kristeva 1982, 52-4).¹³⁴ In the Nineteenth Century the production of a female civilized self through education in courtesy included a strong anti-scatological component. Retention of bodily

ejecta was considered by many educators at girls' schools as the trait of a gentlewoman, since it symbolized **not giving in** to bodily urges (Corbin 174). During the contemporaneous growth of bathrooms, women were enjoined not to let anyone, including their husbands into a bathroom while they were inside (Vigarello 215-16).

In Mark Hurdlestone, Mary Matthews' unfortunate maleness (noted by the narrator and later by Juliet and Anthony 139, 148) is expressed in "coarse jokes" and "profane songs." O'Hagan, Richardson, and Haliburton are even more straightforward. Selva, in a bar, hears a man say "the world's a piss pot. And I've been all around it looking for the handle" (The School-Marm Tree 101). Her shock at the mild colloquialism marks off male and female worlds, just as Clara de Haldimar's shock at the sight of blood in Wacousta marks her sphere off from that of the British soldiers. Clara reproduces the Indian wars when she and Ellen Halloway (who has gone native) fight for possession of a knife, but when Ellen grasps the naked blade Clara faints at the sight of the blood that she has been the means of shedding, and this marks her off even from her feminized brother Charles de Haldimar. Haliburton has Sam Slick beat a man's wife to make her tractable, and Slick raises welts where no one can see. With a certain degree of cynicism, Slick transgresses civilized boundaries and then invokes those very limits, counting on the woman's greater civility: "I calculate you

won't be over forrard to show 'em [the welts] where they be" (122). Grove follows a similar, if more sublimated, pattern. For him female civility is a very thin veneer, but his idealist demands on women are great. Grove's Settlers of the Marsh represents bodily bases of motivation in both Niels Lindstedt and Clara Vogel, but Clara is also (in the tradition of St. Jerome) the cosmetic mask of passion which Niels must see through in order to recognize the death's-head underneath. She is humanized, but only momentarily when she imagines her degradation: "you want to fling me on this. . . this manure pile here" (153). Only when the ideal sphere of womanhood (which Grove both demands and distrusts) is threatened, can Clara become sympathetic. By comparison, Ostenso's Wild Geese (like Settlers of the Marsh published in 1925) does not demand the same ideal sphere of Judith Gare, and Judith is therefore not polluted by her associations with manure.

More surprising is the appearance of this pattern of the over-civilized woman in quite recent novels where the writer is not attempting a mimesis of early Canadian society. In The Story of Bobby O'Malley, Agnes O'Malley can "never admit to using the bathroom" (13). She believes that men are erotic and scatologic, while all women are potential nuns. In this way Johnston makes her enunciate what was and is really a male discourse: for example, medieval Catholic commentators suggested that because virgins were more

continent than others, their urine was also clearer (Not in God's Image 142).¹³⁵ Against such over-civilization of women, a state which must always seem like naive sublimation in post-Freudian epistemologies, Johnston's men repeatedly insist upon the body. Schoolboys color kleenex red to mock Flo's menarche; encouraged by her dismay, they color more and more kleenex Flo is confronted by "a whirling vortex of sanitary napkins" (50-52). Even though one girl, Philly, farts in public without suffering socially, Johnston's mimesis generally implies that the woman herself, not any social discourse, is responsible for the failed attempt to manufacture a clean and proper sphere. Indeed, Johnston's Agnes is doubly bound. Because Ted stands in for the scatological body, she can either let her civilized persona be degraded or set herself apart; however, because setting herself apart is not intellectually reputable in Johnston's epistemology, the option that he has her choose also degrades her sphere of rationality.

In Robertson Davies' system, art comes from a scatological underworld; this immediately sets art in dialectic with the sphere of sophisticated culture that Davies' novels always aspire to, and the dialectic is especially evident in the figure of the female artist. Since Hulda Schnakenburg, the graduate student composer in The Lyre of Orpheus, wears pants with a "yellow stain around the crotch," her dirt is "the real thing" (25) lending

substance to her music. But toward the end of the narrative Davies has her washed, dressed up, and, in an unconscious echo of Elias (court, *courtois*, courtesy), taught to curtsy. For Davies' male protagonists (like Magnus Eisengrim) the civilizing process is not so clearly coded through hygiene. Hulda is first placed among civilized women and only then welcomed as a civilized artist.

ii

At the other extreme are the women who remain constituted by their bodily ejecta: Thomas's Rachel in Latakia, and Smart's personae in By Grand Central Station I Sat Down and Wept and in The Assumption of Rogues and Rascals. Traditionally this would make Thomas's and Smart's protagonists 'polluted women,' but, given the materialist epistemologies that we have noted, pollution becomes a positive rhetorical value. The two writers in Latakia, Rachel and Michael, fight over whose turn it is to clean the bathroom (41); Rachel at first interprets this in primarily social terms: "Prince Charming probably chose Cinderella because she was the only one who could do housework" (87). In The Double Ghetto: Canadian Women and their Segregated Work, Pat Armstrong connects female subordination to the low prestige of household tasks (66). Despite new developments such as vacuum cleaners, automatic washers, and dryers, cleaning work has not really diminished because standards of cleanliness are rising (71), and the partial integration of

Canadian women into the workforce has generally not resulted in a lessened demand upon them to do housework. Thomas goes a step past social analysis, connecting the cleaning and not cleaning of toilets directly to Michael's aesthetics. He types and recites his novel out loud so that Rachel can hear him making progress while she is in the bathroom (30, 70). But he cannot urinate in a dirty public bathroom (113), old bodies disgust him (117), and Rachel implies that precisely because Michael ignores household chores his repression of the material world is much greater than her own: "How are you going to write if you can't get outside yourself?" (118) Rachel asks, and insists that she has a "greater faith in the material" (124).

Although she discounts Michael's claim that men and women write differently (133), she has reached exactly that conclusion. And, although Thomas sometimes treats Rachel with irony--for example, Rachel wants Michael to recognize that people cleaned him up as a baby (119), while she herself has temporarily abandoned her children--Thomas nevertheless emphasizes the social and literary importance of Rachel's experience. One of the first things that Michael learns to say in Greek is *kake gine* which Thomas translates as "bad woman" (50), but which has etymological connections with dirt and scatology. One of the most notable things about Thomas's writing is her rejection of the well-made plot, for which she substitutes the minutiae of

emotional and bodily states.

Men write with a larger historical framework, says Michael (133); his condescending theory seems to hold for the narrator of By Grand Central Station I Sat Down and Wept, who gives only passing mention to World War Two (even though the novel was completed in 1941 and published in 1945): "Why should even ten centuries of the world's woe lessen the fact that I love? Cradle the seed, cradle the seed, even in the volcano's mouth" (90). Elizabeth Smart hints at historical referents through the idiot child born at the end of the novel, yet the female body supersedes history's impingements: "I can only wait, like an egg for the twenty-first day" (100); "Nature is using me. I am a seedbag" (113). The same supersession occurs in The Assumption of Rogues and Rascals (1978) even though the body is much changed. Replacing the tragic "seedbag," is a constipated old woman: "The breakthrough is a bit bogged down. But on, on. . . . It will pour. The worry will there be paper enough. Look after the paper. Nappies too; though you can never really believe that a baby will come out" (107). The metaphors claim a symmetry between female body processes and the process of writing, giving the female writer an authority to compensate for the lack of formal schooling (and Smart an authority to compensate for her innocence of critical theory): "what about. . . the wiped-out pioneers and lonely women agonizing at their too-far-off

water holes? The long meaningless care of their outdoor lavatories? So girls, I recommend a study of manure, and the great rising and falling and fertilizing principles, which are not sad" (109-10). Smart's narrator thus agonizes for the extra-textual and scatological body, while history (of pioneer women, of single mothers) is merely axiomatic. The refusal of sadness is particularly poignant since Smart had to write throw-away articles for women's magazines to support her four children, no doubt while John Barth's Max Spielman of Giles Goat Boy studied postmodern proctology on a grant at Johns Hopkins.

Whatever personal exigencies led to Smart's comic closure, one need look no further than the scatological metaphors to notice how a feminist approach to history makes the association of woman and body problematic. Male rhetoric from Aristotle to Freud has emphasized that women, often through excremental metaphors, stand in for the body. Aristotle believed that women contribute the **matter** to the foetus, while men give the **form**. Women's disorderliness was thus founded on physiology. Until the revolutions in chemistry, women were believed to be composed of cold and wet humours. Hebrew skepticism about the surrounding high cultures and their mythologies was often coded through a rejection of fertility practices and, therefore, through a rejection of women in favor of paternity (Schneidau 90f). Jerome, Tertullian, and Augustine associated women with

filth because women represented an immediate danger to celibate and ascetic callings. Roger Caen in 1095 said that women are dung covered by white skin, and the bodily association of women was an important term during the centuries of witch hunts.¹³⁶

To explain the psychology of this discourse, Mary Douglas says that pollution clusters around sex because sex is potentially explosive. But this does not explain why women historically have seemed to be more susceptible to sexual pollution than men. In Freudian psychoanalysis the association of women and scatology occurs because of childbirth; the bowel contents are given the meaning of baby by the young child. Because of the young child's ignorance of the vagina, Freud claims, the child believes that babies must be evacuated via the only route possible--the anus--a route which indeed is used among amphibians. The difficulty is that when these references appear among patients, Freud always detects a homosexual current, so that whatever is female becomes a filiation of male sexuality. Therefore, in Freud's attempt to explain, he also extends the old discourse in which the female body is a trope for suppressed aspects (homosexuality, excremental functions) of the male body. More importantly, Freud ignores the social code through which the anal birth is articulated,¹³⁷ an omission which Canadian novels correct. The 'abject foetus' appears in The Invention of the World where Wade labours to bring

himself into history and work by farting (158), in A Jest of God where Rachel confuses a uterine tumour with a child, and in The River Horsemen where, according to Nick Sobchuk Sr., a Ukrainian woman gives birth: "When I come up to her, she had a baby dropped in the back of her skirt, like a bloody shit" (73). None of these novels suggest Freud's sublimated homosexual referent, though all three, in different ways, make use of the more general Freudian typology of feces and death. Laurence also addresses the psychology of motherhood through Rachel's reactions against her own mother and 'child,' while Williams' Nick Sr. clearly uses his anecdote to undervalue the labour (childbirth and housework) of his own wife, a patriarchal discourse which Nick Jr. unlearns only with great difficulty.

Because the metaphysical epistemologies at the heart of the Judeo-Christian patrimony have to some extent been reversed (as we shall see in Chapter 9), it is not surprising that theorists like Gilbert and Gubar, Cixous, and Kristeva, in attempt to also reverse power structures, have retained the figural association of woman and body. Gilbert and Gubar emphasize how privatized bodily experience has often operated at the boundaries of and deformed the public alphabet (22). Natalie Davis has shown that in medieval times sexual inversion could give "positive license to the unruly woman" (147). Male speech, argues Hélène Cixous, "deprives him, he knows, of his own bodily

territory" ("Medusa" 247). Cixous projects a new woman who engages in "systematic experimentation with the bodily functions. . . . By writing her self, woman will return to the body which has been more than confiscated from her, which has been turned into the uncanny stranger on display--the ailing or dead figure, which so often turns out to be the nasty companion, the cause and location of inhibitions. Censor the body and you censor breath and speech" ("Medusa" 250). Kristeva follows Freud by asserting that the child "crosses" the maternal bowels and thereupon takes the mother for the abject.¹³⁸ The body becomes a guiltless authority (the order of the mother), split off from the other universe of "socially signifying performances" (the order of the phallus, 1980, 74). While Kristeva has felt uneasy under the sign of feminism and does not reify these differences into biological orders (despite her metaphors), she privileges the writer who allows the mother--abject and scatological--play in the text.¹³⁹

This extension of what the 'polluted woman' means has come under the critique that for the new French feminists the body is too exclusively pleasureable (Eagleton 205). In fact, a social imperative may be operating in this 'pleasureable' body: according to the International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, research via projective techniques (onto inkblots and pictures) suggests that among females there is a moderate increase in body references

beyond age fifteen, compared to a decline among males. D.J. van Lennep interprets: "in Western culture men are supposed to transcend their bodies and turn their energies toward the world. Women, on the other hand, are given approval for continuing and even increasing their investments in their bodies" (Fisher 115-16).

The undercurrent of social oppression in Thomas and Smart suggests that they are aware of the limits to their bodily texts, even though the work of Thomas and Smart approaches Kristeva's notion of the 'feminine-gendered' text. Thomas's Mrs. Blood knows that Jason, her husband, has bought her nightgowns in a bargain basement, which she associates with lysol and dog excrement. More crucial than his economic devaluation of her is Jason's role in her split into Mrs. Blood and Mrs. Thing. Although as Mrs. Blood she subverts patriarchal structures, it was Jason's demand for an abortion that put her, forever after, in conjunction with bleeding. The patriarchal context of this bleeding does not associate it with radical female measures of reproductive control (like abortion or the diuretics which were believed to induce menstruation and prevent conception, Not In God's Image 126); neither does the context fully confirm Kristeva's assertion that excrement represents danger from without while menstrual blood stands for danger from within (1982, 71). Mrs. Blood is lacerated both from within and from without.

The association of women with the body is important because it posits a female narrative, originating in a female body, against the usual male narrative form of tumescence and detumescence (Winnett 509). However, Thomas's focus on violence and power qualifies the rhetorical utility of 'polluted' women. Kristeva recognizes as much when she says that defilement rites are evidence of the attempt by two powers (not necessarily men and women) to share out society without a central authority (1982, 70). In the Canadian novel, scatology often becomes a much more literal register of male oppression. Among Moore's French and natives the derogatory comparison of the warriors to women--"Are you a bunch of pissing women, then?" (Black Robe 200)--covers up the way that Neehatin, for example, always gets his wisdom from his wife before he presents it (as his own) in council. In No Pain Like This Body female suffering, both from within--"I bleed blood to make dat chile" (20)--and without--"You shut you kiss me ass mout and cook!" (66) is registered scatologically, while in Shakespeare's Dog Anne Hathaway changes diapers and takes her husband's "squirt" (123) between her legs: in Rooke's revised standard version, Shakespeare's life is killing her.¹⁴⁰ Sexuality is likewise the site of male violence in Eye of the Father, where Magnus sodomizes his unfaithful girlfriend. In The New Ancestors, Ama Awotchwi Burdener inherits the soiled underwear of her estranged husband, Michael, in a dream (119). Michael eventually recognizes

that social violence is mostly male when he sees that in Mali Islamic law puts a severe taboo on menstruation while ignoring V.D. (314).¹⁴¹

Maria Theotoky, whom Davies constructs as a physical model of idealized femininity in The Rebel Angels, is harrassed by Urquhart McVarish, who uses Rabelais' question--"why is it that a young lady's thighs are always cool?" (Gargantua 1.39; The Rebel Angels 50)--to validate his desire to degrade her. Friar John's answer in Gargantua--the coolness comes from shade, a sort of wind, and something like rain--was at least partially a class attack and was evidently meant to subvert the courtly love tradition. Bakhtin defends Rabelais on precisely this ground: against idealization Rabelais gives women a material body which simultaneously degrades and regenerates (Bakhtin 1984, 239-43).

Davies, however, much more than Rabelais, deals consciously with the social roles in which gender and scatology meet. McVarish's instrumental use of Rabelais qualifies the exorbitant pleasure-giving language by tying the fun to a specific context in the power relations between men and women.¹⁴² Of course, Davies neutralizes the potential criticism of Rabelais by having Maria study him, defend him, and occasionally play Rabelaisian roles herself. Much less insidious than McVarish's harrassment are the attempts by Penelope Raven and Maria to deconstruct

perceived gender roles. Professor Raven says "You've no idea what the whole concept of womankind owes to sphinctres!" (185) Although the emphasis is biological, 'womankind' is nevertheless understood as a social construction; Maria, less circumspect, shouts obscene verse in a restaurant (74). The linguistic play upon her name extends from the mother of Jesus to the alchemist Maria Prophetissa to the *bain-marie*, the rejuvenating dung-bath which, we are told, derives its name from the second-greatest Mary--Miriam, Moses' sister. These symbolic accumulations are compounded because of the way that the violin in the *bomari* is described: "the great lady is undressed for her sleep" (155). The Swiftian echoes in this objectification of women do not reduce Maria despite what one might expect after reading Swift's "Strephon and Chloe" or "Cassinus and Peter." The danger runs the other way: 'woman' is both contained and scatological container, both the work of art and the scatological process without which the violin will lose its timbre. It is possible to see, in such a characterization, simply another version of the split between over-civilization and extreme abjection; however, by giving Maria such a wide range of signification and then allowing her, unlike Hulda Schnakenburg, to refuse the extremes, Davies avoids nailing her to an archetype.

More compelling rejections of the split discourse appear in the work of Munro and Atwood, where the over-civilized woman and the woman who stands in for the body are both clearly social productions. Although Del Jordan hates the well bred girls who would not use the town toilets (131), she occasionally seems no different: ordinarily she will not say that she has to go to the bathroom in front of men (Lives of Girls and Women 159). But the contextual reference to courtship rituals suggests that Del's over-civilized persona is not self-created, but follows what men seem to want. For Violet in Munro's novella "A Queer Streak" the documents from the past are "full of filth. Horse manure. Set out in rows. On purpose. Inside my trunk in my own house" (249). The duplicitous sign "horse" gestures at both her dead horse, King Billy, and her dead father, also called King Billy--to whom Violet's sister, Dawn Rose, once anonymously wrote "You ought to be thrown down the toilet hole head first. You bowlegged stupid rotten pig. You ought to have your things cut off" (220). The wording of Dawn Rose's anger hints that Violet's later propriety and desire to forget the scatological past may really be a desire to forget some kind of sexual abuse.

Male coercion also appears in Who Do You Think You Are, where Rose's urine retention is entirely circumstantial: she avoids the school outhouse only because it has been the site of rape. As a potential victim (like Franny McGill),

Rose cannot be overly dismayed by a civilizing process which produces new washrooms inside the school, allowing the children to be supervised more easily. Neither scatological nostalgia nor bodily renunciation are essential values in Munro's text. When Rose needs to protect herself against male violence, she avoids the washroom; when, much later, she feels intimidated by a perfect housewife, she shares (with Jocelyn) the role of the scatologist who satirizes cleanliness:

"Do you use that special stove-knob polish?"
 "I certainly do. And I use the special stove-knob cloths that come in that special package."
 "That's good. Some people don't."
 "Some people will use anything."
 "Old dishrags."
 "Old snotrags."
 "Old snot." (101)

Munro's complex gendering shows itself particularly when Rose, to protect herself against the culture's demand for the type of female beauty that Cora epitomizes, reminds herself that Cora's grandfather cleaned out latrines. Rose only seems to be the satirist--since she really does worship Cora's image--and she critiques the 'clean and proper' body from the position of one who pretends (who **must** pretend) to be cleaner and more proper than she really is. Although the structures of gender have implications for the body, recourse to the body as an essential value clearly cannot 'solve' the power structure.

Atwood at times uses the discourse which equates the

feminine with the body. In The Handmaid's Tale, the future is, for most purposes (including gender), the past. Because of the cultural premium placed on reproduction in post-nuclear Gilead, menstruation is understood as failure, so that the female body's normal discharge comes to seem (as it historically often has seemed) like a pollutant (69). Gileadean women are not allowed a refuge even in difference. "Think of yourselves as seeds" (18), they are told, an intended self-identification which makes use of the biblical metaphor for semen-- male sexual discharge. Against these conscious repressions, an unconscious discourse forms, a sensuous focus on eggs and ovaries (104, 131). The only moment of community in the novel centres around the abject in childbirth. In Cat's Eye the female body too centers around blood discharges, from Mrs. Risley's miscarriage which creates an enlarged image of what could be an egg--"a huge oval splotch of blood" on the mattress (178)--to Elaine's hyperbolic satisfaction at finally getting her period (244). Although Elaine for a long time believes that she is above gender and blames Susie's big rear for Josef's indifference, the gynecological insistence of Susie's blood after her attempted abortion destroys Elaine's complacency (339). Marian in The Edible Woman recoils from the women at her bridal shower: "What peculiar creatures they were; and the continual flux between the outside and the inside, taking things in, giving them out chewing, words, potato-chips, burps, grease, hair, babies, milk, excrement,

cookies, vomit, coffee, tomato-juice, blood, tea, sweat, liquor, tears, and garbage. . . . She felt suffocated by this thick sargasso-sea of femininity. . . . She wanted something solid, clear: a man" (The Edible Woman 185). Whereas Atwood represents consumer culture as pure surface and surface rhetoric, a discourse which does not really acknowledge **bodily** consumption at all, the female is associated with that which goes on underneath in a real, not a media, body. Atwood therefore gains a rhetorical advantage against the patriarchy much as Thomas does, through exactly that sub-sphere to which the feminine has traditionally been relegated.¹⁴³ Once Marian breaks her engagement to Peter, the shift in power shows itself in muted scatological insurrection: "In a spirit of gay rebellion Marian neglected to erase her bath-tub ring" (296).

But there is a flaw in Marian's vision of the female body: the details of consumption and excretion that she provides (except "babies" and "milk") apply just as easily to the male body. The real problem, Atwood implies through this, is the split discourse. In The Edible Woman, sanitary napkins are much less surely the signifiers of femininity than in The Story of Bobby O'Malley. The survey supervisors appeal to female solidarity in attempt to get interviewers to do the sanitary napkin survey (120); Atwood, however, hints that the suppliers are compromising feminism

commercially. Elaine learns, in Cat's Eye, that female education into a clean and proper body is broader than any specific injunction. At first she thinks that Cordelia is her tormenter, but Cordelia is merely a personal face for the demands of consumer culture, which appear in women's magazines, the demands to get rid of toilet germs, unwanted odors, and pimples: "I see that there is no end to imperfection, or to doing things the wrong way" (148).¹⁴⁴ Grace Smeath succumbs to the discourse; over-constituted as a civilized woman, she will not climb because others might see her underwear (66), but Elaine's cutting out of the paper women and her whole artistic enterprise is an attempt to gain control over these female images. She also recognizes that even the most euphemistic scatological language is a subversion, "of Grace and Mrs. Smeath, of tidy paper ladies pasted into scrapbooks" (134).

For a time Elaine is convinced that access to scatological language will break male power. She knows that it is not simply obscenity, but the back-and-forth play between 'higher' and 'lower' languages that gives a particular male discourse its power, and she imitates this play:¹⁴⁵ "'I wonder what Mary did for diapers? . . . How come there are no pictures of Christ on the potty? I know there's a piece of the Holy Foreskin around, but what about the Holy Shit?' . . . I enjoy pestering girls in this minor, trivial way: it shows I am not like them" (303).

Despite the subject, Elaine's language is concerned with gender and not with religion at all. By means of the last phrase Atwood problematizes the ability of individual discourses to reform gender roles. Women in themselves apparently "are" scatological, but men have control over any scatological discourse; women "ought" to be clean--a demand that is perpetually being renovated--so that when Elaine plays with religious scatology she thinks that she will not be identified with other women.

An earlier incident in Cat's Eye raises precisely the problem that we began the chapter with--Schweickart's problem of identification--except that Elaine must deal with an ironic text. The children make fun of their monarchist teacher, Miss Lumley, by inventing bloomers for her, so that her paraphernalia of the British Empire is always set in the context of the imagined bloomers. What begins as a Rabelaisian attack on colonial authority is suspended once Elaine recognizes the role of gender in the satire. Despite drawing the post-colonial Canadian reader into an identification with the children, Atwood has Elaine recognize that male underwear for some reason does not spark the same response, and Elaine starts to identify hypothetically with the bloomers: "Whatever is wrong with them may be wrong with me also" (85). Using linguistics to describe a lack of sensory enjoyment in Atwood (Cluett 152-3), Robert Cluett is insufficiently attentive to moments

like this: moments during which the protagonist recognizes the gender biases in sensory languages. If Elaine identifies too closely with Mrs. Lumley, she could herself become the victim of social codes of attributed pollution; if Elaine joins in the mockery of Mrs. Lumley's underwear, Elaine would not only falsely distance herself from underwear, women, and thus herself, but she would also set in motion precisely the image that lacerated Elaine herself, the image of the over-civilized woman, without which the image of polluted woman would have no context.

10. "The Hind Parts of God": Materialist Epistemologies
and the Mimesis of Religion

That which cometh out of the
man, that defileth the man.

--Mark 7:20

The soul is the prison of the
body.

--Michel Foucault

To each ego its object, to
each super ego its abject.

--Julia Kristeva

i

It is impossible to understand the image of the over-civilized woman or the representation of the civilizing process, particularly its ambivalent nature (the reference to and then withdrawal from the body that keeps reoccurring), without acknowledging the central role which religious conceptions of holy separation, *k-d-sh* in the Hebrew tradition (Douglas 8), have played. Bodily discharges were seen as impure (especially during worship or war) by the Israelites (Douglas 51), and the scatological image has subsequently been understood in Western religions to be in dialectic with spirit. Since Calvinist practice has vastly enlarged the sphere of the individual (Weber 98-127),¹⁴⁶ an attack on the Protestant persona has come to mean an attack on his conviction in his salvation which (according to Weber) the Protestant projects onto the physical and economic spheres. Because the scatological image is a non-productive aspect of the physical sphere, the "upward mobility of spirit" (McKeon 194) can be attacked at

exactly that point at which the Protestant discovers his salvation enacted in the world. Such a dialectic is implied when George Grant claims that in Canada "public religion has become an unimportant litany of objectified self-righteousness necessary for the more anal of our managers" (G. Grant 186). Even without analyzing Grant's drastic reduction of social and religious complexity to sublimation and its discontents, it is evident that the Freudian metaphor offhandedly relays a tacit epistemology. At the centre of Freudian psychoanalysis, Marxist theory, indeed at the centre of most Twentieth Century filiations of scientific ideology including, *mutatis mutandis*, the novel, is the belief that reality must always in the first instant be understood materially, an understanding with which the scatological image naturally sympathizes.¹⁴⁷ A more subliminal effect created by Grant in the image of anal retention only becomes clear once we analyze the statement according to Bakhtin's dialogic principle. According to Bakhtin's schema, Grant (like Freud in "Character and Anal Eroticism") is not merely engaging in specific psychological analysis but (and the generality of Grant's essay confirms this) is attempting to satirize "high" religious authority by means of the lowly scatological image.

The dialectic of scatological materialism and religious "spirit" is carried out as a much more conscious fiction by a number of Canadian novelists. Some--Atwood, Findley,

Ladoo, Scott, and Johnston--for varying reasons intend the material polemic to undercut the spiritual hubris involved in particular forms of religious faith; others--Davies, Laurence, Williams, Moore, and Richler--appropriate the culture's dominant material epistemology in order to naturalize faith in a bodily context. Excepting perhaps Shoeless Joe, where W.P. Kinsella both tongue-in-cheek and very seriously treats baseball as a religion, Canadian novelists tend to double back over the religious persona just as they do over the civilized self. The writer, using the Freudian model of personality, undercuts the religious persona with the persona's unconscious anality, with evidence of how the centre of his or her faith depends upon the (denied and often obscene) pollution at the margins. The writer thus becomes the revealer and handler of the scatological material, while the religious persona (Mitchell's evangelist Heally Richards for example) attempts, against the evidence of his body, to maintain an untenable metaphysical epistemology. Since social images tend to refer to a past reality, there is, however, an attendant irony when the writer over-values the social power of the religious persona and undervalues (through euphemism) the persona's capability of direct expression.

The more experimental novels of Cohen, Rooke, and Klein are important in this context. They complicate the dialectic between excrement and spirit because these

novelists recognize the parallels between the spiritualizing tendency in religion and the idealizing tendency in mimesis, as well as the epistemological irony inherent in all representations of a scatological body: the representations insist that the body is the beginning of the real, but nevertheless rely on an abstracted textuality to convey that real.

Atwood maintains a fairly straightforward polemic against an imagined Puritan culture in The Handmaid's Tale. Although she intends to mitigate the strict parallel between the Gilead regime and religious fundamentalism by portraying Baptist resistance at the borders of her text, bodily and linguistic practices in the novel clearly mimic stereotypes of Puritan cleanliness. Offred has "pumice for sanding off dead skin. Such Puritan aids are supplied" (60). She scrubs herself with the pumice after the horrifying Particicution, in what is clearly meant to indicate the regime's cynical acquiescence in the Freudian dynamic of (always Puritan) displacement.¹⁴⁸ The Aunts punish Dolores for urinating on the floor, and the regime's euphemistic bid to control language pits Aunt Lydia's word "unhygienic," against Moira's words, "crotch rot" (58).

Cat's Eye, which on the surface seems to be far less polemical, contains similar patterns. Grace Smeath's mother only allows Elaine Risley and Grace four squares of toilet paper; as with Aunt Pearl in The Vanishing Point, Freud's

parsimonious and petty anal erotic is translated without alteration into the novel. Just as Offred does, Elaine internalizes the culture, feeling that just by looking she has helped the washing machine to clean things. After Mr. Smeath cites the schoolboy rhyme "Pork and beans the musical fruit," Elaine is horrified to discover that "toot" means fart, fearing that she has been enlisted in a scatological discourse. Again, Atwood does not complicate "Puritan" society by means of Mr. Smeath's transgression. His comment is eccentric to what Elaine calls "the Smeath dinner table, stronghold of righteousness" (133). That Atwood intends the Smeath household to ramify throughout the macrocosm of Canadian culture is evident in the adult Elaine's description of the art gallery: "It's as if somebody's been around spraying the paintings with air freshener, to kill the smell. The smell of blood on the wall" (90). To counter this Puritan inheritance, Elaine paints works like White Gift, four panels that progressively unwrap tissue paper surrounding the image of Mrs. Smeath. In the final panel she is "in her saggy-legged cotton underpants, her one large breast sectioned to show her heart. Her heart is the heart of a dying turtle: reptilian, dark-red, diseased. Across the bottom of this panel is stenciled: THE*KINGDOM*OF*GOD*IS*WITHIN*YOU" (372). After this painting is vandalized by a woman whom Elaine at first mistakes for Grace Smeath, Elaine recognizes that her painted distortions of Mrs. Smeath are not modernist

Kunstwerke but "washroom graffiti raised to a higher order" (373). Despite the humility of such a statement, Atwood's surrogate artist has, in effect, cleverly traded any ties to Smeathean bourgeois spirituality for a more respectable material epistemology, and incidentally associated herself with Jan Van Eyck, whose "Johannes de Eyck fuit hic" looks "disconcertingly like a washroom scribble" (347). In one of Elaine's last paintings, Mrs. Smeath is "bigger than life. . . . Blotting out God" (426).¹⁴⁹

Findley's polemic in Not Wanted on the Voyage is as definite as Atwood's, though at times more playful. Mottyl the cat suspects because of Yaweh's smell that he is human, and Yaweh takes a long time to "materialize" (66) from a carriage spattered "with the remnants of excrement, eggs and rotten vegetables" (64). The marginal demos, mise en abime in the mythical Genesis narrative, attack Yaweh scatologically just as the democratic Twentieth Century writer, mise en abime in a cat, does.¹⁵⁰ Allusion (to the medieval festi stultorum)¹⁵¹ and generalized historical allegory (higher criticism has, since Julius Wellhausen, materialized the Bible) combine to send up Dr. Noyes' denial of the body of his creator. Yaweh is, of course, in collusion with Dr. Noyes: reporting the affront to his dignity, Yaweh euphemizes excrement as "ordure" (70). The sign of excrement conveys the idea that Dr. Noyes cannot entertain but that the post-Nietzschean writer can--the

death of God. During one of the few moments when *nous* moves beyond the caricature of a villainous, authoritarian mind, the smell of animal and human manure on the sea suggest the disappearance which Mottyl has long expected: "a silent God who refused to materialize" (241). In order to kill both patriarch and the father-narrative, the fooling author makes his own account the original, giving the belated reader the "authentic" story against which the Jahwist's account in Genesis can be measured: "during the summer solstice, the sun had stood still for two whole days and a storm of meteors had pelted the dung heap and killed all the Middenites" (22). Patriarchal political ends evidently distort what was originally a natural referent: midden first; Midian later. Although Findley purposely confuses Greek (Noyes) and Hebrew (Noah), and collapses forms of worship into one another (Catholic into the proto-Hebrew 48), he still, however ironically, claims a type of fabular history.

Findley's theory of marginalia is more explicit in his earlier novel, Famous Last Words. Little Nell enunciates an almost Derridean conception of the parergon: "His theory was that you could sum up the age you lived in by reading its walls. The truth, which loves to hide, had found the perfect hiding place. . . . the partitions of a comfort station" (275). The toilet walls parody the walls of the Grand Elysium Hotel on which Mauberly writes; the demotic

scrawl replaces the stylus of the aesthete's classical paradise, although the toilet graffiti does not actually get reported. What appears to be **outside** the text is a tabooed scatological truth: "Defilement is what is jettisoned from the 'symbolic system.' It is what escapes that social rationality, that logical order on which the social aggregate is based" (Kristeva 65). What is excluded--according to Kristeva the mother's body and all irrational (ego-threatening, parturition-threatening) analogues such as excrement and menstrual blood (71)--is what constitutes the symbolic order.

