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Northrop Frye never traveled to Spain, but, being a comparativist and a polymath, he was naturally familiar with the Spanish cultural tradition, especially its art and literature. As a twenty-six year old, Frye saw Picasso’s Weeping Woman at a 1938 exhibition in London, which prompted him to remark that Picasso was “one of the greatest revolutionary geniuses in Western culture” (Modern Culture 94), and one finds references throughout his work to Spanish painters other than Picasso, especially to Goya and El Greco. I think Frye’s first choice for a place to visit in Spain would have been the Altamira caves, only a couple of hours northwest of here. The Paleolithic drawings at Altamira fascinated him: they represented for him the imaginative identification with things outside the self—an absorption of human consciousness with the natural world into an undifferentiated state of archaic identity. In such a process of metaphorical identification, which he called “ecstatic metaphor,” the subject and object merge into an existential unity.

Frye was also attracted to the Spanish mystical tradition, as it is found especially in St. John of the Cross. He wrote an early essay on the rationalistic mystic Ramon Lull, who hailed from Mallorca and whose first major work was written in Catalan. We know from the annotated books in Frye’s own library that he read Loyola’s Spiritual Exercises, Unamuno’s The Tragic Sense of Life, and Ortega’s What Is Philosophy? In his taxonomy of the specific forms of drama, he takes the name for the myth play from Calderón’s autos sacramentales, the international study of which is of course centered right here at the Universidad de Navarra (see http://griso.cti.unav.es). And Frye’s analysis of the eiron as an archetypal character draws on the gracioso—the scheming valet of Spanish drama as represented by, say, Figaro. Cervantes, as one might expect, appears repeatedly in Frye’s criticism: Don Quixote, which Frye first read as a twenty-year-old (Correspondence 1: 52), is his primary example of the comprehensive fictional form that includes the novel, the romance, and the anatomy. Frye’s most extensive commentary on Spanish literature is his 1949 essay on Don Quixote, occasioned by a new English
translation by Samuel Putnam. Frye did not know the Spanish language, but in his *Diaries*, he is always making resolutions to learn more languages, and in a 1950 entry he says that he would like to learn Spanish because he would not want to publish a book on drama he was planning to write without some first hand knowledge of Calderón (*Diaries* 310).

If Frye was interested in the Spanish tradition, the Spanish have returned the favor. There is a sizeable body of work that underlies the connection between Frye and Spain. Eight of Frye’s books have been translated into Spanish, the first –his little book on Eliot– in 1969; and if we expand the linguistic territory to include the languages of the Iberian Peninsula, then the total is fourteen: six of his books have been translated into Portuguese. Some thirty seven books and articles that relate to Frye in some way have a Hispanic connection. Some are written for Spanish readers; others are written in English for Spanish journals, still others –in both English and Spanish– are applications of Frye’s theories to Spanish literature. This last category would include Pierre Ullman’s book *A Contrapuntal Method for Analyzing Spanish Literature*, an analysis of nine Spanish works based on the method of the first and second essays of Frye’s *Anatomy of Criticism*. An expansive collection of literary texts organized on the principles of the third essay of *Anatomy of Criticism*, exemplifying the main archetypes in each phase of Frye’s four mythoi, is Julián Rodríguez’s textbook anthology of comparative literature, which appeared in 1991 and was issued in an edition for secondary school students in 1998. (For the web site of this anthology, see http://www.um.es/lenlited/didactica.htm.) I am embarrassed to say that I do nor speak or read Spanish, so I am not able to comment on most of this work. I mention it at the beginning only to reinforce the idea that this symposium continues a tradition, already well established, that links Frye to this country and its culture.

In 1957, the year after Juan Ramón Jiménez had won the Nobel Prize for literature, Camilo José Cela became a member of the Spanish Academy. In 1957 the African American writer Richard Wright published *Pagan Spain*, a somewhat bitter series of impressions he had gathered while touring the country under the tight fist of Franco. In 1957 Alfredo di Stéfano, the Blond Arrow, who had helped Real Madrid win its second consecutive European Cup, was named European footballer of the year. In 1957 –fifty years ago this month– the Spanish stock market plummeted, causing the worst crash in Franco’s twenty one year regime. And in 1957, across the Atlantic, a somewhat obscure Canadian professor, who had written a book on Blake ten years earlier, published *Anatomy of Criticism*. Within twenty years it would
become the most frequently cited book in the arts and humanities written by an author born in the twentieth century.

