

CONSTANCY IN THE CANADIAN CANON:
THE RECEPTION HISTORY OF
ROSANNA LEPROHON'S ANTOINETTE DE MIRECOURT
AND WILLIAM KIRBY'S THE GOLDEN DOG

by

Deborah Blacklock

B.A., McGill University, 1981

THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS
in the Department of
ENGLISH

© Deborah Blacklock 1993

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

JULY 1993

All rights reserved. This work may not be reproduced in whole or in part, by photocopy or other means, without permission of the author.

APPROVAL

NAME: Deborah Blacklock
DEGREE: Master of Arts (English)
TITLE OF THESIS: Constancy in the Canadian Canon: The Reception History of Rosanna Leprohon's Antoinette de Mirecourt and William Kirby's The Golden Dog

Examining Committee:

Chair: June Sturrock

Carole Gerson
Senior Supervisor
Assistant Professor of English

Kathy Mezei
Professor of English

Margery Fee
External Examiner
Associate Professor, Department of English
University of British Columbia

Date Approved: July 29/03

PARTIAL COPYRIGHT LICENSE

I hereby grant to Simon Fraser University the right to lend my thesis, project or extended essay (the title of which is shown below) to users of the Simon Fraser University Library, and to make partial or single copies only for such users or in response to a request from the library of any other university, or other educational institution, on its own behalf or for one of its users. I further agree that permission for multiple copying of this work for scholarly purposes may be granted by me or the Dean of Graduate Studies. It is understood that copying or publication of this work for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Title of Thesis/Project/Extended Essay

"Constancy in the Canadian Canon: The Reception History of Rosanna

Leprohon's Antoinette de Mirecourt and William Kirby's The Golden Dog"

Author:

(signature)

Deborah Blacklock

(name)

August 4, 1993

(date)

ABSTRACT

The reception history of Rosanna Leprohon's Antoinette de Mirecourt (1864) and William Kirby's Le Chien d'Or (The Golden Dog) A Legend of Quebec (1877) in English Canada and French Canada reveals an unusual constancy in the Canadian literary canon; for more than a century Kirby's novel has enjoyed higher status than Leprohon's. Canonical theory suggests that since both exist in "classroom" editions their canonical positions should be equivalent; the appearance of Antoinette in the prestigious CEECT format (1989) before The Golden Dog implies that the former has achieved a higher status. Yet research into specific dimensions of canon formation reveals the reverse.

Though changes in literary taste and attitudes towards nation-building and women which inform the opinions of specific readers of a particular era are illuminated by Hans Jauss' notion of the "horizon of expectations" and Wolfgang Iser's hypothesis concerning the interaction between reader and text, their theories do not explain the stability of the relative status of Antoinette and The Golden Dog. Moreover, while the growing number of women and feminists in the academy could be expected to lead to a re-assessment of and subsequent increase in the value of Antoinette, no such change has yet occurred.

Barbara Herrnstein Smith's theory of "contingencies of value," which suggests that canonization is a cumulative process, leads me to hypothesize that in this instance the process itself maintains the stability of the relative status of the novels. For

Antoinette and The Golden Dog, the components of this process are the early English and French reviews, later surveys and reference work entries, introductions to various editions, and recent scholarly analyses. A detailed examination in an historical context of the documents which constitute the novels' reception history reveals that although Antoinette has been "culturally reproduced" almost as often as The Golden Dog, the positive aspect of the frequency of reproduction is, in Antoinette's case, almost negated by the mixed and adverse criticisms found in these documents. And since the accumulated opinions of a century and a quarter are difficult to counter, the relative status of the novels has remained constant.

DEDICATION

I dedicate this work to my supervisor, Dr. Carole Gerson, and my fiancé, Brian. Without their patience, encouragement, and support, I could not have completed this.

