Introduction

In 2014 Colin McCabe wrote, "Nothing fades quicker than critical reputation. In my first year at university [1967], Northrop Frye was the *dernier cri*, but I do not sense that he is much read now, his name having been 'buried' in obscurity" (131). Marjorie Garber sees the alleged demise of Frye as part of a wider turn from myth criticism to new historicism. At mid-century, she says,

> Northrop Frye led the way with strong cross-cultural claims about similitude and difference. A quest for universals and universal myths and patterns preoccupied scholars, whether in the archetypes of Frye or the quite different archetypes of Carl Jung. . . . Myth was everywhere. And then the moment was gone. Historical questions about the local, the specific, the contingent and the idiosyncratic took center stage, and universal claims—claims about universal symbols or universal practices or universal beliefs—tended to be regarded as naïve, or hegemonic, or both. (18–19)

William Kerrigan voices a similar opinion. "More than any critic of his day," he writes, "Frye exercised the literary canon. No one, not even his great rival, M.H. Abrams, seemed able to touch the great works of many periods and languages with such omni-competent authority. But Frye is gone now [2014]. The feminists, postmodernists, new historians, and neo-marxists have buried him in a mass grave marked White Male Liberal Humanism" (198). A variation of this judgment is Sir Frank Kermode's observation: "Looking back at the study of English in universities over the years the first thing that occurs to me is how very important the subject once seemed. . . . the leading academic literary critics were, in those days, very famous people. Think, for example, of Northrop Frye. Frye's is now a name that you never hear mentioned but which was then everywhere" (Sutherland). Denis Donoghue concurs. In a 1992 review of Frye's *The Double Vision*, he writes, "For about fifteen years—say from 1957 to 1972—Frye was the most influential critic in the English-speaking world. . . . [He] went out of phase if not out of sight when readers lost interest in 'first and last things' and set about a political program of one kind or another under the guise of reading and teaching literature." Shehla Burney agrees that Frye has "fallen out of favor since the rise of contemporary literary theory" (44).

In the mid-1960s the English Institute devoted a session to Frye at its annual meeting, and Murray Krieger's bold opinion, delivered on that occasion, was that, because of *Anatomy of Criticism*, Frye "has had an influence—indeed an absolute hold—on a generation of developing literary critics greater and more exclusive than that of any one theorist in recent critical history. One thinks of other movements that have held sway, but these seem not to have developed so completely on a single critic—nay, on a single work—as has the criticism in the work of Frye and his *Anatomy*" (1–2). An op-ed journalist for the *Toronto Star* remarked in 1992 that "by the time of Frye's death at 78, that intellectual hold had been loosened somewhat, but his thought shows every sign of continuing to be a permanent contribution to our understanding of literature" (Anonymous).

But in some circles the "permanent contribution" judgment has not held. Such judgment is summed up by Toronto journalist Phillip Marchand, who writes: "It has become a commonplace for academics and intellectuals to dismiss Frye as outmoded, full of bad, bourgeois habits such as transcendent humanism, liberalism and so on. His reputation has gone for a nose dive. . . . In short, Frye's bones have been pulverized in the mills of academic fashion," however much the metaphors of nose-diving and bone-pulverizing move us away from the point Marchand wants to make. Such opinions, nevertheless, have a tendency to reproduce themselves until they become widespread, having hardened into dogma. Here is a sampler:

Margaret Wente: "I wonder what Northrop Frye would make of modern English studies? Unfortunately (or perhaps fortunately), the giant of literary criticism is not around to say. The grand sweep of his work, with its timeless archetypes and universal themes of fall and redemption, enthralled a generation of students. Today [2015] he's just another dead white male, along with Blake and Shakespeare."

Alec Scott: "During the postmodernist wave that began to wash over North America in the 1980s . . . [the] *Anatomy* fell out of style, and many hip, young literature profs took it off their reading lists."

Joseph Epstein includes Northrop Frye among a group of critics who for some time have been "fading from prominence and now [2007] beginning to fade from memory."

Camille Paglia: "Northrop Frye was a titanic figure during my college and postgraduate years, and it is shocking how quickly his work was swept away by the influx of post-structuralism."

Warren Moore, writing in 2001: "While the broad heading of literary theory seems to offer room for a virtual pantechnicon of ideas, the Canadian theorist's works have been marginalized to the point of being considered something like alchemy—possibly of historical interest but really of no use in a post/modern world. The reasons for this fall from grace range from the lack of immediately apparent political usefulness . . . to the currently fashionable pluralistic worldview that rejects 'synoptic theories' by definition."