To make Little Nell bear post-structuralist theory may be too much to ask of a figure who is a caricature, a lesser aesthete. Yet most of Findley's novels, especially in their moral outrage, are constituted around notions of inner and social defilement. The genres that Findley tends towards (fable, murder mystery, espionage thriller) maintain a Judaic code in their thrust towards moral separation. Although the author apparently forgets it in Not Wanted on the Voyage, Jahweh does show up in Famous Last Words. Holiness and boundary terror appear when an actual bomber drops actual bombs onto a Bahamian audience watching a film of the Battle of Britain. This transgression of the simulated by the real becomes explicitly Hebraic in the plane's sky-writing: "mene mene tekel upharsin; the final scrawl, the ultimate graffiti" (287). At this point the

Hebraic deity, who will not allow the moral code to be blasphemed, and Twentieth Century scato-humanist, who privileges the voice from the "comfort station," coalesce in the figure of an author-judge who (as a former journalist) wants to write his graffiti not on a toilet wall but within reported history, so as to tell us what is right and what is wrong. The author-judge in Not Wanted on the Voyage may be more hidden, but is no less present. The difference between "Yaweh" and Findley is that, for Findley, post-scientific and post-realist, scatology (as the type of all matter) marks what is human instead of the boundary where the categories of creation are mixed (Douglas 53) and where the human consorts with the beast.¹⁵²

ii

Scatological attacks on religion are clearly responses to anti-bodily traditions in Judeo-Christian thinking, only a few instances of which can be cited here. In Deuteronomy the Israelites are enjoined to bury their excrements outside of the camp: "the Lord thy God walketh in the midst of thy camp. . . therefore shall thy camp be holy: that he see no unclean thing in thee, and turn away from thee" (23:13-14). Using these cultural boundaries, the Old Testament writers and, following them, Paul, rely on the image of excrement to portray degradation.¹⁵³ Stressing taboo over sacrifice, the law forms an inner constraint (Kristeva 95), while Christ complicates the self by interiorizing abjection (107): "If

abomination is the lining of my symbolic being, 'I' am therefore heterogeneous, pure and impure, and as such always potentially condemnable" (Kristeva 112). Despite this interiorization, the Christian West has often relied upon an external, almost Manichaean dualism between body and spirit. Among Gnostic-Christian epistemologies this dualism is especially developed, as can be seen in Valentinus' contention that Christ did not excrete his solids.¹⁵⁴ The Arian controversies of the Fourth Century (including the temporary rapprochements like *homoousios* in the Nicene Creed), the Monophysite tensions of the Fifth to Sixth Centuries, and the iconoclast controversies leading up to Lent 843 A.D, centered not only on politics, but on the bodily identity of Christ. Augustine, despite his attacks on the Manichees, identified the "back parts" of God that Moses saw (Exodus 33: 17-23) with Christ's flesh in On the Trinity (2.15-17). In Book Three of the Confessions Augustine tried to balance his crucial personal (and figural) discovery--that God is spirit--by emphasizing the humiliation of the flesh in the person of Christ, but Augustine's terms are still heavily binary. According to Thomas Aquinas, eating, digestion, and all that they entail will disappear after the resurrection: "the use of food serves the corruptible life, for we take in food to avoid the corruption which can follow on the consumption of natural moisture" (Aquinas 4.83).

As a result of this separation of body and soul, and since "the localization of hell in the heart of the earth naturally followed upon the method of interment in the ground," the devil has traditionally been represented in western literature as belonging to the earthly realm (Rudwin 55), as an animal (Rudwin 36), and even as the inventor of lavatories (Rudwin 251). The phenomenon of the second face on the demon's buttocks in an illustration like "St. Wolfgang and the devil" (1483) has been interpreted as "a mark of the devil's lordship of matter and dirt" (Cavendish 58-9).¹⁵⁵ Supplementing the erotic and the blasphemous, scatological obscenity has traditionally been attributed to the persona of the witch or warlock; among the charges brought forward at the sensational pan-European trials of the Knights Templars between 1307 and 1316 were spitting or urinating on crucifixes, kissing the devil's hindquarters in the form of an animal, and ritual homosexuality (Cavendish 72).

Although Nietzsche reads Luther as a dionysiac in The Birth of Tragedy, given medieval associations and given Elias's history of the civilizing process, Luther's farting at the devil is hardly surprising.¹⁵⁶ John Harrington, the English inventor of the water closet was following a long monastic tradition when he wrote about praying at stool:

Pure prayer ascends to Him that high doth sit,
Down falls the filth for fiends of hell more fit.
(quoted in Wright 74)

Protestant attacks on relics often had strong scatological elements.¹⁵⁷ One assault on credulous pilgrims mocks "Thomas a Becket's snotty handkerchief" in attempt to shore faith in a spiritual, not an earthly pilgrimage (McKeon 107). Parodies of indulgences often took scatological form--

My lord who is here present
 Gives you 20 baskets of toothaches
 And to all you others also
 Gives a red bum (Burke 192)--

as did actual desecration of relics, like the depositing of human excrement in holy water basins (N. Davis 179-80). In one 1545 German reformation print, the Pope, with streaming excrement in hand, rides on a pig (Stallybrass and White 51). On the other side, Rabelais' Catholic-humanist attack on the Pope--via the Popefigs who must pull a fig out of an anus with their mouths (Pantagruel 3:544)--and Catholic attacks on the Reformation used similar imagery, as we saw earlier with Thomas More.

In Freud's system, these spiritual self-fashionings and projective attacks are symptomatic of bodily repression, since "the devil is certainly nothing else than the personification of the repressed unconscious instinctual life," while "cleanliness, orderliness and trustworthiness give exactly the impression of a reaction-formation against an interest in what is unclean and disturbing and should not be part of the body" ("Character and Anal Eroticism" 174, 172). Even Foucault's discursive analysis of the soul owes

a lot to Freudian corporeality. For Foucault, the surplus power possessed by the king creates both the corporeal inverse--the body of the condemned man--and a non-corporeal duplicate --the "soul" (1984, 176). By politicizing the soul, Foucault jettisons the universalist, strictly biological aspects of Freud's theory, but nevertheless retains ontological primacy for matter, with "spirit" still a reaction-formation.

Puritan versions of the self give some support to these theoretical outlines of the unconscious. Like the monks who prayed at stool, Cotton Mather represented his religious persona in immediate reaction to the scatological body:

I was once emptying the cistern of nature, and making water at the wall. At the same time, there came a dog, who did so too, before me. Thought I; 'What mean and vile things are the children of men. . . How much do our natural necessities abase us, and place us. . . on the same level with the very dogs!

My though proceeded. 'Yet I will be a more noble creature; and at the very time when my natural necessities debase me into the condition of the beast, my spirit shall (I say at that very time) rise and soar.

Accordingly, I resolved that it should be my ordinary practice, whenever I stop to answer the one or other necessity of nature to make it an opportunity of shaping in my mind some holy, noble, divine thought' (The Diary of Cotton Mather quoted in K. Thomas 38)

Atwood, by dedicating The Handmaid's Tale to Mary Webster (who was among those hanged as witches in Mather's New England), connects the Gileadean rejection of the body to religious persecution in a Freudian dynamic of transference. The same short essay wherein Atwood claims Webster as an

ancestor attacks Mather: "[witch-hunting and torture, did not end with racks, stakes, and Grand Inquisitors, or with Cotton Mather" ("Witches" 332).¹⁵⁸

Biblical translations in this century too are instructive. Where the King James Version identifies the free man as "him that pisseth against the wall" (1 Kings 14:10), the Revised Standard Version contains only "free." The recent tendency has been to dignify references to the inner organs (for example splagknois or splanchnon which indiscriminately refers to heart, lungs, liver, kidneys, and even womb) by rendering them as "heart" instead of "bowels." Where the King James and sometimes Geneva versions render the Greek or Hebrew as "bowels," the Revised Standard Version and the American Standard Version substitute "heart" or "affection" (Job 30:27, Gen. 43:30, Phil. 1:8; Col. 3:12 and 1 John 3:17 in the ASV only), "stomach" (Job 20:14), "womb" (Psalms 71:6), anguish" (Jer. 4:19), or leave the word out entirely (2 Chron. 32:21; Col. 3:12 and 1 John 3:17 in the RSV only). This is not always straightforward bowdlerism because in some places (for example Deut. 23:13) the new translations have become more explicit; nevertheless, the changes confuse ancient boundaries of the body with modern boundaries by attributing modern scientific differentiation of organ functions and present attribution of emotional "seats" to the ancient Hebrews.¹⁵⁹

No matter what we make of the accuracy of the repressive hypothesis, it is certainly central not just to Atwood and Findley but to religious discourse throughout the Canadian novel. The differentiation between "body" and "soul" may be seen in naive form in The History of Emily Montague and in Mark Hurdlestone. In the former, the attack on monks "who make it a point of religion to abjure linen, and wear their habits till they drop off" (33) is made from the simple viewpoint of Protestant cleanliness. In the latter, Clary's post-mortem letter to Anthony sharply divides between "the dust and rubbish of the gay world" (350) and the solitary heart (even though money and inheritance laws are what keep Moodie's narrative in motion at every turn), while profanities sound terrible to newly-converted Mary Matthews' cleansed ear.

After Freud changed Christian literalism about the demonic to a psychoanalytic literalism about the body, the equation of religious respectability with a superficially clean and proper body became difficult to maintain. Stephen Dowling's difficulty mediating between matter and spirit in Such is My Beloved owes much to the clash between Freud and external orientations in Christianity. Sinclair Ross raises the problem in As For Me and My House, where prairie realism demands that the privy be acknowledged, but prairie Protestantism demands euphemism. While Mrs. Bentley defends the limited colloquiality of "belly" (70) and "sweat" (91)

in Paul's classroom, and mocks a pool-hall sign demanding "THE LANGUAGE THAT YOUR MOTHER USED" (96), her sense of restraint is hardly less than Mrs. Wenderby's censorship. The etymology of "perspiration," Mrs. Wenderby's replacement for "sweat," has a built-in history of euphemizing: *perspirare* (Latin, "to breathe through") anthropomorphizes the pores and spiritualizes the out-flow. Mrs. Bentley, whose modernism so determinedly materializes religion nevertheless has something of the Wenderby conscience. When Steve calls their outhouse the Leaning Tower of Pisa, she adds, a rather good name too by virtue of a bad pronunciation" (63). She implies, but does not say, the 'obscene' word. Ross not only breaks the "luminous whole" of modernist theory in Philip's "earthbound" art (Williams, "Void" 38), but also by means of the Bentleys' privy:¹⁶⁰

The privy leans badly, fifteen or twenty degrees anyway from the perpendicular. Last Hallowe'en it was carried off by the hoodlums of the town and left on the steps of the church with a big sign nailed to it **Come Unto Me All Ye That Labour And Are Heavy Laden.** They haven't been able since to get it straight again, but Mrs. Finley says that we can use it with assurance. My neighbor, Mrs. Ellingson, came over this morning to tell me how she and her husband laughed when they saw me go in the first time: 'Sven say she look so scared I maybe tink she waste her time'" (13-14).

Scatology can become credit in a post-Freudian economy of confession. Mrs. Bentley must be fallible enough to gain the reader's sympathy: when she acts as the Puritan and repeats the anal retentive joke against herself, she gains a materialist epistemology to subvert the older, no longer

convincing respectability.¹⁶¹ The symbolic realm is not separate but a function of the self-interested artist. The woman who does not want to be a Puritan of course reports the hoodlums' dialogical reduction of the biblical text; more interesting is the word "assurance," which puns from grace and salvation across to the bodily context, perhaps parodying Luther's *Turnerlebnis*.

The objects and sources of Canadian scatological attacks on religious language are various. In Audrey Thomas's *Mrs. Blood* a feminist problematic revises the old texts: "I stink therefore I am. This is the bloody and bawd of Christ which was riven for thee" (21). The punning female re-corporealizing of communion (less and less a bodily exercise with the historical shrinkage of the wafer) follows a materialization of the Cartesian credo, thereby attacking the two poles of Western male hegemony.¹⁶² The narrator's blood is set in juxtaposition with Pentateuchal laws which name the menstruating woman as unclean, but Thomas's "female" stands for the body in all its forms--not just in blood, but also in scatology.

In Ladoo's *No Pain Like this Body* and *Yesterdays* the attack comes from a less stable skepticism and is directed both at Trinidadian Hinduism and Christianity. In *Yesterdays* Sook and Choonilal sodomize each other in the Anglican church. The characters in *No Pain Like this Body* constantly speak of God in connection with the scatological

image, as one exchange between Ma and Pa shows:

"But it have a God and he watchin from dat sky."
 "God coud kiss me ass!"
 "Well wen a man could cuss God he deserve to dead!"

The scatological blasphemy is not simply a function of Pa's aggressive character, but is enunciated by the innocent: Rama asks, "Why God not kill dat lightnin ass?" (23) and Panday asks, "You mean God does see wen Rama pee on me in de night?" (20) Ladoo continues the religious probing by setting the terror of the novel's weather against the discourse of omniscience:

"Wot God doin now?" Panday asked.
 "He watchin from de sky."
 "But de sky black like coals."
 "God still watchin."
 "Well God playin de ass now!"

By means of the rainstorms, Ladoo intentionally confuses Jahweh and the Hindu storm-god, Indra. "God" is also signified in the unclean typology of father and priest, uncleanness signalled by the contravention of Hindu dietary laws when flies enter Pa's mouth (66) and try to enter Bismath Saddhu's mouth (101).¹⁶³ Although it seems superfluous given the broad typological attack on God, the form of Hinduism transported to Trinidad by the indentured labourers in the Nineteenth Century also comes under attack when the one-legged villager mocks the priest: "He is a modderass chamar and he playin Brahmin. Bisnath Saddhu is not a priest. He fadder used to mind pigs in Jangli Tola. He modderass chamar come to Tola playin holy" (98). Since Ladoo notes in his glossary that most of the Indians who

came to Trinidad were lower-caste chamars (*panchamas*), the disruption of the social system because of the migration may be the reason that the religious system slips into parody.

In his unfinished and posthumously published novel Yesterdays, Ladoo takes more careful account of the mechanism of projection, abandoning the simple typology of Pa and God. Choonilal wants Tailor to repair the latrine because during Tailor's party women defecated by the Jandee pole, made messes on the outhouse floor, and knocked out the eastern wall.¹⁶⁴ Since Choonilal dreams that the stench will keep the Aryan gods from coming near, he projects his own concerns about cleanliness and reincarnation onto Tailor: "wen you dead you go born back a blasted worm in a latrine. Oright!" (3) According to Choonilal's form of religious nostalgia, the man of God is defined by external cleanliness rites, but in Choonilal's caricatured speech--"I is a religious man, a kiss me ass religious man" (3)--and throughout the novel, religion becomes a mystification of bodily action. The attempted rape of Basdai after she visits the outhouse is explained as the work of an evil spirit (11). Tailor and Ragbir think that if someone will "bull" Poonwa, he will forget about his Hindu mission to Canada (73). Religion is also understood as purely instrumental. The main reason that Choonilal wants the toilet cleaned is that he does not want his neighbor Ragbir to get a blessing for allowing Choonilal to use his toilet.

Choonilal feels morally superior to modern Hindus with toilets in their houses, while the other characters feel superior to Choonilal after the climactic scene in which he falls asleep next to his own waste. Pandit Puru knows the materialist bias of Choonilal's religiosity and he uses this knowledge to force Choonilal into re-mortgaging his house so as to finance Poonwa's Hindu mission--"De Hindu gods go make you see trobble till you shit" (58)--while Puru himself can get away with scato-erotic advice because he is designated as a holy man (102). Ladoo's mimesis seems to admit no epistemological basis outside of the scatological, although the reappearance of the flies in Yesterdays, circling from the sleeping Choonilal's mouth to his waste and back again, suggests some fundamental outward distinction between the pure and the impure.

In contrast to Ladoo's extreme skepticism, the scatological image most often comes from a liberal-pluralist position, as it does in Chris Scott's brilliant novel Antichthon. Like Not Wanted on the Voyage and The Handmaid's Tale, Antichthon projects the mimesis of religion into another time when religious authority could immediately, not just vicariously, lacerate the dissenter. Because of this the repressive hypothesis can regain the kind of urgency that it did not always have in the 1980's. Scott allows Giordano Bruno the role of the body--arguing that life comes from putrefaction (14), affirming that flies

have souls and that they will appear in heaven (104), and parodying medieval scholastic language about God: "A worm segmented or a worm integral? A worm infinite or a worm temporal? A worm in *potentia* or in *essentia*?" (109)

Although the Archbishop of Venice Lorenzo Priuli and Pope Clement VIII also want Bruno to exist under the sign of scatology in prison (172, 211) so as to degrade him, Scott reduces the anonymous authority of a dominant Catholic discourse to a material and human constituent in Priuli: "small tears of malice glittered on your cheeks, and around your mouth, pursed and venomous, there formed droplets of a grey effluvia--spittle that had dried in the mouth" (46). Scott's scatological mimesis takes Priuli lower than Bruno. Furthermore, these bodily signs become exactly that which Priuli must repress in order to maintain his faith:

"My faith is firm, but-- Christ's teeth! for fifty years and more I was racked by a doubt, one doubt, an awful little tiny doubt, niggling, my lords, nibbling that's the word, **nibbling**, eating away my soul, nibble, nibble, nibble. **His teeth**, my lords. **His little teeth**, what became of them, eh? Those little pearls of Our Lord's innocence, **His milk teeth**, my lords. Nibble nibble. What happened to them? They fell out, yes, and then? When He rose on the third day, did they rise with Him, those little teeth? If so, how so? If not, why not? Nibble. That's where the rot sets in" (46).

Outside of the strategies of mimesis (the attempt to make Priuli more convincing psychologically than Dostoevsky's Grand Inquisitor) are the problems of Christian history: how does a Sixteenth Century Archbishop settle the question of Christ's divinity and the bodily resurrection? Milk

teeth are only one of the many bodily ejecta which could carry the traditional doubt.¹⁶⁵

But the way that Scott has Priuli handle his doubt is more suggestive of a Gnostic than of a Christian settlement. According to Clement of Alexandria, Valentinus (the Third Century Gnostic) denied that Christ ejected anything from his body: "He ate and drank in a peculiar way and did not evacuate his food. For he had so great a power of continence that the food was not corrupted in him, since he himself was not perishable" (Stromata 3.59.3).¹⁶⁶ The orthodox Catholic settlement was to proclaim that Christ was all human and all divine in a mysterious hypostatic union.¹⁶⁷ The problem of historicizing Priuli is compounded in the subjectivity of the novel since Priuli is a ghost speaking from hell. Scott does not allow the reader to make a judgement on the materiality of the after-lives that the novel represents, but what is certain is that Priuli's discourse foliates the discourse of Bruno; specifically, Priuli's comment about 'rot' continues Bruno's concern with 'putrefaction.' Close to the end of the novel, when Clement VIII says "I am an old man gone in the teeth" (221), the material problematic resurfaces, but without selfconscious commentary. Mimesis without seam, it is presented as simple description, which, of course, it hardly is. In a sophisticated fashion Scott thus extends a silent ideology of the body over papal infallibility and over any human

representation of Christ. Instead of Clement VIII bringing Bruno crashing down to earth like (in Hippolytus's fable) Peter did to Simon Magus (211), and no matter how the historical Priuli and Clement VIII justified their use of torture, Scott brings the Catholic hierarchy down under the sign of Gnostic dualism,¹⁶⁸ while Bruno represents interpretive plenitude--reading both as a literalist and as an allegorist, almost as a liberal pluralist. Indeed, the strength of Antichthon is that each voice is answered with a counter voice.

Wayne Johnston's pluralism also makes much of counter-voicing. Usually Johnston undercuts the signifieds of religious language by replacing them with the scatological in The Story of Bobby O'Malley. When the young Bobby is a "rebel of the pot," his mother Agnes is "sustained by faith alone" (7); when the toilet backs up in their house, Bobby's father Ted asks Agnes to pray that God grant what she calls "the sordid miracle:" "If God can part the Red Sea, he can damn well plug this pipe" (13). The distant, holy, almost purely textual God, is drawn into degrading proximity with excrement. Allegorically, Johnston divides Bobby between the Catholic mother, whom the young Bobby consciously imitates, and the secular father, with whom Bobby unconsciously identifies until he explicitly takes on Ted's persona as the narrator of his own life. Agnes euphemizes "effluent" (12), has "neutered the universe" (49) for Bobby,

and tells him that Protestants do not wash (101). She particularly hates the cleaning of the septic tank because the process makes their excretions public. Ted, meanwhile, talks about confession as the disposing of the past and of the priest as "a kind of garbage-collector" (165), echoing Rabelais' satire in Gargantua. According to Rabelais, monks are shunned because "they eat the world's excrement, that is to say, sins; and as eaters of excrement they are cast into their privies--their convents and abbeys that is--which are cut off from all civil intercourse, as are the privies of a house" (Gargantua 125). Ted regularly undercuts his wife's religious metaphors with material glosses. When Agnes attempts to explain Hell metaphorically, containing not actual flames but "some 'more subtle, but no less purgative agony,'" Ted makes Agnes's metaphor explicit: "Like throwing up?" (102) Although the mother's metaphoricized Hell engenders Bobby's existential fears, the dead father's skeptical materialist voice can consistently be discerned in Bobby's voice. For example, Bobby describes the "visions" of his companion Gabriel: "squirming in agony, face and body coursing with divine wisdom, he might say: 'John gets to blow the biggest frog.' These rulings were not questioned. It was the will of God that John blow the biggest frog" (38). Scatology (the game of blowing through a straw into the frog's anus), religious instrumentality, and male adolescent cruelty are wound up in the sacred associations of names like "Gabriel" and "John." In the "telling," Bobby

does not tell his mother's rosary; he tells his father's jokes.

iv

Although Johnston directs most of his scatology against Agnes, Bobby realizes toward the end of the narrative that he does not really understand his mother. Furthermore, Ted's last testament--"What is more final than flushing the toilet? Do this in memory of me" (184)--almost secularizes and naturalizes Christ.

Davies' Christian pluralism often begins with a dialogic attack on Puritanism. Fifth Business begins with the terrible Puritan mother: "Our privy set the sanitary tone for the village" (18). According to the Puritan interpretive standards of mother and town, the gravel pit where the dirty tramps live is Hell.¹⁶⁹ But what represents the world, the flesh, and the devil to Dunstan Ramsay's mother, fascinates him. Because he believes that he has grown up lacking one whole side of his being, he trades in the Puritan mother for a more promiscuous mother (Mary Dempster), who is not so appalled by gravel pits and dirty tramps. In The Manticore, Ontario Puritanism becomes even more fantastic and lacerating as David Staunton receives a purifying enema, Dr. Tyrrell's Internal Bath, every Saturday to prepare for Sunday church services. Netty takes over the role of the Puritan mother with her smegmal theories,

telling David not to play with other boys: "Probably they did not wash often enough under their foreskins. Netty was very strong on that. . . . 'If you're not clean there, you're not clean anyplace'" (94). David learns the social power of the discourse about cleanliness and later uses it. When, as a lawyer, he must defend a woman who blew her husband's head off while he was sitting on the privy, David tells the court that she had to perform fellatio even though her husband was notoriously dirty. Davies' mimetic purpose is to parody that rationalist theology which pursues filth up into its hiding places, but such purposes are complicated by Netty's unscientific postscript to her rather sound washing injunctions. She also warns David not to spit his brains out like Cece Athelstan, "a man well advanced in syphilis. . . certainly a victim of unchecked spitting" (94). Davies' evident fascination with such archaic mythologies of the unitary body (where the mouth has access to the brain or or the mouth represents the ejaculating penis in an unconscious discourse) make Netty, and not the psychoanalyst Dr. von Haller, the repository of Deptford's bodily unconscious.

As well, Davies, like Alice Munro, seems interdenominational in his scatology. Munro's Del Jordan knows that to ask God to reveal himself in the United Church would be "as inappropriate as farting" (Lives of Girls and Women 80). Munro's satire in this passage appears to come

from a fundamentalist position even though Munro is not herself a fundamentalist. Davies lowers both what seems to be a more rational and what seems to be a more ritual worship: "In the Anglican church I nodded my head, as if to say 'Quite so,' or (in the slang of the day) 'Hot spit!' whenever Jesus was named in a hymn. But in the United Church if Jesus turned up I sang the name very low, and in the secret voice I used when talking to my grandmother about what my bowels were doing" (88). While both Davies and Munro both materialize religious rituals in the parodic way that Nietzsche does in "The Ass Festival," they bypass Nietzsche's extreme skepticism since their parodies are not generalized, but denomination-specific.

In one sense, the dialectic antagonists in Davies' fiction are not so much Dunstan and his mother, David and Doc Staunton, David and Netty, or, in World of Wonders, Magnus/Paul and Willard, but the Protestant and the anus. The characters exist in the gulf between the two. Paul agonizes because of the physical analogy between kneeling to pray and kneeling to allow Willard to sodomize him. Having escaped the two powers--the one which defines the blasphemy and the other which controls him--Paul solemnly spits at Deptford (the Puritanical society) and at the site of his rape by Willard. The material bases in Davies' pluralism are evident in that Paul cannot simply reject the old roles ideologically, but must reject them in a scatological

ritual.¹⁷⁰ John Parlabane's diabolical skepticism in The Rebel Angels is consistently tied to scatology. In What's Bred in the Bone Bella Mae's agony is less because her repression of one antagonist (the anus) greater: "You don't think [Jesus] wants to look at your bare B.T.M." (77), and Simon Darcourt's belief is such that, while he is ready to grant excrement its place, he sublimates Ozias Froats' slides of feces into a vision of the New Jerusalem: "They were of extraordinary beauty, like splendid cuttings of moss-agate, eye-agate, brecciated agate, and my mind turned to that chalcedony which John's Revelation tells us is part of the foundations of the Holy City" (110).¹⁷¹ Not anal, though still scatological, is Hannah's parodic desire in World of Wonders to recoup the body for Protestantism by means of jokes about the river Pison, and her typology of Rango the monkey as "natural, unredeemed man" (80) urinating in public.

Davies satirizes Hannah; nevertheless he follows a similar pattern in his novels, especially in The Rebel Angels. With Uncle Yerko (whose real name is Miya Lautero or Martin Luther), Davies also revises Protestant historical origins in the Reformation. Like Luther, the luthier Yerko maintains a scatological naivety in his constant farting, yet Davies also gives him a pre-Reformation love of images. Yerko thus eludes Parlabane's skeptical attack on all metaphysics and on Luther in particular. But Davies trades

the single-mindedness of the historical Luther's attacks for the broader Rabelaisian laughter that binds all voices in a democracy of the low image. The best example of this is when Darcourt talks about Froats' Sheldonian attempts to situate human personality according to excrement type. Darcourt calls excrement "what is rejected, what is accounted of no worth to mankind. Filth therapy. . . . is astonishingly similar to alchemy in basic principle--the recognition of what is of worth in that which is scorned by the unseeing. The alchemist's long quest for the Stone, and the biblical stone which the builders refused becoming the headstone of the corner" (82). The discourses discernible here are the biblical (most importantly Psalms 118:22, and Acts 4:11 in which Christ is the rejected cornerstone), an alchemical language no longer reputable to Froats, and a scientific language wherein the hypothetical basis of enquiry is over-determined towards materialism. The low image does not so much deny the Christian or alchemical self as link a newer material ideology to these traditions. Despite the potential for extreme skepticism, the discourses of science and religion confirm each other in Froats' coinage, "physiological predestination" (250).¹⁷² Despite the satire hinted at by the compensatory nature of Froats' scholarship, he comes off rather well in the novel as a researcher who is not cowed by the secularized Puritanism of public fashion. In fact the collation of Christian theology, alchemy, and scatology reproduces comments in Carl

Jung's Individual Dream Symbolism in Relation to Alchemy (1936): "The gross materiality of the yellow metal with its odious fiscal flavour. . . . make . . . rejections comprehensible enough--but that is precisely why it is so hard to find the lapis: it is exilis, uncomely, it is thrown out into the street or on the dunghill. . . . But 'the stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner'" (350). Although Maria is surprised that Froats buys excrement for his work, excrement achieves immense exchange value when, at the end of the novel, Froats wins the Nobel prize. Jung's syncretic recuperation of discredited languages in the figure of the collective unconscious is clearly Davies'--as Davies has often admitted--and religious recuperation has certainly had its fiscal rewards for Davies. If Sheldonian constitutional psychology did not merit the attention it once got, that may be the most potent levelling irony in Davies' attempt to shore up religious language with scientific discourse.

In The Diviners the garbage collector Christie Logan is the leveller. He is both Morag's re-adopted father and a re-constituted Christ. Unlike Beckett's Christy in All That Fall, who offers free dung instead of eternal life, Laurence's Christie naturalizes the doctrine of original sin as original abjection, and his parody of Christ's language recuperates that language in a realist context: "I am muck, but so are they. . . . When I carry away their refuse, I'm

carrying off part of them, do you see? By their garbage ye shall know them" (39). The parody returns the spiritualized agriculture of "By their fruits ye shall know them" (Matt. 7:20) to the lower world, and less obviously, it echoes more explicit comments of Christ's: "whatsoever thing from without entereth into a man, it cannot defile him; because it entereth not into his heart, but into the belly and goeth out into the draught, purging all meats. And he said, that which cometh out of the man, that defileth the man" (Mark 7:18-20). As Christ spiritualizes the body, so does Christie: "I see what they throw out, and I don't care a shit, but they think I do, so that's why they cannot look at me. They think muck's dirty. It's no more dirty than what's in their heads" (39).

By uncovering Manawaka's repressed side, Laurence accommodates the Christian mythos to the Freudian mythos of body and repression. This process of accommodation is consistent throughout her novels. In The Stone Angel, Hagar's constipation acts as a counterweight to Rev. Troy's spiritual clichés (40) and yet Hagar plays out the mythos of Christian communion. In A Jest of God the Dukes' mongoloid son swears and uses scatological language during the sermon in the United Church, an unconscionable rebuke to the self-possessed language of Rachel and her mother, just as Rachel's momentary lapse into glossolalia is. Although Morag Gunn in The Diviners represses Ross McVitie's

scatological puns on the line "Ox and ass before him bow" (from the hymn "Good Christian Men Rejoice" 80)--she later opens into an identical language while seeking refuge during a dance:

John of Ages
 locked for me
 let me hide
 myself in thee. (151)

Morag's metaphor for the writing process--divining--parallels the scatomancy of Christie, "who divined with garbage" (394). By consciously identifying the writer with a revised, scatological Christ, Laurence acknowledges, in ways that Atwood and Findley do not, that the civilized self (and Freudian "I") are at least partially constituted through the Christian tradition.

This acknowledgement is even more pronounced in the novels of David Williams and in Brian Moore's Black Robe. In Eye of the Father, the descendants of Magnus Vangdal are each forced to find some way of revising the anal Eden that he bequeaths to them; Wayne and Karen eventually secularize the roles of Joseph and Mary. Williams' materialization of the soul as squalid and smelly in The Burning Wood (118) is comparable to the dialogism of Rabelais when Tripet throws his soul up (Gargantua 116). Although native scatology undercuts the transcendental location of the soul for Joshua Cardiff in The Burning Wood and Jack Cann in The River Horsemen, they erase the soul and then reinscribe, as their

names hint, a different sign of Christ.¹⁷³ In Black Robe Pierre Tallevant's statement--"We're not colonizing the Savages. They're colonizing us" (22)--has no meaning in terms of political power, but Moore, like Williams, insists that it convey an ideological meaning for the Christian. The Jesuits must learn scatological languages in order to work among the indigenes, and this process of learning a new bodily culture enervates Father Laforgue's faith, creating physio-spiritual problem that is compounded when he sees the rotting martyr, Father Duval. The scatological becomes that which Father Laforgue must include in his new conception of faith, but Moore includes it much more provisionally and less easily than Laurence does. Laurence, Williams, and Moore represent Twentieth Century accommodations of Christianity to materialist epistemologies, but their approach was already implicit in Augustine's understanding of the rhetorical implications of the incarnation: "it engenders a new elevated style, which does not scorn everyday life and which is ready to absorb the sensorily realistic, even the ugly, the undignified, the physically-base" (Auerbach 63).

