C'était beaucoup dire, en effet, après trente ans de crises scolaires du Nouveau-Brunswick à l'Alberta et quatre ans avant l'adoption du Règlement 17 en Ontario.

Dans la présentation des *pageants* et la consécration des Plaines en parc historique, c'est donc l'interprétation de Grey qui prévaut : sur les lieux de la confrontation qui scelle la défaite du Canada français, on célèbre une cohabitation (précisons que Grey s'est contenté ici de repiquer une interprétation déjà formulée dans les discours prononcés aux premières cérémonies du monument des Braves en 1854 et 1855; le gouverneur général n'avait pas tant de génie). Des historiens patentés comme Thomas Chapais, William Wood, Arthur Doughty et Ernest Myrand, étroitement associés à l'organisation du programme, ne voient rien d'incongru à cela parce qu'à leurs yeux et à ceux de leurs contemporains, l'histoire est subordonnée à la paix nationale (p. 194–197). Cela se conçoit à une époque où l'historiographie se voyait au service d'un progrès que l'on croyait irréversible.

Grey et les historiens de son temps appartiennent à une génération pour laquelle l'avenir était radieux. En l'enrobant dans le discours unitaire de la commémoration, on souhaitait ôter au présent ses aspérités, quitte à nier celles du passé. H. V. Nelles est de la génération qui a vu le siècle. Bien sûr, il ne fera pas de prédiction. « More darkly, explique-t-il, I wonder what the celebration of the quatrocentenary of Canada will be like in 2008 — if there should be one » (p. 17). En effet, le Canada est-il né, de toute manière, en 1608?

Patrice Groulx
Université Laval

Pierre Nora — *Realms of Memory: The Construction of the French Past*, vol. III, *Symbols* (English edition edited by Lawrence D. Kritzman, translated by Arthur Goldhammer). New York: Columbia University Press, 1999. Pp. xii, 751.

It is difficult to offer any fresh insight into a work first published, albeit in French, years ago. The task is all the more difficult when the work in question is one so monumental as Pierre Nora's collection, *Realms of Memory.* Here is a collection that has had a profound influence on the ways in which historians have refocused their investigations of the national past. Still, Nora's framework is not without its detractors. More eminent reviewers than I have criticized it for its inattention to the very nature of symbols and their reception, or for Nora's contention that modern society has lost its ability to create new sacred symbols and so must pillage those of the past. My dispute is perhaps less sophisticated, but it nonetheless demonstrates why the argument of *Realms of Memory* cannot be accepted as it stands. Despite these objections, I would have to be particularly obtuse not to pay proper tribute to Nora's contribution to historical studies in the 1990s. Few scholars of memory, nationalism, symbols, or modern France (to name only a few instances) can claim expertise without being touched by a reading of the *lieux de mémoire*. Many of these articles can stand alone. Most are provocative and insightful, and the whole is essential reading.

Perhaps the most surprising aspect of this, the third and final Columbia University Press translation of the original seven-volume *Lieux de mémoire* (Gallimard, 1984–

1992), is what it does not do. Entire themes deleted from the original volumes mean that this collection conveys a fairly one-sided representation of French memory. For instance, we are given all the republican details of liberty, equality, and fraternity, the *tricouleur*, and the Panthéon, but nothing on the Sacré-Coeur de Montmartre, Notre-Dame de Paris, or René Rémond's exploration of France as the eldest daughter of the church. A collection with the bold ambitions of this one ought to strive for greater balance. The original had, but English-language readers will need to await the next phase of translation for a corrective. One hopes that the volumes projected by the University of Chicago Press will balance this impression of France as simply secular, republican, and elitist.

Even more unsettling, given the time since the collection's original appearance, is the number of factual errors remaining in the text. For instance, some figures are clearly reversed, and some descriptions of them inaccurate. Raoul Girardet gets us off to an inauspicious start by describing a figure holding a torch, symbol of the Enlightenment, in figure 1.0. But the figure is clearly not holding a torch. It is an unfortunate error, for Girardet's piece on the *tricouleur* is otherwise stimulating and tightly written. Even the most distinguished historians in France are sometimes a little sloppy. For instance, Mona Ozouf informs us of a secret ceremony for the pantheonization of the remains of the young Republican martyrs Joseph Bara and Joseph-Agricole Viala. In truth, that ceremony was never held. Bara and Viala were closely associated with Robespierre, especially following his speech at the Festival of the Supreme Being. When Robespierre was overthrown on 9 Thermidor, the ceremony that had been scheduled for that day was simply cancelled.