*Anatomy of Criticism* went to press in February 1957 and was released three months later, which means it appeared exactly fifty years ago this month. The same month, Carleton University granted Frye the first of his thirty-nine honorary degrees. A month after the conferring of his doctor of laws degree—June 1957—Frye travelled from Harvard, where he was teaching for the term, to Ottawa, where he delivered a speech, “The Study of English in Canada,” at the inauguration of the Association of Canadian University Teachers of English. As for other golden anniversaries, 1957 was the year Lester Pearson, like Frye a Victoria College graduate, won the Nobel Peace Prize, the year Queen Elizabeth II opened the Canadian Parliament (the first monarch to have done so), and the year the Canada Council was established. So 2007 is a jubilee year on several counts. The jubilee celebration goes back a long way. In the Book of Leviticus [25:9-12] we are told that every fifty years there was to be a celebration marking the freeing of slaves and prisoners, the forgiveness of debts, and the outpouring of the mercies of God. The Roman Jubilee can be traced back to Boniface VIII’s calling for the celebration of 1300 as the holy year, when as many as 30,000 pilgrims crossed the Tiber into Rome each day. Far fewer have come to Pamplona on the golden jubilee of the *Anatomy*, but we can still find reasons for celebrating a book that has been continuously in print for fifty years and that has sold 150,000 copies. But I want to begin by noting that, fifty years after, not everyone agrees there is anything to celebrate.

- Item: Marcia Kahan, writing in *Books in Canada* in 1985, reports on a debate between Frank Kermode and Terry Eagleton. “About the only subject on which they could agree,” she says, “was Frye’s obsolescence,” adding that Eagleton asked what was a decidedly rhetorical question, “Who now reads Frye?” (3-4). That was twenty two years ago.

- Item: Graham Good writes in 2004, “This is a wintry season for Frye’s work in the West”; “the once-great repute of the Wizard of the North is now maintained only by a few Keepers of the Flame” (156), the Keepers of the Flame being, apparently, the editors of the Collected Works volumes and a handful of others scattered here and there.

- Item: William Kerrigan remarks,

More than any critic of his day, 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. The feminists, postmodernists, new historians, and neo-marxists have buried him in a mass grave marked White Male Liberal Humanism. (198)
• Item: Joseph Epstein writing in Commentary two years ago includes Northrop Frye in a group of critics who for some time, Epstein claims, have been “fading from prominence and now beginning to fade from memory” (53).

• Item: Denis Donohue writes in a review of The Double Vision,

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.

That was fifteen years ago.

• Item: In a 2006 interview Sir Frank Kermode expresses a similar opinion:

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. In America the New Criticism—a school led by Cleanth Brooks and Robert Penn Warren—argued that the close study of poetry was a supremely valuable thing. This was a view that was then accepted generally. And 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)

• Item: Also writing in 2006, Richard Lane declares, “The overarching project of the Anatomy of Criticism reveals why Frye’s approach is now out of favour: he attempts to account for the entire field of literary criticism in a totalizing gesture that is now read as deluded” (112).

• Item: In a review of Ford Russell’s book on Frye, Warren Moore puts a similar sentiment like this:

Pity the Northrop Frye scholar. While the broad heading of literary theory seems to offer room for a virtual pantheon 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 postmodern 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. (87)

You have no doubt heard sentiments similar to those expressed in these eight items—that Frye is obsolescent, that he has been buried with other dead white males in a mass grave, that no one today reads him, that he is fading from memory if not out of sight, that those deluded few who do read him are to be pitied, that his name is not a name mentioned nowadays, and so on. Several years back I heard a bit of gossip about a poor student at the University of Toronto who wanted to write a dissertation on Frye but who was told that Frye was out of fashion and that he should choose another topic if he wanted to preserve his career in the academy from permanent damage.
Such attitudes go back more than quarter century. In 1980 Frank Lentricchia located the *Anatomy* 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 “free-play” (13-14). Moreover, Frye is said to have privileged spatial over temporal conceptions, centripetal over the centrifugal movements, the romantic over the ironic modes of literature, and Utopian desire over contingent, historical reality, Lentricchia’s assumption obviously being that it is self evident in each case that the latter idea in each of 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 Frygian assumptions that do not conform for his arm chair 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 that by the mid 1960s “Frye… was uncervemoniously tossed ‘on the dump’… with other useless relics” (30). This is the claim that I would like to examine –the claim that Frye was tossed on the critical garbage heap in the mid 1960s, which is about as bad a fate as being tossed in a mass grave. It’s a claim that was made, as I say, in 1980, twenty seven years ago and twenty three years after the *Anatomy* was published.