Robert Cluett has documented the highly nominal nature of Richler's linguistic style (121), and, in a precise play on words, Cluett argues that Richler's language "embodies the apparent future direction of things" (123). If Richler's syntax veers sharply away from function-word dominated

language towards lexemes, his scatology too revises traditional religious language, in his case the language of Judaism: "These are the Days of Awe. Tomorrow is Rosh Hashonna, our new year, and like a week later it's Yom Kippur, when if you shit on anybody during the year you got a legal right to repent. And God forgives you" (Joshua Then and Now 65). The symbiosis between tradition and the body is the satirist's symbiosis. Although Reuben seems to be irreverent in saying these things (and gave Richler much trouble when he spoke in synagogues), Reuben's irreverence is unconscious, as is his later summation of the book of Job: "if you continue to believe in God, even when you're up shit's creek, it can pay off double at the window" (169). Here Richler combines three low languages--cliché, scatology, and the argot of the gambler, the latter of which is nicely sharpened upon God's wager on Job's righteousness. Reuben, however, unlike Agnes O'Malley, is Richler's norm. Judaism becomes important precisely because of its association with Reuben and with all that is low, so that whatever is overly spiritual or overly euphemized in the tradition is discarded by the satirist. The Old Testament, with a strong materialist base in its dietary laws (Stern 322), is therefore not under as much pressure as the New Testament: "Like if a guy is going to shit on you he usually leads with a quote from it. . . . The dirtier the sin, the sweeter the saying. The New Testament covers everything. I recommend it highly" (170).¹⁷⁴ The grown

Joshua, interpreting the spirit of the Pentateuch strangely along Christ's lines, breaks the Mosaic law in Numbers 5:1-5 (which was intended to isolate people with discharges) by kissing his sick homosexual friend Murdoch on the mouth.

This last is a revision of the artist-protagonist in St. Urbain's Horseman. While Joshua merely notes that "there seems to be an awful lot of washing up involved" in the Jewish tradition (Joshua 68), Horseman's Jake Hersch has internalized categories of clean and unclean to the point where he can neither dispose of his excrement nor acknowledge it. Although his pluralist culture tells him that "everything is holy" (Horseman 171), his tradition denies this. Pretending that the excrement is not his, he convinces himself that filth is always elsewhere, and Ormsby-Fletcher's child becomes the scapegoat for the plugged toilet. Contrary to normal satiric practice which makes the sinner pay, the scapegoat in the Old Testament was allowed to go free (albeit into the desert) after having been declared the demon Azazel's while the pure goat was sacrificed. Like the satirist who creates an elite authorial persona, Jake's shedding of responsibility almost sabotages the intent of the religious tradition that Richler intends him to reclaim.

the scatological image rely on a "traditional methodology of biblical hermeneutics. . . whereby the approximation of divinity through material figures was understood to accord with God's own intent" (McKeon 74). In the Protestant West "the really real is asked for in time and space" (Tillich 71). Tillich claims that any natural object could become sacramental (106), although it is unlikely that he gave much thought to the **scatological** object. The difficulty with such metaphors, as McKeon notes, is that the analogy of "material signifier and spiritual signified. . . threatens at times to transform itself into an antithetical signifying relationship in which the priority of sense experience is felt to have not simply a pedagogic but an ontological force" (87). Erasure of the distinction between spiritual and secular callings among early Protestants often caused difficulties in signification, "For it is sometimes difficult to remember which of the things compared is the most important. Was it grace or manure which was honored by the simile?" (Schlatter 197)¹⁷⁵ Especially by the time of Solomon Gursky Was Here, it is more difficult to say whether Richler is embodying or sabotaging Judaism.

The force of sense experience, which makes any incarnation a potentially unstable compound, can already be detected in Luther's "physical creaturalness":¹⁷⁶ "I marvel that man hasn't long since defecated the whole world full, up to the sky" (Table Talk 130); "I'm fed up with the world,

and it is fed up with me. . . . It's as I've often said: 'I'm like a ripe stool and the world's like a gigantic anus, and so we're about to let go of each other" (Table Talk 448). Luther's Augustinian humility about human effort and earthly phenomena could dismiss all ways of knowing but the scatological. Scatology can redraw the line between the sacred and the profane (Davis 180), especially since conceptions of the human body are closely connected to the ways in which man represents God (Bottomly 24). The obscene, which has residual power in keeping with its social boundary status but out of keeping with its linguistic status, can potentially come to stand in the place of the unrepresentable divine so that religion loses its social valence and simply becomes, as it does for Georges Bataille, the encoding of the death drive (Kristeva 1987, 368-71).¹⁷⁷

In The Prince of Darkness and Co., where Robert Graves' mythopoeic desire for the primitive is only Philip Sparrow's desire to see blood flow (22, 140), Daryl Hine mocks this interpretation of the sacred, but Leonard Cohen takes it very seriously in Beautiful Losers, relying upon Luther in the process:

Homage to. . . the Catechism which invited marginal obscenity and contributed to the maintenance of the lavatory as a thrilling temple of the Profane. Homage to the great slabs of marble with which the cubicles were constructed, to which no smear of shit could ever adhere. Here was enshrined the anti-Lutheran possibility of matter which succumbed easily to washing. Homage to marble in the Halls of Excrement, Maginot Line against the invasion of Papal Fallibility" (106).

This traditional use of scatological satire to deflate the pretensions of high religion also telegraphs what Cohen does to reduce Catherine Tekakwitha, the Iroquois Virgin, the moment he begins to imagine her. However, scatology cannot, despite Bakhtin, function entirely on a political level to demystify authority. Once the narrator begins to psychoanalyze his 'Lutheran' constipation--"what unassailable bank in my psyche needs shit?" (40)--scatology trades the pedagogic for the ontological. The trope of constipation allows a focus on consumption--eating, drug addiction, taking in information--and destabilizes the confluence of Platonic (from The Symposium) and Christian traditions of the human as container of an external divinity: "Please make me empty, if I'm empty then I can receive, if I can receive it means it comes from somewhere outside of me, if it comes from outside of me I'm not alone! . . . Please let me be hungry, then I am not the dead center. . . . I want to be fascinated by the phenomena" (Cohen 42). For Cohen consumption globalizes the Nazi economy of thanatos. The excremental and deadly extremes to which F. goes certainly belie Cohen's disingenuous comment that "there are no obscene words ever" and Linda Hutcheon's reading of Beautiful Losers as Bakhtinian carnival (The Candian Postmodern 31). The scatological war against civil and religious boundaries begins rather benignly with "is shit kosher?" (Cohen 95) and "you have been baptized with fire, shit, history, love, and loss" (159), but by the time

that F. and Edith bathe themselves with Mengele's soap made from human flesh, Kristeva's "borderline patient" (who "transforms the abject into the site of the Other") cannot be considered a "frontiersman" or "metaphysician" (Kristeva 1982, 54). The "unavoidable alliance between shame, the obscene, and the sacred" in the process of setting things apart and veiling them (Huxley 13) certainly drives Beautiful Losers, but the extreme degradation that the characters undergo emphasizes (perhaps unintentionally) the social utility of Protestant individualism. Coded through the rejection of the scatological image, the social project behind the older Christian polemic of spirituality becomes intelligible, though not inevitably desirable: the choice in Beautiful Losers is between bodily discontent or thanatos.

Confirming this choice, but complicating our ways of speaking about it, Cohen hints that all the images of the social and of social boundaries may merely be verbal satellites spinning weightlessly around the central signifier of heroin ("shit" in the addict's argot). Religious and all other abjections would then have no significance in themselves. As a result, the erotic finality of Bataille's scatological explosion cannot seduce Cohen's (ultimately) civilized narrator: "Does God love the world? What a monstrous system of nourishment! . . . Tomorrow I begin my fast" (Cohen 42). What could seem a

Gnostic response or at least St. Catherine of Sienna's costive form of self-denial (Wright 24), may have as its subtext heroin withdrawal. More importantly, the narrator's final transformation into a movie destroys the mimetic contract which guaranteed that the narrator's persona represented a real world. The text moves toward pure word; the narrator's drive towards an object which is less and less available moves more and more eccentrically "beyond pleasure" (184) into anal aggression (181-2, 189-91) and coprophagy (201-2), but neither spiritual repression nor an excremental drive to recover the body are any longer sufficient causes to explain the narrator's actions or the textual machine.

Shakespeare's Dog and The Second Scroll are less extreme, but also respond to the limits of the repressive hypothesis and material signification. Hooker's vomit, in Shakespeare's Dog, leads him to theorize about the soul (32), inverting the order of Rabelaisian trope in which the metaphysical soul is deformed by the material signifier. Dirt and bodily anomaly evidently call attention to other levels of existence as Douglas (39) claims. The figure of the beast thus begins impossibly to think as if it had a human soul--"Why Hooker?" (60)--but Hooker consistently refuses to make the grand cosmological claims that his namesake Richard Hooker made. In The Second Scroll, the narrator's early attack on materialism is quite naive: "I

brashly advanced myself as an example of spirituality-- heckled only by the hybris of a Coca-cola belch--and damned all materialisms" (46). It is only by recovering the extemporized body in the Casablanca mellah and in Melech's analysis of the Sistine Chapel ("the flesh majuscule" 105) that the narrator can understand the double nature of his tradition: a (Jewish and Christian) tradition which, despite commandments to the contrary, is constantly representing God, even scatologically, and yet a tradition which refuses to finally trust those representations. It refuses, as Greenstein says, the direct encounter (8). Despite the increasing will to glorify the body, the narrator cannot finally be shown Uncle Melech because Klein cannot finally allow any material signifier to stand in for the holy: "It doffed the flesh that had been its first abode. Yet it persisted. It was the miracle of the Discarnation" (71).¹⁷⁸ Like Cohen and Rooke, Klein does not trust the scatological registers of Twentieth Century material discourses, but neither does he intend to circle religious signification back to a naive Puritan version of spirit; in the end the nature of representation itself, not just a particular religious discourse, comes under interrogation.

PART THREE

TWO STUDIES IN SCATOLOGY AND LITERARY GENRE

They attributed senses and passions. . . to bodies. . . . Later, as these vast imaginations shrank and the powers of abstraction grew, the personifications were reduced to diminutive signs.

--Giambattista Vico, The New Science

If Mary Douglas is right to argue that dirt is the sign whereby people are excluded from participation in religious and social systems, my analyses in Part Two--especially of religious materialism--have been intended to show how scatology is central to literary versions of social or religious patterning. Douglas would certainly agree that all symbolic systems, literature as much as religion, constitute themselves upon scatology in some way. Or, following Vico's theory of mythography--which entails theories of mimesis and genre, of the subtle shifts between belief and sign, thing and representation--we might say that all symbolic systems require a "prior" body from which to signify even if we do not take Vico's history of symbolism quite literally. Dirt, scatology, or the abject, then, are better spoken of as elements within the pattern which maintain the pattern.

I will not here attempt a broad defense of genre, but the next two chapters demand a few preliminary words. Jacques Derrida has enunciated the poststructural claim that genre

falsifies any text. Ralph Cohen, defending genre, will therefore not say that a work belongs to a particular type, but will only cite the hermeneutic consequences of putting the work in that category (212). Yet how are we to explain why my mother-in-law will open up Barbara Cartland to read, while I, with a certain amount of pain, open up Derrida. The differences, surely, are generic and would subsist were we to disguise Derrida under another cover: it would not take either of us long to recognize our genres. But here, too, I have transgressed--beyond the boundary of the civil words that separate me from you. I should have stuck to Derrida and not have mixed myself up with laws and taboos.

The historicist critics know best what to say about mother-in-laws and reading habits. Attempts to isolate genres as if they were singulative systems that completely inhabit a text (for example Todorov's The Fantastic or Frye's Anatomy of Criticism) represent the victory of de Saussure's langue over parole, and are therefore extremely limited as tools to understanding the complex forces operating in particular texts and cultures. Reception theorists like Jonathan Culler, with a looser version of langue, have done better--interpreting genre in the context of reader anticipation. This is roughly parallel to Marshall McLuhan's conception of genre as cliché, to Viktor Shklovsky's "defamiliarization," and to Roman Jakobson's application of frustrated expectation to poetic devices:

"The **langue** is a theoretical tool useful for explaining why and how **language** works," and is not limited to intention (Eco, "The Influence of Jacobson" 115, 118-19). Fredric Jameson and Barbara Foley define genre as a social contract between a work and a particular public (R. Cohen 208, Foley 51).¹⁷⁹ Mikhail Bakhtin speaks of genres as historically determined languages (1981, 288),¹⁸⁰ and Hayden White's interdisciplinary studies of textuality show the presence of fictional genres even in historiography. "Genre is the principle category by which we acknowledge the inescapable historicity of form itself" (McKeon 6), and, as a counterfigure to Frye's heirophanic "displacement," Michael McKeon claims that genre "emplaces"--it progressively specifies "imaginative forms to the only locus of real meaning, the circumstantial and material reality of human experience" (10). He cites the key tension in the novel as that between "the individual life and the overarching pattern[s]" (90) created by social, economic, scientific, and religious forces. Advertising, for example, markets even genre-breaking texts according to some category. "Genre" thus avoids the premature equation of the text (even the autobiographical text) with the ego of its author. If in Derrida's witty deconstruction of genre the desire to classify always manifests a fear of contagion (1980, 204), Maxmilian Novak extends and historicizes Derrida's logic to imply that the fear of genre itself expresses the same taboo, the old interdiction--we might add--of the academic

against popular culture.

"Mimesis inherently generalizes," says Foley (65), but abstraction has its limits. As the exchange between Derrida and anthropology shows, even the most abstract of texts gesture back to the body, though I would hesitate to say just which taboos--speaking of one's mother-in-law or referring to excrement--Derrida means the reader to take as "impurity, anomaly or monstrosity" (1980, 204). The uses to which an author puts scatology imply generic boundaries to a text, and this holds as true for the discourse that has come to be known as postmodernism as for discourses that rely on more traditional autobiographical conventions. Some theorists (Kroker, Calinescu, Lyotard, and Spariosu) are very reluctant to set postmodernism among other "genres." If postmodernism can be defined as "anti-mimetic" (Calinescu 8), an "incredulity toward metanarratives" (Lyotard xxiv, 37), or "anti-allegorical" (Spariosu 61), postmodernism cannot generate a meta-narrative like *bildung*.¹⁸¹ Lyotard, however, clearly recognizes that postmodernism at most destroys the notion of a **grand** consensus, and still produces the "little narrative" (*petit récit*, (60) or "language game." Unless we take seriously Kroker's (following Bataille's) melodramatic proclamation of the end of history, we may still speak of "genres" even if we distrust the biological meta-narrative behind this trope.

Yet, according to Derrida's stricter logic, my transgression occurs even earlier because postmodernism and autobiography overlap, so that all cases are already extra-legal. I nevertheless oppose the categories because of their argument about the relations between world and text (or body and text): the postmodernist understands the relations as wholly simulated, while the traditional autobiographer has faith in the possibility of a transliteration between the body and its other. But works like Beautiful Losers immediately exemplify the miscegenation that thwarts the study of genre. Even as the characters in the novel at points reveal their simulation by becoming interchangeable, the novel also relies on known details from the life of Cohen (his drug addiction most notably), and Cohen has made a more or less referential claim in an interview: "Beautiful Losers only sold one thousand copies when it came out. Then the landscape opens up as more people have a certain kind of experience" (Cohen in Twigg 57). Further complicating this refusal to stay on the level of the "diminutive sign," we might guess that "a certain kind of experience" refers at least partly to the experience of media simulation.

In response to Derrida I would argue that here we have to do with history: to address a particular work as if it were completely co-extensive with a genre would confirm Derrida's suspicions, because such a supposition would incarcerate

fiction prematurely in a ridiculously pure form of historical discourse; on the other hand, to exempt literature from genre is to exempt it from history. If social structures are never exempt from taboos or codified laws, how can literature be wholly different. A refusal to speak of genres makes each text anomalous and ignores not only the impulses behind consumer categories but also the absolute pervasiveness of parody--hosts and guests--in textual production. Since anomalous language operates initially upon the **conventions** of language, we may also expect that anomalous texts operate initially upon the **conventions** of language forms. If 'genres' do not belong to 'things in themselves,' genres at the very least belong to the reception of any speech act, to its historical context.

11. "When I de small man sometime I used to eat goat shit":
The Base and Written Self in Fictional Autobiography

Others fashion man, I repeat
him. . . . I describe not the
essence, but the passage.

--Montaigne, "Of Repenting"
(Florio translation)

His principal subject of
complaint was that. . . he was
cut off from the world by a
veil. This veil was torn only
at one moment--when, after an
enema, the contents of the
bowel left the intestinal
canal; and then he felt well
and normal again.

--Sigmund Freud, From the
History of an Infantile
Neurosis

I forgot about constipation!
Constipation didn't let me
forget. Constipation ever
since I compiled the list.
Five days ruined in their
first half-hours. Why me?--
the great complaint of the
constipated. Why doesn't the
world work for me? The lonely
man sitting on the porcelain
machine. What did I do wrong
yesterday? What unassailable
bank in my psyche needs shit?
How can I begin anything new
with all of yesterday in me?
The hater of history crouched
over the immaculate bowl. How
can I prove the body is on my
side? Lost ordinary
magic! The squatting man
bargaining with God,
submitting list after list of
New Year's Resolutions. I
will eat only lettuce. . . .
Nothing helps, is that what
you want me to learn? The
straining man perched on a
circle prepares to abandon all
systems.

--the narrator of Beautiful
Losers

We turn first to the fictionalization of a form in which the relation between body and text gestures at transparency. At the popular level of autobiography, the categorical claim of the autobiographer is to offer an almost unmediated translation of world into the text. What better way to refer to the world than by the sign of excrement: common to every body, the realist's old ploy, often private or censored (and therefore so convincingly the thing **outside** of the text; excrement appears to have been the last link between Freud's sadistic patient and the world. Even in detecting autobiographical lies or distortions, and especially in detecting omissions, the reader does not so much refuse the mimetic contract as confirm its premises. While it is premature to suggest as Karl Stich does that autobiography stands up against deconstruction, the rhetorical status of the genre depends upon the mimetic claim to "worldliness," and despite Paul de Man's warnings,¹⁸² theorists like Philippe Lejeune and John Paul Eakin correctly refuse to jettison the referential impulse entirely.¹⁸³ De Man argues that "As soon as we understand the rhetorical function of prosopopeia as positing voice or face by means of language, we also understand that what we are deprived of is not life but the shape and the sense of a world accessible only in the privative way of understanding" (De Man 930). However, recent post-mortem intrusions into de Man's collaborationist past,¹⁸⁴ like researches into Frederick Philip Grove, make it impossible to ignore the

private interest in the "defacement" trope that de Man sets in contest with the 'voice from beyond the grave.' De Man's trope reveals a certain **autobiographical** ingenuity involved in the post-structural privation of the world, a calculated "de-Manning" of World War II literary history. His theory of autobiography does not forget his personal past, even if he does.¹⁸⁵

For Emile Benveniste discourse is, more broadly than for de Man or Stich, the arena in which man designates himself as a continuous **subject**, a "unity that transcends the totality of actual experiences": "'Ego' is he who says 'ego'" (224). Although the personal pronoun (in its referential shift with each individual speaker) does not take part in the same order of referentiality that other nominal objects do (218), Benveniste's mobilization of speech act theory to explain how each "I" appropriates deictic markers ('here,' 'this,' 'now') for itself, sets another kind of referential structure in place. In other words, the "I" does not disappear in an autobiographical mask, but appropriates the speech of another to its own purposes (Benveniste 227). In fictional autobiography--the literary re-orientation of autobiography, the representational claim is transposed to another level: no longer does the writer claim to report the affairs of a particular body but rather claims a secondary artistic fidelity to certain types of experiences and bodies.

Because of this, the theoretical difference between a first person account and a third person limited omniscient account (or other third person forms for that matter) is not always a substantive difference. A strictly formalist definition like Gérard Genette's autodiegesis (wherein the equation of narrator and character is the salient which distinguishes 'autobiography' from other texts) cannot, therefore, be maintained under pressure. We cannot *a priori* exclude novels like Under the Volcano, Yesterdays, Who Do You Think You Are, and The River Horsemen, which, though not in the first person, cross over significantly into the lives of their authors. As Lejeune says, "What would prevent me from writing my life's story and calling myself 'you'?" (7) When Flo holds up a pair of stained shorts in Who Do You Think You Are, glad to be able to signal decay and death, we cannot fully separate her act or her persona from Munro's mother who died of Parkinson's disease after a long illness, despite the autobiographical disclaimers that Munro and others employ.¹⁸⁶ The third person "alienation" of the narrative voice allows for more stable authorial ironies than does a first person voice, but it can also foster the illusion of a loss of agency. The mimetic level can accommodate both the discourse of fictional autobiography and theoretical discourse *about* autobiography, without forcing us to (perhaps falsely in this case) to follow Genette in differentiating mimesis from diegesis. An interesting case is Davies' essay "In Pursuit of Pornography." Davies'

argument that a man's library is a portrait of the man--we must see all of a man's books, even his pornography to know him (264)--turns the library into a patient, with a conscious and a repressed self. But "I" (unintentionally or intentionally) breaks down the rational tone of the objective authority psychoanalyzing a culture even before the analysis is made. The elevated position from which the author looks at pornography as evidence of certain social conditions disintegrates as the subject matter comes to seem more and more a constituent of the writer's (and reader's) personal abjection, or, in other words, more and more a function of autobiography than of scientific investigation. Once the author says "I" (and no writer can completely avoid this), the author, not any other matter, becomes the Subject. "There is now virtually no written form that has not either been included in some study of autobiography or else been subjected to autobiographical analysis" (Spengemann xii). We might go farther: there is no writing which does not in some way disclose the subject.

On the other hand, recent critical theory has taught us above all to be reluctant even to address the relations between the author's historical self and the textual representation of that self. "'I' is an other" says Lejeune (9),¹⁸⁷ but we can get a much more emotionally-charged sense of how opaque the mask of authorship is by looking at Yesterdays. There Tailor, whose name and whose habit of

chronicling village "affairs" (95) suggest that he is a persona for the author, unintentionally reveals something about his past to Ragbir:

"People shit is de wost kinda shit to smell," Tailor said. "cow shit does smell nice. Horse shit does smell good too. Goat shit and sheep shit is nice shit to smell. But dog shit does stink like people own, you know boy Rag."

"Korek."

"You know when I de small boy Rag, we de have a goat. Wen I de small man sometime I used to eat goat shit man Rag."

"Wat make you stop?"

Realizing that he had said something about his past life, Tailor maintained a stony silence. (74)

How are we to measure this confessional moment? Has Ladoo confessed a detail of his pre-Canadian past through a third person? Has he confessed in order to record the past or merely to shock his Canadian readers with the primitive? Is the relatively minor transgression of coprophagy a screen whereby Ladoo secretly confesses something unspeakable? More damaging to the *genre*, has he anything to confess at all?--couldn't he simply be playing with the reader who demands scandal? If Tailor makes a slip of the tongue, Ladoo, after all, does not speak: as the initial editor of his own graphic slips, Ladoo's cover-up can always precede even post-humous publication.

Instead of providing answers about Ladoo's life or attempting here what even full-scale biography has difficulty doing, I will limit myself mostly to fictional

stagings of the autobiographical problem in order to see how particular authors address the problems of autobiography as a genre rather than by what complex processes they refer to their own lives outside of the text. For example, Ladoo's momentary autobiographical gesture addresses the problem of reportage and suppression, of how the written self represses and yet wants to confess scatological details about the body. Authorial practices can reveal particular lives--Eliot's dissociation of sensibility notwithstanding--but can only do so through a series of cultural and generic screens.

The example from Yesterdays suggests that everything said in Part One about personal and social histories--the formation of the self in reaction to scatology, the doubling back into the country or the past to recover the body,¹⁸⁸ and the extreme skepticism which mistrusts even bodily signification--could be repeated as a background to how scatology constitutes the autobiographical subject. In fact, we could repeat each chapter from the rhetorical adoption of lower class positions to the material reorientation of religious materials, so that each separate "topic" becomes a simultaneous masking and divulging of the self.

If scatology can found symbolic systems by initiating a series of exclusions, we might expect it to function simultaneously as that system's base and as its photographic negative. In other words, without some reference to what is

excluded neither the autobiographical subject nor the system within which she takes her meaning can be intelligible, but the base reference threatens to destroy the logical integrity of the system simply by being present in the system's discourse about itself. We need not go to post-structuralism or postmodernism for versions of this paradox. In Canadian fictional autobiography a basic constituent of the written self is the scatological, which forms a "base" self in both senses of the word. In World of Wonders, Lives of Girls and Women, and The Story of Bobby O'Malley, the authors create a "base" self which is at once the fundament of the written self and the excremental version of the self that is rejected in the founding act.¹⁸⁹ "Paul" in World of Wonders inherits a double body when he climbs inside the card-playing machine, "Abdullah." Echoing the Odyssean ruse, Paul calls himself "Nobody," and although the interior smells of urine, Abdullah becomes a hermetically safe body, a respite from Willard the "arse-bandit" (61). Magnus, with the transcendence brought about by retrospect, a name change, and the actor's mask, ties his (oral) historical self-explanation to the disappearance of filth. During a performance he entertains the idea of throwing a full chamberpot into the royal box (110), but his adoption of Sir John Tresize's persona prevents so gross a gesture; instead, Magnus learns how to say "'kiss my arse' with class" (181). Like St. Augustine--"I stank in Thine eyes" (Confessions 2.23)--Magnus has come a long way from his "foul" past, but

we might expect that the transcendent location of the narrating self in Augustinian autobiography (Spengemann 1) would be negated by scatology in both of the two central topoi marking the fictional autobiographer's base self: these topoi are 'the scatological body as dead self' and 'confession as purgation.'¹⁹⁰ By pursuing these and other scatological peculiarities (such as those marking the suppression of information and the mechanism of projection,) we can see how a particular "thematic" can signal the world and yet dismantle the very structure that makes theme intelligible.¹⁹¹

ii The Dead Self

"It falls to the punitive technique. . . to reconstitute all the sordid details of a life in the form of knowledge" (219), argues Foucault, connecting biography, the human sciences, and criminology. As readers of confessional autobiographies know, such attempts at making not only a crime but an abject narrated life answer to the knower (God, or a later converted self) occur long before the Eighteenth Century. In the Twentieth Century, confessions of a dead self are necessarily more oblique and less pious. Lives of Girls and Women obviously exposes a trauma about the self and not about the lives of cows when Del Jordan reports her own overbearing and scatological reaction to the dead cow. She wants to "pee on it, anything to punish it" for being dead (38), and later realizes that "to be made of flesh was

humiliation" (48). Not coincidentally in the same chapter, "Heirs of the Living Body," Del is able to define her status as a writer and to distinguish her own voice from the voice that her aunts want her to imitate, the dead historical voice in Uncle Craig's manuscript. Dead Uncle Craig is something like a dead cow, an abject version of the self; this must be so because Del senses enough of a personal stake to refuse to see the body of her relative. What is this but confession? On the other hand, Del's pleasure at seeing that Uncle Craig's manuscript (post-humously given into Del's care) has become waterlogged requires a less communitarian explanation. The fate of Uncle Craig's body signals her own body; the fate of Uncle Craig's composition signals nothing about her own compositions. Why? For Del, at least, the fate of the written self must evidently be distinguishable (almost romantically so) from the abject fate of the body, and the written self is for her less a question of shared discourse than (also romantically) of individual style. These premises are not treated ironically in "Heirs of the Living Body," but Munro does interrogate them in the "Epilogue." Until Del begins to theorize about the relations between her life and her text, writing is stable and distinct from the body, an early separation that may grow out of the problem of gender: Del cannot afford a great deal of fellow-feeling when her anxiety of (at this point) male influence is paramount.¹⁹²

The scatological association of the self with the dead body is less stable in The Story of Bobby O'Malley. The O'Malley septic tank is "the size of a coffin" (13), and the sewage hose used to empty the tank becomes the first vortex for Bobby's existential fears: "it'll suck ye right inside, an' no-one'll know ye ever lived" (14). "My father told me to remember that I got older every time I flushed the toilet. I imagined what it was like inside the tank. . . 'Dark and foul' my father said, 'dark and foul'" (15). The retrospective narrator understands the bathroom as the site of disillusionment and of the beginning of Bobby's fears that his father will desert the family. In the bathroom, Bobby's father tells Bobby that he is going bowling when he really plans to see Harold's Mother. Bobby, sensing a repeated deception, forces his father to let him help plan elaborate bowling strategies in the bathroom.

But there is a certain speciousness about speaking of time, process, and beginnings in autobiography. Can the written event be isolated outside of its retrospective emplotment? Given the later associations of the father's apparent suicide and the toilet, it is not by chance that Bobby begins his own story with sewage and the dead self. On the day that Bobby follows his mother around, hoping to find clues to the secret of her being, he wants to depend upon a Freudian epistemology in which identity is marked materially and scatologically by repression: "I hoped that,

when no-one was looking, she would give herself away--pick her nose, or scratch her backside, or put a roll of candy in her pocket and walk out without paying" (155). Johnston is not hesitant to admit the limits of this epistemology when Bobby's mother does not give him the required sign and Bobby fails (perhaps inevitably given his epistemology) to understand her. Johnston, inverting Augustine, "converts" Bobby out of the priesthood and into secular society. However, in Geoffrey Harpham's reading of Augustine, the mode of conversion--particularly as a species of writing--can never include a prior state. "The fact that we are never free from impingement by the 'word of another' leads to [a] quarrel with Vance (and with almost every other reader of Augustine's), this time in his claim that conversion can be assigned to a definite temporal moment. . . . No moment of consciousness is 'pre-conversion.' Nor, we must remember, does the subject ever achieve a 'post-conversional' condition" (Harpham 48). Harpham argues that the always-prior condition of language (the word of another) is too near the meaning of Augustine's conversion (impingement by the Word of another) to allow for proper conceptual differentiation. Spengemann analyzes Books 1-9 of the Confessions in a similar way: "while the protagonist believes that he is going to the Manichees to find the truth, the narrator knows that he really went in order to become disillusioned with them" (Spengemann 8). While the protagonist of The Story of Bobby O'Malley believes that he

is gravitating towards the priesthood because his mother knows the truth about the world, the narrator knows that he went in order to become disillusioned with the church. The retrospective Bobby, who relies on Ted's epistemology, does not for a moment believe in Bobby the potential vicar of Christ. A primary justification for autobiography is the representation of change through time, but the "new" self always shows up "back there" (at almost every moment) in the graphic past to make teleological sense of the "old" self. The 'panopticon,' we might say, is not the exclusive tool of the state or a religious tradition, but also a tool in counter-epistemologies.

This is important in novels like Fifth Business where self-making and myth-making are inextricably bound. Scatology runs counter to miracle and myth, and it is the image of the rotting corpse that Dunstan Ramsay must better in the case of his brother Willie's "stubborn retention" (58) of urine. Urine signals death because if Willie cannot expel his waste he will become it;¹⁹³ but the autobiographer's deck is stacked against urine and death: by presenting Mary Dempster's role in Willie's cure first (before Ramsay's "conversion" to her and before a rational explanation) Ramsay's temporal rhetoric favors the miracle as an objective event. This is true in The Story of Bobby O'Malley as well. The early association between the mother's puritanical embracing of sterilization and Bobby's

isolation very quickly signifies that Bobby has adopted the maternal persona but ought not have. Yet the presentation of "Bobby"--in formalist terms Johnston's **machine** --has already ensured that the puritanical self is merely a screen for the apparently **later** (but already planned) secular conversion. The real issue is the provenance of the father's scatology (not the mother's hygiene) in Bobby's father-bound voice. Indeed, autobiography presents to psychoanalysis a need for a conception of "screen memory" that can account for the retrospective encoding of experience. While "screen memory" is usually a trope for how retrospective analysis can unlock a repressed past, scatology in Bobby O'Malley has never really been repressed, and rather shows us how the retrospective act itself skews the earlier memories towards its own teleology. To maintain the unity of the autobiographical subject, the late conversion must be shown by the autobiographer **in potentia**. Although lives may change, prolepsis prevents those changes from being fully mirrored in narrative. Therefore: sewage in the beginning.

Sewage in the beginning is located in the father at the end, and the emphasis on scatology marks Bobby's attempt to recapture his father's skeptical mode of expression, indeed, to become Ted O'Malley by turning Ted's eight chapter outline of the innocently-titled Our Memoirs into The Story of Bobby O'Malley. Bobby discovers that his father has

apparently been flushing the familial autobiography down the toilet as each page was completed. The dead self thus circumscribes a greater area than it does for Del, extending even into writing. On the back of the outline, Bobby finds several pencilled notes: "What is more final than flushing the toilet? Do this in memory of me" and "The book is a pound of flesh on every page" (184). The deformation of Christian language suggests an alternative to the hagiographic models of the gospels, under which Agnes has tried to set Bobby's life. Ted's dialogic recasting of religious language informs the novel at its deepest level, and the toilet becomes the medium of Bobby's secular conversion. Bobby takes the videotape of his father, his mother's hair (saved from her pre-marital celibacy), and the St. Joseph's beard that he was once forced to wear--relics all--and burns them in the toilet:¹⁹⁴

The bowl was blazing as if hell itself was backing up inside the pipes. . . . On my knees I had to keep my face back from the flame and reach around it with my arm to flush the toilet. Eyes burning from the smoke, my forehead hot, I somehow found the handle and pushed it down. As the water rushed in, the flames started going round and going out at the same time. The water ate in from the outer edge until only the core of flame was left, a island getting smaller, going round and round and down. Finally, there was just one central spark which, with the water at the bottom, seemed to turn inside out, then vanished. (186)

Without the transcendental location of self driving traditional autobiography, which, because of its spiritual programme is no longer available to Ted, the possibility of ontological defeat becomes a potential trap for Bobby.