Ian Buchanan: In 2010 he opines that "Frye's work has fallen into a state of relative neglect."

Richard Halpern: "It is no accident that Northrop Frye occupies the third and middle chapter in this study of Shakespeare and modernism, for Frye's career dominated Anglo-American literary criticism in the middle decades of this century. Like the Tower of Babel he was so fond of referring to, Frye achieved an eminence in the field of literary studies that remains unequaled by any successor. And like that biblical tower, Frye's elaborately constructed system now [1997] lies in ruins."

Richard Lane: "The overarching project of the *Anatomy of Criticism* reveals why Frye's approach is now [2006] out of favour: he attempts to account for the entire field of literary criticism in a totalizing gesture that is now read as deluded"

Mervyn Nicholson: "Frye himself is now an elephant in the room, someone who is there but not there—a strange figure, an outsider in literary/cultural studies, whose ideas are now [2016] rejected but were never really absorbed or digested. Frye is arguably the most original thinker Canada has produced. His impact from 1950 to 1975 was enormous. That influence screeched to a halt in the late 1970s."

Graham Good. "This is a wintry season for Frye's work in the West"; "the once-great repute of the Wizard of the North is now [2004] maintained only by a few Keepers of the Flame."

Marcia Kahan, writing in 1985 on a debate between Frank Kermode and Terry Eagleton: "About the only subject on which they could agree was Frye's obsolescence," adding that Eagleton asked what was a decidedly rhetorical question, 'Who now reads Frye?'"

One of the more prominent surveyors of critical theories, Frank Lentricchia, located *Anatomy of Criticism* at the head of a line of "-ologies" and "-isms" that marched onto the scene "after the new criticism"—existentialism, phenomenology, structuralism, and poststructuralism. Lentricchia worried about Frye's attack on subjectivity, individuation, and the romantic conception of the self, and he noted that Frye's conception of the centre of the order of words "anticipates and, then, crucially rejects" Derrida's notion that such metaphors of centre, origin, and structure close off the possibility of "freeplay" (13–14). Moreover, Frye is said to have privileged spatial over temporal conceptions, centripetal over centrifugal movements, romantic over ironic modes of literature, and utopian desire over contingent, historical reality, Lentricchia's unstated assumption being that it is self-evident in each case that the latter idea in these oppositions is to be preferred to the former. Years later he claimed that his essay "tried to point up the structuralist and poststructuralist moment in Frye" (Salusinszky 186), but that is a caricature of the aim of his chapter, which is to debunk all Frygean assumptions that do not conform to his armchair view of historical consciousness and antifoundational awareness. Lentricchia maintains that Frye continued to "water down"—his phrase—the positions taken in the *Anatomy* through a series of books (30), but he gives no evidence of having read, say, *The Critical Path* (1971), where Frye addresses the forms of ideology that underlie the program for criticism that Lentricchia prefers. He concludes by asserting that no one in the mid-1960s would have predicted that Frye would be "unceremoniously tossed 'on the dump' . . . with other useless relics" (30). The "useless relic" thesis was advanced by Lentricchia in 1980, twenty-three years after the *Anatomy* appeared but before the richly productive decade that saw the publication of *The Secular Scripture*, *The Great Code*, *Words with Power*, *The Double Vision,* and *Myth and Metaphor*, not to say the previously unpublished material (notebooks, diaries, correspondence, student papers, and the like), which would practically double the Frye corpus.[1] *The Reception of Northrop Frye* is offered as evidence that the demise of Frye's influence, like the rumours of Mark Twain's death, have been very greatly exaggerated.

What kinds of evidence might be offered to test the truth of the claims that Frye is obsolete, that his works have been buried in obscurity, that he is now seen as deluded,

1 This paragraph borrows some sentences from my "Pity the Northrop Frye Scholar? *Anatomy of Criticism* Fifty Years After."

that his influence screeched to a halt in the late-1970s, that his criticism fell out of style and has begun to fade from memory, and that the history of literary criticism has now passed him by? One obvious way to challenge the nay-sayers is to consider the ways that Frye's readers have responded to his practical and theoretical criticism. The title of the present book points to the general principle that one can determine the way literary critics have been received by studying what has been written about them. A record of this writing is contained in *The Reception of Northrop Frye*. It provides a listing of the responses of readers to Frye's texts. This listing is a form of what has been called "reception aesthetics," as advanced by its chief theorists, Hans Robert Jauss and Wolfgang Iser, both of whom have set forth forms of reader-response criticism.

