Christian programs were produced are discussed within financial conditions within which particular serve, however, to diminish the usefulness of its resultant organization of the book around analyses on a strident and elaborate notion of and the existence of national programming and the development of series (dramatic and comedic) has regularly run up against the CBC's reluctance to develop star personas and the fiscal difficulty of producing and testing competing pilots for series programming slots. At the same time, it has weakened the once-productive links between the culture of television programming and that of local or national theatrical and literary activity – links at the root of what Miller sees as exciting and challenging in the programming of the 1980s and 1990s.

If Turn Up The Contrast seems without controversy, this is largely because her proposals for CBC programming recapitulate and endorse many of those put forward over a generation of efforts to improve the system. Her observation that current dramatic programming suffers, not only in comparison to that of two or three decades ago, but relative to the current offerings of PBS or Britain’s Channel 4, is a reminder of a familiar but scandalous fact. It should be noted, as well, that many of the strongest passages of Turn Up The Contrast are those in which Miller argues for continued exposure to the accumulated archive of CBC television drama (something best achieved, Miller argues, through the proposed second channel), less for the evidence such programs provide of lost glories than for the sense of historical continuity which may then be reestablished.

Will Straw  * Film Studies Department Carleton University

**TURN UP THE CONTRAST**
**CBC Television Drama Since 1952**
**MARY JANE MILLER**

Andre Gaudreault
*Du littéraire au cinématographique: Système du récit*
Préface de Paul Ricoeur
Les Presses de l'Université Laval
Meridiens Klincksieck, 200 pp., ISBN 2-7637-7163-7

"Que le cinéma puisse devenir autre chose que cette machine à raconter des histoires, cela n'était pas encore prévu" – Christian Metz

In 1937, the French writer Stendhal observed of his colleague Gustave Flaubert:

"If one could forge in Birmingham or in Manchester store-telling or analyzing machines made out of good English steel that would function all by themselves by unknown dynamics, these machines would operate exactly like M. Flaubert." Stendhal's observation poses the problem of (modern) narrative that has since become the basis for the relatively new human science of narratology, a science whose interrogations begin with the question: "Who speaks in a narrative?"

For there is, at least to the higher forms of discourse that describe themselves as science, something scandalous about all this unexamined yet proliferating babble. While there may be many kinds of narrations, tellings or recountings of events, why is it that only some become narratives; and only some achieve sufficient completeness to become stories? Stories, for instance, can be distinguished by the active participation of the perceiver in "narrativity", what is narrativity? And what are the forms of narrativity? Is it, for instance, a kind of language that would form a systematic whole within the presumed cultural unity of the Western world? Or do the different literary modes (prose, poetry, drama) involve different narrativities? And what of cinematic narrativity, the encounter of story-telling with a real machine, whose accounts Stendhal had foreseen in Flaubert? It is in response to such problems and how they are articulated along with other key related terms (e.g. the narrator), that narratology has developed.

But as with any new science (or perhaps any science), there exists a lack of expert consensus, particularly within the sub-field of film narrative, as to the definition of basic notions, for instance, the narrator in film narrative. Also, any science is to some extent its own mythology, and narratology has been, in this sense, oversimplified by the history of its development out of specifically literary studies. The challenge that prompts André Gaudreault's *Du littéraire au cinématographique* is, on the one hand, to establish the parameters common to the different forms of artistic practice (written, theatrical, filmic) relative to their narrativity, and on the other, to lay the foundations of a narratological theory of cinema. This, then, is the 'theoretical' portion of the system; a second volume in which the system of cinema narrative is more fully applied will follow. Gaudreault argues that the filmic medium constitutes a more complex narratological object than either the written or the theatrical since it results from the combination of the narrative possibilities of both. Cinema combines both the narrativity of the written and Gaudreault calls the "monstration" of the theatrical, deriving from this combinatory cinema's narrative specificity as a system. It is in deploying the systemic nature of cinematographic narrative that Gaudreault demonstrates the theoretical virtuosity that has made him, at 36, one of this country's leading film scholars and Laval University one of the world centres for the study of early cinema. In order to show the perversely original character of the system of film narrative (as opposed, for instance, to the lightness of a written narrative), Gaudreault assembles a battery of theoretical figures whose narratological adventures constitute some of the most fascinating chapters of *Du littéraire au cinématographique*. These figures include the mega-narrator, the filmic narrator, the cinematic monstrosity, the cinematic monstrosity and the profilmic monstrosity – narratological entities necessary to account for the functions of the vast array of machines (cameras, microphones, tape-recorders, editing benches, mixing consoles, projectors and so on) that operate to produce the system of film narrative. For cinematographic language, as Gaudreault points out, came about as the result of both the invention of a process (the camera) as well as the introduction of a procedure (montage of different shots).

More broadly, Gaudreault's deployment of a system of film narrative is accomplished through two moves: a philosophical return to the beginnings of narratology in Plato and Aristotle, and a theoretical-historical return to the early silent cinema of about 1903-1915. Literary critical tradition had set up an unfortunate and apparently irremediable opposition between Platonic mimesis or imitation of action and Aristotelian diégèse or the narrative of a narrator. On the one hand, imitation but no narrator; on the other, a narrator but no imitation. On the basis of the split, narratology had refused any narratological status to theatre because of the absence of a narrator. Rereading Plato (Book X of the *Republic*) and Aristotle (*Poetics*), Gaudreault contends that they've been misunderstood philologically. The Platonic concept of mimesis, in which the poet can both narrate or speak through characters, contains the notion of *lalyp diégèse*, narration without imitation, and that of *mimeis*, narration with imitation. Aristotle, for his part, drops Plato's *lalyp*, and so slides towards the fatal opposition of diégèse and mimesis. This rereading allows Gaudreault to distinguish between mimetic and non-mimetic diégèse as the two fundamental modes of narrative communication, thus establishing a level of narratological equivalence between the