Given the likelihood that his father's death was suicide, the relations between central sparks and authoritative models of the self has implications beyond rhetoric. To return Bobby's "life" to the scene of the body, Johnston has him get drunk and then purge his insides into the same toilet. For Johnston the repressed self asserts itself against Bobby's rational self: "It's probably true that, as Little Laurence said, I paused between regurgitations to communicate a marked, if heretofore well hidden aversion to clerical life" (189).

Thus Bobby's life; not thus the writing of it: the demands for artistic coherence are such that any single text describes a state, not a process. To the scandal of referentiality, Bobby's scatology insists that the aversion never was hidden, and that even a scatological conversion requires a "transcendent" narrator, one who can see eternal patterns at work. It would be inaccurate to say that Bobby has abandoned all systems.

iii Confession

These scenes near the end of The Story of Bobby O'Malley also rely on another topos in the abject identification of the self: confession as scatological. The association between purification and purgation, much older than Rabelais' satire against monks, perhaps helps to explain Freud's sadistic patient and his literal-minded need for

enemas.¹⁹⁵ "I lack the confessional spirit" (The Manticore 23), says Davies' often cruel David Staunton, "my nature is a retentive, secretive one" (43). The cliché of 'dumping on someone' (The Telling of Lies 18) is a popular and off-handed version of this, but the topos becomes more central in works like Eye of the Father, where Wayne Goodman must acknowledge the scatological sins of the grandfather as his own personality before the narrative can come to a comic resolution. Likewise, The Assumption of Rogues and Rascals builds toward a confession of inner abjection, but the triple evacuation of excrement, child, and writing conveniently allow Smart to claim experience as more important than literary structure. The scatological implications are shifted away from the lonely, the pollutive, the forced, the hemorrhoidal, towards the relational, as the act of excretion is transferred from the writer to the baby through the metaphor of the necessary diaper.

Although I hesitate to equate any sign directly with a moral function, there are hints that a depersonalized scatology or a lack of scatology can point to an incomplete confession. In A Search for America, Philip's "lack of condescension to everyday slang" (3) seems modified when he enters the foul-smelling lavatory in the basement of the restaurant where he works (41). Throughout his autobiography, Philip implies that he is in the process of

both dirtying himself in America and giving away terrible secrets about himself, yet someone else always seems to either be responsible or provide an alibi for his shortcomings. The structuring of the moment of descent is symptomatic of Philip's (and perhaps Grove's) maintenance of a transcendental version of the self: Philip assimilates the lavatory to an epic pattern of descent into the underworld, so that he retains his aristocratic bearing (and alibi) in a formal sense. A more thoroughgoing elision occurs at the end of The Telling of Lies. Findley has his detective, Vanessa Van Horne, "confess" her own role in the "collective lie" (288) that contributed to Calder Maddox's murder. Her confession rings hollow because she is not implicated in any bodily, material, or personal way. The novel tends towards a moral dimorphism between class authorities and innocent victims.

While conclusions based on absences are at best hypothetical, some writers have more consciously enacted instances where the repression of scatology points to problems in autobiographical reportage. Hagar, in The Stone Angel wets her sheets every night for several months but does not "remember" this in her narrative (73-4); Laurence's disclosure of this through Doris changes the shape of the narrative from Hagar's autobiographical sense of herself as a victim to a more ambiguous structure in which writing is not circumscribed by the first person. For this instance we

might rename the "panopticon" as the tool of consciousness, self-scrutiny. In Running in the Family, Ondaatje's sisters are so embarrassed that for fifteen years they will not speak of their grandmother Lalla urinating behind the bushes on Parents' Day (124). The gap in the autobiographer's reportage in both cases is exactly that which the self represses in order to become civilized, and in order to have access to record-keeping languages.

iv Dirty Shadows

Compared to the problem of the gap, projection is more easily identified. David Staunton dreams of wiping the filth off his father's (Percy Boyd Staunton's) face and uncovering there his own face as a child (The Manticore 98). Elsewhere, Adrian Pledger-Brown draws up an appropriate heraldic device for the Stauntons and then calls it "anitergium. . . . a trifle, a sketch, something disposable. Well actually the monks used it for the throwouts from the scriptorium which they used for bumwipe" (237). Although the former image is "psychological" and the latter is "external" to David, their symbolic collusion in an autobiography points to the teller's sense of scatological abjection. Davies plays these projective signs against David's tendency to disavow evil. For example, David reduces his own role in an incident of vandalism by emphasizing how Bill Unsworth defecates on somebody's photographs: "as he struggled, red-faced and pop-eyed, and

as he appeared at last with a great stool dangling from his apelike rump, I regained my senses and said to myself. . . 'Why is he doing that?' The destruction was simply a prelude to this. It is a dirty, animal act of defiance and protest against--well, against what?" (168) In Davies' Jungian scheme, projection of course heralds the beginning of self-knowledge, as the subject separates himself from the shadow. Scatology thus becomes the signal cue for self-construction, and Dr. Von Haller interprets David's dream of his father's backside as an unmasking of David's **internalized** authorities, especially the one nominated "Judge Staunton."

Father, fear, bear; Davies is unwilling to fully dematerialize them into a Law of the Father or even into David himself, "devourer" of witnesses (278). Even so, it is not clear at the end of the narrative whether a real bear or an archetype has confronted David in the dark cave. In any case, David's "second birth" (evidently meant as a psycho-analytic representation of the child filling the birth canal with meconium) involves David's recognition that the stinking backside belongs not to his father or to a bear, but to himself: "the terrible stench that filled the tunnel was my own" (304). The fluidity of exchange between internal and external is a basic psychoanalytic principle, but this process of creating symbols of the self (even out of one's excrements) is at once basic to and disruptive of

autobiography. If excrement, which more than anything ought to refer to real things and actual deeds in their chaotic, unidealized existence, if even excrement inevitably takes the guise of one more symbol of the self, then the aspect of autobiography that promises to refer to the world is compromised. If scatology cannot even signify the world, what can?

The problem of how reportage is affected by projection is increased for Davies by the time of What's Bred in the Bone, the fictional biography of Francis Cornish. "The Looner," who farts loudly and masturbates in public, is not only a figure for what exists before manners, but, as Cornish's older brother and indeed the original Francis Cornish, the Looner specifically becomes the "first self" for the other, later Francis. Once the hidden scatological double is discovered, he becomes a central feature in Cornish's anachronistic art. This can hardly surprise us, given what we have seen of doubling back, but who narrates the Looner's history? Other private histories in the novel press toward the same question. At the beginning of the novel Cornish hates shaking hands: "Said he could smell mortality on his hand when it touched somebody else's. When he absolutely had to shake hands with some fellow who didn't get his clear signals, he would shoot off to the washroom as soon as he could and wash his hands. Compulsive behavior. . . . He didn't bathe much" (6-7). By the end we know that Cornish,

before he to all intents and purposes killed Jean-Paul Letzpfennig, had to shake Letzpfennig's "unpleasantly damp" (420) hand, and that Cornish "wished he could wash the corpse-sweat from his right hand" (421). Darcourt reports Cornish's words in the first instance (6-7), but who vouchsafes the unspoken scatological details of the second instance (421)? In yet another scene, Cornish's schoolfellows stick a straw up a frog's "cloaca, and blow it up to enormous size. As the frog swelled, there was a delightful apprehension that it might burst. There was an even more splendid hope that the boy who was blowing might, if enough funny things were said to him, stop blowing for a moment and suck and then--why, he might even die, which would richly crown the fun. Frank's eyes were on the frog, whose contortions and wildly waving legs pierced his heart with a vivid sense of the sufferings of Jesus" (96-7). We might say that the language divides neatly between the cadences of a good-humoured aristocrat and the limited sensibilities of young boys, or, in a different vein, that Davies here strangely reverses Bakhtin's dialogic so that the myth of the incarnation is confirmed by what we would expect to read parodically--a suffering frog.

But again, who or what narrates? Apparently a film-like machine that the daimon Maimas and the angel of biography, the Lesser Zadkiel, have access to. The biographer's problem, especially in a post-phenomenological age--of being

limited only to Cornish's external contacts with the world--initially seems exactly opposite to that of the autobiographer, but Davies, unlike Cornish's biographer Simon Darcourt, requires Cornish to think and sense in the first person. The quirky use of Maimas and Zadkiel implies a lack of confidence in the omniscient narrator, the traditional formal solution to the problem of insider knowledge. Maimas and Zadkiel, instead of solving the problem in a new way, are *dei*, literally *ex machina*, and their omniscience--limited to Francis Cornish--thus produces autobiography in the third person even though they claim not to know the full truth about Cornish. Darcourt rationalizes theology (including Maimas and Zadkiel) as a type of medieval psychological science, while Davies apparently means to criticize him by means of Maria Cornish, who refuses to modernize her language. Italicized, outside of the main narrative, Maimas and Zadkiel approach the old, omniscient narrator; yet, inside of the main narrative, they are nothing more or less than Francis Cornish to the point where they paradoxically confirm Darcourt's rationalizing against Davies' irony. In this *reductio*, the scatological details of the private body push the narrative towards a singulative point of view, and, what is more crucial in the wake of discourse theory, towards a singulative vision: that of Davies, call him Maria Cornish (who picks up her archaic language from other Davies novels), call her Simon Darcourt (who with qualifications adopts her terms), call

him Maimas and the Lesser Zadkiel (who appear as soon as Darcourt speaks their names), call them Francis Cornish (whose thoughts are accessible to daimons and angels), call him Davies (for whom anachronism and the pre-civilized Looner are the substance of art). We are left with the same problem of projection, not just in the characters, but in the formal choices.

Scatological details, initially worldly gestures that separate the text from the world, just as often trap, or at least bracket, the world phenomenologically within the pattern of one self. The details that structure the "inside" of the text are used in such a way that they cannot help but dismantle the system of "external" references.

12. Postmodern Decomposition: Guaranteeing the World
of an Indeterminate Text

Don't despise things.

--Saraceni in
What's Bred in the Bone

I shat those theories out
completely.

--Buddy Bolden in
Coming Through Slaughter

Writing is that neuter, that
composite, that obliquity into
which the subject flees, the black
and white where all identity is
lost, beginning with the very
identity of the body that writes.

--Roland Barthes

The Romantic creator, as
originating and original source of
meaning, may well be dead, as
Barthes argued years ago, but the
creator's position--a position of
discursive authority--remains, and
increasingly is the self-conscious
focus of much contemporary art.

--Linda Hutcheon

If in discussing autobiography I appear to have succumbed
to the logic of Paul de Man--asking for Newton's
autobiography and then feigning surprise when scatology
disappoints a solar system of the objectified self--I hope
it will become clear that I mean this reading to take place
within the ambidextrous (if I may co-ordinate human bodies
with celestial) theory of Lejeune, who notices that writing
is to some extent always an alibi but that this does not
automatically make autobiography non-referential. Barthes'
'death of the author' and his later sense of textual
pleasure,¹⁹⁶ like Baudrillard's recent discussions of the
media, depend on a sliding non-systematic form of reference

and contain assumptions about mimesis that are clearly at odds with the dominant assumptions in most fictional autobiographies. But if scatology lets the autobiographer articulate a skepticism which destroys the referential certainties within the *bildungs* genre, it is worth asking several questions of the postmodern: is scatology as a trope then inherently allied with postmodern skepticism? Or does scatology undermine the conventions of even skeptical and ironic genres? In other words, instead of here blaming postmodernism for its political significations as Jürgen Habermas, Fredric Jameson, Terry Eagleton, and Barbara Foley do,¹⁹⁷ I want to extend Linda Hutcheon's "on the other hand"--arguing, like she does, that postmodern texts question referentiality and subjecthood, but only from within history and the subject (Hutcheon 1988b, 19).

What is postmodernism? For most theorists, postmodernism sets itself equally against modernism and realism (Lyotard 75; Pache 76; Kroker 15; Hutcheon 1988, 4, 149; Bowering 1982, 79-81). Theorists often come up against the difficulty that the specific techniques used to define postmodernism--the pleasure of the fragmentary, the blurring of genre boundaries, the blurring of boundaries between art and life, the distrust for totalizing languages, the play on surfaces, and skepticism about "depth"--are not new. Some theorists, as a result, expand the definition to the point of inutility: Arthur Kroker locates the crisis of

representation in St. Augustine, calling him the first postmodernist and equating Augustine's "closing of the eye of the flesh" with Bataille's "pineal eye" (Kroker 28). Lyotard insists that postmodernism precedes modernism, and is in fact modernism in its nascent moment (79)--when modernism breaks with the real to "present the fact that the unrepresentable exists" (78) and before modernist fragments project a nostalgia for realist totalities. Postmodernism thus becomes a synonym for all avant-gardes.

An alternate theoretical strategy involves defining modernism narrowly and totally as a pure break with history (Hutcheon 1988: 4) and as an escape into the world of symbol. This approach emphasizes modern architecture (Hutcheon 1988: 26), and de-emphasizes contingency in modernist literature. In a modernist text like Sheila Watson's The Double Hook, the language--"Coyote made the land his pastime. . . .He breathed on the grass. His spittle eyed it with prickly pear" (22) or "[James] smelt the stench of Coyote's bedhole" (43)--is often entirely double: purely symbolic (especially since Watson does not put a literal faith in native mythology) and yet edged with bodily contingencies. The symbolic language makes discourse (and not reality) the primary constituent of the 'novel,' creating serious opacities for those not familiar with the compressions of Imagism. It is therefore true to say that the principle of order is "not in the sequence of historical

time or the evolving sequence of character . . . as in realism or naturalism; [modernist writers] tend to work spatially or through layers of consciousness, working toward a logic of metaphor or form" (Bradbury and McFarlane 50). Yet the consistent attribution of scatological materiality to the creator Coyote implies a primary 'real' world antecedent to the text; this invalidates the further claim that the modernist novel flees from "material realism" or that "language ceases to be what we see through, and becomes what we see" (Fletcher and Bradbury 401). Both the metropolitan language of modernism and the dirty farmyard in The Double Hook qualify each other's precedence. The characters are eventually redeemed by the old Christian symbols (spoken anew by Felix), but to focus only on this would be to ignore the historical contingency of incarnated characters who are at the mercy of Canadian settlement patterns.

My purpose, however, is not to affirm or create a particular definition of postmodernism. Some elements, such as the emphasis on surfaces, can seem deceptively simple, especially to those critics who make political arguments against certain **styles** of representation.¹⁹⁸ But I would be hesitant to jettison any of these definitions: even Kroker is useful in showing that simulation was not invented in the 1970's.¹⁹⁹ Since many of these definitions are included in Hutcheon's claim that postmodern texts question

referentiality and subjecthood, and since this claim marks what I see as postmodernism's most insistent historical departure, it is her definition that I will rely on the most. Hutcheon does not allow Richard Rorty's and Michel Riffaterre's contention that the referential status of fiction is entirely different from the referential status of history (1988, 143, 148): "The familiar humanist separation of art and life (or human imagination and order *versus* chaos and disorder) no longer holds" (1988, 7). I suspect that these "separations" reappear (if in altered form) in postmodernism, but my approach is quite limited in scope: if autobiographical scatology (intended to be stable) eventually decomposes assurances about the narrated world, it is conversely possible that postmodern scatology, often intended as a destabilizer, also unintentionally guarantees a stable system of references.

i

Postmodernism does not entirely succeed in overcoming structuralist binaries, but in each case we must initially agree with Hutcheon that postmodern scatological parody can destabilize older authoritative narratives. Mary Douglas argues that "dirt was created by the differentiating activity of mind, it was a by-product of the creation of order" (161). Thus, the ritual pollution described in Leviticus signifies both the chaos before creation and the dissolution to come, while the taboos were intended to

support the Genesis narrative of an ordered creation. It is not surprising, then, that theorists of parody emphasize how scatology destroys the founding narratives of western culture--Jewish, Christian, Platonic, all of them patriarchal. Kristeva (1982, 4; 1987, 368) and Kroker (134) follow Bataille's sense of parody: "The terrestrial globe is covered with volcanoes, which serve as its anus. Although the globe eats nothing it often violently ejects the contents of its entrails. . . spreading death and terror everywhere. . . . It is clear that the world is purely parodic. . . . I am the Jesuve, the filthy parody of the torrid and blinding sun" ("The Solar Anus" 5-9). When Cixous argues that female writing cannot be defined because it is "against theory," that female language wrecks "partitions, classes, and rhetorics, regulations and codes," she too uses scatology: "oral drive, anal drive, vocal drive--all these drives are our strengths" ("The Laugh of the Medusa" 253, 256, 261). Even theorists who have no interest in postmodernism acknowledge the dislocating power of the grotesque (Philip Thompson 18).

In Canadian postmodernism, as in John Barth's Giles Goat Boy (with the Mathematical Psycho-Proctocologist Max Spielman) or in Thomas Pynchon's The Crying of Lot 49 (with the W.A.S.T.E. mail system), scatology parodically devalues cultural conventions. Leon Rooke, for example, deflects the reader's gaze from the classic Shakespearean text and its

attendant chain of the writer's metaphysical authority, focussing on what was evidently repressed--Shakespeare's dog's life. The material and grotesquely sensual dog's autobiography trades the high ritual agony of kings for the sniffing of turds, and thrusts a grotesque body upon The Greatest English Writer Of All Time, who has unceremoniously been banished to the periphery of the text. Moreover, Rooke's formal inversions trade the well-made plot for intimate descriptions of Hooker at stoole, and Hooker is not always prepared to find a systematic coherence in his actions: "'Why did you leak there?' she said. 'Oh I wish I understood you accursed dogs.' I kept quiet. If I had to give brain to every act, as she did hers, I'd soon be knitted up like a stew!" (125) Since Old John Shakespeare predicts the imparking of the world (44), the only way out of systematic enclosures, it seems, is to live as a dog.

If Rooke's Hooker can undermine the English cleric who turns the caprice of a divorce-eager king into pious order and good ecclesiastical government, dog nevertheless has his own implied principles of order: "Man's upright and he takes his news from that" (33), says Hooker, of course hinting that dog is four-footed and "takes his news from that." At one level, Shakespeare's Dog must therefore necessarily be the simplest of inversions: the "smooth and impenetrable surface" of the classical body (Bakhtin 1984, 317) exchanged for the scatological body. This occurs

biographically and discursively. The image of the classic, quoted Shakespeare is broken up by the knowledge that it eventually takes "a dog's wide learning" to make Shakespeare a "playspinner" (47)--Shakespeare reduced to the sum of Hooker's gathered knowledge.²⁰⁰ The images inherited from biblical discourse are refracted through matter: a 'dog returning to his vomit' is no longer mainly the vehicle of a metaphor or mainly proverbial, but is treated mimetically as a sensual event. Rooke satirizes (and reverses) traditional Judeo-Christian cosmology in which spirit animates inert matter by fiat, parodying, as we have seen in Chapter 10, metaphysical explanations of the soul. Arguing from vomit, the tangible insides, Hooker posits that fifth unbodied "element"--the quintessence or 'soul' (32). This is a crucial moment in the education of Rooke's Shakespeare, who is something of a skeptic.

Crucial for us is Rooke's substitution of scatology for soul at the original moment. Even though Hooker does not trust human materialism, the material, mimetic qualities of scatology have the central role here in administering a shock to Christian metaphysics. Of course, this mimetic centre does not cover all there is to Rooke's postmodernism. The parodic inversion of Proverbs does not so much reverse the spiritualizing tendencies of Jewish folk wisdom as write another account over or beside Proverbs. Rooke's sense of scatological mimesis writes over the past in two divergent

ways: the imitative and the fabular. On the one hand, by describing the treading of phlegm underfoot (91), Rooke clearly strives for historical accuracy about the difference in bodily minutiae between the Sixteenth Century and the present. Erasmus, in De civilitate morum puerilium, says that "the polite way is to catch the matter from the nose in a handkerchief, and this should be done by turning away slightly if decent people are present. If, in clearing your nose with two fingers, some matter falls on the ground, it should be immediately ground under foot" (275). Rooke's mimetic gesture thus argues against Eagleton's claim that history is what "postmodernism must at all costs efface" (68). On the other hand, the fable of origins comprised in 'why Shakespeare came to London' (to save Hooker from the Regarders) depends upon a tactical disregard for history. These contradictions--referential parody and destabilizing parody--are not the poles of postmodern discourse, but the nucleus.²⁰¹

Like Rooke to Shakespeare, Findley gets to Noah "first," before the original collectors and the priestly redactors. "Middenites" (Not Wanted on the Voyage 22) and "the rain of Onan" (130) thus get material significations "before" they are systematically politicized and moralized by Judaism and Christianity as "Midian" and "onanism." Findley's central focus is on how a new dispensation allegorized the master drama of the world's salvation, and Findley applies

scatology as a solvent for the transcendent battle between Yaweh and Lucifer. Late in the novel, a demon grows hot and bright in its nether regions, while Lucy holds its paws the way a mother might hold the hands of a child having "a difficult moment on the pot (301). This parody of toilet-training domesticates the demonic realm, and although we might be tempted to read the scene as a slaughter of the referents (both of Christian dualism and of realism), the parody of mother and child also has a humanizing effect. Indeed, fabular scatology paradoxically becomes a kind of realist ploy; the gap made by the dispersal of transcendental meaning is "always already" filled by more "natural" subjects--little demons on the potty and cats. When Mottyl, the cat who narrates, discovers the dead dog, Bip, with his crown of flies, she prays for him and leaves her "heat-infested traces" nearby (56-7). The adoption of a cat's point of view does **not** disperse the human subject. The animal in fact fulfills the anti-ideal emphasis of liberal humanism and the broadening egalitarian scope of the civilized self. The characters in Not Wanted on the Voyage and Shakespeare's Dog are marked as to whether they care for or mistreat the scatological beast-narrators. As in Shakespeare's Dog, the fabular in Not Wanted on the Voyage therefore does not destroy history even though Findley's social history--that of the late Twentieth Century animal rights--is less self-conscious than Rooke's.

The realist confidence that matter, particularly scatological matter, is more authentic than a religious code, and the humanist confidence that the thing is more honest than the miracle appears often in Findley's work. As if to guarantee honesty, Findley has Vanessa Van Horne lose control of her bladder while weeping for her dead father in The Telling of Lies. Weeping, it seems, can be feigned, abject urination cannot--very much a referential faith. Reference is much more complex in Famous Last Words because Mauberly, Ezra Pound's text, cannot always be taken as analogous to a real person. Against Lieutenant Quinn's defense of Mauberly's mythological writing, Captain Freyberg attacks with the fury of historical reference: "It's not the Trojan War I don't believe in. . . it's the Trojan horseshit" (150). Freyberg's serious critique of fiction as devious and false is made all the more powerful because of Mauberly's implication in Fascist plotting and, by extension, in Dachau.

But Freyberg's desire, according to Quinn, is for blank walls. This is another sort of aestheticism, which admits the scatological in human beings but does not allow for the soiling of walls and pages. The scatological terms of Freyberg's denunciation of Mauberly--"He's beginning to smell, isn't he" (149)--initially work against Freyberg. Mauberly, after all, has been smelling since the beginning of the novel, where we first saw him in rotted underwear

fleeing the Allies (4). The "smell" there served to humanize Mauberly according to the dictates of Findley's novelistic mimesis (as opposed to Pound's arcane poetic dialect). Findley shifts Pound's Mauberly from a satiric figure to a character for whom we can feel bodily sympathy, especially given the wholesale transgressions against his fastidiousness. In other words, for the length of Mauberly's dispossession Findley gives him a body which suggests victimhood. Such an attribution is heavily referential in a humanist direction--even Fascists have feelings. Scatology therefore becomes Findley's material concession to Freyberg's over-stable sense of historical reference. If Hutcheon shows how postmodernism "de-natures" (1989, 2), we can see in these references how it "natures." But of course Mauberly's ahistorical status puts all this in postmodern brackets, since we know that despite the traces of a real body Mauberly is always only *figura*. Famous Last Words is postmodern not because it erases reference, but because it places human affect and the body very consciously within the context of what can only be a simulated reality and a simulated subject.

ii

Here we are no longer precisely dealing with the scatological corrosion of master narratives. Rooke and Findley both point us in two directions: first, the "text" reaches so far into the "world" that it infects the world

with its own radical disembodiment; in other words the world is no longer the world, but becomes a tangent to itself. Secondly, the references to scatology could become so corrosive that they not only destroy ideal structures but also the realist faith in matter. In theory we can distinguish between the two directions. The first phenomenologically brackets the world within a somewhat ideal theory of discourse. In the second, "heterogeneous matter" is so repulsive that it resists "not only the idealisms of Christians, Hegelians, and surrealists, but even the edifice building of traditional materialists. . . . Bataille precisely recognizes that the fall of the elevated and noble threatens the coherent theory of allegory itself. . . . At the end of reason, at the end of man, at the end of the Cartesian pineal gland (the supposed seat of consciousness) there is only organism and a simultaneous fall, a simultaneous death" (Stoekl xi-xiv).²⁰² Bataille says that Gnosticism, for example, attributes "the creation of the earth, where our repugnant and derisory agitation takes place, to a horrible and perfectly illegitimate principle." Taking heresiological polemic quite literally, Bataille maintains that a being obsessed with matter and bestiality can "only submit to what is lower, to what can never serve in any case to ape a given authority" ("Base Materialism and Gnosticism" 47, 50).

Phrased in this way, both directions seem anti-mimetic.

In practice, however, the case is not so simple. William Gibson's "designer bodies" might initially seem to be a pure instance of the first direction. Gibson's heroes in Neuromancer and Count Zero, with biochips implanted in their brains, operate for much of the novels in virtual realities where the "old mystification, which always consists in placing Nature at the bottom of history" (Barthes 1973, 101) no longer operates. Many accounts of how postmodernism de-natures the world rely on disembodiment. In "What is an Author?" Foucault follows the Barthesian model by placing the text while refusing to place a biological subject in the author function. Lyotard calls the self a post for messages (15), while Kroker, somewhat curiously given his reliance on Bataille, argues that virtual technologies and the philosophy of the sign mean not only "the end of the fantasy of the Real" (15), but also that simulations triumph over rationalization (272). For Kroker the postmodern is a state in which everything is decentered and disembodied as the inner (pineal) eye opens to simulated experience (73-4). "We will never in future be able to separate reality from its statistical, simulative projection in the media" (Baudrillard 1988, 210) seems at first to describe Gibson's texts, and David Porush (the best commentator on Gibson) notes that in cybernetic theory the self becomes a message of the self (1989, 374-5).

However, as Hutcheon shows, postmodern practice is not

always identical with post-structural theory.²⁰³ Big corporations are the radical forces in Gibson's novels, creating new virtual environments so that the characters can go places where their bodies cannot. Deconstruction is accomplished not in the literary arena, but by genetics and computers. In virtual realities, apparently, the pull of mimesis is powerful but entirely deceptive: Neuromancer, an artificial intelligence or "AI," almost seduces Case into accepting the virtual reality as all that is the world, a complete shadowland in which Case can have whatever he did not really get. However, if the science-fiction writer reconciles us to new technologies, scatology in Gibson's work is inherently conservative, gesturing back, almost nostalgically, to the "past" biological unity of the individual human body.²⁰⁴ Gibson follows the logic of colloquial usage which makes the scatological--"We wait for him, pick him up, get his ass to Hosaka intact" (Count Zero 23)--a metonym for the entire human being and the basic constituent of language and identity: "You poor stupid shit. Poor stupid dead shit" (Count Zero 144).²⁰⁵ In one sense, of course, all texts signal the deferral of the body, but Gibson counters with scatology and human affect against the post-biological model--to maintain something like the traditional humanist subject.

This technique is so grounded in conventional referentiality that we might almost suspect that Gibson is a

realist masquerading as something else. But in his AI's, some of whom have citizenship (Count Zero 78), we see a more complicated form of reference. The amoral AI in Count Zero (the result of Neuromancer's conjunction with Wintermute) manipulates characters, including Christopher Mitchell who is convinced to leave Maas Biolabs. It is not only this echo of Pynchon that makes the novel postmodern, but the AI may be read as a computer deconstruction of the humanist subject; the AI operates from out in space as a disembodied power that overarches individual functionaries and makes its presences felt in human bodies. Thus far the structure resembles Foucault's analysis of discursivity, and, when the characters use the metaphor of **vodou** to speak of the AI's disparate sub-programs, the description very much resembles Lyotard's performativity principle: "'Vodou isn't like that,' Beauvoir said. 'It isn't concerned with notions of salvation and transcendence. What it's about is getting things **done**'" (76). Of course, the anachronistic language of **vodou** and the explicit force of will interrupt the notion that the subject has been dispersed. Speech act theorists would not deny that the text as text disperses the author, but would insist that to jettison the positions of sender and receiver is to mystify discourse. While we do not know what sort of body or will the AI in Count Zero is, we do know that its artistic tendency is to parody the boxes of Joseph Cornell: the AI creates "an arrangement of brown old maps and tarnished mirror. The seas of the cartographers

had been cut away, exposing the flaking mirrors, landmasses afloat on dirty silver" (226). This art is an art of garbage, fragments, a W.A.S.T.E. system in which the artist does not try to put the world back together. Marly Krushkhova in fact guesses that even the AI is "someone else's collage," into whom has been "spilled, somehow, all the worn sad evidence of a family's humanity" (227). Sender and message, both coded through refuse, are scatological and to some extent "human" without reversing textual disembodiment in any simple way. If the territory is now rotting on the map (Baudrillard 1988, 166), shreds of the real (including bits of old maps) tell us that a territory is still scatologically there even if we virtually ignore it. The AI is not some body, but Gibson at the end of the novel reveals the hidden sender of messages to at least one receiver who completes the biological model of the speech act. Marly's tears indicate that the receiver is not "a man without history, without biography, without psychology" (Barthes 1968, 59).

Gibson qualifies postmodern theories of disembodiment by staging a scatological speech act, but the second direction of postmodern theory--that toward "heterogeneous matter"--cannot as easily be recuperated to mimesis. Ondaatje's texts serve as an example. Left hands, headless chickens, and the seeping out of bodily fluids in The Collected Works of Billy the Kid signal the disappearance of the rational

grids (including prose) that cover experience. The last moments of manic activity before death are scatological, whether they belong to Charlie Bowdre "giggling" and "pissing into his trouser legs in pain" (12) or to a flower's "sweat like lilac urine smell" (56). Tom O'Folliard drinking urine in the desert (50), Billy having sex with Angela on the toilet (68), and urinating down his legs onto his horse (76)--draw attention to how Billy and his men (intentionally and unintentionally) have transgressed the boundaries of civilized life. Death becomes the post-scatological location of rational order:

if you cut the stalk. . . .
 the flower gets small smells sane
 deteriorates in a hand (56)

In Coming Through Slaughter Webb, the policeman, finds excrement unreadable. To him, Crawley's report about "the tail of shit" (30) is tangential to the search for Buddy, but to Buddy (and to Ondaatje), the things (mostly scatological) that don't **mean** are the substance of art: "the wet slime from toilets, grey rub of phones, the alley shit on his shoe when he crouched where others had crouched, tea leaves, beer stains off tables, piano sweat, trombone spit, someone's smell off a towel" (40). Buddy's songs therefore seem to be formless and genre-breaking. From Buddy's comments on the rational analysis of relationships--"I shat those theories out completely" (113)--it is clear in taking up the pre-history before jazz recordings, Ondaatje makes scatology stand for the absence

of maps, even materialist ones. Scatology defines the post-theoretical moment.²⁰⁶

But what are we to make of Stephen Tatum's reasons for calling Ondaatje's Billy the "richest" (Tatum 149) treatment of the legend of Billy the Kid? "Ondaatje's Kid, no saint or Satan, kills plants with his urine, fornicates on an outhouse floor, vomits in the desert during a hang-over" (Tatum 143). He is "a human being caught in a maelstrom of biological and political circumstances" (Tatum 151). Clearly, for Tatum a particularized body is more authentic than documented history. As a repeated affront to civilization and even sanity, Ondaatje's scatology is destructive of order, but Tatum's almost realist, certainly referential faith is not simply mistaken. What Tatum understands is that Ondaatje has not completely defected from order, but has been substituting a less programmatic order for traditional character motivations. Even if postmodernism purposefully distorts history, it does not escape history or mimesis. The gypsy-foot whores who carry on their trade around raw sewage (119) certainly signal the history of slavery and perhaps even of Buddy's reified enslavement. When Buddy describes his music, he uses a modernist hierarchy of forms: "every now and then my note like a bird flying out of shit and hanging loud and long" (129).²⁰⁷

Buddy's very inscrutability, once it is converted to language, becomes a system in the text, so that excrement becomes a trope for the pre-textual world, becomes an alibi or pretext for the "real" thing. This is not just because Buddy parodies a primate marking system which Hooker and Mottyl might be familiar with, but because even the enunciations least susceptible to analysis are formal rather than heterogeneous. Ondaatje says as much about Buddy through Frank Lewis: "We thought he was formless, but I think now he was tormented by order, what was outside it" (37).