At the beginning we should notice that the proponents of the "useless relic" thesis have focused almost exclusively on *Anatomy of Criticism*. But Frye's writing career spanned sixty years, so by far the largest portion of his published work appeared after the time of his reputed demise as an important critical force. Of the forty books Frye published, thirty-four appeared after the mid-1960s. Readers of Frye should be wary of pronouncements about the value of his work when 85 per cent of what would eventually represent the corpus was not yet published. Moreover, the appearance of the thirty-volume Collected Works of Northrop Frye has, as just suggested, significantly expanded the Frye canon. Any generalizations about Frye should not exclude this large body of work, particularly the notebooks that he wrote during the last decade of his life—what I have called the Longinian phase of his career.[2] This later corpus includes *The Great Code: The Bible and Literature*, which became a bestseller in Canada. The reception of this book can be gauged in part by the reviews it received, and, as the list in chapter 6 reveals, the book was reviewed in some 200 periodicals. That is an extraordinary number for any book, much less an academic one. *The Great Code* reached number two on the Canadian bestseller list, succeeded for several weeks only by *Jane Fonda's Workout Book*. So much for Denis Donoghue's 1992 observation, a year after Frye's death, that he doesn't hear Frye's name mentioned any more. Speaking of death, chapter 3 records 138 obituaries, most of which were published shortly after Frye's death (23 January 1991), which is not the kind of response engendered by someone who has become a "useless relic." Literary critics do not ordinarily receive that kind of reception. David Bevington wrote in his glowing obituary for Frye that "his archetypal kind of criticism is a little out of fashion these days, as students turn to post-modern modes of critical discourse (new historicism, feminism, deconstruction); one doesn't see Frye noted as often as he used to be" (126). The second part of this observation is challenged by the present volume, its evidence showing that Frye is noted much more often now than he used to be—substantially more.

Reader-response criticism is one of the most widely recognized forms of "reception aesthetics." Chapters 6 and 7—reviews of Frye's books—provide another index for Frye's reception. Book reviewers engage the reader's interpretation and evaluation of critical texts directly, and Frye's books have garnered a bountiful assortment of reviews: more than 1300, including those for the thirty-volume Collected Works. Chapter 2 contains the largest category—essays, articles, and parts of books that use Frye's work in one way or another. That chapter contains close to 5000 items, a number that continues to expand exponentially.

One of the best indexes of Frye's continuing influence in the academy comes from the uses to which his criticism has been put in graduate study. Chapter 8 records Frye's appearances in doctoral dissertations and master's theses. The theses and dissertations are not necessarily devoted in their entirety or even in major portion to some aspect of Frye's work, though of course many are. They may call on Frye to support a reading of a particular literary work. They may contain only a single reference to Frye. I have not by any means consulted all of these graduate school documents, relying instead on a number of databases that have recorded "Frye" as a keyword in a search for dissertations and theses. *Northrop Frye: An Annotated Bibliography of Primary and Secondary Sources*, which was published in 1987, listed 39 theses and dissertations in which Frye played a role. Three decades later the list contains 3712 such titles—almost one thousand times more titles than in the original survey. The chart immediately below shows the steady increase in the number of dissertations and theses that have been recorded by decade. These data reveal clearly that in graduate study there has been no diminution of interest in Frye's work. Far from it.

1950–69	54
1970s	193
1980s	217
1990s	622
2000s	804
2010–19	1795

Here the steady exponential progression gives lie to the "useless relic" thesis. The number of theses and dissertations was greatest during the years 2014 and 2015, when there were respectively 228 and 209 theses and dissertations that had Frye content. Most of these writers assume that Frye need not be identified: he has entered in to the common

2 See Denham, "Frye and Longinus."

parlance of critical discussion. A similar observation can be made about David Richter's *The Critical Tradition: Classic Texts and Contemporary Trends*. In the first edition of this textbook anthology (1989) Frye takes his place alongside Freud, Jung, and Lacan as an exemplar of one of the contemporary trends, psychological criticism. In the second edition of the book (1998) Frye is considered to be no longer a member of a contemporary trend but a writer of classic texts. He is now accorded membership in the grand tradition beginning with the Greeks as someone who speaks with an authority not afforded trendsetters. Those who have written dissertations and theses on Frye tend to see him as one whose authority has already been established.

