be little reason to expect Styron to be an allusive writer: *The Long March*, copyrighted in 1952, followed his first novel, *Lie Down in Darkness*, which, though an immediate success, was not an allusive work.

As Machacek points out, "phraseological adaptation is generally integrated unobtrusively into the alluding text, so that uninformed readers will generally not be aware that they are missing anything; they will simply take the phrase as the later author's own" (526–27). If the echoed phrase is obscure enough for the author to expect his audience to take it as his own, is that a legitimate borrowing?

In *Religion and Philosophy in Germany* (1882), Heinrich Heine avers that "there is no such thing as plagiarism in philosophy." Is that true of literature too? As an admirer of Styron, I would like my suspicion that he committed a literary misdemeanor dispelled. Otherwise, I would like it confirmed.

Jane Reed
University of California, Davis (retired)

To the Editor:

I find practically nothing to criticize in Gregory Machacek's splendid "Allusion," but I would like to suggest a few supplements and alternative approaches.

Regarding terminology: *spur* and *reprise* are excellent. I've used *alluding text*, which doesn't have anything special to recommend it, and *target text*, which I think does: it expresses the purpose and creative energy of both writer and reader, and since targets can be missed, it avoids the mechanistic determinism of *trigger*.

I've preferred "textual allusion" to "literary allusion," since it doesn't privilege "literature" as a source of spurs, but "phraseological adaptation" is certainly an improvement on this term as well as on its other predecessors.

It's interesting to watch the evolution of M. H. Abrams's definition of *allusion* in his *Glossary of Literary Terms*. In 1957, it ran as follows: "a brief reference to a person, place or event assumed to be sufficiently well known to

be recognized by the reader." Not a hint of anything like "phraseological adaptation"! By the sixth edition (1993), Abrams was much closer to Machacek.

My taxonomy is a four-part classification: direct or indirect; and historical or textual (with "topical" as a subset of "historical"). Direct textual allusion involves a quotation indicated as such or mention of the name of an author, work, or character. Direct historical allusion names the event or person; indirect doesn't (e.g., Margaret Thatcher once declared, "I was revolted by what I saw on television last night," alluding to soccer riots). In all of these, even the last, readers who don't know what is being alluded to are aware of their ignorance. What crucially distinguishes phraseological adaptations from these other kinds of allusion, as Machacek recognizes, is that they *can* be missed without readers' knowing that they did so. In other words, the allusion can fail, can miss the target.

What needs more emphasis than Machacek gives it is the corresponding advantage: if readers do hit the target, they have made the discovery themselves and are thus more actively involved in creating the allusion's meaning. (Cf. Joseph Addison's *Spectator* 512 on the role of the reader in creating the meaning of works like John Dryden's *Absalom and Achitophel*.) Identifying the spur by a footnote, necessary though it often is, impoverishes the experience to some degree, though the reader's creativity still has plenty of scope in determining the relations between spur and reprise.

There's some crossover between these categories. A phraseological adaptation can allude to a historical figure or event: if your chair says, "Le département, c'est moi!" he or she is alluding not only to what Louis XIV said but to Louis himself. And in many cases it's moot whether a direct allusion is historical or textual; when Shylock says of Portia, "A Daniel come to judgment!" it doesn't matter whether Daniel is a historical character or a fictitious one.

Allusion can also be related to quotation and plagiarism. In quotation, one repeats another's words and acknowledges them as another's.

(Some quotations are allusions; most have other functions.) In plagiarism, one repeats another's words without acknowledgment, hoping that the reader will attribute them to oneself. In indirect allusion, one repeats or adapts another's words without acknowledgment but hopes the reader will spot the spur and understand the allusive purpose of the repetition, rather than condemning it as robbery. Again, indirection has its risks.

Another metaphor for allusion is the coil of a car's ignition system, which strengthens an already existing current to the point where it can jump the gap in the spark plug.

Machacek offers some interpretations of Prufrock's allusion to Hamlet (527): the allusion may also suggest that Prufrock was not meant to be at all, was not meant to exist. Or, closer to the terms of the allusion, was meant not to be.

The double signifier: a reprise can be seen as signifying two kinds of signifieds. Its words mean what they normally mean, but taken together they also signify the spur. This effect is somewhat analogous to the way my speech, besides its conceptual content, signifies that I probably wasn't brought up in Texas, Ottawa, or Liverpool. This aspect of allusion calls for more investigation.

The multiple allusion: a single reprise can often allude to two or more spurs, in one or more earlier authors. *Paradise Lost* offers especially rich possibilities here. It is relentlessly cross-referential or autoallusive, and its autoallusions are often parodic: e.g., Satan, Sin, and Death are an infernal trinity that parodies the heavenly trinity of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. In *The Dunciad*, Pope often alludes to two or three such spurs at once—i.e., both to a basic text and to Milton's parody of it (and sometimes simultaneously to the Bible or Blackmore's *Creation* or Dryden's *Mac Flecknoe*), thus exponentially enriching his own text. Wordsworth sometimes uses *Paradise Lost* this way in *The Prelude*. The earliest explicit description of multiple allusion that I know of is Michael Wilding's "Allusion and Innuendo in *Mac Flecknoe*" (*Essays in Criticism* 19 [1969]: 355–70).

One of Machacek's examples (526) is really a double allusion. Milton's "In the beginning" (*Paradise Lost* 1.9) alludes not only to Genesis 1.1 but also to the opening of Saint John's Gospel, "In the beginning was the Word," which itself alludes to Genesis 1.1. Bringing John's spur into action emphasizes the role of God's word in creating the world, in inspiring the words of Moses that repeat the word of creation, and, Milton hopes, in making his own words worthy of their subject. Theologically, it implies the unity of the Old and New Testaments.

Envoi: Machacek's essay is well designed to stimulate the sustained theoretical study that allusion deserves but has not yet received. Remember, the abbreviation of allusion is *all*.

<div align="right">

William Kinsley
Université de Montréal (retired)

</div>

Genre and the Memoir

To the Editor:

Nancy Miller's essay "The Entangled Self: Genre Bondage in the Age of Memoir" (122 [2007]: 537–48) offers wide-ranging and provocative musings on the complexity of memoir writing—an ever more elusive, ambivalent, and nowadays almost indefinable genre. I hope it is not out of order to add to the many variants of "truth-telling" and "truth-reflecting" that Miller explores one other approach I consider valid, even though it may be somewhat unorthodox, perhaps even simplistic.

My recent book, *Ten Dollars in My Pocket: The American Education of a Holocaust Survivor*, is labeled a memoir—not quite accurately so, for it presents separately aspects that in many memoirs are interwoven and thereby make it difficult for the reader to differentiate among objective, reflected, or manipulated facts, emotional or critical coloration, creative expansion or compression, distortion, and so forth. The book juxtaposes the following elements: diary entries, published articles, letters, and documents, all written during the period in question and presented verbatim or, if needed,