Running in the Family too, although corrosive of autobiographical narrative, does not fully escape mimesis and attendant hierarchies. The massive gaps in the narrative corrode the notion of historical continuity even if we hear the names and deeds of Ondaatje's parents and grandparents. When the narrator's father urinates "into darkness and mysterious foliage" (187) or when the ants attack the father's novel left on the bathroom floor (189), we are invited to feel that experience consists of a few animal markings but of very little order: "No sweeper for weeks. And nature advanced. . . . If you stood still you were invaded. . . . A whole batallion was carrying one page away from its source. . . . It was page 189" (189). The "magical" conjunction of 189 and 189 is, however, finally ambidextrous: on the one hand it suggests that anything can

get into a text, and that texts very easily decompose, especially under the sign of the body (the bathroom and "sub-animal" nature). On the other hand, the illusion that anything can get into a text requires very careful planning (and the unusual co-operation of a publisher). As such, it overwhelmingly signals the presence of the author. "To assign an author to a text is to impose a brake on it," says Roland Barthes (1968, 58) who, so the critical commonplace goes, did not fail to append a proper name nor to copyright "The Death of the Author." When "Ondaatje" shows up in Coming Through Slaughter or in the final photograph of The Collected Works of Billy the Kid we take this as direct autobiography only at our peril. Such a technique is partly confessional and referential because of who authorizes the "intrusions," but only partly because once the author becomes a **character**, his chosen surrogate is hypostatically separated from the referent. However, when the author manipulates page numbers, he acts only as a composed subject and not as a surface feature of the text. On page 189, then, for a moment, we had the referent of Ondaatje's discontinuous autobiography.

iii

Leonard Cohen, whose Beautiful Losers is surely an early instance of postmodernism (Hutcheon 1988a, 27), may be taken as its most comprehensive case because his text moves in both directions--towards disembodiment and towards

heterogeneous matter--at once. When we first run across the narrator--"I am an old scholar, better-looking now than when I was young. That's what sitting on your ass does to your face" (3)--we might expect Bakhtin's dialogue of the face with the buttocks (1984, 434) to follow. It does not, mainly because F., the narrator's teacher, has spent much of his life not merely subverting the high, but attempting to confuse all hierarchies of high and low, outer and inner, good and evil. Bakhtin's jubilant folk wisdom still maintains such distinctions in the faith that if birth and decomposition are at the heart of things themselves, then a low humane parody can always restore egalitarianism against priests and party members who superficially style themselves as high. F., conversely, says "We've got to learn to stop bravely at the surface. We've got to learn to love appearances" (4). To the (stylistic) patchwork question "do you think I can learn to perceive the diamonds of good amongst all this shit?" F. replies, "It is all diamond" (9). The fallout of this anti-depth education is the narrator's repeated question "Are the stars tiny after all?" (5) According to bodily surfaces, the thumbless narrator is really F., who blew his own thumb away during a mistimed terrorist bombing. If surfaces are the whole story, "appearances," including confusion between individuals, need no longer be "saved" by explanation. These are the initial stages of the narrator's disembodiment which drives him into a Total Fast and eventually turns him into a movie of Ray

Charles. These are also postmodern games of the type that trouble a theorist like Jameson, who comments on the "facetiousness" (1984b, 370) of postmodernism.²⁰⁸

Yet F. is more than a decadent master willing to try any aphorism on his pupil/himself. The narrator discovers that his wife, Edith, was created by F. using the Pimple Cure, "bosom aggrandizers," and perhaps the "Sphincter Kit" (171). "Her buttocks" says F., "were my masterpiece" (176) and he criticizes the narrator for improperly exercising his buttock muscles: "a very selfish development and a factor in your bowel predicament" (170). In this way F. represents the commodification of the body, a process that the narrator both desires (he is pleased with Edith's beauty) and despises (he wishes that she were a product of "nature," he hates to hear of her production). This commodification is at once a disembodiment, since it substitutes a simulated body for the original, and a signal of the presence of heterogeneous matter, since the substitution implies a disgust for the first body. More, F. is also a representative of the Creator--at one point elaborating upon his initial, he says, "call me Dr. Frankenstein with a deadline" (186)--who can neither be pleased with the original chaos nor be enchanted with his creations, and consequently always pushes further "beyond pleasure" (184). The narrator, post-pleasure, recognizes the force of the question 'Where do we go next?' "Once you ate shit. How

can I live in the world beside all your damn adventures" (16). These "adventures" lead to an orgasm during which F. and Edith bathe themselves in Mengele's human soap while F. reads a post-erotic litany parodying extremist pornographic magazines--"Not Models! Actual Photos of Male and Female Sex Organs and Excrement. . . . Men masturbated to death. Cannibalism during Foreplay. Skull Coition" (181-2)--culminating in a description of the torture of Brébeuf and Lalement (183).

Heterogeneous matter with a vengeance, Cohen's 'end of man' includes what Bataille's does not: a mimetic process in which matter signals not its own "heterogeneity" but real historical atrocities. One response to these horrors is an equally exorbitant sign of care:

--I injured the waterfall with urine. Pray for me. . . .
 --I soiled a loincloth. Pray for me. (221)

But these aching confessions by the Iroquois appear among less innocent confessions:

--I long for a human morsel. Pray for me. . . .
 --I got the yellow out of a worm. Pray for me. . . .
 --I killed a Jew. Pray for me. . . .
 --I tortured a raccoon. Pray for me. . . .
 --I prayed for a famine lesson. Pray for me.
 --I dirtied on my beads. Pray for me. (221-2)

Furthermore, it is not always clear where the Confessor Tekakwitha's preferences lie, since her masochism allies her with Edith. The equation of Tekakwitha's asceticism with institutionalized Twentieth Century sado-masochisms seems to

collapse historical forms into each other. There may be no way, in Beautiful Losers, of isolating the meaning of the narrator's suffering or transformation--the text is not Jewish, Christian, anti-technological, or even nihilistic (given the post-climactic Part 3) in Bataille's explosive sense.²⁰⁹ The parodic reinterpretation of Tekakwitha's religious devotion should then lead to simulacra if Cohen seamlessly replaced the belief in historical difference with a sense that the imaging of history in language finally effaces all past events.

However, even if Tekakwitha's and the narrator's Total Fasts become ambiguous and extreme simulacra, neither all referents nor even a moral position have been completely destroyed. The scatological confessions are indeed deflected from Iroquois culture towards European history by "I killed a Jew." Historiography has often been the place in which the powerful organize the facts to confirm those narrative which give them their positions, so the redirection of history is not necessarily synonymous with "collapse." Cohen avoids the kind of forgetfulness which would presume that because the writer gives us bodily details we have somehow got an accurate transcription of Iroquois voices. Such built-in skepticism about historiography cannot be called mimetic, but paradoxically might be called an extension of realist practices since the realist uneasiness with idealized narratives extends to a

skepticism about the way even the "real" has been abstracted into singulative narratives and ideological forms.²¹⁰ Historical commentary might also invite us to see the narrator's constipation as a parody of Luther's *Turmerlebnis*, when Luther discovered on the privy that the just shall live by faith: "Nothing helps, is that what you want me to learn? The strain man perched on a circle prepares to abandon all systems" (41).²¹¹ In both the parody of the Iroquois and of Luther, the past returns to comment on the present historical moment: on anti-semitism, on sadism, on the complexities of post-Reformation skepticism about religious and other systems of order.²¹² History, Cohen implies, is always partially simulated for present purposes, but this knowledge only allows us a skeptical distance from the multiform past instead of exhausting it.

Cohen's historiographic parodies force us to reconsider what I earlier called his drive into pure word. The catalogue of scatological and mortifying practices, if it transgresses the bodily limits created by most systems of social mores, does not entirely trade mimesis for pure surface. The body's inside "shows up in order to compensate for the collapse of the border between inside and outside." Skin becomes transparent, a weak boundary, and gives way "before the dejection of its contents. Urine, blood, sperm, excrement then show up in order to reassure a subject that is lacking its 'own and clean self'" (Kristeva 1982, 53).

Despite Lyotard, the obscene is precisely not the "unpresentable." "Fuck her on the moon with a steel hourglass up your hole" (13)--language loosed from its referents--may be called "unpresentable," "facetious," or, (to be more literal) "weightless,"²¹³ but it does not belong to the final orgasm because F.'s climax exactingly requires that the reader be able to imagine the obscenities **embodied**. If language entails the loss of the object (Kristeva 1982, 41), it still keeps the object in mind. Cohen imagines possible bodies and follows documented history: the Jesuit Relations, the history of Nazi Germany, the history of pornographic discourse. If Edith's acne recalled Tekakwitha's pre-Enlightenment face (pock-marked by the Plague), it was F.'s "famous soap collection" (142) that "cured" her.

The commercial surface of and in Beautiful Losers is thus not glib but terminally blemished. Elias anticipated the skepticism about depth, and the serious problems with looking at human beings as containers. Most "inner" processes, he argued, are touched by society (259).²¹⁴ Other theorists have been less measured: "Psychoanalysis puts an end to the unconscious and desire, just as Marxism put an end to the class struggle, because it hypostatizes them and buries them in their theoretical project" (Baudrillard 1980, 89). For Marcel D tienne, quoted in Michel de Certeau's The Practice of Everyday Life, Greek stories about metis "say

exactly what they do. . . . There is no need to add a gloss that knows what they express without knowing it, nor to wonder what they are a metaphor of. You ask what they 'mean'? I'll tell them to you again" (80).²¹⁵ Baudrillard and D tienne want to foreclose on particular types of speech, but Cohen's novel is not post-interpretive, and history has not collapsed simply because F. wanted to blow things up. 'Are the stars tiny?' is finally not nostalgic or anti-historical. It depends for its effect on the interpretive knowledge that the stars could not possibly be tiny. Appearances are important ruses in the novel, but the Pimple Cure and constipation require social and historical interpretation. As such Cohen moves the lexis away from ontological arguments towards the level of game, but not towards a game without parameters. When we come the long way round to the live author's claims that the source of Beautiful Losers was "a certain type of experience" (interview with Twigg 57), or when Cohen calls Beautiful Losers both an expression of his chemico-mental state on Cos in 1965 and prophetic of his difficulties a year or two later (Harris 55, Lumsden 72), we are strangely in the territory of autobiography and *bildung*: not that we could make a realist equation between Cohen and the narrator, not that Cohen hasn't made a career of adopting poses, but that instead of being loose among the surfaces of signs, even the most exorbitant text is anchored to another discursive post and body, that shifting depth which Adrienne Clarkson,

following convention, still calls Leonard Cohen.

Epilogue: New Detours to the Symbolic

But all this may be referred to the narrow suture of the Spirit and the body, enter-communicating their fortunes one unto another.

--Montaigne "Of the Force of Imagination" (Florio translation)

Slang is a language of hatred that knocks the reader out very nicely. . . annihilates him! . . . completely in your power! . . . he just lies there like an eightball!

--Louis-Ferdinand Céline

Only for a moment. "As late as 1930, four-letter words made visual on the printed page seemed portentous. . . Most 'four-letter words' are heavy with tactile-involving stress. For this reason they seem earthy and vigorous to visual man" (McLuhan 1964, 116). The offhanded way that "late" and "1930" roll off McLuhan's tongue, as if Ulysses and Lady Chatterly's Lover changed the cultural landscape in an evening, makes McLuhan seem urbane (almost as if he claims personal responsibility for the 1960's) but it does not make him an accurate commentator on the Canadian ethos. Yet the 1954 Céline quote also seems too extreme in the opposite direction. Hodgins' Madmother Thomas keeps "pog mahone" ("kiss my arse" 335) as a reserve fund against the world, and she never spends it--possibly because she, like her mother who bequeathed the words, knows that they will not really knock anyone out for long. From lampoon to autohagiography, all writing transgresses the boundaries between word and world (especially writing which confusedly

gives the metaphor "tongue" for print), but scatology is a special case, allowing us neither to approach it dispassionately as only a textual feature or emotionally as just the sign of hatred. In The History of Sexuality Michel Foucault attacks the Freudian repressive hypothesis by speaking of the massive increase in discourse about sexuality; as the least-sophisticated writer knows, sexual language can incite a physiological response. I would argue that at the moment of physiological response the separation of world from word is fogged over, if not erased. Here the arts are fluid in that word-picture does almost what the picture does. The same is true of meta-physics: the moment of faith closes the gap (existentially, if not theoretically) between the sacred text and the world it represents. The same is **not** true of scatology. Like a written description of music, scatology may never get near the referent.²¹⁶ Yet scatology, unlike discourse about music (but like some musical forms) has at times been suppressed. On the popular level, it has evidently been felt that slang can knock the reader out. Literary theorists have insisted that even when the sign displaces the world, the duplicitous sign refers to a real body (Howells 125, 130; Foley 18; Cixous 1980, 252) and to the subject who deploys the language (Foley 97).

At its most level, scatology functions as a trope for the "world" in a narrative text which abstracts itself,

mimetically, from the world. Scatology does indeed gesture at the world (as realists and modernists in their destruction of romance or romanticism or Victorianism always suspected,) but scatology is also unavoidably rhetorical, even, in its own way, ideal.

We have seen that Canadian postmodernists too retain the old model of signification, mimesis, in which excrement signals a "real" chaotic world. Like Kristeva, if less explicitly and only partially, they too declare an alliance with "the Idea, the Logos, the Form: in short, the old Judeo-Christian Europe" (Kristeva, "My Memory's Hyperbole" 235). If we pursue scatology in enough detail, from one angle postmodern texts begin to appear curiously referential and stable, very much at ease in the world. These texts bring more and more of the human body into the order of language, perhaps expanding the practices we call 'civilized.' The effect is somewhat like Miss Manners' approach to etiquette: she no longer fully believes in the conventions but she still uses them and passes them on. Rooke's Will Shakespeare makes this clear in his despair: "Begone Hooker. . . . Better you had followed a maggot to its nursing or a turd to its disintegration" (101). The passage owes something to the world in that Will and Rooke are able to formulate an "inner" emotion by fixing on "outer" processes. But these processes have already been treated by past writers as signs appropriate to "despair,"

so Will's use of the topos is conventional. The death's-head conceits, the rather elegant way decomposition is worded, eventually limit the despair. They call attention to a civilized voice even if Will is sewn onto biodegradable matter, and call attention to a collective existence in the reader who activates the conceit.

I offer two contradictory conclusions. First, the untranslatable body is what makes metaphors possible. Secondly, scatology is a language; matter in a text is never completely heterogeneous or corrosive, but as part of a sign system, represents historical and bodily depths. The etymologies of words sometimes used to describe scatology--obscene (ill omen) and graphic--bear this doubleness. My sympathy, I confess, is with those displaced souls who when they are confronted by a thing search for words and, when they are confronted with a word look for things. Too many theorists, who recognize that one must take the body into any account of texts, emphasize one of these conclusions over the other. Bataille says that "the Abject is merely the inability to assume with sufficient strength the imperative act of excluding things (and that act establishes the foundations of collective existence)" (quoted in Kristeva 1982, 56). But even if one wants to deconstruct sociology, language puts the neurotic (not autistic) frontiersman into a social context at the moment when he theoretically wants to Fall into decomposition. A

distinction between unorganized or amoral experience and the moralistic interpretation of experience (Davis 93) oversimplifies a dialectic that Montaigne knew was, and still is, more complex. MacLennan tries to insist upon the ontological primacy of the 'real' world when he depicts World War I: "Some had stood up to their necks in cold water stained with blood and human excrement while they waited for hours to crawl a few yards closer to Passchendaele. . . . Words are human and have a history and this had none" (309, 312). But MacLennan must have had some faith that words can register suffering, and he would not have wanted to dislodge his description from the historical context of conscription battles in Quebec.

We might, then, sympathize with Descartes, for whom matter was constantly telling things not about matter but about consciousness. If he displaced the old location of the soul up higher into the "pineal" gland, he was not alone. According to Kristeva we cannot get rid of the impure, but we can "bring it into being a second time, and differently from the original impurity. It is a repetition through rhythm and song. . . . The writer is a phobic who succeeds in metaphorizing in order to keep from being frightened to death; instead he comes to life again in signs" (1982, 28, 38). The strength of this formulation is that despite the emphasis on the individual origins of abjection Kristeva acknowledges language as a symbolic

system deploying subject positions. The model that "repetition" approaches is that of a feedback loop. The writer metaphorizes his or her impurity; later the textual mechanism is perceived as too empty of the world; the next phobic brings in new impurities; but those also, living for a while as symbols, come to seem too abstract; and so on.

ii

At the end of a study such as this we cannot ignore the vast growth in scatological discourse that the Canadian novel is symptomatic of. Changes in obscenity laws are partially responsible, but they may be effect rather than cause. Narratives that cannot accommodate scatology are becoming obsolete, and are increasingly consigned to the dump of anachronism. Kristeva's comment on Leviticus--"The body must bear no trace of its debt to nature: it must be clean and proper in order to be fully symbolic" (1982, 102)--may be inverted to correspond with the latter half of the Twentieth Century. The body must signify its debt to nature: it must include the foul and abject in order to be fully symbolic. We see this when writers like Laurence or Atwood parody the disembodiments of, for example, romantic poetry or travel writing: "what the hell is this crap? 'I wandered lonely as a cloud.' This Wordsworth, now, he was a pansy" (The Diviners 63); "'Throwing up in the Sun,' [Rennie] thinks briefly. Tippy would say everthing's raw material, you just have to know how to work it in" (Bodily

Harm 98). Duddy Kravitz's apprenticeship in language is to save obscenity even when passing through the censors. Mrs. Cox wants to change the boys' language without seeming Victorian or other than them: "you only use those words for their shock value and that's silly, because you can't shock me. . . . Do you know what a penis is?" Duddy's answer takes the form of feigned innocence: "'Sure,' Duddy said. 'A penis is a guy that plays the piano'" (21). Duddy goes Mrs. Cox one better by adding her "correct" word, "penis," to the list of what needs to be repressed and by simultaneously recuperating its obscene value for the boys via insinuation and wordplay (just as Richler does with Mrs. Cox's name). In Joshua Then and Now Richler gives us two versions of the same event to show that we only get close to ideological and emotional truth before the interior censor clicks on:

". . . And then I said," McMaster droned on, as the Sony whirled, "'Look Colucci, you dumb dago, you North End asshole, I don't know what you got with anybody else in No. 4, but you can stuff that envelope where the monkey where the monkey put his fingers.' Cut. Stop. Correction. And then I said, 'Look Colucci, you are dissimulating, you are not a credit to your people, like Dante or Mayor La Guardia, I don't know what arrangements you have with other officers in this station, but I do not accept emoluments, and therefore please put that envelope back in your pocket.' Is that better?" (301)

"The alliance between literature and excrement has been consolidated since the former began to identify itself more and more with the violation of a system" (Enzensberger 34). McMaster, a policeman, is especially cognizant of laws and

standards of expression, but his impulse as a writer and a bigot is to break the rules.

Do these satires against disembodiment herald the devaluation of language as a mode of existence? Tillich claims that "the word as breath, as sound, as something heard, is a natural phenomena" (98). Davies' Kinghoven goes further:

"You're all mad for words. Words are just farts from a lot of fools who have swallowed too many books. Give me things! Give me the appearances of a thing, and I'll show you the way to photograph it so the reality comes right out in front of your eyes. The Devil? Balls! God? Balls! Get me that Fat Woman and I'll photograph her one way and you'll know the Devil made her, then I'll photograph her another way and you'll swear you see the work of God! Light! That's the whole secret. . . . Let there be light! Who said that? I said it!" (World of Wonders 87)

Kinghoven's skepticism about the high does not stop him from taking more than a princely role while he assures his auditors that mimesis, and perhaps creation, is all fakery. Magnus, however, spends much of the narrative trying to find the proper way of arranging his life in language. Even if he is a master illusionist and even if he feels dismay when writers begin to name certain acts, Magnus's deepest impulse is to bring into being a second time in language the true impropriety of his rape by Williard: "it was something going in where I knew only that filthy things should come out, as secretly as could be managed" (34). Kinghoven praises and devalues all art as a mode of existence divorced from things; Magnus, alternatively, turns writing into a

repository for the impure, and he thereby changes the make-up of the sphere of culture. In World of Wonders, as in other post-war Canadian novels, there is little room for an unqualified "high" language, but the system of words has by no means been dismissed. Rather, one language has been displaced by another.

One of the functions of Bakhtin's polyglossia was to confront high languages with their repressed bodies. Scatology limits the idealization of particular narratives, including that of Magnus's great success: the new detour to the symbolic is through the abject. Scatology does not destroy allegory or hermeneutics but makes a different route, through the minutiae of the body instead of Platonic ascent or Christian asceticism, to what is outside of the text. However, that scatology almost always defines itself against idealized bodies and idealized narratives exposes a limit to my study. The problem is enunciated in a different context by Michael McKeon: "Medieval romance, in which the antecedents of our "history" and "romance" coexist in fluid suspension, becomes "medieval romance," the product of an earlier period and increasingly the locus of strictly "romance" elements that have been separated out from the documentary objectivity of "history" and of print, the technology to which it therefore owes (at least in part) both its birth and its instantaneous obsolescence" (McKeon 45). I say little about romances like Tay John and Shoeless

Joe because they nearly evade scatology. In Tay John scatology is only found in the historical sections and then only in abbreviated form: "I think these railway men must have their brains in their bowels" (181); "'Lady, yer cawn't sing with yer buttocks'" (196). The latter comment is thrown at Ardith Aeriola before O'Hagan transforms her from railroaders' mistress to romantic heroine. In Shoeless Joe, J.D. Salinger equates writing (as a job) with a farmer's barn-cleaning (92), and after Kid Scissons wears his baseball out, he practises "with rocks and frozen horse turds" (145). To a small extent, scatology enters these romances on behalf of the disillusioning bits of world that must be overcome for the story to approach a higher realm. Scatology, I claimed early on, stands for the past, but once it is recuperated in the epistemological reversal that we have seen in Chapter 3, scatology becomes all of the present while romance, less scatological, functions as the obsolete immediate past or, at most, as a failed mimetic move. The deepest affinity of scatology is with ironic modes.

It would be false to conclude that romances and, on the other hand, postmodern texts are actually realist texts in disguise, or that no texts really undermine material signification. McKeon speaks of the tension in ideology between the "will to engage what is problematic" and the "will to naturalize" (233); the resolution of these tensions inevitably varies. Just as the basic constituents and the

realist meaning-gestures of fictional autobiography cannot be completely exploded by internal skepticism, so romance cannot fully be explained by what it represses. In different way, the postmodern need to refer to the world does not completely secure postmodern epistemologies to a referential model. In Running in the Family after a wild pig steals the soap that kept the narrator "aristocratic" and "feeling good all through the filthy hotels of Africa," he imagines the creature "returning to his friends with Pears Transparent Soap and then all of them bathing and scrubbing their armpits in the rain in a foul parody of us" (143). Too anthropomorphic, this parody of human cleanliness is also too amenable to the theory of the liberal humanist expansion of the civilized self to be admitted as evidence of my claims. What were the pigs thinking? Had they found sufficient strength to give up slang, hoping, even without opposable thumbs, to educate their bodies in the rudiments of courtesy? Or were they laughing at the young sons of nobility, Erasmus, Miss Manners, the whole crew? Their cloven-hoofed bodies, though they don't exist, trouble me.

Works Cited

- Adams, Robert M. "Review of The Civilizing Process." Times Literary Supplement Sept 15 (1978): 1015.
- Ahenakew, Edward. "Cree Trickster Tales." Journal of American Folklore 42 (1929): 309-53.
- Aquin, Hubert. Prochain Episode. trans. Penny Williams. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1967.
- Aquinas, Thomas. On the Truth of the Catholic Faith (Summa Contra Gentiles). trans. Charles J. O'Neil. Garden City, N.Y.: Hanover House, 1957.
- Armstrong, Pat and Hugh. The Double Ghetto: Canadian Women and their Segregated Work. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1978.
- Atwood, Margaret. Bodily Harm. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1981.
- _____. Cat's Eye. Toronto: Bantam, 1988.
- _____. The Handmaid's Tale. Toronto: McLelland & Stewart, 1985.
- _____. and Robert Weaver eds. The Oxford Book of Canadian Short Stories. Toronto: Oxford UP, 1986.
- _____. Selected Poems. Toronto: Oxford UP, 1976.
- _____. "Witches" (1980). Second Words: Selected Critical Prose. Toronto: Anansi, 1982, 329-33.
- Auerbach, Eric. Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature. trans. Willard Trask. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1953.
- Augustine. On Christian Doctrine. trans. D.W. Robertson jr. N.Y.: Bobbs Merrill, 1958.
- _____. On the Trinity. trans. A.W. Haddan, rev. W.G.T. Shedd. Basic Writings of Saint Augustine. ed. Whitney J. Oates. N.Y.: Random House, 1948.
- Babcock, Barbara ed. The Reversible World: Symbolic Inversion in Art and Society. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell UP, 1978.
- Bader, Rudolf. "Frederick Philip Grove and Naturalism Reconsidered." Gaining Ground: European Critics on Canadian Literature. ed. R. Kroetsch and Reingard M.

Nischick. Edmonton: NeWest P, 1985, 222-233.

Bakhtin, M.M. The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays. trans. Michael Holquist and Caryl Emerson. Austin: U of Texas P, 1981.

_____. Rabelais and His World. trans. Helen Iswolsky. Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana UP, 1984.

Barker, Francis. The Tremulous Private Body. London: Methuen, 1984.

Barthes, Roland. "The Death of the Author" (1968). trans. Richard Howard. Contemporary Critical Theory. ed. Dan Latimer. N.Y.: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1989, 53-9.

_____. Mythologies. trans. Annette Lavers. London: Paladin, 1973.

_____. The Pleasure of the Text. trans. Richard Miller. New York: Hill and Wang, 1975.

Bataille, Georges. "The Notion of Expenditure," "The Labyrinth." Deconstruction in Context: Literature and Philosophy. ed. Mark C. Taylor. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1986.

_____. Visions of Excess: Selected Writings 1927-1939. ed., trans., and intro. Allan Stoekl. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1985.

Baudrillard, Jean. "Forgetting Foucault." trans. Nicole Dufresne. Humanities in Society 3:1 (Winter 1980): 87-111.

_____. Jean Baudrillard: Selected Writings. ed. and trans. Mark Poster. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1988.

Bernal, J.D. The World, the Flesh, and the Devil. Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana UP, 1929.

Bjerring, Nancy E. "Deconstructing the 'Desert of Facts': Detection and Antidetection in Coming Through Slaughter." English Studies in Canada 16:3 (Sept. 1990): 325-338.

Bottomley, Frank. Attitudes to the Body in Western Christendom. London: Lepus, 1979.

Bourke, John G. Scatological Rites of All Nations (1891). N.Y.: Johnson Reprint, 1968.

Bowering, George. Burning Water. Toronto: General

Publishing, 1980.

_____. "Modernism Could Not Last Forever." The Mask in Place. Winnipeg: Turnstone, 1982.

Breton, Raymond. "West Indian, Chinese and European Ethnic Groups in Toronto: Perceptions of Problems and Resources." Two Nations, Many Cultures: Ethnic Groups in Canada. ed. Jean Leonard Elliot. Scarborough: Prentice-Hall, 1983.

Brooke, Frances. The History of Emily Montague (1769). Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1961.

Brown, Jennifer S.H. & Robert Brightman. "Orders of the Dreamed": George Nelson on Cree and Northern Ojibway Religion and Myth (1823). Winnipeg: U of Manitoba P, 1988.

Brown, N.O. Life Against Death: the Psychoanalytic Meaning of History. N.Y.: Vintage, 1959.

Buckler, Ernest. The Mountain and the Valley. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1952.

Bukatman, Scott. "The Cybernetic (City) State: Terminal Space becomes Phenomenal." in Journal of the Fantastic in the Arts 2:2 (Summer 1989): 43-63.

Bullough, Vern L. "Review of The Civilizing Process." American Historical Review 84 (April 1979): 444.

Burke, Carolyn G. and Jane Gallop. "Psychoanalysis and Feminism in France." The Future of Difference. ed. Hester Eisenstein and Alice Jardine. New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 1985.

Burke, Kenneth. "Ritual Drama as Hub." Terms for Order. ed. Stanley Edgar Hyman. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1964.

Burke, Peter. Popular Culture in Early Modern Europe. London: Harper and Row, 1978.

Calinescu, Matei. "Introductory Remarks: Postmodernism, the Mimetic and Theatrical Fallacies." Exploring Postmodernism. ed. Matei Calinescu and Douwe Fokkema. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1987, 3-16.

Callaghan, Morley. Such is My Beloved. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1934.

Cartier, Jacques. Jacques Cartier [Voyages]. ed.

Marcel Trudel. Montréal: Fides, 1968.

Cavendish, Richard. A History of Witchcraft. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1977.

Certeau, Michel de. The Practice of Everyday Life. trans. Steven F. Rendall. Los Angeles: U of California P, 1984.

Cixous, Hélène. "The Laugh of the Medusa." New French Feminisms: An Anthology. ed. Elaine Marks and Isabelle de Courtivron. N.Y.: Schocken, 1980, 245-64.

_____. "Tancredi continues." Writing Differences: Readings from the Seminar of Hélène Cixous. ed. & trans. Susan Sellers. N.Y.: St. Martin's P, 1988.

Clatworthy, Stewart and Harvey Stevens. An Overview of the Housing Conditions of Registered Indians in Canada. Ottawa: Indian and Northern Affairs Canada, 1987.

Clement, Wallace. Class, Power and Property: Essays on Canadian Society. Toronto: Methuen, 1983.

Cluett, Robert. Canadian Prose Style: A Preliminary Stylistic Analysis. Toronto: ECW Press, 1990.

Cohen, Leonard. Beautiful Losers. Toronto: McLelland & Stewart, 1966.

Cohen, Ralph. "History and Genre." New Literary History 17:2 (Winter 1986): 203-19.

Corbin, Alain. The Foul and the Fragrant: Odor and the French Social Imagination. Cambridge, Mass. Harvard UP, 1986.

Cosman, Madeleine Pelner. Fabulous Feasts: Medieval Cookery and Ceremony. N.Y.: George Braziller, 1976.

Craig, Alec. The Banned Books of England and Other Countries. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1962.

Craig, Terrence. Racial Attitudes in English-Canadian Fiction, 1905-1980. Waterloo: Wilfred Laurier UP, 1987.

Culler, Jonathan. Structuralist Poetics. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell UP, 1975.

Culleton, Beatrice. In Search of April Raintree. Winnipeg: Pemmican, 1983.

Davies, Robertson. The Enthusiasms of Robertson

Davies, ed. Judith Skelton Grant. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1979.

____. Fifth Business. Markham, Ont.: Penguin, 1970.

____. The Lyre of Orpheus. N.Y.: Penguin, 1988.

____. The Manticore. Markham Ont.: Penguin, 1973.

____. The Rebel Angels. N.Y.: Penguin, 1981.

____. A Voice from the Attic. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1960.

____. What's Bred in the Bone. N.Y.: Penguin, 1985.

____. World of Wonders. Markham, Ont.: Penguin, 1975.

Davis, Murray S. Smut: Erotic Reality/Obscene Ideology. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1983.

Davis, Natalie Zemon. Society and Culture in Early Modern France. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1975.

Dell, Floyd. Love in the Machine Age. N.Y.: Farrar and Rinehart, 1930.

Della Casa, Giovanni. Galateo. trans. Konrad Eisenbichler and Kenneth R. Bartlett. Toronto: Centre for Reformation and Renaissance Studies, 1986.

De Man, Paul. "Autobiography as De-facement." Modern Language Notes 94:5 (Dec. 1979): 919-30.

De Mille, James. The Dodge Club, or, Italy in MDCCCLIX (1869). Sackville, N.B.: Mount Allison Bell Library, 1981.

____. A Stange Manuscript Found in a Copper Cylinder (1880). Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1969.

Derrida, Jacques. "The Law of Genre." trans. Avital Ronell. Glyph: Textual Studies. ed. Samuel Weber. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1980, 221-3.

Descartes, Rene. The Essential Descartes. ed. Margaret D. Wilson. N.Y.: New American Library, 1969.

Douglas, Mary. Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1966.

Eagleton, Terry. "Capitalism, Modernism and Postmodernism." New Left Review 152 (July/August 1985):

60-73.

Eco, Umberto. "The Influence of Roman Jakobson on the Development of Semiotics." Classics of Semiotics. ed. Martin Krampen et al. N.Y.: Plenum, 1987.

Elias, Norbert. The Civilizing Process: The History of Manners (1939). trans. Edmund Jephcott. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1978.

Ellis, Havelock. Studies in the Psychology of Sex, Vol. II, Part 1. N.Y.: Random House, 1936.

Engen, Trygg. "Children's Sense of Smell." Clinical Measurement of Taste and Smell. ed. Herbert L. Meiselman and Richard S. Rivilin. N.Y.: MacMillan, 1986, 318-23.