The catalogue of dissertations in chapter 8 has a decidedly international character. Dissertations and theses have originated at universities and other institutions for advanced academic work in 51 countries,[3] and they have been written in 34 languages.[4] Frye has been used, interpreted, critiqued, analysed, appropriated, cited, summarized, explained, evaluated, appealed to, and quoted in dissertations from all over the world, beginning in 1963, which is when Lentricchia declared that Frye's work had been consigned to the trash heap or, to use Philip Marchand's curious metaphor, been pulverized on the mill of academic fashion. To say that Frye has "fallen out of favour" or that his name is never mentioned anymore, having been "buried" in obscurity, is clearly not supported by the expansive range of research topics involving Frye that graduate students have chosen to study and write about. The first dissertations devoted substantially to Frye were written in the mid-1960s, which marked the beginning, according to Lentricchia, of Frye's having become a "useless relic." What it actually marked was a tremendous upsurge of interest in the study of Frye at the graduate level. As for Eagleton's question, "Who now reads Frye?," the answer is a very sizable number. There are more references to Frye in theses and dissertations than ever before. This is also seen in the lists in chapters 1 and 2 of the present volume—books devoted exclusively to Frye and essays and parts of books in which he makes an appearance. Taking again 1965 as our point of reference—the date according to Lentricchia, that Frye allegedly fell from grace—all 64 books devoted solely to Frye (listed in chapter 1) have appeared since 1965. During the four decades 1960 through 1990 there were 25 monographs devoted solely to Frye. For the following two decades—2010 through 2019—there were 40. These data counter the claim that there has been a decline of interest in Frye. Quite the contrary: the data show that there has been a substantial increase. By far the largest indicator, quantitatively, of the continuing, even the resurgent, interest in Frye is found in chapter 2, essays and articles in which Frye figures to a greater or lesser degree. Here there are more than 4400 entries. This category, which constitutes the base for understanding Frye's reception, amounted to 588 entries in the 1987 bibliography. This amount constitutes 13 per cent of the total in the present list, which again is a clear marker that Frye's work has not fallen out of style or faded from memory: 87 per cent of the entries in chapter 2 have appeared since 1987. Chapter 2 also records the fact that essays that draw on Frye have appeared in 36 languages.[5]

Many, in fact most, of the entries in *The Reception of Northrop Frye* are annotated. My intent is for these annotations to provide sufficient information for users of this book to determine whether they need to access the individual articles and essays. When an annotation begins and ends with double quotation marks, such marks indicate that that I am quoting either from the article itself or from abstracts ordinarily provided by the author or publisher.

The appendix is a list of the various editions and translations of Frye's books, which means of course, that it is a record of primary, not secondary, material. I have included the list because it is one index of Frye's reception internationally. The fact that his books have been translated into 26 languages is a clear indicator that he has not fallen out of fashion internationally. Rather the fact that international publishers want to have Frye translated at all is another answer to Eagleton's query, "Who now reads Frye?"

One somewhat surprising feature of an account of Frye's reception is the degree to which he has engaged readers from the East. We see this most directly in the lists of chapters 2 and 8. Part of this surge may be a result of the two international Frye conferences that were held in China—at the University of Peking in 1994 and at the University of Inner Mongolia in Hoh-Hot in 1999. Part of it may have resulted from the attention Frye received from well-known Frye scholars such as Wang Ning, Ye Shuxian, and the late

3 Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Gujarati, Hong Kong, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Lithuania, Malta, Morocco, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Portugal, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Scotland, Senegal, Serbia, Slovenia, South Africa, South Korea, Spain, Sweden, Taiwan, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States, Wales.

4 Afrikaans, Bosnian, Catalan, Chinese, Croatian, Czech, Danish, Dutch, English, Finnish, French, Frisian, German, Greek, Gujarati, Hindi, Hungarian, Icelandic, Indonesian, Italian, Japanese, Korean, Lithuanian, Malayalam, Marathi, Norwegian, Portuguese, Serbian, Slovak, Spanish, Swahili, Swedish, Turkish.

5 Afrikaans, Arabic, Bosnian, Catalan, Chinese, Croatian, Czech, Danish, Dutch, Estonian, Finnish, French, Frisian, German, Greek, Hungarian, Indonesian, Italian, Japanese, Korean, Lithuanian, Luxembourgish, Macedonian, Malay, Norwegian, Polish, Portuguese, Romanian, Russian, Serbian, Slovak, Slovenian, Spanish, Swedish, Turkish, Welsh.