I would also like to thank my second reader, Dr. Kathy Mezei for her assistance, and Dr. Margery Fee and Dr. June Sturrock for taking the time to be on my committee.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title Page	
Approval Page	ii
Abstract	iii
Dedication	v
Introduction	1
Chapter One: Beginnings	14
<u>Antoinette's</u> Preface and Early Reviews in English	18
<u>The Golden Dog's</u> Dedication and Early Reviews in English	23
<u>Antoinette</u> and Early Reviews in French	29
<u>The Golden Dog</u> and Early Reviews in French	34
Chapter Two: Surveys	38
Surveys in English	40
Surveys in French	55
Chapter Three: Later Editions	63
Later Editions of <u>The Golden Dog</u> in English	64
Later Editions of <u>Antoinette</u>	70
<u>The Golden Dog</u> and its Later French Edition	76
Chapter Four: Entries in Reference Works	79
Chapter Five: Scholarly Analyses	93
Appendix A - Biographies: Rosanna Leprohon	107
William Kirby	108
Appendix B - Publishing history of <u>Antoinette</u> and <u>The Golden Dog</u>	
<u>Antoinette</u>	109
<u>The Golden Dog</u>	110
Appendix C - The early reviews	
Reviews of <u>Antoinette</u>	111
Reviews of <u>The Golden Dog</u>	112
Works Cited	113
Works Consulted (Partial List)	125

INTRODUCTION

[B]ecause Kirby, though foreign born, was in spirit essentially a genuine Canadian man of letters, we must regard The Golden Dog as more important in the *development* of Canadian fiction than are Richardson's and Rosanna Mullin's [Leprohon's] romances, and as worthy of a more significant status in Canadian creative literature.

(Logan and French Highways of Canadian Literature 1924 [their italics] 94)

The above quotation is not the only place where I have seen Kirby's novel, Le Chien D'Or (The Golden Dog) A Legend of Quebec¹ (1877), placed in comparison with Leprohon's work (such as Antoinette de Mirecourt² 1864), nor the first where his novel is proclaimed the better of the two. But a reading of both novels and the documents which make up their reception history³ reveals that Antoinette has been consistently devalued. The early critics' desire to find a literature appropriate to the new nation of Canada affected the reception of both novels as did a pervasive tendency to dismiss women and their writing. However, though the criteria applied to the novels have changed over the decades, their relative position in the canon has not. I hypothesize that the process of canonization is itself a large part of the cause; the opinions repeated for over one hundred years are difficult to challenge. Thus, in this

¹ The novel shall be hereafter referred to as The Golden Dog.

² Hereafter called Antoinette.

³ Danna McGaw's recent thesis (1991) also reviews the reception history of Antoinette though McGaw does so in relation to James De Mille and Isabella Valancy Crawford. Furthermore, my thesis differs from hers in that I focus on the process of canon-making while hers investigates the biases and colonial insecurities of Canadian critics which kept the three authors noted above on the margins of the canon. Finally, while I gleaned some sources from her bibliography I found the majority on my own. I will review her thesis in more detail in Chapter Five.

thesis, I map the "phases" of canonization which these novels follow (paralleling Barbara Herrnstein Smith's theory which I will discuss more fully later) while also exposing the "horizon of expectations" of various era and genres of English-Canadian and French-Canadian criticism. To achieve the latter goal I include historical and theoretical information appropriate to each chapter. While I scrutinize these various texts more intently than the usual reader, I contend that those facets which I note consciously influence other readers.

A brief synopsis of the novels seems in order at this point.⁴ Leprohon's novel tells of Antoinette, a seventeen-year-old French-Canadian heiress, and her secret marriage to Major Sternfield, an unprincipled English officer, her subsequent suffering, and her eventual happiness through her marriage to Colonel Evelyn. This marriage is expedited by the fact that her childhood friend and her father's choice of a husband for her, Louis Beauchesne, fatally wounds Major Sternfield in a duel and is forced to flee the country. However, most important is the fact that Antoinette and Colonel Evelyn grow to respect each other. The love story is set in Montreal shortly after the British conquest of Quebec (early 1760s) and reflects Leprohon's own situation in the early 1860s when British soldiers were stationed in Montreal because

⁴ I include three appendices after my last chapter so that my readers will be able to easily access certain information which I discuss throughout the thesis. To counter the misinformation found in many of the surveys and reference works, I include brief biographies of Leprohon and Kirby (Appendix A) which are particularly useful for Chapters Two and Four. The publishing history of the novels in Appendix B may illuminate parts of Chapter Three. Appendix C is included for the convenience of other researchers; it is a list of the early reviews (including some not cited in my thesis for reasons of space) of the novels which would be otherwise difficult to locate in the full bibliography.

of the American Civil War. Inserted into this love story is an entire chapter (Chapter 5) devoted to describing the political situation of French-Canadians during the years that followed the Conquest.