Enzensberger, Christian. Smut: An Anatomy of Dirt (1968). trans. Sandra Morris. N.Y.: Seabury P, 1972.

Erasmus. On Good Manners for Boys (De civilitate morum puerilium). Collected Works of Erasmus, Vol.3. ed. J. K. Sowards. Toronto: U. of Toronto P, 1985.

Ewen, Stewart. Captains of Consciousness: Advertising and the Social Roots of Consumer Culture. N.Y.: McGraw-Hill, 1976.

Fekete, John. "Literature and Politics/Literary Politics." Dalhousie Review 66:1-2 (Spring/Summer 1986): 45-86.

Findley, Timothy. Famous Last Words. Markham Ont.: Penguin, 1981.

_____. Not Wanted on the Voyage. Markham Ont.: Penguin, 1984.

_____. The Telling of Lies. Markham Ont.: Penguin, 1986.

Fisher, Seymour. "Body Image." International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences. ed. David L. Sills. N.Y.: MacMillan, 1968.

Fleming, Joyce Dudney. "Field Report: The State of the Apes." Anthropology: Contemporary Perspectives. ed. David E.K. Hunter and Phillip Whitten. Toronto: Little, Brown & Co., 1982, 96-103.

Foley, Barbara. Telling the Truth: The Theory and Practice of Documentary Fiction. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell UP, 1986.

Ford, Charlotte. Charlotte Ford's Book of Modern Manners. N.Y.: Simon & Schuster, 1980.

Foucault, Michel. Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison. The Foucault Reader. ed. Paul Rabinow. trans. Alan Sheridan. N.Y.: Pantheon, 1984.

_____. The History of Sexuality: Vol. 1, An Introduction. trans. Robert Hurley. N.Y.: Random House, 1978.

Freud, Sigmund. Beyond the Pleasure Principle (1920). Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works. trans. and ed. James Strachey. London: Hogarth P, 1953, Vol. 19.

_____. Character and Anal Eroticism (1908). SE, Vol. 9.

_____. Civilization and Its Discontents. trans. James Strachey. N.Y.: Norton, 1961.

_____. Dreams in Folklore (1957 [1911]). SE, Vol. 12.

_____. From the History of an Infantile Neurosis (1918 [1914]). SE, Vol. 12.

_____. Medusa's Head (1940 [1922]). SE, Vol. 19.

_____. New Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis (1933 [1932]). SE, Vol. 22.

_____. On the Sexual Theories of Children (1908). SE, Vol. 9.

_____. On the Transformations of Instinct as Exemplified in Anal Eroticism (1917). SE, Vol. 17.

_____. Psycho-Analytic Notes on an Autobiographical Account of a Case of Paranoia (Dementia Praecox) (the Case of Schreber). SE, Vol. 12.

_____. Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality (1905) SE, Vol. 7.

_____. Totem and Taboo. The Basic Writings of Sigmund Freud. ed. and trans. A.A. Brill. N.Y.: Random House, 1938.

Frye, Northrop. Anatomy of Criticism. Princeton N.J.: Princeton UP, 1957.

_____. "Conclusion." Literary History of Canada. eds. Carl F. Klinck et al. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1965.

Gallop, Jane and Carolyn G. Burke. "Psychoanalysis and Feminism in France." The Future of Difference, 106-121.

Geddes, Gary ed. 15 Canadian Poets X 2. Toronto: Oxford UP, 1988.

Gibson, William. Count Zero. N.Y.: Ace, 1986.

_____. Neuromancer. N.Y.: Ace, 1984.

Gillan, Patricia. "Therapeutic Uses of Obscenity." Censorship and Obscenity. ed. Rajeev Dhavan and Christie Davies. London: Martin Robertson, 1978, 127-47.

Godard, Barbara. "Robertson Davies' Dialogic Imagination." Essays on Canadian Writing 34 (Spring 1987): 64-80.

Godfrey, Dave. The New Ancestors. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1970.

_____. Untitled letter in Man Deserves Man: CUSO in Developing Countries. ed. Bill McWhinney and Dave Godfrey. Toronto: Ryerson P, 1968.

Goldie, Terry. Fear and Temptation: The Image of the Indigene in Canadian, Australian and New Zealand Literatures Kingston: McGill-Queen's UP, 1989.

_____. "Getting It Right: The Image of Indigenous Peoples in Canadian Fiction in the Eighties." English Studies in Canada 14:1 (March 1988): 64-81.

Grant, Damian. Realism. London: Methuen, 1970.

Grant, George. "In Defense of North America." A Passion for Identity: Introduction to Canadian Studies. ed. Eli Mandel and David Taras. Toronto: Methuen, 1987.

Greenstein, Michael. Third Solitudes: Tradition and Discontinuity in Jewish-Canadian Literature Kingston: McGill-Queen's UP, 1989.

Grove, Frederick Philip. A Search for America. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1927.

_____. Settlers of the Marsh. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1925.

Gunn, James ed. The New Encyclopedia of Science Fiction. N.Y.: Viking, 1988.

Guthrie, R. Dale. Body Hotspots: The Anatomy of Human

Social Organs and Behavior. N.Y.: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1976.

Habermas, Jürgen. "Modernity--An Incomplete Project." trans. Selya Ben-Habib. Postmodern Culture. ed. Hal Foster. London: Pluto P, 1983, 3-15.

Haliburton, Thomas. The Clockmaker. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1958.

Harpham, Geoffrey Galt. "Conversion and the Language of Autobiography." Studies in Autobiography. ed. James Olney. New York: Oxford UP, 1988, 42-50.

Harris, Michael. "Leonard Cohen: The Poet as Hero" (interview). Leonard Cohen: The Artist and his Critics. ed. Michael Gnarowski. Toronto: McGraw-Hill, 1976, 46-56.

Harvey, Elizabeth D. "Property, Digestion, and Intertext in Robertson Davies' The Rebel Angels." English Studies in Canada 16:1 (March 1990): 91-106.

Heidenreich, Rosmarin. The Postwar Novel in Canada: Narrative Patterns and Reader Response. Waterloo: Wilfred Laurier UP, 1989.

Heine, Heinrich. Works of Prose. ed. Hermann Kesten. trans. E.B. Ashton. N.Y.: L.B. Fischer, 1943.

Heinzelman, Kurt. The Economics of the Imagination. Amherst: U of Massachusetts P, 1980.

Hermant, Jost. Stänker und Weismacher. Stuttgart: J.B. Metzleresche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1971.

Highway, Tomson. Dry Lips Oughta Move To Kapuskasing. Saskatoon: Fifth House, 1989.

_____. The Rez Sisters. Saskatoon: Fifth House, 1988.

Hine, Daryl. The Prince of Darkness & Co. London: Abelard-Schuman, 1961.

Hodgins, Jack. The Invention of the World. Scarborough, Ont.: MacMillan, 1977.

Hooker, Richard. Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity, Vol. 1. ed. Georges Edelen. Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap, 1977.

Howells, Coral Ann. "Worlds Alongside: Contradictory Discourses in the Fiction of Alice Munro and Margaret Atwood." Gaining Ground, 121-136.

Hughes, David R. and Evelyn Kallen, "The Persistence of Systems of Ethnic Stratification" (1974). Canada: A Sociological Profile, 3rd ed. eds. W.E. Mann and Les Wheatcroft. Toronto: Copp Clark, 1976.

Hutcheon, Linda. The Canadian Postmodern: A Study of English-Canadian Fiction. Toronto: Oxford UP, 1988a.

_____. A Poetics of Postmodernism: History, Theory, Fiction. London: Routledge, 1988b.

_____. The Politics of Postmodernism. London, Routledge, 1989.

_____. A Theory of Parody: The Teachings of Twentieth Century Art Forms. London: Methuen, 1985.

Huxley, Francis. The Way of the Sacred. London: Bloomsbury, 1989.

James, E.O. Seasonal Feasts and Festivals. London: Thames and Hudson, 1961.

Jameson, Fredric. "Foreword." (1984a) The Postmodern Condition, vii-xxi.

_____. "Of Islands and Trenches: Neutralization and the Production of Utopian Discourse" (1977). Ideologies of Theory: Essays 1971-1986, Vol. 2. Minneapolis: U of Minneapolis P, 1988, 75-101.

_____. "Pleasure: A Political Issue" (1983). The Ideologies of Theory, Vol. 2, 61-74.

_____. The Political Unconscious. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell UP, 1981.

_____. "The Politics of Theory: Ideological Positions in the Postmodernism Debate" (1984b). Contemporary Critical Theory, 369-83.

_____. "Postmodernism and Consumer Society" (1982). Postmodern Culture, 111-125.

_____. Postmodernism, or, The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism. Durham: Duke UP, 1991.

Jarry, Alfred. Ubu Roi. trans. Cyril Connolly and Simon Watson Taylor. London: Methuen, 1968.

Jung, Carl. Answer to Job. Psychology and Religion: East and West, 2nd ed. trans. R.F.C. Hull. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton UP, 1969.

_____. Individual Dream Symbolism in Relation to Alchemy. The Portable Jung. ed. Joseph Campbell, trans. R.F.C. Hull. N.Y.: Viking, 1971.

Kayser, Wolfgang. The Grotesque in Art and Literature. trans. Ulrich Weisstein. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1963.

Kinsella, W.P. Shoeless Joe. N.Y.: Ballantine, 1982.

Kira, Alexander. The Bathroom, 2nd ed. N.Y.: Viking P, 1976.

Klein, A.M. The Second Scroll. Toronto: McLelland & Stewart, 1951.

Kristeva, Julia. "Bataille and the Sun, or the Guilty Text." Tales of Love. trans. Leon S. Roudiez. N.Y.: Columbia UP, 1987.

_____. "My Memory's Hyperbole." The Female Autograph: Theory and Practice of Autobiography From the Tenth to the Twentieth Century. ed. Domna C. Stanton. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1984, 219-35.

_____. Powers of Horror: An Essay on Abjection. trans. Leon S. Roudiez. N.Y.: Columbia UP, 1982.

Kroker, Arthur and David Cook. The Postmodern Condition: Excremental Culture and Hyper-Aesthetics. N.Y.: St. Martin's P, 1986.

_____. Technology and the Canadian Mind: Innis/McLuhan/Grant. Montreal: New World Perspectives, 1984.

Lacan, Jacques. The Seminar of Jacques Lacan (1953-4). ed. Jacques-Alain Miller. trans. Sylvanna Tomaselli. N.Y.: W.W. Norton, 1988.

Ladoo, Harold Sonny. No Pain Like This Body. Toronto: Anansi, 1972.

_____. Yesterdays. Toronto: Anansi, 1974.

Laurence, Margaret. The Diviners. Toronto: Bantam, 1974.

_____. A Jest of God. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1966.

_____. The Stone Angel. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1964.

Leacock, Stephen. My Discovery of England. (1921)
Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1961.

Lee, Jae Num. Swift and Scatalogical Satire.
Albuquerque: U of New Mexico P, 1971.

Lejeune, Philippe. On Autobiography. ed. Paul John
Eakin. trans. Katherine Leary. Minneapolis: U of
Minnesota P, 1989.

Lévi-Strauss, Claude. The Savage Mind. trans. George
Weidenfeld. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1966.

_____. Tristes Tropiques. trans. John and Doreen
Weightman. N.Y.: Simon & Schuster, 1974.

Limon, John. The Place of Fiction in the Time of
Science: A Disciplinary History of American Writing. N.Y.:
Cambridge UP, 1990.

Linden, Eugene. Apes, Men, and Language, New York:
E.P. Dutton, 1974.

Lowry, Malcolm. Under the Volcano. Harmondsworth,
Middlesex: Penguin, 1947.

Lumsden, Susan. "Leonard Cohen Wants the Unconditional
Leadership of the World," in Gnarowski 69-73.

Luther, Martin. Table Talk. Luther's Works, Vol. 54.
ed. and trans. Theodore G. Tappert. Philadelphia:
Fortress P, 1967.

Lyotard, Jean Francois. The Postmodern Condition.
trans. Geoff Bennington and Brian Massumi. Minneapolis: U
of Minnesota P, 1984.

McFarland, David ed. The Oxford Companion to Animal
Behavior. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1987.

McGrew, Roderick E. Encyclopedia of Medical History.
N.Y.: McGraw-Hill, 1985.

McKeon, Michael. The Origins of the English Novel
1600-1740. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins P, 1987.

MacLennan, Hugh. Two Solitudes. Toronto: MacMillan,
1945.

McLuhan, Marshall. "Canada: the Borderline Case."
The Canadian Imagination: Dimensions of a Literary Culture.
ed. David Staines. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 1977.

_____. The Gutenberg Galaxy: The Making of Typographic Man. N.Y.: Signet, 1962.

_____. Letters of Marshall McLuhan. ed. Matie Molinaro, Corinne McLuhan, William Toye. Toronto: Oxford UP, 1987.

_____. Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man. N.Y.: Signet, 1964.

Manuel, Frank and Fritzie. Utopian Thought in the Western World. Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap, 1979.

Marchak, M. Patricia. Ideological Perspectives on Canada, 2nd ed. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson, 1981.

Marks, Geoffrey and William K. Beatty. Epidemics. N.Y.: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1976.

Martin, Judith. Miss Manners' Guide to Rearing Perfect Children. N.Y.: Atheneum, 1984.

Matthews, Robin. Canadian Literature. Toronto: Steel Rail, 1978.

Mennell, Stephen. Norbert Elias: Civilization and the Human Self-Image. Oxford: Blackwell, 1989.

Miller, Llewellyn. The Encyclopedia of Etiquette. N.Y.: Crown, 1967.

Mitchell, W.O. The Vanishing Point. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1973.

Monk, Patricia. "Somatotyping, Scatomancy, and Sophia: The Relation of Body and Soul in the Novels of Robertson Davies." English Studies in Canada 12:1 (March 1986): 79-100.

Montaigne, Michel de. "Of the Force of Imagination." "Of Repenting." Essays. trans. John Florio. N.Y.: Random House, n.d.

Moodie, Susanna. Mark Hurdlestone; or, the Two Brothers. N.Y.: Dewitt & Davenport, n.d.

_____. Roughing It in the Bush, 2nd ed. (1852). Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1989.

_____. Susanna Moodie: Letters of a Lifetime. ed. Carl Ballstadt, Elizabeth Hopkins, and Michael Peterman. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1985.

Moore, Barrington jr. Privacy: Studies in Social and

Cultural History. Armonk, N.Y.: M.E. Sharpe, 1984.

Moore, Brian. Black Robe. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1985.

_____. The Luck of Ginger Coffey. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1960.

Mowat, Farley. People of the Deer. N.Y.: Pyramid, 1952.

Mullen, Barbara D. and Kerry Anne McGinn. The Ostomy Book. Palo Alto: Bull, 1980.

Munro, Alice. Lives of Girls and Women. N.Y.: Signet, 1971.

_____. The Progress of Love. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1986.

_____. Who Do You Think You Are? Toronto: MacMillan, 1978.

Naylor, R.T. Canada in the European Age: 1453-1919. Vancouver: New Star Books, 1987.

Nietzsche, Friedrich. "The Ass Festival." Thus Spake Zarathustra. trans. R.J. Hollingdale. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1961.

_____. The Birth of Tragedy from the Spirit of Music. trans. Francis Golffing. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1956.

Novak, Maximillian E. "Gulliver's Travels and the Picaresque Voyage: Some Reflections on the Hazards of Genre Criticism." The Genres of Gulliver's Travels. ed. Frederick N. Smith. Newark: U of Delaware P, 1990, 23-38.

O'Faolain, Julia and Lauro Martines, eds. Not in God's Image: Women in History from the Greeks to the Victorians. N.Y.: Harper & Row, 1973.

Ondaatje, Michael. The Collected Works of Billy the Kid: Left-Handed Poems. Toronto: Anansi, 1970.

_____. Coming Through Slaughter. Toronto: Anansi, 1976.

_____. Running in the Family. Toronto: General Publishing, 1982.

O'Hagan, Howard. The School-Marm Tree. Vancouver:

Talonbooks, 1977.

____. Tay John. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1939.

Onians, Richard Broxton. The Origins of European Thought about the body, the mind, the soul, the world, time, and fate: new interpretations of Greek, Roman, and kindred evidence, also of some basic Jewish and Christian beliefs. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1954.

Ostenso, Martha. Wild Geese (1925). Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1989.

Pache, Walter. "'The Fiction Makes us Real': Aspects of Postmodernism in Canada." Gaining Ground, 64-78.

Pachter, Henry M. Magic into Science; the Story of Paracelsus. N.Y.: Henry Shuman, 1951.

Palmer, Howard. "Mosaic versus Melting Pot?: Immigration and Ethnicity in Canada and the United States." A Passion for Identity: Introduction to Canadian Studies, ed. Eli Mandel and David Taras, Toronto: Methuen, 1987.

Paracelsus. The Hermetic and Alchemical Writings, Vol. 2. ed. Arthur Edward Waite. Berkeley: Shambhala, 1976.

Partridge, Eric. A Dictionary of Slang and Unconventional English, Vol. 2. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1961.

Paz, Octavio. Conjunctions and Disjunctions. trans. Helen R. Lane. N.Y.: Viking, 1969.

Peyser, C.S. "William Herbert Sheldon." Concise Encyclopedia of Psychology. ed. Raymond J. Corsini. N.Y.: John Wiley and Sons, 1987.

Pineo, Peter C. and John Porter. "Ethnic Origins and Occupational Attainment." Ascription and Achievement: Studies in Mobility and Status Attainment in Canada. ed. Monica Boyd et al. Ottawa: Carleton UP, 1985.

Pops, Martin. "The Metamorphoses of Shit." Salmagundi 56 (Spring 1982): 26-61.

Porter, John. The Vertical Mosaic: An Analysis of Social Class and Power in Canada. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1965.

Porush, David. "Cybernavts in Cyberspace: William Gibson's Neuromancer." Aliens: The Anthropology of Science Fiction. ed. George E. Slusser and Eric S. Rabkin.

Edwardsville, Ill.: Southern Illinois UP, 1987, 168-78.

____. "Cybernetic Fiction and Postmodern Science." New Literary History 20:2 (Winter 1989): 373-96.

Post, Elizabeth L. Emily Post's Etiquette. N.Y.: Harper & Row, 1984.

Preston, James J. "Purification." Encyclopedia of Religion. ed. Mircea Eliade et al. N.Y.: MacMillan, 1987.

Pudney, John. The Smallest Room. London: Michael Joseph, 1954.

Rabelais, Francois. The Histories of Gargantua and Pantagruel. trans. J.M. Cohen. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1955.

Ramcharan, Subhas. Racism: Nonwhites in Canada. Toronto: Butterworths, 1982.

Rawcliffe, D.H. Occult and Supernatural Phenomena. N.Y.: Dover, 1952.

Richardson, John. Wacousta (1832). Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1967.

Richler, Mordecai. The Apprenticeship of Duddy Kravitz. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1959.

____. Jacob Two-Two Meets the Hooded Fang. N.Y.: Bantam, 1975.

____. Joshua Then and Now. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1980.

____. St. Urbain's Horseman. Toronto: Bantam, 1966.

____. Solomon Gursky Was Here. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1989.

____. Son of a Smaller Hero. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1955.

Rooke, Leon. Shakespeare's Dog. Toronto: General Publishing, 1981.

Rosebury, Theodor. Life on Man. N.Y.: Viking P, 1969.

Rosenberg, Stuart. E. The Jewish Community in Canada. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1970.

Rosso, Stefano. "Postmodern Italy: Notes on the 'Crisis of Reason,' 'Weak Thought,' and The Name of the Rose." Exploring Postmodernism, 79-92.

Roy, Gabrielle. La Petite Poule D'eau. Montréal: Beauchemin, 1970.

_____. Where Nests the Water Hen. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1951.

Rudwin, Maximilian. The Devil in Language and Literature. N.Y.: AMS Press, 1931.

Said, Edward W. "Opponents, Audiences, Constituencies and Community." Postmodern Culture, 135-59.

_____. The World, the Text and the Critic. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 1983.

Scarry, Elaine. The Body in Pain: The Making and Unmaking of the World. N.Y.: Oxford UP, 1985.

_____. "Introduction." Literature and the Body: Essays on Populations and Persons. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1988.

Schlatter, Richard B. The Social Ideas of Religious Leaders, 1660-1688. London: Oxford UP, 1940.

Schneidau, Herbert N. Sacred Discontent: The Bible and Western Tradition. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State UP, 1976.

Schweickart, Patrocino P. "Reading Ourselves: Toward a Feminist Theory of Reading." Speaking of Gender. ed. Elaine Showalter. N.Y.: Routledge, 1989, 17-44.

Schwenger, Peter. "The Masculine Mode." Speaking of Gender, 101-112.

Scobie, Stephen. Signature Event Context. Edmonton: NeWest P, 1989.

Scott, Chris. Antichthon. Dunvegan, Ont.: Quadrant, 1982.

Seigel, Jerrold. "Review of The Civilizing Process." Journal of Modern History 51 (March 1979): 123-6.

Shell, Marc. The Economy of Literature. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1978.

Showalter, Elaine. "Introduction: The Rise of

Gender." Speaking of Gender, 1-13.

Smart, Elizabeth. The Assumption of Rogues and Rascals. London: Granada, 1978.

_____. By Grand Central Station I Sat Down and Wept. N.Y.: Panther, 1945.

Smith, Anthony. The Body. N.Y.: Walker & Co., 1968.

Spariosu, Mihai. "Allegory, Hermeneutics, and Postmodernism." Exploring Postmodernism, 59-78.

Spengemann, William C. The Forms of Autobiography: Episodes from the History of a Literary Genre. New Haven: Yale UP, 1980.

Stallybrass, Peter and Allon White. The Politics and Poetics of Transgression. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell UP, 1986.

Stein, Harold S. "The Ethics of the Clean and the Unclean." Judaism 6 (1957): 319-27.

Stich, K.P. "Introduction." Reflections: Autobiography and Canadian Literature. Ottawa: U of Ottawa P, 1988, ix-xii.

Stimpson, Catherine. "Are the Differences Spreading? Feminist Criticism and Postmodernism." English Studies in Canada 15:4 (Dec. 1989): 364-82.

Such, Peter. Riverrun. Toronto: Clarke, Irwin, 1973.

_____. "The Short Life and Sudden Death of Harold Ladoo." Saturday Night 89 (May 1974): 36.

Sutherland, John. Offensive Literature: Decensorship in Britain 1960-1982. Totown N.J.: Barnes & Noble, 1982.

Swift, Jonathan. Jonathan Swift: A Selection of His Works. ed. Philip Pinkus. Toronto: MacMillan, 1965.

_____. 'A Tale of a Tub' with other Early Works 1696-1707. ed. Herbert Davis. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1939.

Tatum, Stephen. Inventing Billy the Kid: Visions of the Outlaw in America 1881-1981. Albuquerque: U of New Mexico P, 1982.

Thomas, Audrey. Latakia. Vancouver: Talonbooks, 1979.

- ____. Mrs. Blood. Vancouver: Talonbooks, 1975.
- Thomas, Keith. Man and the Natural World. N.Y.: Pantheon, 1983.
- Thompson, Judith. White Biting Dog. Toronto: Playwrights, 1984.
- Thompson, Philip. The Grotesque. London: Methuen, 1972.
- Tillich, Paul. The Protestant Era. trans. James Luther Adams. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1948.
- Turner, Bryan S. The Body and Society: Explorations in Social Theory. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1984.
- Twigg, Alan. For Openers: Conversations with 24 Canadian Writers. Madeira Park, B.C.: Harbour Publishing, 1981.
- Vanderbilt, Amy. The Amy Vanderbilt Complete Book of Etiquette. rev. and expanded by Letita Baldrige. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1978.
- Vico, Giambattista. The New Science, rev. trans. of the 3rd ed. (1744). trans. Thomas Goddard Bergin and Max Harold Fisch. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell UP, 1968.
- Vigarelo, Georges. Concepts of Cleanliness: Changing Attitudes in France Since the Middle Ages. trans. Jean Birrell. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1988.
- Vogt, A.E. van. The World of Null-A. N.Y.: Berkley, 1945.
- Walker, Benjamin. The Encyclopedia of Esoteric Man. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1977.
- Watson, Sheila. The Double Hook. Toronto: McLelland & Stewart, 1959.
- Weber, Max. The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism. N.Y.: Scribner's, 1958.
- Welsford, Enid. The Fool: His Social and Literary History. London: Faber & Faber, 1935.
- Wiebe, Rudy. The Temptations of Big Bear. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1973.
- Williams, David. "After Post-modernism." Trace: Prairie Writers on Writing. ed. Birk Sproxtton. Winnipeg:

Turnstone, 1986.

____. The Burning Wood. Toronto: Anansi, 1975.

____. Confessional Fictions: A Portrait of the Artist in the Canadian Novel. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1991.

____. The Confessions of a Self-Made Man: Forms of Autobiography in Fifth Business." Journal of Canadian Studies 24:1 (Spring 1989): 81-102.

____. Eye of the Father. Toronto: Anansi, 1985.

____. "'Looking into a Void': The Clash of Realism and Modernism in As For Me and My House." Canadiana: Studies in Canadian Literature. eds. Jorn Carlsen and Knud Larsen Aarhus, Denmark: Canadian Studies Conference, U of Aarhus, 1984, 25-42.

____. The River Horsemen. Toronto: Anansi, 1981.

Wilson, Ethel. Swamp Angel. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1954.

Woodcock, George. "Don't Ever Ask for the True Story; or, Second Thoughts on Autobiography." Essays on Canadian Writing 29 (Summer 1984): 16.

Wright, Lawrence. Clean and Decent: The Fascinating History of the Bathroom and the Water Closet. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1960.

Wyke, Clement H. "Harold Ladoo's Alternate Worlds: Canada and Carib Island." Canadian Literature 95 (Winter 1982): 39-49.

Ziolkowski, Jan M. "The Form and Spirit of Beast Fable," Bestia 2 (May 1990): 4-18.

¹ Although Elias starts with the Middle Ages in order to get at later developments, the Middle Ages should obviously not be literally understood as "origins." For example, euphemisms for toilet (itself a euphemism) were in force in medieval times: garderobe (ie. wardrobe), necessarium, necessary house (Wright 47). Francis Barker, in The Tremulous Private Body, locates the beginnings of the modern separation of public and private realms in the English Revolution, and suggests in particular that Milton's Areopagitica interiorized censorship, emphasizing private copyright over Jacobean collaborative writing. Julia Kristeva in Powers of Horror attributes this movement into private guilt to Christ. The English Revolution does represent a codification of the privatizing tendencies in copyright law, and Kristeva is also correct to suggest Christ's importance for the interiorization of the "abject" that accompanies the interiorization of Jewish ritual law. However, when one traces scatology, such "cruxes" proliferate: Ezekiel's scatological transgression (Ezekiel 4:12) in the Sixth Century B.C., for example, personalizes the abject even though his enactment was intended as drama. To insist upon a particular moment is to prematurely simplify the process.

² In Richler's children's book Jacob Two-Two Meets the Hooded Fang, Jacob confronts exactly this when he is

constantly reminded of his scatological nature. He is called to court by Justice Rough for "peeing without lifting the seat" (18). Even when he merely forgets to euphemize (by mentioning that his older brother is "doing his dump" 30), he gets into trouble.

³ Elias is much less total in his explanations than his critics make him out to be. Bullough ignores Elias's comment that the growth of shame is not explicable by one social factor, but that changes in technical apparatus cannot be explained simply on a scientific level (Elias 139-40); Adams completely misreads Elias as a Freudian primitivist. For a better analysis of Elias's ideas, see Stephen Mennell's book-length study, Norbert Elias: Civilization and the Human Self-Image.

⁴ Although the writers of books on manners present idealized worlds, they cannot be dismissed simply as prudish distorters of actual culture. Even as the voices of conservatism they can be in the avant-garde of cultural change: many cities have recently adopted by-laws requiring owners to remove their pets' feces from public areas; Ford advocates some swearing so that women can gain access to male language (64).

⁵ "Good education demands. . . to close up and limit the body's confines and to smooth the bulges" (Bakhtin 1984, 322). The emission of bodily substances and speech about them are "bulges" in Bakhtin's sense.

- ⁶ Semiotics must be interdisciplinary to look at methods of signification (Eco 115). The refusal to cross disciplines is one of the ways in which literary studies have been de-politicized and marginalized (Saïd 1983, 146-53). Mennell notes that Elias's interest in the body has interdisciplinary sources: Elias studied both medicine and philosophy, and was disturbed for many years by "the discrepancy between the philosophical-idealist and the anatomical-physiological image of man" (Elias quoted in Mennell 7).
- ⁷ Lucy, another signing chimpanzee, urinated on one of her keepers and "signed 'funny' in a self-congratulatory way" (Linden 97). For her, "dirty" and "leash" were always associated, as were "dirty" and "cat" (113). Linden says that, for the outsider, swearing is the most dramatic way in which the signing chimpanzees appear human (114).
- ⁸ See, for example, Saïd's criticism of functionalist theories which pay too little attention to the text's materiality (1983, 148). "For the critic, texts are texts not as symbols of something else but as displacements (Frye's vocabulary is useful here) of other things; texts are deviations from, exaggerations and negations of, human presence" (147). Although Saïd overstates his case, his work is a good corrective to less worldly theories of literature.

- ⁹ In her study The Body in Pain Scarry cites the McGill Pain Questionnaire (which gathers the seemingly random words of patients into diagnostic sets) as an instance of how the human voice is a reliable instrument for "exposing even the most resistant aspects of material reality" (1985, 8).
- ¹⁰ See John Sutherland, Offensive Literature: Decensorship in Britain 1960-1982, 21-28; and Alec Craig, The Banned Books of England and other Countries, 133.
- ¹¹ Not unrelated to this is Robert Cluett's computer analysis of prose styles and parts of speech. He identifies a movement, over the last one hundred years "away from ornament towards utility and matter" (169).
- ¹² Again, this is a comment that Kayser makes about the grotesque (31).
- ¹³ "The tip-tilted outhouse looking like a child's parody of the leaning tower" (114), Laurence's direct copy of Steve's artwork in Sinclair Ross's As For Me and My House, is what bothers Hagar the most about the home that she and Bram share.
- ¹⁴ For a parodic history of the topos of Christy, the quaint old hired man, see F. Scott Fitzgerald's letter to Maxwell Perkins (ca. June 1, 1925), The Letters of F. Scott Fitzgerald, ed. Andrew Turnbull, Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1963, 204-6. We might add Beckett's Christy from All That Fall and Laurence's

Christie to a scatological post-World War II extension of Fitzgerald's list.

¹⁵ "Smell must be civilization's first casualty," says Carlyle Sinclair in Mitchell's The Vanishing Point (133) as Mitchell re-activates Sinclair's lost sense on a Cree reservation. On the elimination of smell in literate societies, see Marshall McLuhan, Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man, (N.Y.: Signet, 1964) 136. In 1929, scientist J.D. Bernal predicted that in the future, smell would have a "less primitively emotional role than now" (39). For a connection between a heightened sense of smell and decivilization, see Judith Thompson's play, White Biting Dog, (Toronto: Playwrights, 1984) 20.

¹⁶ Compare a less sympathetic variant in R.V. Krafft-Ebing's Lehrbuch der Psychiatrie: a patient believes that the smells and odors of his neighbor's greasy cooking are getting into his skin and that excrement is falling from from his ceiling (Enzensberger 22).

¹⁷ On the discipline involved in getting French school-children to sit not climb and squat on toilets, see Corbin 174.

¹⁸ See also Elizabeth D. Harvey, "Property, Digestion, and Intertext in Robertson Davies' The Rebel Angels," English Studies in Canada 16:1 (March 1990) 91-106, and Patricia Monk, "Somatogyping, Scatomancy, and Sophia: The Relations of the Body and Soul in the

Novels of Robertson Davies," English Studies in Canada 12:1 (March 1986) 79-100.

¹⁹ On the varieties of new Canadian social histories, see George S. Kealey, "Introduction," Class, Gender, and Region: Essays in Canadian Historical Sociology, ed. Kealey, (St. John's: Canadian Journal of Sociology, 1988) 1-7.

²⁰ Gregory the Great, who recommended bathing (24) and Christchurch Monastery at Canterbury, with its elaborate water supply system (26), represent the modern in a medieval world where St. Benedict, St. Jerome, and St. Francis all considered bathing as a sign of affectation (24). Da Vinci's plan for Ten New Towns (including spiral stairways "to prevent unsanitary misuse of landings" 53) and Sir John Harrington's 1596 invention of the flushing water closet (71) represent a renaissance to Wright that only finds its fulfillment in the Eighteenth Century. Along the way there are famous regressions, as Anthony à Wood recounts of Charles II's courtiers: "Though they were neat and gay in their apparell, yet they were very nasty and beastly, leaving at their departure their excrements in every corner, in chimneys, studies, colehouses, cellars. Rude, rough, whoremongers; vaine, empty, careless" (Wright 76).

²¹ To put a point on the obvious hierarchical change that Bataille is attempting, compare Bernardus

Silvestris's Twelfth Century comment in the Cosmographia that man's head is purposely placed so that it is far from the bowels and regions of decay.