Chizhe Wu.[6] Astonishingly, twenty-two people with the Chinese surname "Li" appear as authors in the list of dissertations in chapter 8. In any event, there appears to be a great deal more attention to Frye by the Japanese, Chinese, and Koreans than there is to his work by those who speak languages other than English. As for the Central and Eastern European languages, those who consult the present book will no doubt have a quizzical reaction upon discovering just how many essays have been written in Czech, Polish, Lithuanian, Hungarian, Serbian, Slovenian, Romanian, Albanian, Slovak, Croatian, and Bosnian.

I have been suggesting that the "useless relic" thesis cannot be supported by the bibliographic facts. This does not mean, however, that Frye and his proponents were unaware of the powerful force that Derrida and deconstruction brought to the discussions about critical theory that exploded following the structuralist conference at Johns Hopkins University in 1966. I have written about the relation between Frye and Derrida elsewhere.[7] Suffice it here to say that in the critical contests that followed in the wake of the Johns Hopkins conference, Frye was very much aware of the ballpark in which the game was being played. In one of his late notebooks he muses, "If I'm old hat because I'm 'logocentric,' I want to know why I'm that, and not just be that because I'm ignorant of the possibility of being anything else" (23). *The Reception of Northrop Frye* argues that Frye is actually not "old hat," given the widespread attention his work has received, the various forms of which are catalogued in the present volume. There can be little doubt that the work of the new theoreticians in the elite universities came to us with a French accent and dominated discussions of theory for some years. But that does not mean that Frye and his readers were mute, and the fact that other critical voices were being heard throughout Frye's career, beginning with the New Criticism of the 1950s, does not mean that history has passed him by.

Let me close with a few examples of what we can discover once we have a fairly complete record of Frye's reception in front of us. In the Third Essay of *Anatomy of Criticism* Frye develops his theory myths, which is a theory of narrative patterns. He discovers four basic patterns: comedy, romance, tragedy, and irony. Each of these four *mythoi* turns out to have six "phases," and for each phase Frye specifies a number of characteristics that are set down in his taxonomy in intricate detail.[8] Countless readers have found Frye's theory of myths useful in their understanding and interpretation of works other than literary. One of these is the late Hayden White, who applied Frye's schema to historical writing, discovering that historians tended to impose one of the four narrative patterns on their historical material, yielding either comic, romantic, tragic, or ironic accounts of historical events. Jonathan Arac has argued that White's work has led to a reconception of the entire field of historiography. Hayden White's name appears more than 90 times in the entries in chapter 2 (essays about Frye), all having to do with Frygean "modes of emplotment." Rozalia Cherepanova has noted the ways that Frye's four narrative patterns have influenced the study of narratives in other fields, such as history (Hayden White), as just mentioned, and psychology (Kevin Murray).

Related to the Frye–White connection is Byron Almén's *A Theory of Musical Narrative* and James Jakób Liszka's *The Semiotic of Myth*. Almén has formalized for musical analysis Frye's and Liszka's theories of narrative archetypes. Those interested in studying the application of Frye's theory of myths to musical theory will find more than a dozen essays in chapter 2 that call attention to this link. Eagleton, Lentricchia, and friends would not have known about musical archetypes: Liszka's book was not published until 1989 and Almén's until 2009. In other words, while it is true that conventional areas of applied or practical criticism continued to draw on Frye's theory of myths, it is no less true that new areas of inquiry, such as narrative archetypes in music, began to open up.

The use of narrative archetypes is found as well in other domains. Steffen Schneider has discovered that the four *mythoi* apply to the narratives of political systems. Jonathan M. Smith has found that geographers construct their meanings by using one or the other of the *mythoi*. Philip Smith has noted that the narrative genre model, which owes its existence to Frye, can be applied to risk evaluation. Roy Schafer has written that he found the four narrative archetypes applicable to his work "in that they pulled a lot of things together that were closer to experience than the very formal categories of metapsychology, and they corresponded to my experience as a therapist. I thought it would be worth trying to develop it at length"—which he proceeded to do in *A New Language for Psychoanalysis*. He was joined in this enterprise by Kevin Murray, who has provided an overview of narrative psychology. An example from legal discourse is Robin West's view that various jurisprudential traditions can be read as narratives, the various traditions corresponding to one of Frye's four *mythoi*. James F. Hopewell has used Frye's theory of myths to characterize four different kinds of Protestant congregations:

6 From 1997 to 2004 Professor Wu of the University of Inner Mongolia was an unswerving translator of Frye. During this time he translated into Chinese *Anatomy of Criticism*, *The Educated Imagination*, *Creation and Recreation*, *The Well-Tempered Critic*, *Northrop Frye on Culture and Literature*, *Words with Power*, and *Selected Essays*. For Wang Ning's and Ye Shuxian's accounts of archetypal criticism in China, see the entries under "Wang" and "Ye" in chapter 2.