Kirby's novel is set in Quebec City before the Conquest (1748) and examines a number of historical personages (Pierre Philibert, Angélique des Meloises, Le Gardeur, Intendant Bigot, Swedish scientist Peter Kalm, La Corriveau, the governor and Caroline de St. Castin) and fictional characters (Amélie de Repentigny and the "belle Josephine"). Against the background of war preparations the novel tells the love story of Amélie and Pierre and two love triangles: Angélique, Le Gardeur and Bigot; and Angélique, Caroline and Bigot. Pierre is the son of the "Bourgeois Philibert," an upright merchant, friend of the ordinary people and enemy of Bigot (the Intendant who exploits the colony for financial gain). Le Gardeur (Amélie's brother) loves Angélique who returns his feelings but rejects love in favour of ambition; her desire to be Bigot's wife (and thus open a path to Versailles) leads her to have Caroline (who loves Bigot) killed. As part of a plot to stop the bourgeois Philibert from interfering in Bigot's swindle of the colony, Angélique incites a drunken Le Gardeur to kill Philibert in the street. Disgraced by the murder of her intended father-in-law by her brother, Amélie retires to a convent where she soon dies. Thus we are shown how the good people of the colony were destroyed by the evil ones and the implication is that the colony itself was destroyed by a few evil individuals.

Kirby's novel is longer (almost 700 pages to Antoinette's slightly more than 200), has more characters, more closely follows the style of Sir Walter Scott (who was very

popular in nineteenth-century Canada), is more overtly historical and has a more complicated plot than Leprohon's. In addition, Kirby's novel makes use of literary allusions, folklore and an abundance of historical detail; these features have contributed to Kirby's acceptance as a "better" writer, but, in fact, they do not necessarily contribute to a better historical romance. Both novels present common Victorian plot devices like the secret marriage, duel and purifying illness in Antoinette and the undetectable poison, "angelic" women and a man's dissipation due to unrequited love in The Golden Dog. However, I find that Antoinette's struggle to satisfy her personal desires and her conscience at the same time makes her a full character while Kirby's characters (with the possible exception of Angélique) seem one-dimensional. I further find that Leprohon's novel captures the "soul" of the eighteenth century and the people who lived at that time more than Kirby's work and that Antoinette transcends time; the "lessons" in the novel are applicable not only to the era from which Leprohon wrote (1860s), but to any time and place where a conquered people find themselves attracted to the conquerors. For these reasons I think Antoinette should have an place in the canon at least equal to that of The Golden Dog. At this point I must acknowledge my bias; I prefer Antoinette to The Golden Dog. Furthermore, while it may seem contradictory to proclaim my prejudices and then to criticize the opinions of others, I would like to point out that my aim is to analyze the critics' views not argue their right to have them.

Since a reading of the novels suggests that The Golden Dog is not a better novel than Antoinette, I turned to theory to explain why the latter has been consistently

undervalued. I found that Hans Jauss' "horizon of expectations," or the "sum total of reactions, prejudgments and other behaviour that greet a work upon its appearance" (1982, xii) explains changes like the sudden lack of interest in Antoinette (after 1901) and The Golden Dog (after 1926) from French Canada after decades of popularity in translation (both were originally written in English). So does Wolfgang Iser's hypothesis that "central to the reading of every literary work is the interaction between its structure and its recipient" (1978, 20). However neither of these theories explain why the relative status of Antoinette and The Golden Dog in the Canadian canon has been consistent across the generations; this stability is revealed by the fact that even as recently as the 1980s more serious attention was given to Kirby's novel than Leprohon's.⁵ I do not claim that The Golden Dog has always been treated well and Antoinette poorly, only that overall Kirby's book has been dealt with more thoughtfully than Leprohon's.