²² I refer to Lévi-Strauss's proposed play, "The Apotheosis of Augustus," in which Augustus very clearly represents the civilized anthropologist: "Augustus would realize that he had become a god, not by some radiant sensation or the power to work miracles, but by his ability to tolerate the proximity of a wild beast without a sensation of disgust, to put up with its stench and the excrement with which it would cover him" (Tristes Tropiques, trans. John and Doreen Weightman, N.Y.: Pocket, 1974. 432). Academia, of course, has its own rhetorical techniques which preclude such returns, and register distance from origins: see, for example, Lévi-Strauss's use of pseudo-mathematics at the same time as he discusses a myth of auto-chthonic origins in "The Structural Study of Myth," Structural Anthropology, (trans. Claire Jacobson and Brooke Grundfest Schoepf, Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1963. 225). To this we might compare Paracelsus's more naive version of the same scientizing stance when he insists that he did not get his (rather chthonic) knowledge from a urinal. "Manual Concerning the Medicinal Stone of the Philosophers," The Hermetic and Alchemical Writings, vol.2, ed. Arthur Edward Waite, 1894, (rpt.

- Berkeley: Shambhala, 1976) 104.
- ²³ Pineo and Porter have shown how a rural background is often a greater debility to occupational attainment than ethnic status (391). On the connections between class and country or town origins in Canada, see Dennis Forcese, The Canadian Class Structure, 3rd ed. (Toronto: McGraw-Hill, 1986) 33-7.
- ²⁴ It is unclear whether Ostenso was aware of the etymology, or whether genre closes its own circuits, so that the realist naming of the process can, even inadvertently, register the real work involved. See Raymond Williams, The Country and the City (1973) on the testing of language about farming--in particular the pastoral--against experience. Williams takes language as a material activity in attempt to expand materialist conceptions beyond sense apprehensions and positivism (Marxism and Literature 1977, 30f).
- ²⁵ Haliburton (13) criticizes the Bluenosers, Frances Brooke the French Canadians (60, 167) for being too lazy to manure their crops. Although Moodie usually resists scatology, she is proud of fields "plentifully manured" (421). The Romans, notes Theodor Rosebury, deified Stercus because of the invention of manuring (111). Alain Corbin notes that agriculturists distrusted attempts to deodorize dung (213).
- ²⁶ For the inability to see the comic in the grotesque because of civilized values see Philip Thompson, The

Grotesque, (London: Methuen, 1972) 55. For the taboo against choosing a urinal immediately next to another man (when other urinals are available), see R. Dale Guthrie, Body Hotspots: The Anatomy of Human Social Organs and Behavior, (N.Y.: Nostrand Reinhold, 1976) 191, and Moore, 60-61.

²⁷ In "The American Scholar," just prior to proclaiming "the new importance given to the single person," Emerson writes of how Swedenborg "showed the mysterious bond that allies moral evil to the foul material forms" (Selected Essays, ed. Larzer Ziff, Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1982, 103. The correspondences between Emerson and David Canaan are many.

²⁸ For David Canaan as artist, see David Williams, Confessional Fictions: A Portrait of the Artist in the Canadian Novel, (Toronto: Toronto UP, 1991). For outhouses, see Outhouses of the East, Ray Guy, Photographs by Sherman Hines, (Halifax: Nimbus, 1988).

²⁹ See Albert and Theresa Moritz, The Oxford Illustrated Literary Guide to Canada, (Toronto: Oxford UP, 1987), and The Oxford Companion to English Literature, ed. William Toye, Toronto: Oxford UP, 1983. See also Rosmarin Heidenreich, The Postwar Novel in Canada: Narrative Patterns and Reader Response, Waterloo: Wilfred Laurier UP, 1989, 14-15, on the structures in the text that imply a desire to

affirm threatened rural norms.

³⁰ McKeon's book is of obvious importance for this study, but his structure is the inverse of the one implied by the scatological image. His sources posit idealist origins for the novel, origins which naive empiricists criticized with the "truth" of history; the empiricists in turn came under attack from an extreme skeptical position. The difference between attitudes to genre in the Eighteenth Century (Defoe defining himself against romance) and the imagined history of the self in Twentieth Century novels owes something to historical changes (since both modernists and postmodernists have tended to define themselves against realism. Because "origins" in the Canadian novel are so often posited as scatological, the second move is a civilizing or idealizing process which only "later" comes under skeptical attack. In the extreme version of this third move--"the parodic maneuvers of extreme skepticism" (McKeon 115)--my categories for the first time properly coincide with those of McKeon.

³¹ On the scatological roles of pigs, particularly on the differences between town versions and country versions of the pig, see Stallybrass and White 45, 49.

³² A similar historical revisionism, by means of the repressive hypothesis, also marks D.G. Jones'

renovation of Archibald Lampman's voice--"We cared/little for Arcadia its/ elementary joys, its excrement" in "Kate, These Flowers...", 15 Canadian Poets X 2, ed. Gary Geddes, (Toronto: Oxford UP, 1988)--as well as Margaret Atwood's revision of Susanna Moodie in The Journals of Susanna Moodie, (Toronto: Oxford UP, 1970).

^{3 3} Compare Morag's knowing irony in The Diviners when she reports on the town dump's name change from "Nuisance Grounds" to "Municipal Disposal Area." Morag's attitude towards garbage is not at all different from the attitudes that initiate the name change.

^{3 4} While he was a book reviewer for the Toronto Daily Star, Davies himself enacted the process of "recovering" excluded scatology, praising Wright's Clean and Decent, John Pudney's The Smallest Room, and Reginald Reynolds' Cleanliness and Godliness (11 June 1960, reprinted in The Enthusiasms of Robertson Davies, ed. Judith Skelton Grant, Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1979): "Clean and Decent has changed my notions of plumbing and history" (191). "You don't want to read about sewage? I am grieved but not surprised" (193).

^{3 5} For the outhouse as a symbol for leaving behind "the effete, deodorized, decaffeinated East" (8), see Outhouses of the West, Silver Donald Cameron, Photographs by Sherman Hines, (Halifax: Nimbus,

1988). One of the euphemisms for outhouse--"house of Parliament" (Backhouses of the North, Muriel E. Newton White. Cobalt Ont.: Highway Book Shop, 1972. 18)--suggests precise political satire.

³⁶ There are even hints of a North/South axis to the coding of scatology. Nick Sluzick prefers to spit rather than speak in Where Nests the Water Hen (19, 27), and he plans on moving further north once he feels that there are too many people settled near the Water Hen River.

³⁷ See also McLuhan's metaphor--the city as middenheap in From Cliché to Archetype, (N.Y.: Viking, 1970) 65. The scatological element in the modern wasteland topos may owe something to Nineteenth Century attempts to run city sewage systems on town lines. See Wright 90, 144.

³⁸ Compare Rabelais' report of Fabrius dying because he held a fart in while he was in the presence of the emperor Claudius. Pantagruel Book 3, 489.

³⁹ Kristeva puts the abject on the boundary of man and animal (1982, 12), while Murray Davis shows how excrement is used to signal the sub-human and bestial (138-9). Mennell finds the ability to identify with animals in the increasing reluctance of people to eat such things as animal testicles. See also Corbin on the decline of animal perfumes like musk, civet, and ambergris (73-74).

- ⁴⁰ For Nazi reactions to literary scatology, see Jost Hermand, Stänker und Weismacher.
- ⁴¹ See Michael McKeon (150-159) on the shifting epistemology in the concept of "honor" when the post-medieval English aristocracy shored its ranks by means of practices such as the sale of honors, surrogate heirship, and name-changing.
- ⁴² In Hindu culture the head (Brahmin) does the thinking and praying, while the despised parts (Harijan) carry away the waste (Douglas 123). Secular society complicates such symbolic markers, but does not do away with them: Douglas cites a study of Canadian mental patients in which hospitalization marks a threshold of toleration. As long as the patients are not hospitalized, their aberrant behavior is tolerated, but once they are hospitalized, they are avoided as taboo (Douglas 97).
- ⁴³ "The axis of the body is transcoded through the axis of the city" (Stallybrass 145). Freud "brilliantly imagines the splitting of the Subject, but then he proceeds to suppress the social terrain through which that splitting is articulated" (Stallybrass 153). Compare Freud's From the History of an Infantile Neurosis, Standard Edition vol. 17, especially pages 95-101.
- ⁴⁴ For example, if we use job status as a criterion, a number of the characters under discussion would

belong to what Wallace Clement in Class, Power and Property calls the 'resource proletariat.'

- ⁴⁵ In Not Wanted on the Voyage, Mottyl's voice is even more humane than that of Shakespeare's dog. Findley combines Mottyl's integrity with scatological concerns. See especially Mottyl's search for her missing kitten in the latrines (315-16).
- ⁴⁶ On the association of offal with the food of the poor, see Mennell, All Manners of Food: Eating and Taste in England from the Middle Ages to the Present, (Oxford: Blackwell, 1985) 312.
- ⁴⁷ On the relations between Grove's life and his autobiographical poses, see David Williams, Confessional Fictions, 44-54.
- ⁴⁸ Compare the advertisement for soap as a 'Kit for Climbers' (Ewen 45). The ad showed climbers scaling a mountain up to 'Heart's Desire.' Ewen notes the irony inherent in an attempt to evade mass life (to "climb") while one is dependent on a mass-produced commodity--"a sort of mass pseudo-demassification" (45).
- ⁴⁹ "The inexpungeability of aristocratic nobility" is a romance convention, but "the stories of successful younger sons of the nobility tended to be accommodated to the progressive plot-model of the career open to talents" (McKeon 213, 219). This creates a high degree of confusion "between

'restorations' and 'original raisings'" (McKeon 220).

⁵⁰ On modern reactions to the moralizing qualities of the fable, see Thomas Noel, Theories of the Fable in the Eighteenth Century, (N.Y.: Columbia UP, 1975).

⁵¹ Godard argues her case using The Rebel Angels, not The Lyre of Orpheus. Nevertheless, she, as I do, intends her claims to hold good for the bulk of Davies' writing. Her analysis of the competing voices in Davies' work is quite valuable, except for the claim that Davies includes "no single authoritative vision of truth" (75). Although Davies repeatedly undercuts authorities, the authoritative position from which he does so can be deduced from almost any page of his writing. Godard seems to approach this conception when she notices a censorship that occurs in his writing, but she implies that the censors are external to Davies (Godard 78). Not only are there always clear hierarchies in Davies, but it is even doubtful whether there are competing voices (Cluett 107). Rather, ideas generally compete within a single voice. Although Davies wants Hulda Schnakenburg to speak with the inflexions of 1980's youth culture, he ends up giving her the voice of a 1960's teenager--"it kinda grabs me" (27)--or the voice of a 75-year-old British-inflected Upper Canadian English professor: "Fat lot of good that'll be" (26). Davies only avoids anachronism when he

becomes scatological: "They don't know shit about music" (26).

^{5 2} See The Rebel Angels 32. Compare Freud's Character and Anal Eroticism (1908) Standard Edition, vol. 9, 169-75.

^{5 3} "De mortuis nil nisi bonum" ("Of the dead, nothing but good") is attributed to Chilo. The statement has nothing scatological about it until Davies translates it into his idea of the speech of the lower classes.

^{5 4} According to Barker, "Pepysian corporeality" and, later in the argument, Rembrandt's "The Anatomy Lesson of Dr. Nicholas Tulp" (1632) assign the "spectacular body" to a "secret half-life": "This spectacular visible body is the proper gauge of what the bourgeoisie had to forget" (24-25). (See also Stallybrass and White 83.) Barker ends his book with Caspar Barlaeus, who wrote poetry in praise of the same Dr. Tulp that Rembrandt commemorated. Apparently Barlaeus became afraid to sit because he thought that his buttocks were made of glass; Barker finds "something at once risible and haunting about a poet of the bourgeois class who thought his body was made of glass" (Barker 115). It does not help Barker's argument that he relied on an expurgated version of Pepys and that he did not compare "The Anatomy of Dr. Nicholas Tulp" to "The Anatomy Lesson of Dr. Deyman" (1656), where the corpses recall

Bergiani's and Mantegna's Christs, or to "The Descent from the Cross" (1633), where Christ's body is the focus of most of the gazes and where the apostle recovering the body (presumably John) has his face in close proximity to Christ's pubic region. Barker, so careful about political and class nuances, does not notice the subtle lessons of religious irony which might, in a painter like Rembrandt, enter even secular anatomy lessons. On the other hand, the expurgated version of Pepys makes Barker an inadvertent commentator not on the Seventeenth Century, but on the Nineteenth and the first half of the Twentieth Century.

^{5 5} For a corresponding analysis of the aristocratic elements in Davies' prose style, see Cluett 97-8. The hierarchizing of academic and non-academic language by means of scatological attributions to a lower class shows up even in writers who seem to be apologists for popular culture. Marshall McLuhan speaks of Joyce and Pound renewing language that is fouled a million times a day in normal use (From Cliché to Archetype 115).

^{5 6} Corbin refers to turn-of-the-century Parisian society, but his statement is also an accurate reflection of the Canadian prairies between 1920 and 1970. Older excretory patterns tend to obscure the line between man and animal.

- ⁵⁷ A different balance may be observed in skepticism of Yesterdays. Although much of Ladoo's intensely scatological novel takes place among a low class, the two wealthy men (the lawyer and Pandit Puru) are also represented scatologically--the one farting, and the other picking his nose (91-2). Ladoo collapses the image of social differentiation into a single class.
- ⁵⁸ According to Certeau, "marginality is today no longer limited to minority groups, but. . . is becoming universal. A marginal group has now become a silent majority. That does not mean the group is homogeneous" (xvii).
- ⁵⁹ This holds for most ethnic groups except natives, but Pineo and Porter's research design is limited to testing for job status rather than for the less measurable effects of discrimination.
- ⁶⁰ For the rhetorical sources of Canadian immigration policy, see Porter 61 and Terence Craig's introduction to Racial Attitudes in English-Canadian Fiction, 1905-1980--particularly the words "lower breeds" and "lower race" that Craig quotes from a 1920 essay by Andrew MacPhail.
- ⁶¹ Jost Hermand describes the effects of Nazi policy on German literature: "Die Nazis brauchten daraus nur noch die Folgerung zu ziehen, die 'Hässlichkeit' der expressionistischen Asphaltliterature in blasphemischer Überspitzung auf die schmutzige

Phantasie jener semitischen 'Wüstenbewohner' zurückzuführen, deren 'stinkiger Atem' fast die gesamte deutsche Kunst verpestet habe. Als sie daher 1933 die Macht antraten, brach eine Periode der kulturellen 'Sauberkeit' an (11, "The Nazis only had to draw the conclusion, to suggest that the "ugliness" of expressionist Asphalt-literature was a blasphemous attempt to outdo the dirty fantasies of those semitic 'desert-dwellers,' whose 'stinking breath' was said to have infected nearly the whole of German art. So when the Nazis came to power, a period of cultural 'cleanliness' broke upon us.") On the unsettled nature of the German language in reference to urination, see Enzensberger 59. Enzensberger also attributes the discovery of soap to the Teutons (14) in what must be a fabular fiction since soap was apparently already used in Sumer (Valérie-Anne Giscard d'Estaing, The World Almanac Book of Inventions, N.Y.: World Almanac, 1985, 163-4). One of the initial Nazi attempts to degrade the Jews was to force them to clean the streets (Nathan Ausubel, Pictorial History of the Jewish People, N.Y.: Crown, 1953, 255). Scatological degradation of the Jews was, of course, hardly news in Europe. On the British demonization of the Jew by means of porcine and excremental imagery, see Stallybrass and White 54.

^{6 2} One Canadian writer on immigration during the 1950's argued that the English, Germans, and Dutch were interchangeable since they had the same cleanliness standards (Porter 69).

^{6 3} The discourse of Anglo-conformity was not always subtle: "Learning English and living under the British flag may make a British subject in the legal sense, but not in the real sense, in the light of national history and continuity. A few such people can easily be absorbed--over a large area many thousands can be absorbed. A little dose of them may even by variation do good, like a minute dose of poison in a medicine. But if you get enough of them, you get absorbed yourself. What you called the British Empire turns into the Russian and Galician Empire. I am not saying that we should absolutely shut out and debar the European foreigner, as we should and do shut out the Oriental. But we should in no way facilitate his coming." The words are Stephen Leacock's, from Economic Prosperity in the British Empire, Toronto: MacMillan, 1930, 196. Leacock follows with an account of how the desirable British immigrant ought to be integrated into the Canadian economy.

^{6 4} Richler even broadens his racial critique: the policeman McMaster speaks Harry Stein's lower-class language (so appealing to Jake Hersch), but, like Stein with

women, he reduces the French, changing *Monsieur* to "mon-sewer" (266). This occurs even though Richler is generally not sympathetic to Quebecois aspirations. Quebecois literature is outside of the parameters of this study. However, we might note that the French response to English-Canadian hegemony can be coded through scatology, as it is when Hubert Aquin's narrator in *Prochain Episode* speaks of "the vomit of our national history" (53).

⁶⁵ See David Williams, "The Indian Our Ancestor: Three Modes of Vision in Recent Canadian Fiction," *Dalhousie Review* 58 (Summer 1978) 309-29, for other forms of the myth of reconciliation.

⁶⁶ Diet and hygiene conventions are likely the causes for Burdener's perception.

⁶⁷ Ladoo's ironic tone makes it unlikely that the doctor has performed a rectal and vaginal examination.

⁶⁸ On the problem of parody, racial stereotyping, and fossilized cultures, see the exchange between Robert Kroetsch and Andrew Suknaski in "Ethnicity and Identity: The Question of One's Literary Passport," *Identifications: Ethnicity and the Writer in Canada*, ed. Jars Balan, Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1982.

⁶⁹ On Ladoo's social critique and Creole linguistic markings, see Clement H. Wyke, "Harold Ladoo's Alternate Worlds: Canada and Carib Island," *Canadian*

Literature 95 (Winter 1982) 39-49. Wyke calls Ladoo to task for his "unsteady world" and "haphazard depiction." However, the destabilization is quite purposeful; in fact, the only criticism that might be made of Ladoo in this respect is that he is so single-minded in his mimesis that he narrows human complexity to a simple scatological obsession. Of course, these were also the criticisms traditionally levelled at Swift and Pope. On Ladoo's biography, including the role of race, see Peter Such, "The Short Life and Sudden Death of Harold Ladoo," Saturday Night May 1974, 35-38.

⁷⁰ Sir Reginald Morton (Wacousta) recalls pursuing a wounded deer in the Scottish Highlands, a deer that led him to his faithless lover, Clara Beverly.

⁷¹ Both E.J. Pratt and his source in The Jesuit Relations, Christophe Regnaut, underestimate these traditions when reporting how the natives drink de Brébeuf's blood. See The Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents, ed. S.R. Mealing, Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1963, 69.

⁷² contrast the tears in Wacousta, which signal either British losses at the hands of the natives (186, 195) or gratitude for narrow escapes (65).

⁷³ On the strong Orange representation among the forces that put down the Northwest Rebellion, see Hereward Senior, Orangeism: The Canadian Phase (Toronto:

McGraw-Hill Ryerson, 1972), 71-91. In Senior's account, Orangeism is much more complex than in Wiebe's novel. The strong emphasis on moral rectitude (Senior 8) did not preclude occasions of religious tolerance on a practical level (9, 88), nor did it preclude a tongue-in-cheek, albeit militant scatology, as is evident in one charter oath: "May we never want a Williamite to kick the ... [sic] of a Jacobite! and a ... [sic] for the Bishop of Cork!" (quoted in Senior 3).

⁷⁴ To Erich Auerbach figural use of the Old Testament suggests a key antagonism in the Christian world-view between things and their meaning: the Christianizing of the Old Testament involved moving "away from sensory occurrence and towards its meaning" (Auerbach 42).

⁷⁵ In Wacousta, Ellen Halloway's slovenly eating among the Ottawas is likewise a sign of her fall from civilization.

⁷⁶ For generalized statements on the trickster, see Paul Radin, The Trickster: A Study in American Indian Mythology (N.Y.: Schocken Books, 1956), and Franz Boas, "Introduction." Traditions of the Thompson River Indians. James Teit. 1891. (rpt. N.Y.: Kraus Reprint, 1969). Radin has come under attack from anthropologists who believe that the Winnebago culture that he studied was anomalous and not

representative of Amerindian attitudes towards the trickster. However, the more one looks at Amerindian myth as literature rather than as field report, the more convincing Radin's account of the trickster's satire becomes.

⁷⁷ Compare Brown's comments on the "massive structure of excremental magic" in archaic man (Life Against Death: The Psychoanalytic Meaning of History 299).

⁷⁸ In The Rez Sisters and Dry Lips Oughta Move to Kapuskasing, Manitoba Cree playwright Tomson Highway explicitly disperses the Ojibway trickster Nanabush's scatology and subversive jokes among native women and men. American Laguna writer Leslie Marmon Silko's Coyote in "Toe'osh: A Laguna Coyote Legend" (Modern Poems ed. Richard Ellmann and Robert O'Clair, N.Y.: W.W. Norton, 1989, 840-42) is scatological, as is the trickster-narrator in American Blackfoot writer James Welch's Winter in the Blood.

⁷⁹ For Cree shamanism and the historical Fine-day, see David G. Mandelbaum. The Plains Cree: An Ethnographic, Historical and Comparative Study (Regina: Canadian Plains Research Center, 1979), 160-70, 363-70 and the historical Fine-day's own account, post-humously edited by Adolph Hungry Wolf, My Cree People (Invermere, B.C.: Good Medicine Books, 1973). For a general theory of shamanism, see Mircea Eliade. Shamanism: Archaic Techniques of Ecstasy. trans.

Willard R. Trask (N.Y.: Harper & Row. 1958). Despite Eliade's reductive dualism of sacred and profane, this is still a worthwhile study.

⁸⁰ Porter is careful not to confuse high occupational levels with political power in Canada, since Jewish representation on the boards of Canadian corporate institutions has been small (Porter 88).

⁸¹ This complication appears in Métis writer Beatrice Culleton's In Search of April Raintree, where April uses the social criteria of white society to lord it over her younger sister Cheryl, and in Highway's Dry Lips Oughta Move to Kapuskasing, where Ojibway/Cree men suffer under white prejudice and yet subjugate the women on the reserve.

⁸² In this regard Klein's "Political Meeting" is of special interest. The scatological "body-odour of race" (15 Canadian Poets X 2, 96), evoked by the orator's (Camillien Houde's) reference to French suffering under English-Canadian conscription can only be ambivalent when it is reported by a Jew who has little reason to trust Houde's Parti National Social Crétien.

⁸³ On the role of epic in relation to culture, see Bakhtin. Bakhtin overstates the monologism of the epic, but the discussion is nevertheless important in that it codifies how someone from the margins of a culture would see epic representations of that culture and

the aesthetic resolutions of the culture's tensions.

⁸⁴ Klein does so in a strange combination of scatological invective and anti-materialist doctrine: "Ezra Pound senses no compunction of his aesthetic conscience when he fertilizes the poetic field with his genius and with adjectives manurial. . . . What today is heralded as imagist is no more than a reactionary reversal to the rebus intelligence, a degradation into the concrete, an acceptance of the nous of the noun" ("Worse Verse" from The McGill Daily 29 Oct.-10 Dec. 1927, A.M. Klein: Literary Essays and Reviews, ed. Usher Caplan and M.W. Steinberg, Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1987, 151-2). Again: "one does not award the Nobel Prize to the coiner, no matter how gifted, of an epigram" ("T.S. Eliot and the Nobel Prize" 12-26 Nov. 1948, Caplan and Steinberg 270).

⁸⁵ A Marxist, Foley makes an interlocked series of attacks on post-structuralism, addressing the practice of postmodern novelists who continue "to invoke discursive contracts that [are] decidedly fictional or non-fictional" (14), and situating post-structuralism historically in "advanced monopoly capitalism" which makes a fetish of the text (18). Her most telling criticism is that non-referential theories concentrate purely on textual features without acknowledging the reader/author axis (51). "A postitivist epistemology lurks not far beneath the

surface of the non-referentiality criterion: the only realities, it seems, are palpable 'facts,' and if a discourse cannot refer to those, it has no referent at all" (47).

⁸⁶ For precise examples of how "personal" micro-narratives support the macro-narratives of social or religious history, see McKeon, particularly 212-217.

⁸⁷ For associations between scatology, imprisonment, and torture, see Atwood's "Footnote to the Amnesty Report on Torture" (Modern Poems. 2nd ed. Richard Ellmann and Robert O'Clair eds. N.Y.: W.W. Norton, 1989. 801), Bodily Harm, Pat Lowther's "Chacabuco, The Pit" (15 Canadian Poets X 2 366), and Elaine Scarry's The Body in Pain (18).

⁸⁸ In a letter Godfrey refutes ideologically polarized representations of African society by describing a middle class that predated the Portuguese landing in 1471, a middle class created by North African trade in gold and slaves (printed in Man Deserves Man 195).

⁸⁹ See Roland Oliver and Anthony Atmore. Africa Since 1800. 2nd ed. (London: Cambridge UP, 1972) 229-30.

⁹⁰ See Godfrey's letter in Man Deserves Man for the ways in which the Nkrumah government's rhetoric simply reproduced the utilitarian discourse of British colonialism. The letter was written one month before a 1966 military coup took advantage of Nkrumah's visit to Hanoi, deposing him and sending him into

exile in Guinea.

- ^{9 1} See also the "shit-smearred crowns" of the Furrycats in Pantagruel (633), from where Bakhtin probably got his metaphor.
- ^{9 2} Kristeva makes exactly this point about Greek democracy and the "discovery" of the tyrant's abjection in Oedipus (1982, 88).
- ^{9 3} See McKeon 138. Edward Walker in 1653 writes, "the Curtain being drawn they were discovered to be Men that heretofore were revered as Angels" (quoted in McKeon 152).
- ^{9 4} See Shell's The Economy of Literature on the connection between coinage and the Greek tyrant, who was the middle term in the classical Greek polity between aristocratic rule and democracy.
- ^{9 5} In order to sell hygiene products, companies create a whole new range of bodily categories that are considered scatological. Ewen reports a 1922 Pepsodent ad directed at parents and children: "'Shall They Suffer as you did from film on teeth?' Implying that film on the teeth was known about, much less suffered by parents, the ad conveyed the message that the needs of the child were better understood by industry" (Ewen 145). Baudrillard too arrives at a version of the commodity-self: "Strictly speaking, men of wealth are no longer surrounded by other human beings, as they have been in the past, but by

objects" (1988, 29). The problem with Baudrillard's version is the sociologist's proposed confusion between "mass man" and the Western "self." This eventually leads him to theorize the disappearance of the subject, which he never integrates with his own status as author. Compared to Ewen's dialectical self, Baudrillard's analysis of the self appears somewhat mystical.

⁹⁶ One of the reviewers of The Civilizing Process book notes that new market conditions have undermined both classic and Victorian forms of civility (Seigal 125).

⁹⁷ Clara also voices a more traditional economic satire dependent upon Freud. Of her son Arthur's hoarding of excrement she says, "maybe he'll grow up to be a banker" (144).

⁹⁸ See Foucault's, The History of Sexuality: Vol.1 An Introduction, and Baudrillard, "Forgetting Foucault" 94.

⁹⁹ According to Kroker art enhances "capital accumulation," which is in its "last, purely aesthetic phase: the phase of designer bodies" (Postmodern 18).

¹⁰⁰ There are medieval punishments too. Dingleman advises Duddy not to pursue money as if he has "a hot poker up his ass" (141). Compare this to the anal punishments suffered by misers in medieval art or in the work of Heironymus Bosch.

¹⁰¹ See also Freud's From the History of an Infantile

Neurosis 84 and Character and Anal Eroticism 173.

- ¹⁰² Brown claims that "all values are bodily values" and that if money were not excrement, it would have no value (293).
- ¹⁰³ Interestingly, Bataille (in "The Notion of Expenditure") and Baudrillard (in "Consumer Society" 34-5) do not challenge Freud's reading.
- ¹⁰⁴ Despite the similarities as systems of symbolization, the translation from language to money is a complex process. See Shell's discussion in The Economy of Literature 3-6.
- ¹⁰⁵ In his fever Moodie's miser sleepwalks to where his gold is hidden and asks Max Weber's question, "will this save my soul?" (69) The problem is a formal one for Moodie as well: as in Emily Brontë's Wuthering Heights money is never far below the surface of the Victorian woman's version of the romance plot, and gendered inheritance laws constantly set the narrative in motion. Saving one's soul at times therefore seems subordinate to getting a share of the inheritance.
- ¹⁰⁶ Compare Rosebury on how Vespasian increased revenues via public urinals. "Does this money stink?" Vespasian is reputed to have asked his son. After the son's negative reply, Vespasian explains, "And yet it comes from urine" (Rosebury 124).
- ¹⁰⁷ See Shell, Money, Language and Thought: Literary and

Philosophical Economies from the Medieval to the Modern Era. (Berkeley: U of California P, 1982) 5-23.

¹⁰⁸ In this connection it is worth looking at Robin Matthews' Canadian Literature (Toronto: Steel Rail, 1978. 93, 158) despite the shrill tone and the strident nationalism which obscures the depth of Canadian-American interrelations.

¹⁰⁹ See Robert L. McDougall's "Introduction" to the New Canadian Library edition of The Clockmaker.

¹¹⁰ This is also true of Haliburton's attitude towards America. Of Jefferson's declaration, Slick says, "He gave the British the but-eend of his mind there" (130). The document is lowered to the level of the everyday, the homely, the practical, but it is not demystified in any way.

¹¹¹ This describes what happens in Black Robe, where the Algonkian leaders insult each other scatologically even if they cannot control the council's decisions. The abuse blows off steam and simultaneously keeps power from solidifying in any one individual.

¹¹² Bataille's translator, Allan Stoekl, detects a similar connection between Bataille's words and his politics. Stoekl connects the Fascist orgy to the orgy which is forced by heterogeneous matter in Bataille's work (Stoekl xvii). For example, in "The Notion of Expenditure," Bataille collapses together

two of Freud's interpretations of feces--as money and death (366). Any "gift" thus unconsciously signals loss, destruction, and death, so that a potlach economy celebrates death, not the social process of wealth redistribution. The potlach, in this reading, is meant only to "illuminate the night for an instant" (1986, 381).

¹¹³ Rational hygienic explanations often occur long after a particular custom (for example the restriction on spitting) has been adopted (Elias 156). Shame, in particular, must be a social agent because many things that are dangerous to human beings do not inspire shame in the way that bodily smells do. Elias contrasts poison gas to passed gas (158), which contains no known pathogens (Guthrie 194). Unlike his successors Elias does not, however, argue that shame is explicable by a single social factor such as class status (Elias 139). It should also be noted that Pasteur's work dignified scatological disgust and his work became the main reason that guano was substituted for human excrement as fertilizer (Corbin 224).

¹¹⁴ On miasmatic theories of putrefaction, on attempts to deodorize excrement, and on the opening of the sewers, see Corbin 28, 55, 123, 212. Melville, Moodie's contemporary but better versed than her in science, clearly takes miasmatic theory seriously in

"The Affidavit" chapter of Moby Dick. For the De Mille reference, see The Dodge Club 30.

¹¹⁵ Moodie spoke of the cholera as a visitation of God (Letters of a Lifetime 226). Geoffrey Bilson, in A Darkened House: Cholera in Nineteenth Century Canada (Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1980) argues that there was no general support for the water-borne theory until the 1880's (Bilson 3), and by then cess-pools began to be eliminated in favor of closed sewage systems (Corbin 224). Mark Hurdlestone was published in final form in 1853, though written, Moodie says, in 1838-9 (Letters of a Lifetime 123). The Literary Garland serialized a shorter version of the same plot, "The Miser and His Son: A Tale," which does not contain Juliet's visits to the infectious poor, beginning in June 1842.

¹¹⁶ For examples of how science emplots its narratives, see Hayden White, "The Fictions of Factual Representation" in The Literature of Fact: Selected Papers from the English Institute. ed. Angus Fletcher (N.Y.: Columbia UP, 1976) 21-44, and Francis Barker's analysis of Rembrandt's "The Anatomy of Dr. Nicholas Tulp." On the connection between the quantifying premises of the empirical sciences and those of the monied interest, see McKeon 188.

¹¹⁷ On microbiological distinctions between odors, see

Rosebury xiv, 170. Even the respective valences of high and low may not simply be social. The higher one goes in the atmosphere, the less microbes there are (Rosebury 32). The analogy does not hold for the body, where anus and mouth have the greatest concentration of microbiological life.

¹¹⁸ See Douglas 29-31. DShe argues against this doctrine, suggesting that Hebrew purification laws were instead ways of ordering the categories of creation (53). In its Twentieth Century incarnation, medical materialism appears as a faith in the power of science to erase past discourses about the body. Thus Floyd Dell claims that modern sanitation will make disgust an unnecessary didactic aid in toilet training. "Objective" and "unemotional" toilet training will also happily lessen interest in scatological humour on the part of young people, besides eliminating homosexuality (Dell 89)!

