

114303

scene, which does indeed become "more obviously gross" as it progresses. Wall's chink is usually presented in accordance with the direction "Wall holds up his fingers" (V, i, 175-1), added to the text by Capell in 1768. (Quotations are from Professor Peter Alexander's edition (1951).) This direction appears in none of the extant earlier texts. It might be argued that Capell was justified in this addition by Bottom's earlier suggestion that Wall must "hold his fingers thus, and through that cranny shall Pyramus and Thisbe whisper" (III, i, 61-3). But a comparison of the rehearsal scene with the actual performance by the mechanicals shows that none of the lines rehearsed is performed. Furthermore, the play in preparation is so changeable that the parts of Thisbe's father and mother and Pyramus's father, originally assigned to Starveling, Quince, and Snout (II, ii, 50ff.), are dropped from the performance in favour of Moonshine, Prologue, and Wall. Thus Bottom's suggestions about staging, made in III, i, need not be binding upon the performance in V, i, where indeed the mechanicals appear to be ad libbing some of their lines and, from the evidence of these lines, some of their staging as well.

Hence Wall, when called upon to show Pyramus his chink (V, i, 175) indeed respond in confusion by slightly spreading his legs rather than holding up his fingers, a staging which seems appropriate to the increasing frequency of bawdy double meanings which Professor Leech points out. Thisbe would kneel behind him at 186, and Bottom before him at 191. Then, when Pyramus cries "O, kiss me through the hole of this vile wall", and she responds "I kiss the wall's hole, not your lips at all" (199-200), Thisbe would attempt to kiss Pyramus through Wall's legs from behind, presenting us with a comic commonplace reminiscent of *The Miller's Tale* or (perhaps more immediately relevant) of the oath-swearing in *Gammer Gurton's Needle*, where Hodge "kyssoth Diccons breeche" (quoted from J. Quincy Adams, *Chief Pre-Shakespearean Dramas*, II, i, 76).

This was probably the manner in which the Chamberlain's Men staged the scene, and one might conclude that Capell's stage direction ought not be retained in editions of *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. I know of no recent productions that have restored this piece of apparently original staging (perhaps your readers might correct me if there have been any), but a forthcoming production at Glendon College, directed by Professor Michael Gregory, plans to do so, following the bawdy suggestions of the scene to their logical end.

G. B. SHAND,
Department of English, Glendon
College, York University, Toronto 317,
Ontario, Canada.

Automation and the National Libraries

Sir.—In his article (January 15) Maurice Line enumerates the advantages to be gained if regional union catalogues were put into machine readable form and new acquisitions of libraries recorded centrally. This is not, however, as he suggests, still a matter of surmise.

The London and South Eastern Library Region (L.A.S.E.R.) now records English language material published on or after January 1, 1970, on a computer file using Standard Book Numbers as control numbers. The new system, devised in conjunction with B.N.B., requires libraries to notify us of books added to stock merely by a list of S.B.N.s.

In addition L.A.S.E.R. is at present conducting a controlled experiment, using multiple copies of computer-produced location catalogues, in an attempt to test the feasibility of direct interlending between libraries without reference to a centrally housed union catalogue. We are also looking into the possibility of producing this catalogue on microform by computer output microfilming techniques.

This has proved, as Mr. Line surmised, a most promising area for automation, and I am sure that he will be pleased to know that all the advantages which he predicted for the system in his article have in fact been proved by our experience to be correct.

J. M. PLAISTER,
London and South Eastern Library
Region, National Central Library,
Store Street, London, WC1E 7DG.

The Norwegian Capitulation

Sir.—Now that so much wartime history is being rewritten by British authorities, young and old, it is right that they should know of extraordinary developments in Norway recently in regard to this important branch of study.

Sir Llewellyn Woodward's long overdue summary of the British Cabinet

papers for 1940, David Irving on Convoy PO17 and soon his biographies of Hitler and Field Marshal Erhard Milch, Correlli Barnett's military history in general, and particularly Martin Gilbert's next volume of the official Churchill biography—all concern Norway in some degree, great or small. It is therefore desirable that accumulating mountains of Norwegian documentation and writing on Norway 1940-45 should be studied thoroughly despite the language difficulties and in context with the prevailing Norwegian academic climate. This, to say the least, is disturbing.

On September 3, 1970, the State Lawyer Håkon Wiker broadcast over the national television network that massive documented revelations by the State Historian, Sverre Hartmann, concerning the nature and aftermath of the Norwegian and German High Commands' capitulation agreement of June 10, 1940, would be investigated by the national legal authorities (*Aftenposten*, September 4). This investigation will be led by Police Adjutant T. Haukenes of the Criminal Police, it was further reported next day.

On September 26 the national socialist weekly, *Aktuell*, revealed that the senior State Lawyer, L. J. Dørenfeldt, had "given the green light" to the police investigation. This has not been denied since.

Naturally, this prospect has raised a national outcry. Hartmann has described the investigation as "an attack on historical research" and his view is widely held, but not universally.

The opposition has not been ameliorated by Herr Wiker's answer to the question whether the authorities and the police intend to seek the help of qualified historians, notably Professor Magne Skodvin (Contemporary Norwegian History, Oslo University).

Herr Wiker replied: "It is pretty clear that we must have assistance from qualified historians to get to the bottom of the matter [the 1940 capitulation], but which 'qualified historians' I don't yet know."