7 "Introduction" to *Myth and Metaphor*, xiii–xviii, and "Editor's Introduction: The *Anatomy* and Poststructuralism," lv–lxvi.

8 For an analytical exposition of Frye's "Theory of Myths" see my *Northrop Frye and Critical Method*, 58–87.

charismatic negotiation (Frye's romance), canonic negotiation (Frye's tragedy), agnostic negotiation (Frye's comedy), and empiric negotiation (Frye's irony). The four categories have become a template for describing the different approaches Protestants take to the spiritual life. Ryu Kyun and colleagues have given us a similar analysis of four narrative patterns lying behind documentary television films. Dominika Biegoń used narrative discourse analysis as advanced by Frye and Hayden White to understand the capitalist market economy. Riikka Kuusisto relied on such discourse to characterize one or another of the four emplotments one finds in narratives about international relations.

Readers will discover numerous fields other than those provided by this sampler where the four emplotments have been used as a methodological and analytical tool. Jan Golinski has argued that some strands of the constructivist history of science have used the literary genre theory of Northrop Frye to highlight the literariness of scientific writing, also noting that the analysis of Hutton's geological tours of Scotland can be read in terms of Frye's account of the quest romance. Similarly, William Clark illustrates how writings in the history of science rely on Frye's conventions of the four *mythoi*. William P. Fouse illustrates how the four narrative emplotments about occupied Yugoslavia during World War II effected the development of American foreign policy. Wulf Kansteiner gives a close reading of Saul Friedlander's comprehensive history of the Holocaust, using Hayden White's theory of emplotments. Merav Katz-Kimchi uses White's theory to examine histories of the internet. Michael Lambek uses the four modes of emplotment to analyse performances of the Sakalava people of Madagaskar. T.D. MacLulich argues that Canadian exploration literature can be understood as fitting into one of Frye's four mythological patterns. Louis Mackey maintains that just as the four emplotments can be applied to the writing of history so can they be applied to the "path of philosophy." Reinhold Martin believes that the typology of emplotment can "shed some light on the historiography of modern architecture." Barbara Stern has examined the influence of myths in consumption texts, using Frye's taxonomy to assign consumer narratives and selected advertisements to four categories of mythic plots: comedy, romance, tragedy, and irony. She discovers links between Frye's four *mythoi* and consumption myths. Each *mythos* also incorporates values that are encoded in the plot and that reappear in consumption narratives and in advertising appeals using mythic patterns and characterization. Alexander Spencer and Kai Oppermann have investigated the way that the four Frye/White emplotments can help us understand the reason that the British voted to leave the European Union, and Spencer Wade wrote a dissertation seeking to understand illness narratives through the lens of emplotments.

I have been briefly tracing the uses to which Frye's theory of myths can be seen as spreading out over a number of discursive disciplines, so that we have a network of applications that trace their foundation back to the four "mythoi" (Frye) and their subsequent iteration in the four emplotments (White). Other examples of such thematic repetition include Frye's green-world theory of comedy, found in 48 of the essays in chapter 2. In the field of Canadian literature, his famous question "Where is here?" is examined in 43 of the essays. His related theory of the "garrison mentality" appears in 63 of the articles. The point is that Frye's work continues to generate a still-expanding body of commentary; not only that, a single entry about a Frygean topic in chapter 2 can be linked to a number of other instances of the same topic. Frye's criticism invites, even encourages, such networking. To conclude, the answer to Terry Eagleton's rhetorical question, "Who now reads Frye?," is a very considerable and ever-growing number. The present volume is intended to support that claim and at the same time to provide a relatively full record of the reception of one of the seminal critical minds of the last century.

WORKS CITED

Almén, Byron *A Theory of Musical Narrative*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2008.

Anonymous. "Northrop Frye 1912–1991: Charting the Eternal World." *Toronto Star* (1 November 1992): 70.

Bevington, David. "Northrop Frye (14 July 1912–23 January 1991)." *American Philosophical Society, Proceedings* 137, no. 1 (March 1993): 126–8.

Biegoń, Dominika. "Narrative Legitimation: The Capitalist Market Economy as a Success Story." In *Capitalism and Its Legitimacy in Times of Crisis*, ed. Steffen Schneider, Henning Schmidtke, Sebastian Haunss, and Jennifer Gronau. Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017.