Since reception theory does not provide the answer, I turned to theories about the canon for an explanation. Most critics accept that the literary canon consists of "that set of authors and works generally included in basic . . . literature college courses and textbooks, and those ordinarily discussed in standard volumes of literary history,

⁵ There are two recently published works, both of which are examined in Chapter Five, which may indicate that a change in Antoinette's status is in progress: Danna McGaw's M.A. thesis (1991) and Silenced Sextet edited by Carrie MacMillan, Lorraine McMullen and Elizabeth Waterston (1992). However, it is too soon to be sure.

bibliography or criticism" (Lauter 1983, 435)⁶; or, as Leslie Fiedler succinctly puts it, "'literature' is effectively what we teach in departments of English" (1982, 58). Thus both novels have canonical status since both have been published in a "classroom" edition by the New Canadian Library (NCL).⁷ Antoinette has also been released by the prestigious Centre for Editing Early Canadian Texts (CEEECT) who are currently preparing a definitive edition of The Golden Dog (CEEECT Newsletter 3 [1992] 2-3).

However, if the form of the canon is determined by the curriculum, its function is to provide "a means by which culture validates social power" (Lauter 1983, 435); this power has been primarily in the hands of men and frequently "tailored" to "fit the country's immediate political concerns and current social ideology" (Gerson "Changing Contours" 1988, 888). Yet some "political concerns" do endure and nationalism⁸ is one of them; Leprohon herself promoted Antoinette as "essentially Canadian." Interestingly enough, Leprohon evinced more confidence concerning

⁶ Donna Bennett, Virgil Nemoianu and Wendell Harris are three of the dissenters; Bennett claims that there are many different kinds of canons (1991, 133), Nemoianu distinguishes between curriculum and canon (1991, 219) while Harris cites Alistair Fowler's six canons and adds four of his own of which the "pedagogical canon" is one (1991, 112-113).

⁷ One has to be careful about interpreting details such as the fact that the most recent NCL publishing list includes The Golden Dog but not Antoinette. This could be taken as an indication the former novel is more in demand, but in actuality Kirby's novel is still on the list because there is a backlog of stock and Leprohon's novel is off the list because a new version with a new afterword is being prepared (information from David Staines [General Editor of NCL] via Carole Gerson 13 May 1993).

⁸ I use the terms "nationalism" and "nationalistic" to refer to the ideological creation, definition, and deliberate promotion of Canada as a "nation."

Canadian literature three years before Confederation than many critics have since that time; in 1929 Douglas Bush asked if there is a Canadian literature, in 1972 Atwood suggested that Canadians do not know their literature and unless we learn "we will not survive" (19), and Linda Hutcheon claimed in 1990 that Canada is "[o]bsessed (still) with articulating its identity" (9).⁹ And though some critics like John Metcalfe may deplore the nationalistic aspect of Canadian literature and criticism (1988, 7)--a sentiment which was heard as early as in 1922 when critic Edmund Broadus claimed that most "criticism" of Canadian literature was "puffery" which kept literature in the country from developing properly (21-22)--most critics would probably agree with Tracy Ware that "nationalism is a part of the context of Canadian criticism"; not "that nationalism can or should determine evaluations, but that it determines the selection of subjects and texts" (1991, 491).

Moreover, as Margery Fee points out in her PhD dissertation (1981), though the rationale behind nationalism has changed over the decades the attempt to define Canada has always played a role in literary criticism in this country (276). In other words, the practice of judging a work by its "Canadian-ness" (Surette 1991, 17; Bennett 1991, 131) has always been in place. However, this fact does not explain the relative status of Antoinette and The Golden Dog; for, Logan and French

⁹ In Imagined Communities Benedict Anderson claims that "the nation is always conceived [of] as a deep, horizontal comradeship" (1983, 16). If one accepts his definition one finds that Canada has never been a nation since no such sense of comradeship between the English and the French has ever existed (as my comparison of the reception history of these novels in French and English Canada reveals). This fact may partially explain the ongoing "identity crisis."

notwithstanding, it is difficult to see how Kirby's historical romance based on events in Quebec in 1748 can be considered more "Canadian" than Leprohon's novel set in the Quebec of the mid-eighteenth century. Therefore, other factors must be involved; one of these is that traditionally a male elite has made the decisions concerning literature in Canada. Carey Kaplan and Ellen Cronan Rose locate this elite in the academy (1990, xvii), while English professors are specifically named at least twice as the canon-makers in Canada (Matthews 1991, 155; Gerson "Canon between the Wars" 1991, 47). Gerson also adds publishers and editors to English professors as the creators of the Canadian canon between the wars, but as will be shown, the three groups are highly interrelated.