How might one go about testing the truth of Lentricchia’s claims? One could point, first of all, to counter claims. It was in the mid sixties that the English Institute devoted its session to Frye, and Murray Krieger’s bold opinion delivered on that occasion was that because of the *Anatomy* 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)

This claim was echoed by Lawrence Lipking six years later: “More than any other modern critic, [Frye] stands at the center of critical activity” (180). In
1976, eleven years after Frye was declared to be a “useless relic,” Harold Bloom remarked that Frye had “earned the reputation of being the leading theoretician of literary criticism among all those writing in English today” (“Northrop Frye”) and a decade later Bloom had not changed his opinion: Frye, he wrote, “is the foremost living student of Western literature” and “surely the major literary critic in the English language” (Salusinszky 58, 62). The judgments of these surveyors of the critical scene from the mid 1960s until the late 1980s are about as far as one can get from the useless relic declaration. And what would Lentricchia do with the fact that at the very time he was engaged in his debunking antics the Anatomy was, as I have said, the most frequently cited book by a writer born in the twentieth century?6

In his foreword to the reissue of the Anatomy in 2000 Harold Bloom remarks that he is “not so fond of the Anatomy now” as he was when he reviewed it forty three years earlier (vii). Bloom’s ambivalence springs from his conviction that there is no place in Frye’s myth of concern for a theory of the anxiety of influence. Frye’s view of influence being a matter of “temperament and circumstances” (vii). Bloom’s foreword, however, is devoted chiefly, not to the Anatomy, but to his own anxieties about Frye’s influence, presented in the context of his well-known disquiet about what he calls the School of Resentment—the various forms of “cultural criticism” that take their cues from identity politics. In the 1950s, Bloom says, Frye provided an alternative to the New Criticism, especially Eliot’s High Church variety, but today he is powerless to free us from the critical wilderness. Because Frye saw literature as a “benignly cooperative enterprise,” he is of little help with its agonistic traditions. His schematizations will fall away: what will remain is the rhapsodic quality of his criticism. In the extraordinary proliferation of texts today, according to Bloom, Frye will provide “little comfort and assistance”: if he is to afford any sustenance, it will be outside the universities. Still, Bloom believes that Frye’s criticism will survive not because of the system outlined in the Anatomy, but “because it is serious, spiritual, and comprehensive” (xii).

There is no denying the importance of the poststructural moment, which has clearly made its presence known in Spain, as the bibliographies of José Ángel García Landa reveal.7 Frye’s late work illustrates clearly that he was quite aware of the dominant modes of inquiry during the last two or three decades of the twentieth century. One runs across occasional comments in his notebooks about his being “old hat,” “a member of an aging chorus” (Late Notebooks 1: 23, 175), and the like. At times he even seems anxious about his position in the contemporary critical world.
I am told that the structure of the Anatomy is impressive but futile, because it would make every other critic a Gauleiter of Frye. People don’t realize that I’m building temples to—well, “the gods” will do. There’s an outer court for casual tourists, an inner court for those who want to stay for communion (incidentally, the rewards of doing so are very considerable). But I’ve left a space where neither they nor I belong. It’s not a tower of Babel: that tries to reach something above itself: I want to contain what, with a shift of perspective, contains it. Why am I so respected and yet so isolated? Is it only because I take criticism more seriously than any other living critic? (Late Notebooks 1:120).

In a notebook entry from the early 1980’s Frye wrote:

My function as a critic right now is to reverse the whole ‘deconstruction’ procedure, which leads eventually to the total extinction of both literature and criticism: people are naturally attracted first, and most, by the suicidal and destructive. (Notebooks on Renaissance Literature 302)

Well, Frye was of course not able to reverse the “whole ‘deconstruction’ procedure.” But if we take a somewhat longer view of things, it seems to me clear that if Frye is no longer at “the center of critical activity,” as he was in the mid 1960s, he still remains very much a containing presence at the circumference. While it is true that graduate courses in critical theory often exclude his work, it is no less true, as a glance at current university catalogues and course descriptions reveal, that both undergraduate and graduate students continue to read his works at a number of major universities. A couple of years ago I did an on-line survey of course descriptions, and I discovered that Frye was on the reading list in English and comparative literature courses at a large number of universities, including Harvard, Yale, Berkeley, Stanford, Chicago, Virginia, North Carolina, Vanderbilt, Pennsylvania, Notre Dame, York, McMaster, Texas, and Concordia. Outside of North America, students were reading Frye at universities in Bucharest, Oslo, Rome, Brussels, Budapest, Prague, Stuttgart, Venice, Lecce (in Italy), Syddansk (in southern Denmark), Lisbon, Rennes (in Brittany), Mainz, Olo-mouc (in the Czech Republic), Brazil, Aalborg (in Denmark), Nanjing and Heilongjiang (in China), Freiburg, Copenhagen, Oviedo (in Spain), Toulouse, and Hoh-Hot (in Inner Mongolia). Bloom’s prediction, then, that Frye will disappear from the universities appears to have not yet begun.