Buchanan, Ian. "Frye, Northrop. *A Dictionary of Critical Theory*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2010. 191.

Burney, Shehla. "Edward Said and Postcolonial Theory: Disjunctured Identities and the Subaltern Voice." In *Counterpoints*, vol. 417, *Pedagogy of the Other: Edward Said, Postcolonial Theory, and Strategies for Critique*. New York: Peter Lang, 2012. 41–60.

Cherepanova, Rozalia. "A Commentator or a Character in a Story? The Problem of the Narrator in Oral History." In *Reclaiming the Personal: Oral History in Post-Socialist Europe*, ed. Natalia Khanenko-Friesen and Gelinada Grinchenko. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2015. 122–46.

Clark, William. "Narratology and the History of Science." *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science* 26 (1995): 1–71.

Denham, Robert D. "Editor's Introduction." In *Myth and Metaphor: Selected Essays 1974–1988*. Ed. Robert D. Denham. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1990. Collected Works of Northrop Frye, vol. 22.

– "Editor's Introduction: The *Anatomy* and Poststructuralism." In *Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays*. Ed. Robert D. Denham. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2006.

– "Frye and Longinus." In *Northrop Frye and Others: Twelve Writers Who Helped Shape His Thinking*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 2015. 63–83.
– "Pity the Northrop Frye Scholar? *Anatomy of Criticism* Fifty Years After." In *Essays on Frye: Word and Spirit*. Emory, VA: Iron Mountain Press, 2015. 223–39.
– "Theory of Myths." In *Northrop Frye and Critical Method*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1978.
Donoghue, Denis. Review of *The Double Vision*. *New York Review of Books* 39 (9 April 1992): 25.
Epstein, Joseph. "Forgetting Edmund Wilson." *Commentary* 120 (1 December 2005): 53–8.
Fouse, William P. *The Power of Narratives: A Cultural History of US Involvement in Axis-Occupied Yugoslavia*. MA thesis, University of Rhode Island, 2018.
Garber, Marjorie. "Ovid, Now and Then." Chapter 2 of *The Muses on Their Lunch Hour*: New York: Fordham University Press, 2017. 11–31.
Golinksi, Jan. *Making Natural Knowledge: Constructivism and the History of Science,* 2nd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005.
Good, Graham. "Frye in China." *Canadian Literature* 183 (Winter 2004): 156–8.
Halpern, Richard. "Modernist in the Middle." *Shakespeare among the Moderns*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1997.
Hopewell, James F. *Congregation: Stories and Structures*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987.
Iser, Wolfgang. *The Act of Reading A Theory of Aesthetic Response*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978.
– *The Implied Reader: Patterns of Communication in Prose Fiction from Bunyan to Beckett.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1974.
Jauss, Hans Robert. *Aesthetic Experience and Literary Hermeneutics*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1982.
– *Toward an Aesthetics of Reception*. Trans. Timothy Bahti. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1978.
Kahan, Marcia. "Pillow Talk." *Books in Canada* 14 (April 1985): 3–4.
Kansteiner, Wulf. "Success, Truth, and Modernism in Holocaust Historiography: Reading Saul Friedländer Thirty-Five Years after the Publication of *Metahistory*." *History and Theory* 48, no. 2 (May 2009): 25–53.
Katz-Kimchi, Merav. "'Singing the Strong Light Works of [American] Engineers': Popular Histories of the Internet as Mythopoetic Literature." *Information & Culture* 50, no. 2 (2015): 160–80.
Kerrigan, William. "Bloom and the Great Ones." *Clio* 25 (Winter 1996): 196–206.
Krieger, Murray. "Northrop Frye and Contemporary Criticism: Ariel and the Spirit of Gravity." In *Northrop Frye in Modern Criticism: Selected Papers from the English Institute*, ed. Murray Krieger. New York: Columbia University Press, 1966. 1–30.
Kuusisto, Riikka. "Comparing International Relations Plots: Dismal Tragedies, Exuberant Romances, Hopeful Comedies and Cynical Satires." *International Politics* 55, no. 2 (March 2018): 160–76.
Kyun, Ryu. "Analysis of Narrative Strategy in the Korean TV Natural Documentary Epilogue System: Focused on *Antarctic Tears*." *Journal of the Korean Contents Association* 14, no. 4 (2014): 67–77.
Lambek, Michael. "The Sakalava Poiesis of History: Realizing the Past through Spirit Possession in Madagascar." *American Ethnologist* 25, no. 2 (1998): 106–27.
Lane, Richard. "Northrop Frye." *Fifty Key Literary Theorists*. London: Routledge, 2006. 111–16.
Lentricchia, Frank. *After the New Criticism*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980.
Liszka, James Jakob. *The Semiotic of Myth: A Critical Study of the Symbol*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1990.
McCabe, Colin. "Editorial." *Critical Quarterly* 56, no. 2 (July 2014): 131.
MacLulich, T.D. "Canadian Exploration as Literature." *Canadian Literature* 81 (Summer 1979): 72–85.
Mackey, Louis. "Poetry, History, Truth, and Redemption." In *Literature and History*, ed. Leonard Schulze and Walter Wetzels. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1983. 65–83.
Marchand, Philip. "Are Northrop Frye's Ideas Now DOA?" *National Post* (6 July 2015). http://news.nationalpost.com/arts/marchand-the-legacy-of-northrop-frye.
Martin, Reinhold. "History after History." *AA Files* 58 (2009): 14–16.
Moore, Warren S. III. Review of *Northrop Frye on Myth: An Introduction*, by Ford Russell. *Journal of the Midwest Modern Language Association* 34, no. 3 (Autumn 2001): 87–9.
Murray, Kevin D. "Narratology." In *Rethinking Psychology*, ed. J.A. Smith, R. Harré, and L. Van Langenhove. London: Sage Publications, 1995. 179–95.
Nicholson, Mervyn. Review of *Northrop Frye's Uncollected Prose. English Studies in Canada* 42, nos. 1–2 (March–June 2016): 233–7.
Paglia, Camille. "Falando sobre a tradição intelectual norte-americana, Liberdade de expressão e educação com Camille Paglia." *Interfaces Brasil/Canada* 18, no. 3 (2018): 193–214.
Salusinszky, Imre. *Criticism in Society: Interviews with Jacques Derrida, Northrop Frye, Harold Bloom, Geoffrey Hartman, Frank Kermode, Edward Said, Barbara Johnson, Frank Lentricchia, and J. Hillis Miller*. New York: Methuen, 1987.
Schafer, Roy. "Language, Narrative, and Psychoanalysis: An Interview with Roy Schafer." In *Criticism and Lacan: Essays and Dialogue on Language, Structure, and the Unconscious*, ed. Patrick Colm Hogan and Lalita Pandit. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1990.
– *A New Language for Psychoanalysis.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1976. 22–56.
Schneider, Steffen. "Good, Bad, or Ugly? Narratives of Democratic Legitimacy in Western Public Spheres." Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Canadian Political Science Association, Montreal, 1–3 June 2010.