¹¹⁹ The main difference that distinguishes present reappearances has been the adoption of scientific rhetoric--thus the advertiser tells us that Buckley's contains the oil of pine needles or that Listerine "kills germs."

¹²⁰ Rosebury creates a new post-evolutionary topos when he plays with the genealogical possibility that bacteria are our ancestors (31-2).

¹²¹ In Munro's work too, bacteriology is a social tool:

"Don't come near me, I'm full of germs" ("A Queer Streak" 229) is Trevor's distancing tactic from Violet when he begins to think that her family problems make her unfit to become his wife. Clearly, Elias's thesis can explain behavior just as much after Pasteur as before.

- ^{1 2 2} On the necessity for microbes in order to maintain life, and on the sorry state of germ-free animals, see Rosebury 43-50.
- ^{1 2 3} See Corbin on how "two opposed conceptions of air, dirt, and excrement" are connected to the present "ecological dream" (232).
- ^{1 2 4} Historically train tracks limited the migratory patterns of the buffalo and contributed to its disappearance.
- ^{1 2 5} See William A.R. Thompson, Black's Medical Dictionary, (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1976).
- ^{1 2 6} Gibson's matrix may be compared to the lack of scatology in scientist J.D. Bernal's earlier and more cerebral prediction of escape from the body in The World, the Flesh, and the Devil. (Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1929). Bernal predicted that man's final state would be a brain immersed in cerebro-spinal fluid. As well, the cultural past in Gibson's work is signified by technological waste, for example by "the guts of a television so old it was studded with the glass stumps of vacuum tubes" (48).
- ^{1 2 7} This is Marshall McLuhan's formula in From Cliché to

Archetype.

- ¹²⁸ See Chapter 12 for the ways in which Cohen moves beyond play.
- ¹²⁹ See Arthur Kroker's analysis of Canadian technological humanism in Technology and the Canadian Mind: Innis/McLuhan/Grant 14, 56-72.
- ¹³⁰ A New York Times article approaches Hawking's progressive motor-neuron disease thus: "It is perhaps significant, then, that Stephen W. Hawking, a physicist whose insights about gravity and matter are changing the way we look at the universe, should have attained his intellectual stature while his body was failing him, atrophying, shaping him increasingly into a cerebral being" (Jan. 23, 1983, 16).
- ¹³¹ In World of Wonders it is "poetry and wonder which might reveal themselves in the dunghill" (287).
- ¹³² See I. Bernard Cohen, Revolutions in Science, (Harvard: Belknap P, 1985). The volume of blood, when Harvey measured it against the volume of food intake, could only be accounted for by return through a circuit.
- ¹³³ Schweickart, in looking at the problems of female identification with male protagonists, refuses to make what she calls a false choice between emphasis on difference and emphasis on essential humanity (43), thereby avoiding a facile negation of the simultaneously autonomous and inclusive self created

by male and female writers. Linda Hutcheon similarly claims that female writing is not more conservative than male writing--it's just that "you can assume selfhood ('character formation') or 'subjectivity' only when you have attained it. Subjectivity in the Western liberal humanist tradition has been defined in terms of rationality, individuality, and power; in other words, it is defined in terms of those domains traditionally denied women" (1988a, 5). Catherine Stimpson makes this the key term in the feminist quarrel with 'the death of the author' (Stimpson 366-7). Meanwhile, Peter Schwenger notes that the importance of the penis to the male is rarely reflected in literature. He suggests that this is because the female tends to be put in the place of the body in literature, and the male in the place of the rational self.

¹³⁴ "Happy virgin! She does not weigh down sluggish limbs with an imprisoned embryo; she is not depressed and worn out by its awkward weight. . . . When the belly swells from its would and sensual dropsy grows, the woman's exhausted health hangs by a hair. The raised skin is so distend and misshapen that even though the mother may be happy with her burden, she becomes ashamed. . . . How describe the tears shed at the moment when the muscles relax to release the prisoner and procure relief for the viscera? A

way is forced violently through the passage and a being, perhaps lifeless, brought to life" (Sixth Century poet Fortunatus quoted in Not in God's Image 138). Aunt Moira's "gynecological odor" (34) and Naomi's constipation during pregnancy (195) in Lives of Girls and Women belong to this pattern.

¹³⁵ See Not in God's Image 137-43. Some medieval feminists like Christine de Pisan also guarded the discourse of female holiness (N. Davis 126-7), likely because it was one way that women, despite their gender, could attain the sphere of rationality and power that Hutcheon refers to. Douglas puts forward a similar explanation for the emphasis on virginity in early Christianity (157). In response to the power of this discourse, Trotula, an Eleventh Century woman doctor from Salerno passed on "remedies for a damaged maidenhead"--special baths, suppositories, and leeches--which would tighten the vagina and/or induce bleeding on the wedding night so as to simulate the hymen (Not in God's Image 142-3).

¹³⁶ See Not in God's Image xiii, 120, 207f; Murray Davis 88; Natalie Davis 124.

¹³⁷ For the anal birth, see On the Sexual Theories of Children 219, and From the History of an Infantile Neurosis 77-8, 82. Analyzing Senatspräsident Schreber's memoirs, in which Schreber speaks of drawing female buttocks on his body, Freud draws the

identical conclusion (Psycho-Analytic Notes on an Autobiographical Account of a Case of Paranoia [Dementia Praecox], 1911, commonly known as "The Case of Schreber," 32-3). For an analysis of Freud's social axis, see Stallybrass and White 153f.

¹³⁸ The function of religious taboo, according to Kristeva, is to avoid letting identity sink back into the mother (1982, 64).

¹³⁹ In Kristeva's understanding, the avant-garde (notably Joyce and Céline) expands "the limits of the signifiable," producing feminine-gendered texts which carry the signification of the body or "semiotic" against the symbolic order (Carolyn Burke 112).

¹⁴⁰ Despite Rooke's artistic affiliations, the processed feminism of postmodern advertising in which sexual signifiers are reversed--80's woman as 50's male (Kroker and Cook 22)--does not appear in Shakespeare's Dog. See also The Oxford Book of Canadian Short Stories for Rooke's story "The Woman Who Talked to Horses," in which male chauvinism is doubly registered in the treatment of women and horses. The horse "speaks" to the man in the only voice that he can understand--the nether voice.

¹⁴¹ On Islamic taboos against intercourse during menstruation, see Not in God's Image 113 and "The Cow" in the Koran.

- ¹⁴² While it would be a mistake to equate Rabelais's extensive and hyperbolic corporeality with misogyny, it is just as naive to dismiss (like Bakhtin does) the violence in some of Rabelais's attacks as simply anti-mimetic play. This violence is perhaps best exemplified when Panurge cuts up the genitalia of a bitch in heat and, by sprinkling it on a woman who has refused his advances, calls in the dogs to punish her (Pantagruel 2.22).
- ¹⁴³ For a concise and powerful version of an underground female discourse, see Atwood's poem, "Marrying the Hangman" in Twentieth Century Poetry and Poetics.
- ¹⁴⁴ See Ewen 148 for examples of how advertisers operate under the sign of sexual difference when advertising products such as the feminine douche.
- ¹⁴⁵ See for example how her brother Stephen's language moves from simple scatological references (108), to the same references mutated in Pig Latin (180), to apotheosis of slang in the language of mathematics: "You surd!" (230) In her book on manners, Charlotte Ford advocates swearing as a means of access to male language.
- ¹⁴⁶ Weber contrasts the moral isolation in Calvinist theology with the communal laxity created by the "relative moral helplessness of Lutheranism" (126). The privatization of sin, guilt, and confession, however, is a general feature of the Protestant

Reformation above any denominational differences.

- ¹⁴⁷ About this history of novelistic mimesis, the two most important historians of the novel, Ian Watt and Michael McKeon, have agreed. McKeon's Marxist ideology, however, immediately allows him to uncover the romance constructions and their generation in social ideology--which Watt ignored.
- ¹⁴⁸ See Totem and Taboo, where Freud insists that every prohibition points to a desire. Washing thus becomes a compensation for taboo violation (829-833). An interesting footnote to Atwood's pumice is that the Roundheads apparently did not favor soap. Cromwell had a heavy tax on it (Wright 240).
- ¹⁴⁹ For additional versions of Atwood's Puritan persona, see also The Edible Woman, where Ainsley leaves rings in the bathtub "which the lady down below regards as a violation of her shrine" (59), and Atwood's short story "The War in the Bathroom" (Dancing Girls). A possible internal countermovement in Cat's Eye to Atwood's rhetoric occurs in Mr. Hrbik's criticism of Elaine. He criticizes her for being able to draw objects, but not life: "God first made the bowdy out of dirt and after he breathed in the soul" (sic, 291), he says. It is not clear whether this epistemology is a confirmation of Atwood's artistic persona or a self-directed critique.

¹⁵⁰ These are not entirely new developments in Canadian literature. In E.J. Pratt's 1943 poem, "The Truant," man rebels against a figure who is called "the great Panjandrum" and who appears as an Archon, but who has a number of features that tie him (as the Gnostics would have) to Yahweh. The Panjandrum intends to reinforce the old hierarchies but his scatological invective against man undermines his separateness, his "height":

The ALL HIGH swore until his face was black.
He called him a coprophagite.

¹⁵¹ See Bakhtin 1984, 147. The bishop-elect of fools rode through the crowd during the Feast of Fools and threw dung at the people in parody of the real bishop's censuring. On the biblical sanction for the Feast of Fools--the Magnificat's "he lifteth up the beggar from the dunghill to set them among princes" (1 Sam. 2:8, Psalms 113:7)--see Enid Welsford, The Fool: His Social and Literary History (London: Faber and Faber, 1935) 200.

¹⁵² This new marking of what is human constitutes Derrida's system, given the transgressive beast that appears in "The Law of Genre" and "Structure, Sign, and Play in the Discourse of the Human Sciences," (1967) Writing and Difference, trans. Alan Bass (Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1978) 278-93. This beast confirms Elaine Scarry's comment's: "Enough instances occur

to make it reasonable, when in the presence of nonmaterialist or antimaterialist recommendations about language, to wonder whether there is not some piece of the material world lending those recommendations substance (1985, xxii-xxiii).

- ¹⁵³ See 2 Kings 10:27, 6:25, 18:27; Job 20:7; Ezekiel 4:12, 15; Malachi 2:3; Philippians 3:8 for example. Also see Kristeva 109 on so'im, excrementitious.
- ¹⁵⁴ See Irenaeus 1:4:2, two Valentinian fragments ("E" and "H") in Bentley Layton, The Gnostic Scriptures (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday: 1987) 239, 245; and Kurt Rudolph, Gnosis: The Nature and History of Gnosticism 1977, trans. Robert McLachlan Wilson, (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1983) 72.
- ¹⁵⁵ See also the carving of "Satan and a soul" pictured in Wildridge, T. Tindall. The Grotesque in Church Art. London: William Andrews, 1899, 89.
- ¹⁵⁶ "When the argument that the Christian is without the law and above the law doesn't help, I instantly chase him away with a fart" (Table Talk 78). On the Devil as Luther's middle term between anality and justification by faith, see Norman O. Brown 206-25.
- ¹⁵⁷ For samples of Luther's, see his discussion of a dog who had become "Lutheran" and shit into the grave of the bishop of Halle (Table Talk April 11-June 14, 1542), or Luther's citation of Count Hoyer of Mansfeld who, though a "papist," satirized relics: "in a certain

place the chamber pots of eleven thousand virgins had been exhibited" (Table Talk Feb. 28, 1538). On the other hand, Luther rejected the medieval tradition that women's private parts were putrid (Not in God's Image: Women in History from the Greeks to the Victorians 197).

¹⁵⁸ Mather's role was not nearly as clear-cut as Atwood implies. He defended a literalist belief in demonic appearances and his writings almost certainly led to the Salem trials, but he also argued against accepting spectre evidence. Nevertheless Atwood is right to suggest that witches were assigned the role of "illegitimate" bodily impulses. See Not in God's Image 207f.

¹⁵⁹ This divorce of religious signifieds from the scatological signifier in the Twentieth Century of course enters secular culture. Since taboos on scatological language are still in place, but since they no longer have a strong supporting ideology, writers on manners have difficulty explaining to a pluralist audience why scatological discourse should be suppressed at all. Elizabeth Post suggests that the decorum is about place, not about language: "There is nothing really objectionable in these words--they are universally used and understood and as [the child] grows older he will develop a natural modesty about his bodily functions" (291). The

appeal to nature neatly obscures the social construction of obscenity. The more sophisticated Judith Martin gives an even more evasive answer: "the person who grows up saying 'I'm going to have a bowel movement now' is not going to have much of a social life" (334). The appeal to the social is a thinly disguised appeal (again) to nature (this time as an eternal social verity).

- ¹⁶⁰ Compare the bathroom scenes in Ulysses or the scatological imagery of Eliot's "East Coker," which also undercut modernist approaches to myth.
- ¹⁶¹ On other ways in which Mrs. Bentley gains sympathy, see Evelyn Hinz and John Teunissen, "Who's the Father of Mrs. Bentley's Child? As for Me and My House and the Conventions of Dramatic Monologue." Canadian Literature 111 (Winter 1986) 101-113.
- ¹⁶² For Mrs. Blood as a parody of the grail legend, see Linda Hutcheon, The Canadian Postmodern 6.
- ¹⁶³ Saliva is extremely defiling to the Brahmin (which Bisnath claims to be): the orthodox Brahmin throws food into his mouth or pours it in (Douglas 33-4).
- ¹⁶⁴ As regent of the eastern quarter, Indra may again be under scatological attack. See Benjamin Walker The Hindu World: An Encyclopedic Survey of Hinduism. Vol.1, (N.Y.: Fredrich Praeger, 1968).
- ¹⁶⁵ Compare Freud's patient in From the History of an Infantile Neurosis (1918), whose first religious

doubts concerned "whether Christ had had a behind" (71). Freud interprets this as standing for a repulsion from the father who stood for God and the law (87). Interestingly, the same Gnostic problem reappears in Carl Jung's later analysis of God's hind parts in Answer to Job (381-2).

- ¹⁶⁶ According to Layton, this passage may play on a double meaning in John 6:27: "Jesus answered them. . . do not labour for (or digest) the food that perishes, but for the food which endures to eternal life" (Layton 239).
- ¹⁶⁷ See Aquinas, On the Truth of the Catholic Faith 4:38-9 for example.
- ¹⁶⁸ Interestingly enough, in Irenaeus's system, Simon Magus is the heresiarch responsible for Gnosticism.
- ¹⁶⁹ Rev. Andrew Boyer's sermon paralleling the tramps' pit to the Jewish Gehenna is not simply a mythical connection as Dunstan supposes. Gehenna was originally the Valley of Hinnom near Jerusalem and at a later date was thought to have become the city's rubbish heap. See "Hell," A Theological Word Book of the Bible, ed. Alan Richardson, London: SCM Press, 1957.
- ¹⁷⁰ Daniel attempts a broader denunciation in Black Robe when he metaphorically spits on Jesus (12).
- ¹⁷¹ Excrement for the first time in history came under a microscopic gaze in the Seventeenth Century.

Compare Antony van Leewenhoek's fascinated 1683 description of his own excrements, quoted in Rosebury 13-16. Religious paradises are usually represented as free of scatology, despite the sensate and material nature of popular utopias like Cockayne (Manuel 80-81). Thomas Aquinas's heaven and the "not-decaying, not-rotting Zoroastrian paradise reported in the Manuels' Utopian Thought in the Western World (38) are cases in point. In contrast, one of the reasons that the "underworld" from which the two daimons speak in Davies' The Lyre of Orpheus seems so contrived, is that Davies forgoes the traditional associations of the anus with the daimonic. The closest that the novel comes to the daimonic is in its evocation of the past, the prompter's sub-stage hell in Hoffman's Nineteenth Century theatre (458).

¹⁷² Paracelsus, who figures prominently in The Rebel Angels and who is a father of modern chemistry because he argued that external agents and not an imbalance of humours caused disease, may be one source for Davies' physiological predestination. In The Archidoxies Book 2, Paracelus says that all kinds of bodies arise out of the four elements according to their predestined conditions.

¹⁷³ Compare also Luther--"it's my opinion that the soul isn't added from the outside but is created out of

the matter of the semen" (Table Talk Sept. 2-17, 1540)--and Paracelsus: "spirit grows out of the sperm, or out of the seed" (The Archidoxies 5.40-41). Bakhtin cites "De flatibus" in the Hippocratic anthology in a similar vein: "the spirit penetrates in a more or less large quantity. This is obvious from the fact that many persons belch when eating and drinking" (quoted in Bakhtin 1984, 356). A version of this trope appears in Irving Layton's rewriting of Plato's Symposium, "Socrates at the Centaur" in Canadian Literature 112 (Spring 1987) 16-17:

Inwardly I laughed
to see them swallow the hook I'd baited
with their own vanity, their faces made
suddenly grave from that self-importance
every possessor of a soul feels
between one evacuation of his inflamed
bladder and the next.

¹⁷⁴ The referential difference between Old and New Testaments may be very easily illustrated by looking up "dung" in a biblical concordance.

¹⁷⁵ Jae Num Lee believes that the scatological metaphor in English Restoration satire was often meant to instill "a theocentric rather than homocentric perspective" (Lee 47), but he deals only with authorial intent, not with the epistemologies of discourse. Francis Bacon uses the view of nature as "God's other book" to divert attention onto matter: "the relationship between spiritual and material

study ceases to be one of hierarchical superordination and becomes one of analogy. This change may be sensed, perhaps, in the careless ease with which Bacon employs the model of divine authority as though it were a rhetorical figure. . . . The familiar language of spiritual events finds its highest function to rest in signifying a more present reality of material success" (McKeon 66).

¹⁷⁶ This is the designation that Auerbach applies to Shakespearean mimesis in Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in European Literature, 275.

¹⁷⁷ Theodor Rosebury, a popularizer of science uneasy with religious repression, also makes Bataille's naive equation of divinity with the obscene. Since both the unclean and the holy require ritual ablutions, Rosebury disingenuously wonders whether the Hebrews execrated or worshipped swine (73). Such confusion comes from the separation of social categories from both religion and the obscene: elsewhere Rosebury imagines that the language can be "detoxified" of obscenity once we become objective in our approach to excrement (189). To criticize Bataille and Rosebury is not to deny that there are cases in which scatological abasement (without a social purpose) have become linked to religious observation. See Havelock Ellis, Studies in the

Psychology of Sex 57-9.

- ¹⁷⁸ See also Barbara Babcock on the relation between Negativity Theory, the "reversible world," and religion, "perhaps the most explicitly negativistic of all symbol systems" (18).
- ¹⁷⁹ See also Foley 36-8. Although Foley's comments apply initially to mimesis, the way she speaks of mimesis and her etymological play on types of filiation suggest that she has genre in mind as well: "Mimesis inherently generalizes" our social existence, and in this way creates cognition through "analagous configuration" (68, 65).
- ¹⁸⁰ Bakhtin is important not because of his generic attempts to distinguish between epic and novel (as if the novel could never retain elements of the tribal encyclopedia), but because we can apply his description of the novel's multiplicity of voices to the novel's multiplicity of genres.
- ¹⁸¹ "Postmodern literary texts will take an anti-allegorical stand, either by building and then destroying allegorical structures within their own fictional framework or by postulating a world of simulacra without depth, center, or meaning, where events are governed not by necessity or causation, but by pure chance" (Spariosu 61). Lyotard argues that the traditional meta-narratives driving the accumulation of knowlege--(1) the philosophical evolution of a

'world of spirit' or (2) the emancipation of 'the people'--have already been eclipsed by the "performativity" principle, so that all knowledge is reduced to a series of mini-games in which the system's enhanced performance is always the main criterion for legitimacy. Critics have identified the repressed narrative driving Lyotard's excellent study as "the dystopian prospect of a global private monopoly of information" (Jameson 1984a, xx) or "the métarécit of the dissolution of métarécits" (Rosso 1987).

¹⁸² See also Domna Stanton, whose distrust for generic commentary appears odd beside her "genderic" analysis (11) of male theorists of autobiography. In her reading, gender creates formal markings in autobiographical theory.

¹⁸³ "Telling the truth about the self, constituting the self as complete subject--it is a fantasy. In spite of the fact that autobiography is impossible, this in no way prevents it from existing" (Lejeune 131-2).

¹⁸⁴ On de Man's past, see Jon Wiener, "Deconstructing Paul de Man," The Nation, Jan. 9, 1988, 22-4.

¹⁸⁵ See also Isobel M. Findlay, "Intimations of Accountability in the Discourse of Paul de Man," English Studies in Canada 18:1 (March 1992): 59-81.

¹⁸⁶ "This novel is autobiographical in form but not in fact. My family, neighbors and friends did not serve as

models" (Lives of Girls and Women). "This book, though not about my parents, is dedicated to them" (The Story of Bobby O'Malley). For a good account of the relations between Munro's life and text, see Robert Thacker, "'So Shocking a Verdict in Real Life': Autobiography in Alice Munro's Stories," Stich, 153-61.

¹⁸⁷ The words apparently (and appropriately) belong to another, Arthur Rimbaud. See Scobie 127. Lejeune means to raise the problem that the first person in any narrative is an assumed role. Especially in using quotations we speak the word of another, and to some extent all language is a form of quotation (as Roland Barthes has argued in "The Death of the Author"). As soon as we speak, therefore, we take the position of another. In this respect we might notice the pervasive theatrical metaphors throughout Munro's Lives of Girls and Women. Lejeune departs from Barthes by stressing the full ambidexterity of the motto: "As soon as I write, as a matter of fact, I share the desires and illusions of autobiographers, and I am surely not ready to renounce them. I say outloud: 'I is someone else,' and in a whisper perhaps I add: 'but what a shame!'" (133)

¹⁸⁸ Lejeune also explains how autobiography functions to restore roots, especially to an urban middle class

(213).

¹⁸⁹ My echo of Marxian discourse in the word "base" (with its implication of superstructure) is intentional: the mimetic focus in autobiographical scatology, including postmodern versions, is strongly circumstantial. The explanation that I offer, however, is not completely determined by an economic mode of production, but predicated on the text's reproduction of the cultural body-images that we have seen in chapters 1-10, of which economic production is one facet.

¹⁹⁰ Augustine's case is more complex than the use to which I am putting him. In Book Four of De Doctrina Christiana Augustine's desire for a natural, unadorned beauty suggests that the metaphor of the body can cut through rhetoric. Although Spengemann is quite right to call the narrator of the Confessions transcendent, autobiography may itself have been an abject alternative to less formal and transcendent modes of expression.

¹⁹¹ Despite recent and justifiable attacks on "thematic" reading (Goldie), there is no such thing as a "bounded" theme, no such thing as a trope that is purely textual. Scatology shows this more clearly than something like "light imagery" can, but I suspect that within every thematic is a theory of representation.

¹⁹² Her anxiety of influence is not fully distinct from what Gilbert and Gubar call "the anxiety of authorship"--the feeling that origins, shapes, sequences and inheritances of the alphabet militate against a woman's writing (Gilbert and Gubar 41)--since Uncle Craig's self-important and ridiculously over-detailed recordkeeping is a hyperbolic parody of the objective tendencies in historiography. If the female autobiographer tends to mistrust biological identity and yet initially to assert identity rather than subvert it (Stanton 15, C. Burke 108), such gestures owe something to the traditional exclusion of women from the symbolic order and to the determination of women by a patronymic alphabet (Gilbert and Gubar).

¹⁹³ The body that will not rot is a staple of saints' lives, as Dunstan the hagiographer would know, and the topos reaches self-conscious expression in Dostoevsky's The Brothers Karamazov and Cohen's Beautiful Losers.

¹⁹⁴ Of the videotape, Bobby says, "My father was there and not there, an animated relic" (179). Although Bobby repudiates only the priesthood and not Catholicism, the scatological destruction of relics is a traditional technique of religious repudiation. See Chapter 10.

¹⁹⁵ See James J. Preston, "Purification," Encyclopedia of

Religion. ed. Mircea Eliade et al., N.Y.: MacMillan, 1987. The Rabelaisian analogy is quoted in Chapter 10; for other discussions, see Martin Pops, "The Metamorphoses of Shit," 52; Kenneth Burke, "Ritual Drama as Hub," 131-2; and The Story of Bobby O'Malley 165. Douglas emphasizes how confession can often cancel the pollution caused by breaking taboos. This symbolic tradition allows Arthur Kroker to reinterpret past autobiographies: speaking of Augustine, Kroker says that "guilt offers the promise of a final peace through the mechanism of 'confession,' or shall we say 'evacuation'" (46).

¹⁹⁶ "The pleasure of the text is that moment when my body pursues its own ideas--for my body does not have the same ideas that I do" (Barthes 1975, 17).

¹⁹⁷ Habermas reads postmodernism as a neo-conservative movement. Jameson quite rightly questions the populist rhetoric of postmodernism and, with Eagleton and Foley, criticizes the connections between postmodernism and advanced monopoly capitalism. Foley adds that postmodernism promotes "the fetishization of textuality" and thus "mediates the extreme abstractions of a society in which all human functions are rendered equivalent" (18). Such a dismissal seems curiously unselfconscious about the marketing of texts (including Telling the Truth:

The Theory and Practice of Documentary Fiction), and not fully conversant with how postmodern texts denature economic structures. See Chapter 7, especially the account of Gibson's work.

¹⁹⁸ Jameson contrasts "hermeneutical" readings, "in which the work in its inert, objectal form is taken as a clue or a symptom for some vaster reality" with postmodern art, which confronts the "viewer" with "all the contingency of some inexplicable natural object" (1991, 8). The unremarked sliding of Jameson's prose from "reading" to "viewer" is instructive: Jameson's contrast between depth and surface functions certainly work when one compares Van Gogh to Warhol, but not when one addresses Pynchon (whom Jameson very briefly mentions) or Canadian postmodernists.

¹⁹⁹ Writing is a simulacrum; so, no doubt, is speech. When writing was a recent and elite technology the apocryphal writer of the 1st Century A.D. Book of Enoch said, "men were not created for this that they should confirm their faith. . . with pen and ink" (1 Enoch, trans. M.A. Knibb, The Apocryphal Old Testament, ed. H.F.D. Sparks, Oxford, 1984, 69:10). Lao Tzu, in 4th Century B.C. China, went further: "Bring it about that the people will return to the use of the knotted rope" (Lao Tzu, Tao Te Ching, trans. D.C. Lau, Harmondsworth, 1963, 80.193b).

Socrates warned that writing would "implant forgetfulness" in men's souls and that they would call things to remembrance "no longer within themselves, but by means of external marks" (Plato, Phaedrus, trans. R. Hackforth, The Collected Dialogues of Plato, ed. Edith Hamilton and Huntington Cairns, Princeton, 1961, 520). See also Hutcheon on skepticism about the "real" in simulacra theory (1988: 229).

²⁰⁰ Never completely broken up. Although Rooke emphasizes process against a completed world, he also contributes to the fetishizing of Shakespeare because parody needs the original "central" text in order to gain a reading. A novel quoting the classic name of "Shakespeare" in the title has a better chance of being noticed by the Governor General's Award judges (those proxies for monarchs and classics). The parodic imitation employed in the text thus gets (and got not only a "classic" reading but, in 1982, a Governor General's Award. "Even in mocking terms, parody reinforces; in formal terms, it inscribes the mocked conventions onto itself, thereby guaranteeing their continued existence (Hutcheon 1985, 75). To this we could add: guaranteeing not only the continued existence of the conventions but also the continued existence of the new text.

²⁰¹ This corresponds partially with Hutcheon's comment on the politics of parody: "ambivalence set up between conservative repetition and revolutionary difference is part of the very paradoxical essence of parody" (Hutcheon 1985, 77).

²⁰² This is perhaps what dismays Kaspar Schopp (whose name is the Old English word for poet) in Antichthon. Lost in Rome he sees a sewer, "a feculent pool" (294) and he recoils in horror from this version of Giordano Bruno's natural Avernus. Judith Thompson's play, White Biting Dog, is another instance in which the nauseous specifics of matter destroy a materialist as much as a transcendent epistemology. From the beginning a transcendent lexis--God, prophecy, salvation, communion--orbits the unseen figure of a white Dog; this alphabetic inversion does not subvert the transcendent (in Bakhtin's sense), but combines it volatily with a vocabulary and action which is bodily in the extreme: Pony eats and vomits the meat of the dachshunds that Cape stored in the freezer. There are no materialist consolations: Lomia, who can hear her food digesting (84), says, "I love being inside my six layers of skin. . . . I feel. . . like sewage" (68).

²⁰³ The closest meeting between theoretical and practical disembodiments occurs in Prochain Episode. Jailed, judicially separated from the objects of his desire,

the narrator understands very clearly how writing defers. He substitutes words for his body: the words make an endless parabola towards the object, but the narrator is under no delusions that he is acting, doing, loving, excreting, dying when he writes. Yet even he speaks as if scatology is primary: "Nothing prevents a depressed and politically-aware man from attributing aesthetic values to the verbal secretion" (22).

²⁰⁴ "Data banks. . . . are "nature" for postmodern man" (Lyotard 51).

²⁰⁵ See 15 Canadian Poets x 2 where Bowering makes a similar metonymic reduction in "Summer Solstice":

shit, it comes
& goes, it goes, thru us pretending we are
not some more, shit

²⁰⁶ On the absence of rationalist paradigms, see Nancy E. Bjerring, "Deconstructing the 'Desert of Facts': Detection and Antidetection in Coming Through Slaughter, English Studies in Canada 16:3 (Sept. 1990) 325-338. Bjerring's reading is mostly accurate, but strangely celebratory of Buddy's anti-rational silence at the end of the novel: the reader discovers that Buddy is being sodomized by the attendants in the mental hospital, though Buddy himself does not seem to understand what is happening.

²⁰⁷ Compare August Strindberg's A Dream Play in which a

gilded castle rises out of stable-muck.

²⁰⁸ See also Sandra Djwa's critique that F. lacks depth ("Leonard Cohen: Black Romantic" in Gnarewski 94-105).

²⁰⁹ Dennis Lee criticizes Cohen for adding an anti-climax by adding Part 3. Lee's "savage fields" invite the explosion of past cosmologies, but Lee's call for revolution in Savage Fields and elsewhere are elegantly and very civilly put. For a critique of the "pseudo-historical and anti-hierarchical pretense" that accepts equally "all acts of self-creativity," see Fekete 59-60. Fekete does not name Bataille, but almost certainly has him in mind.

²¹⁰ For Jameson such skepticism goes too far. He criticizes Bob Perelman's poem "China" because it provides captions for the pictures of a missing book without so declaring itself. For Jameson, E.L. Doctorow's Ragtime similarly verifies our confinement in Plato's cave: "If there is any realism left here, it is a "realism" which springs from the shock of grasping that confinement and of realizing that, for whatever peculiar reasons, we seem condemned to seek the historical past through our own pop images and stereotypes about that past, which itself remains forever out of reach" (1982, 118). It is curious that in his nostalgia for direct, if non-realist signification Jameson should rely for his metaphors

on the source of dialectic and the concept of mimesis: the movement from the tribal encyclopedia or *doxa* to a conception of literature in which the receiver does not dramatically re-enact the story but stands outside of it and interprets it as the sign of something else (if not yet as politics).

^{2 1 1} For Norman O. Brown's famous thesis about Luther and depth commentary upon the bodily meaning of grace, see Life Against Death: The Psychoanalytic Meaning of History.

^{2 1 2} "I dirtied on my beads" predicts a host of late-Twentieth Century artistic practices, such as Andres Serrano's plastic crucifix soaking in his own urine (1989), a work that led to American congressional attacks on the National Endowment of the Arts.

^{2 1 3} "When language and the body are placed side by side, the weightlessness of any language that has lost its referential aspirations becomes especially noticeable" (Scarry 1988, xxii). I am conscious that my study cannot, finally, address the "unpresentable." and that, to some extent, I have taken Bataille (and perhaps Lyotard and Cohen) in bad faith. Someone like Kristeva allows Bataille a broader scope: "How can one make visible that which is not visible because no code, convention, contract, or identity holds it up? As long as we speak, we shall never get rid of repression. .

. . . 'Metaphor' as poetic figure is out of place along with its retinue of idealizations and mysteries" (Kristeva 1987, 366-7). In this chapter I have taken Bataille and Cohen at their metaphors rather than in the feeling which they want to say precedes the metaphor.

²¹⁴ For this reason Elias distrusted both "isolationist dualism"-- or human sciences set against the natural sciences, the human mind as a distinct entity within an organic container--and "reductionist monism": behaviorism, ethology, sociobiology, in which human behavior is explained as the product of biological urges (Mennell 202).

²¹⁵ The refusal to express, so well expressed, is of course another sort of depth commentary with its own historical resources.

²¹⁶ The clash of metaphors between an Atwood narrator who speaks of "the obscure base note of ancient throwup and pee" (Cat's Eye 16), and a Mitchell narrator who speaks of "urine's high soprano" (The Vanishing Point 6) is therefore not surprising.