We get similar evidence, at least at the graduate level, when we consider the relatively large number of people who continue to write dissertations in which Frye figures importantly. In 1963 Mary Curtis Tucker wrote the first doctoral dissertation on Frye. The period 1964 through 2003 saw another 192 dissertations devoted in whole or part to Frye, “in part” meaning that “Frye” is indexed as a subject in Dissertation Abstracts International. The
The number of dissertations for each of the decades falls out as follows: 1960s = 5; 1970s = 28; 1980s = 63; 1990s = 68; 2000-2004 = 29. These data obviously indicate that during the twenty year period following the height of the poststructural moment interest in Frye as a topic of graduate research has increased rather than diminished. During the 1980s and 1990s he figured importantly in more than six dissertations per year and for the years 2000-2003, eight per year. In 2003, Frye was indexed as a subject in fourteen doctoral dissertations, which was the highest number for any year, and the majority of these have to do with topics treated in the Anatomy—Menippean satire, romance, myth, genre theory, typological imagery. The two Spanish dissertations devoted completely to Frye are by Julián Rodríguez on the principles of Frye’s theory of literary structure (Autonomous University of Barcelona, 1982) and by Sofía Muñoz Valdivieso’s on Frye’s idea of romance (University of Málaga, 1995). But I have run across eleven other dissertations that have used Frye to explore topics in Spanish literature. The point I want to make is that the interest in Frye in doctoral studies has not abated at all. Whether the geometric progression of this interest in the 1970s and 1980s will level off in the current decade is not clear, but what is clear is that a large number of graduate students and their advisors have not been convinced by the useless relic hypothesis.

Other indicators also suggest increased academic attention to Frye. When Northrop Frye: An Annotated Bibliography was published in 1987, there were eight books devoted in their entirety to his work. Since that time another thirty one have appeared. The two most recent relate Frye’s Anatomy to music and film. And I should not fail to mention the most ingenious application of the Anatomy— a literal appliqué. For their mid term project in a fabric design class at the University of Georgia students were asked to take an old piece of clothing and refurbish it with something unconventional in order to give the item a new life. For her project Amy Brodnax, a sophomore, attached pages of Frye’s Anatomy to the skirt of an old dress with mirrors and aluminum foil at the top (McWane).
Frye continues to wear well, one might say—figuratively and literally. I don’t know what it is about Frye and Georgia. One of the reviews of the Anatomy I ran across some years ago was in Florence Hill Morris’s 1976 column “Fire-side Gardening” in the Augusta [Georgia] Chronicle. After advising her readers to “pore through books on the subject” of foliage and flower arrangement, she proceeded to annotate a list of such books. Included among them is, in a classic case of generic confusion, Anatomy of Criticism, the complete annotation for which is this: “A difficult book to read, but with study the material is most helpful.” I don’t know how to explain this bizarre thirteen word review. Perhaps Florence Hill Morris had remembered what Frye had said in the Second Essay of the Anatomy (72) about books on gardening being an example of verbal structures in the descriptive phase of symbolism.

But to return to the counter evidence for the useless relic thesis: The 1987 bibliography recorded 588 essays or parts of books devoted to Frye, written over the course of forty years. Since that time, more than 950 additional entries (excluding the hundreds of news stories about Frye and reviews of his books) have been added to the bibliography. In other words, during the past two decades about twice as much has been written about Frye than in the previous forty or so years. Of the seventeen symposia and conferences devoted to his work, which have taken place on four continents, thirteen have occurred since 1986: two have been held in China, two in Australia, two in the U.S., seven in Canada, one in Italy, and one in Korea. Of course, what we are doing now will add one more to the list.