Scott, Alec. "Frye's *Anatomy*." *U of T Magazine* (Spring 2012). http://magazine.utoronto.ca/feature/northrop-frye-anatomy-of-criticism-alec-scott/.

Smith, Jonathan M. "Geographical Rhetoric: Modes and Tropes of Appeal." *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 86, no. 1 (1996): 1–20.

Smith, Philip. "Narrating Global Warming." In *The Oxford Handbook of Cultural Sociology*, ed. Jeffrey C. Alexander, Ronald N. Jacobs, and Philip Smith. New York: Oxford University Press, 2012. 745–60.

Spencer, Alexander, and Kai Oppermann. "Narrative Genres of Brexit: The Leave Campaign and the Success of Romance." *Journal of European Public Policy: Special Issue: The Brexit Policy Fiasco* 27, no. 5 (2020): 666–84.

Stern, Barbara B. "Consumer Myths: Frye's Taxonomy and the Structural Analysis of Consumption Text." *Journal of Consumer Research* 22 (September 1995): 165–85.

Sutherland, John. "The Ideas Interview: Frank Kermode." *The Guardian Unlimited* (29 August 2006). http://books.guardian.co.uk/comment/story/0,,1860357,00.html.

Wade, Spencer. *The Development of Illness Narrative in a Structured Cancer Group*. PhD dissertation, University of British Columbia, 2003.

Wente, Margaret. "Adventures in Academia: The Stuff of Fiction." *Globe and Mail* (June 1 2015; updated 23 March 2018). http://www.theglobeandmail.com/globe-debate/adventures-in-academia-the-stuff-of-fiction/article24731318/.

West, Robin. "Jurisprudence as Narrative: An Aesthetic Analysis of Modern Legal Theory." *New York University Law Review* 60 (May 1985): 145–211.

White, Hayden. *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973.