Concern has been long expressed in the Norwegian mass media about Professor Skodvin's academic approach to the controversial capitulation—in his books and the Law Courts. For instance, his doctorate thesis, *The Struggle over the Occupation Powers in Norway to September 25, 1940* (Oslo, 1956), does not mention the capitulation. Moreover in *Between Neutrality and Alliance* (Oslo, 1968) he misquotes the Defence Chief and Commander-in-Chief, General Otto Ruge, who was left to arrange the capitulation when the Royal Norwegian Government went into British exile on June 7, 1940, so as to suggest that Norway (as a state) remained "at war" whereas Ruge's proclamation on June 9 actually stated that only "Norwegians" were still fighting on other fronts—a fine but vital distinction. Furthermore Professor Skodvin repeated flatly during the re-trial of the former Gestapo Chief, Hellmuth Reinhard, in Karlsruhe (September 21, 1970) that there was no total capitulation—only one between the Norwegian Sixth Division (hitherto under the Allied Commander, Admiral Lord Cork and Orrery) and the Germans in North Norway.

His stand has produced a head-on collision with his fellow state historian, Hartmann: hence the police investigation.

Further topicality to this issue is provided by the impending appearance of the 588-page *Quisling, Rosenberg und Terboven* (Stuttgart) by Professor Hans-Dietrich Looek, which was reviewed at length in *Der Spiegel* on September 7, with copious repercussion in Norway, including the news that his inspiration in this work was none other than the controversial Professor Skodvin.

It has been pointed out in the Norwegian press that the investigation of historical data by the police and the associated threat to the ventilation of historical discoveries, with professional comment by highly qualified historians, such as Sverre Hartmann, amounts to an undermining of paragraph 100 in the written Norwegian Constitution, guaranteeing freedom of expression.

Two of Professor Skodvin's own pupils in his Historical Institute at Oslo University have had the courage to protest against the police action.

Finally, in default of any definitive or convincing historical agreement in Norway on the nature of the 1940 capitulation, unprejudiced by state-employed lawyers or the police, a test case on this touchy subject was submitted to the European Convention on Human Rights at Strasbourg on September 25.

The historical issue is the nature of the exiled Royal Norwegian Government's association with Great Britain from June 10, 1940—later with the United States and the Soviet Union—up to and including the "liberation" period (May 8-November 1, 1945). The legal issue is whether Norway as a state

was "at war" after June, 1940, as has always been maintained officially here, despite academic doubts which have not until now filtered through to the populace or school textbooks.

Further, the legal issue is whether such prominent Norwegians as the late Chief Justice Paal Berg, the late primate Bishop Eivind Berggrav, and their associates committed offences in creating the Administrative Council for the Occupied Territories and thus seeking a *modus vivendi* with the German Occupying Power (April 15 to September 25, 1940) and whether Major Vidkun Quisling committed high treason in seeking a similar *modus vivendi* during his second government (February 1, 1942, to May 8, 1945), likewise his numerous supporters.

Both issues are further complicated by the mysterious disappearance of the original capitulation document from the State archives in 1947, at the height of the "treason" trials, and the State Archivist, Dagfinn Mannsåker, is now looking for it. Also the twenty-five-year-old report of the state Military Investigation Committee, which is widely believed to confirm the totality of 1940 capitulation, is still "top secret".

As the author of two books on Scandinavia during the war and as a participant in the Norwegian Campaign, the "Free Norwegian" activities in Stockholm, the liberation and the Quisling Case—as a journalist—I feel it is my duty to acquaint my fellow non-Norwegian historians with the curious academic situation in this outpost of Western Democracy today.

RALPH HEWINS.

Oslo.

James Joyce

Sir, I wish to disclaim responsibility for the title *James Joyce: the Man and His Works* under which my book *Exploring James Joyce* (first published in 1964 by the Southern Illinois University Press) has been reprinted in paperback by the Forum House Publishing Company. I was unaware of the existence of the new title until I saw a copy of the paperback edition for the first time last October.

In my judgment, anyone who is offered a book with this title has a right to assume that the book combines something like a biography of Joyce with something like a comprehensive survey of his works. My book contains neither, but is instead a selection from my writings on Joyce consisting of an essay on his use of words, an essay on *Stephen Hero*, and five essays on *Ulysses*.

JOSEPH PRESCOTT,
Department of English, College of
Liberal Arts, Wayne State University,
Detroit, Michigan 48202, U.S.A.

Art and Design Education

Sir.—Your reviewer of Mr. Hanne-ma's book on art education, *Fads, Fakes and Fantasies* (*TLS*, January 15) suggests that the Royal Academy should call a congress of all parties interested in art education.

Your readers may be interested to know that we are organizing two symposia on Art and Design Education at the I.C.A. in the Mall on two successive weekends, April 24-25 and May 1-2, 1971, from 10 a.m. to 10 p.m. on each of the four days. The aim is to provide a forum for rational discussion. The first weekend will concentrate largely on the theory of art and design education, and the second will examine how well the existing system provides the kind of education desired. Each weekend will conclude in a formal debate.

The convener is David Warren Piper, senior lecturer at the Institute of Education and a former member of staff at Hornsey. Further details and a list of speakers will be published in due course.

DAVID THOMPSON,
Institute of Contemporary Arts, The
Mall, London, S.W.1.

'The Jews in Soviet Russia since 1917'

Sir.—That standards of scholarly accuracy often slip when certain lively political subjects are being discussed is all too notorious. One of the many services rendered by the *TLS* is to keep a watchful eye on such aberrations. Occasionally, though, your reviewers overlook them, and even appear to connive at them.

An example of such a slip being actually recommended to your readers is to be found in the review (August 21) of *The Jews in Soviet Russia since 1917*,