Furthermore, feminist critics have noticed how the (primarily) male academy tends to prefer works which incorporate masculine interests. For example, Gerson cites "the still prevalent modernist critical embargo on 'feminine' concerns and the subsequent demotion of social and domestic issues as 'sentimental' (and not explicitly 'Canadian')" ("Canon between the Wars" 1991, 47). Nina Baym makes the point more specifically: "a preference for stories about whaling rather than housekeeping . . . may well have operated unjustly to exclude women's books from serious critical consideration" (1977, 215). Lorraine Weir even goes so far as to label those interests and preferences as "misogyny" (1988, 31). Furthermore, Helsinger, Sheets and Veeder observe that during the nineteenth-century "Critics direct women to the areas they presumably know best--the manners of society and the affairs of the heart; however, the authors who follow their advice often discover that novels on the first

subject are considered trivial, while novels on the second are dangerous" (3: 1983, 53). In this paraphrase of Mary Ellmann, Toril Moi shows that the same attitudes are still in force in 1988:

male reviewers just cannot attach the same degree of authority to a voice they know to be female. Even when they do give a good review to a woman they automatically select adjectives and phrases that tend to make the woman's [work] charming and sweet (as women are supposed to be), as opposed to serious and significant (as men are supposed to be). (35)

Moreover, Kaplan and Rose note that "although feminist scholarship has challenged, it has not succeeded in transforming the academy" (1990, xix). Given the extensive role of women academics like Gerson and Weir in Canada (though overall women are still in the minority), one must ask why it has not succeeded; why has Antoinette maintained a lower canonical status than The Golden Dog?

I believe that part of the answer lies in the actual process of canonization.

Richard Ohmann proposes a model by which the modern canon in the United States was shaped--the work becomes a bestseller, it is reviewed in the New York Times, then incorporated into the curriculum (1987). But this model cannot be applied to Antoinette and The Golden Dog because the theory does not take into consideration the fact that canonical status accumulates over time. Barbara Herrnstein Smith offers the most helpful model of canon-formation to date. Smith asserts that a literary work

that performs certain desired/able functions particularly well at a given time for some community of subjects . . . [will be] more frequently read or recited, copied or reprinted, translated, imitated, cited, commented upon . . . in short, culturally re-produced--and thus will be more readily available to perform those or other functions for other subjects at a subsequent time. (1988, 48)

From this "desired/able" state (which both Antoinette and The Golden Dog achieved),

Smith suggests that a work may take one of two "trajectories." The first trajectory involves a work which no longer performs any "desired/able" functions either because of new competition or changing sensibilities. Such a work will no longer be "culturally re-produced" and will fade from view. Smith adds, however, that a work which has taken this trajectory may be found "desired/able" at a later time either as a relic or an "unjustly neglected masterpiece" and will enter the second trajectory (48-9). Antoinette roughly fits into this category.

The second trajectory occurs when a work continues to perform some "desired/able" functions (though not necessarily the same ones as originally) over time and given changing circumstances. A work following this trajectory will "continue to be cited and recited, continue to be visible and available to succeeding generations of subjects, and thus continue to be culturally re-produced" (49). The Golden Dog fits here. Smith also notes that the longer a work remains within the canon the more secure it is from extinction (49). She posits two causes of this trend:

For one thing, when the value of a work is seen as unquestionable, those of its features that would, in a noncanonical work, be found alienating . . . will be glozed [sic] over or backgrounded [and] [s]econd, . . . it will also begin to perform certain characteristic cultural functions by virtue of the very fact that it *has* endured. (49-50)

These trajectories suggest that once in the canon all works have the same relative status, but they do not. For example, the fact that Antoinette has been released by the CEECT signals that the novel merits serious attention, yet Stockdale's preface (which I analyze comprehensively in Chapter Three) makes it clear that the novel is not to be treated seriously. In effect, one finds the cumulative effect that Smith

describes (citation, re-citation, etc.) takes on an inertia-like quality; once a work is established in a canon it is difficult to remove, and once outside a canon, it is very difficult for a work to be "reclaimed."