Almost all of what has been written about the Anatomy has been within the field of literary criticism. But critic’s reputation and status is also revealed by the extent to which his or her work has been appropriated by those outside the field. In this regard it is worth reminding the death of Frye prophets that his ideas have been applied by philosophers, historians, geographers, anthropologists, political scientists, and by writers in the fields of advertising, communication studies, nursing, political economy, legal theory, organization science, and consumer research.13

The Anatomy was the book that made Frye’s international reputation. In 1964, about the time that, according to Lentricchia, Frye had become a “useless relic,” the German translation of the Anatomy appeared. This was followed on the European continent by the French, Italian, Romanian, Portuguese, Spanish, and Greek translations. In Eastern Europe, one can read the Anatomy in Serbo Croatian, Hungarian, and Czech; in the East, in Japanese, Korean, and Chinese. In 1991 two Arabic translations appeared—one in Libya and the other in Jordan. Altogether, the Anatomy has been translated into fifteen languages. Six of these have appeared since 1990. It
appears, then, that there is no diminishing of the interest in the *Anatomy* outside the Anglo American world. And to judge by the increasing number of translations of all of Frye’s books, the interest in reading him in other languages has been increasing steadily: of the 104 translations into twenty languages, almost three quarters (76) have appeared since 1980.

Finally, pockets of Frye scholars exist in what might at first seem unlikely places. From 1997 to 2004 the late Professor Wu Chizhe of Hoh Hot University in Inner Mongolia translated the *Anatomy* and five of Frye’s other books into Chinese. In Budapest, Sára Tóth has recently completed a dissertation on Frye; in 2003 János Kenyeres published *Revolving around the Bible: A Study of Northrop Frye*; Péter Pásztor has translated *The Great Code* and *Words with Power* into Hungarian; Tibor Fabiny, the dean of the Hungarian Frygians, continues to lecture and publish on Frye; and courses on Frye have recently been offered at two universities in Budapest. In Italy, Korea, and China Frye is frequently taught in Canadian Studies Programs.

Earlier I noted Warren Moore’s woeful observation that readers of Northrop Frye are to be pitied because his works are more or less like alchemical texts, possibly of some historical interest but of no use to the modern reader. Pity is an emotion we feel in the presence of a fallen hero, like Oedipus. I see little evidence that we should be pitied for coming together in a conference like this: I have tried to suggest that the proper answer to Terry Eagleton’s question, “Who now reads Frye?” is “A considerable number.” Even a poststructuralist like Jonathan Culler, who had never been very friendly to Frye’s enterprise, has lately come around to granting that Frye’s vision of a coherent literary tradition is something devoutly to be wished for literary studies.

In Frye’s late work we see very clearly that he knew the ball park in which the game was being played. But he also knew that the rules of the game remained constant. Thus he could write in one of his notebooks from the 1980s.

If there’s no real difference between creation & criticism, I have as much right to build palaces of criticism as Milton had to write epic poems. My whole and part interchange works here too: inside the Anatomy, everyone is a disciple & to some degree a captive of Frye – every writer has a captive audience – but surely one can finish the book & then do as one likes, with something of me inside him. If he doesn’t have something of me inside him, he won’t, at this time of history, have anything of much use to say as a critic. (*Late Notebooks* 1:123)

My own view of this passage, for all of its uncharacteristic immodesty, is that it is true. I have tried to make the case that Frye continues to instruct and
delight. Critical fashions, like literary ones, come and go. But I think we are beyond the time of talking about fashions, for Frye has already entered into the critical tradition. We are today in the same position as Eliot, looking back on Arnold’s *Culture and Anarchy* a half century after it appeared. Eliot, who saw his own work as forming a radical break with the poetry and criticism of the nineteenth century, nevertheless says of Arnold that he “does still hold us… by the power of his rhetoric and by representing a point of view which is particular” (382-83). All of the writing about Frye that I’ve briefly summarized convinces me that Frye also still holds us, and my guess is that as we begin to inch toward the centennial of the *Anatomy*, new readers, with the Collected Works at their disposal, will continue to find instruction and delight in his work.