Certainly it is unfair to paint such lapses, however frustrating, as indicative of the thrust of the main argument. For that, we must descend upon Nora's introduction and main contribution, "The Era of Commemoration". Here the issues become far more contentious. Nora argues that it is only in memory that we find a France of cohesiveness and unity. Only in memory does France really exist. "France", as Nora puts it, no longer makes sense as a unit of study and "only a symbolic history can restore to 'France' the unity and dynamism not recognized by either the man in the street or the academic historian" (p. xii). This is perhaps a bit much. To claim that only in memory can France recover its unity is, in some ways, to preclude an understanding of the very competition over the construction and display of symbols that Nora's approach seems to champion. Are there no counter-memories of France to rock this mnemonic unity? Of course there are, but, for Nora, symbols are either imposed or constructed. An imposed symbol, he claims, is "so inherently expressive of [its] own memory" that the politics behind its creation and imposition need not be analysed critically, whereas historians must dissect the various layers of meaning built up in constructed symbols. Imposed memories are not political constructions "because they were an integral part of national memory" (p. x). What is national memory, however, if not a corpus of reminiscences *constructed* through power relationships? The distinction Nora draws is similar to John Bodnar's equally troubling division between "official" and "vernacular" memories. It is sometimes a useful dichotomy, but nonetheless one that attempts to claim a greater legitimacy, purity, or authenticity for one over the other. In Bodnar's case it argues for the spontaneity of

vernacular memory over the imposition of official memory; it is the reverse in Nora's conception. Moreover, this artificial dichotomy would enshrine a canon whose existence Nora will later deny.

Nora is fond of such diadic formulations. In "The Era of Commemoration", he builds another dichotomy between two models for contemporary commemoration. This time, they can be either generation or centennials. Again, the split is between the self-evident and the creative: centennials are obvious commemorations, but generation is an "existential unit that gives shape and meaning to time as it is actually experienced" (p. 613). Their combination, merging the bland, chronological counting of the years and the emotion of people living out their past experiences, has reshaped commemoration. It has subverted the old, national commemoration and its canon, replacing it with one more subject to perpetual revision. (One wonders if that canon was imposed or constructed; if the latter, was it not also subject to revision during its generation?) Somehow this explains the weakness of the national model, which has been overturned by a memorial model that places importance not on the past, but on what we bring to it. Memory has replaced history; our recollections have subverted the imposed, official canon. With this canon gone, the capriciousness of popular politics has replaced the old national unity of France. Thus, Nora can claim that only in memory is France whole. Certainly, this quick overview does not do justice to the complete argument, but it suggests the problem. Nora's dichotomies strike me as artificial. He wants to claim a fundamental rupture, but his collection documents similar patterns in France's past. Michel Pastoureau's story of the Gallic Cock reveals how the French rooster changed its meaning and its allegiances, from a Roman pun, through a Capetian emblem, to the Fifth Republic and the mascot of *Mondial 98*. At each stage, the symbol was generated, imposed, and contested, not according to self-evident meanings, but according to the meanings that people brought to the past. The general thrust of *Realms of Memory* is contradicted by its director.

Alan Gordon
Queen's University

Beryl Satter — *Each Mind a Kingdom: American Women, Sexual Purity and the New Thought Movement, 1875–1920*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1999. Pp. xii, 382.

This is an intellectual history of the "New Thought" movement in turn-of-the-century America. The term "movement" is a bit of a convenience for the historian, for it is an umbrella category that links people who actually would have refused such company in their own time. Beryl Satter groups the most famous of the Christian Scientists — especially Mary Baker Eddy — with those Eddy considered "false lecturers and teachers", a host of former students and others who became her rivals and, after her death, inheritors. Yet Satters sees more similarities than differences here. All of her subjects believed that the "mental or spiritual world was the true reality" while the material world was a "secondary creation of the mind". They also