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The Netherlands continues to press its claim as a major centre for research on Postmodernism with the launch of a new series of Yearbooks devoted to the subject. The volume under review marks an auspicious beginning to the venture.

Postmodernism is considered as a two-dimensional phenomenon, for the purposes of this collection, naming at once a literary movement and also a broader social and epistemological movement. In the words of the editors' introduction, Postmodernism refers to "the literary movement or current customarily indicated by that name, and, in the broader sense, to the period in which this movement or current can be said to have been dominant" (p. 9). Obviously there are some important questions left begging by such an abstract agenda, but it must be that the editors' purpose here is not so much to achieve theoretical rigour as it is to attract the widest possible range of contributions for the next Yearbook. Consequently this announcement of a liberal agenda is to be applauded, in the expectation that the Postmodern Studies series as a whole will benefit. Notwithstanding a few excellent journals publishing work in the area of Postmodernism, there remains a need for space devoted exclusively to the staging of debates and the reporting of controversies in this still contentious area of inquiry.

Though the first volume deals almost entirely with literary Postmodernism, it provides a valuable counter to the Anglo-American bias that characterizes much recent work in the field. Here we have informed descriptions of Postmodernism in Norwegian, Slavic and Dutch literature, as well as the more familiar Latin American, Italian, French, Hispanic, Canadian and British varieties. It is particularly surprising (and refreshing) to find contributors who do not baulk at rejecting the term "Postmodernism" when it is inappropriate. Given the persistent fashion of the term, it is almost shocking to find Iris Zavala (on Hispanic literature), Geert Lernout (on Canadian fiction), and Wladimir Krysinki (on the Slavic literatures) who will resist the temptation to contort customary definitions of Postmodernism to fit their texts.

Wladimir Krysinki, for example, rejects the view of Postmodernism as marked by a metafictional foregrounding of narrativity and a radical instability or indeterminacy of meaning as irrelevant to the nature of contemporary Slavic literature, since Slavic metafictional texts operate upon the assumptions that meaning can be determined and that final truths can be realized. However, the broadly metafictional view is developed by A. Kibedi Varga in her discussion of modern French literary history, Arild Linneberg and Geir Mork in their description of Norwegian fiction, and Brian McHale in his thoughts about American literary and theoretical Postmodernism. Further, it is this view of Postmodernism as a linguistically motivated and formalistic phenomenon that is modified to suit the literatures discussed by the other contributors: Richard Todd, who makes a case for a British canon of Postmodernist fiction; Anthony Mertens, as he describes the assimilation by some Dutch writers of an imported Postmodernist literary style; Stefano Tani, who names the latest generation of Italian Postmodernists; and Julio Ortega, as he describes the relationship between contemporary politico-economic conditions in Latin America and the more universal, or at least internationally renowned, features of Latin American Postmodernist texts.

The "flagship" article of this new series is Brian McHale's consideration of the relationship between Postmodernist literature and critical theorizing about it. He concludes that, given the fictive nature of each, both should be judged by the entertainment they provide or, more importantly, by their relevance. This is a lesson that Theo D'haen and Hans Bertens have successfully transformed into an editorial guideline: providing well-written essays that make clear their relevance both to the critical category "Postmodernism" and to those who are working within its domain.
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