I conclude by letting Frye have the last word: the final paragraphs of his essay on *Don Quixote*:

One feels at times that Quixote rather enjoys the paradoxical clash of his inner and outer worlds, and that, like so many who have committed themselves to heroism, he finds that the damage he does is something of an end in itself. But, the Don insists, he really has a positive mission: it is to restore the world to the golden age. In a passage of wonderful irony he tells Sancho that the golden age would soon return if people would speak the simple truth, stop flattering their superiors, and show things exactly as they are. The childish element in Quixote, which breaks through in fantasy, believes that the golden age is a wonderful time of make believe, where endless dreams of conquered giants and rescued maidens keep coming true. But then he comes across a group of peasants eating acorns and goat’s cheese, who hospitably invite him to join them, and he suddenly breaks out into a long panegyric about the golden age, which, it appears, was not an age of chivalry at all but an age of complete simplicity and equality. In such a kingdom the social difference between himself and Sancho no longer exists, and he asks Sancho to sit beside him, quoting from the Bible that the humble shall be exalted. The bedrock of Quixote’s mind has been reached, and it is not romantic at all, but apocalyptic. The childishness has disappeared and the genuinely childlike has taken its place, the simple acceptance of innocence.

This dream returns at the end, where Quixote and Sancho plan to retire to a quiet pastoral life, and the author intends us to feel that by dying Quixote has picked a surer means of getting there. With this in our minds, we are not at all surprised that when Sancho, who has been promised the rule of an island, actually gets one to administer, he rules it so efficiently and wisely that he has to be yanked out of office in a hurry before he wrecks the Spanish aristocracy. We are even less surprised to find that Quixote’s advice to him is full of sound and humane good sense. The world is still looking for that lost island, and it still asks for nothing better than to have Sancho for its ruler and Don Quixote for his honoured counsellor. (“Acceptance” 163-64)
Notes

1. Following Lévy-Bruhl, Frye referred to such imaginative identification as participation mystique. On the cave drawings at Altamira and Lascaux, see Myth and Metaphor 132, 193-4; Late Notebooks 1:98, 210, 250, 289, 316, 320, 326, 392, 2:502-3, 515, 527, 535, 552, 586, 718; Words with Power 250.

2. On Don Quixote see also Frye’s essay “The Imaginative and the Imaginary,” in “The Educated Imagination” and Other Writings 433-5.

3. See Appendix A.

4. See Appendix B.

5. See Appendix C.

6. Garfield’s article lists the one hundred most cited authors in the Arts & Humanities Citation Index for 1977 and 1978. The list reveals that in the more than 900,000 entries in the AHCI only Marx, Aristotle, Shakespeare, Lenin, Plato, Freud, and Barthes were more frequently cited than Frye. A second list published by Garfield in the same article shows that for 1978 and 1979 Anatomy of Criticism was the most frequently cited book written by an author born in the twentieth century. Eight years after his initial survey Garfield updated and expanded the list, publishing the results in 1986: Marx remained in first place, followed by Aristotle, Shakespeare, Lenin, Plato, Freud, Barthes, Kant, Cicero, Chomsky, Hegel, and Frye. At the time, then, Frye was the third most-cited author born in the twentieth century.

7. See the entries in García Landa’s bibliography on Spanish poststructuralism.

8. My cursory search of recent catalogues and course descriptions turned up these courses in English (e), comparative literature (cl), and other fields in which Frye was being read: Harvard University (e193); Yale University (e463b), Berkeley (cl100, cl.155) Stanford (e166/266A, e302A, cl369, c 172), University of Chicago (e47200), University of Virginia (e255, e481), University of North Carolina (e027.003), Vanderbilt University (e337a, e105W, cl312, cl314 [course on Frye’s central texts]), University of Pennsylvania (cl360.401), University of Notre Dame (e510), York University (e4109), McMaster University (e798), University of Texas, Austin (e5360), Concordia University (Religion 365). Similar courses can be found in numerous college catalogues.

9. These data include six Ed.D. and two D.L.S. dissertations. While it is difficult to get an accurate count of M.A. theses, fifty one have been recorded from 1967 to 2004.

10. Within the past dozen years the one hundred or so universities where students have completed dissertations in which Northrop Frye is a subject include Harvard, Yale, Princeton, Penn, Chicago, Toronto, Wisconsin, Indiana, Illinois, Ohio State, Virginia, NYU, McMaster, Oxford, and Stockholm.

11. The thirteen dissertations are these: Margarita Caveda Batlle, A Critical Study of Cervantes’ “Entremeses” (Ph.D. dissertation, University of New Mexico, 1980); Julián Rodríguez, Enseñanza de la literatura comparada desde temprana edad hasta la universidad: pautas generales en su estudio y enseñanza a través de los principios estructurales de la teoría de Northrop Frye y maneras posibles de su aplicabilidad (Ph.D. dissertation, Univ. Autonoma de Barcelona, 1982); Margarita Cadena Ponce, La ironia en la poesía de Rosario Castellanos (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Southern California,
12. For the books on Frye, see Appendix D.
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