The reception of the two novels in question (in their original English and in translation) in Quebec provides a parallel yet unique conundrum; the relative status of The Golden Dog and Antoinette is similar to that in English Canada, yet after enjoying decades of popularity (Antoinette was even more popular in French Canada than in English Canada from approximately 1864 to 1901 when the stage version of a translation was produced) both novels virtually disappear from the French-Canadian canon. Of course, a study of the novels' reception in French Canada must acknowledge the issues around translation. For instance, Jacques Gouin reveals that from 1850 to 1867 a revival of Quebec cultural life included a surge in French-Canadian translators (1977, 31) and cites as evidence Le May's translation of The Golden Dog and "la traduction des romans de sa belle-soeur Rosanna Leprohon par Joseph-Édouard Lefebvre de Bellefeuille, seigneur des Mille-îles" (31).¹⁰ Interestingly, Gouin seems to equate translation with translation from English to French without acknowledging the implications of such an equation, implications which do, however, interest Laurent Mailhot. His "Traduction et «nontraduction»: L'épreuve du voisin étranger dans la littérature québécoise" (1987) is an exploration of the psychological and political ramifications of translation, particularly the

¹⁰ I include the quotation because Gouin is in error; de Bellefeuille is Leprohon's nephew-in-law not her brother-in-law, and though he translated Leprohon's other novels, Joseph-Auguste Genand, not de Bellefeuille, translated Antoinette.

emphasis on translation from English to French. He notes, for example, that "Le Canadien du XIXe siècle prendra ainsi l'habitude, littéralement et littérairement, de se voir par les yeux de l'autre" (26). Leprohon's works in general and Kirby's The Golden Dog in particular, are named as examples of non-*québécois* sources from which French-Canadians have taken their identity in the past. Mailhot later claims that due to this tendency of French-Canadians to accept others' definitions of themselves, "Les problèmes d'identité et d'altérité sont en effet fondamentaux, sans compter ceux, corollaires, de fidélité et de trahison" (42).

Loosely following chronological order, I begin by examining Leprohon's preface, Kirby's dedication and the early reviews in Chapter One, surveys in Chapter Two, the introductions¹¹ to the later editions and the reviews they generated in Chapter Three, entries in reference works in Chapter Four and scholarly analyses in Chapter Five. I have organized the material according to what I see as "phases" of canonization (the last four of which represent various activities of the academy: surveys, later editions, entries in reference works and scholarly analyses). Each phase offers a different insight into the process of canonization and together they create a network of some strength.

Reviews, surveys and later editions written in French will be presented separately from those in English to acknowledge the separate concerns of French-Canadians.

¹¹ Like Frank Davey (1990) I have found that prefaces (and introductions) bind a text to a single possible meaning and like him I explore the language of those items to determine the meaning being given. However, I extend this exploration to include entries in reference works, scholarly analyses and reviews.

However, the authors of the reference work entries often write for both French and English reference books and so entries in the two languages are integrated in Chapter Four. Finally, the French scholarly analyses do not significantly differ from those written in English (at least no more than the English ones differ from each other) and so again studies written in French are integrated with those written in English.

CHAPTER ONE: BEGINNINGS

Leprohon's Preface, Kirby's Dedication and the Early Reviews

Leprohon's preface and Kirby's dedication as well as the first reviews of the novels together form part of the novels' earliest reception. The introductory statements by the authors themselves are important because they are echoed by the reviewers. The time frame covered will be the period from 1864, when Antoinette was first published, to 1906, the year Kirby died. Also, I will deal with the French reviews separately from the English ones not only because of the language differences, but also because the French-Canadian reviewers tend to have significantly different nationalist concerns from those of their English counterparts.

But before entering into the reviews themselves, I wish to ground them in a brief outline of the "horizon of expectations"--the historical events and the prevalent attitudes towards the genre of the novel and women writers and towards women's writing--into which the novels and the reviews were written. This information is important for a clear understanding of the attitudes of the authors and their reviewers. In 1864, when Antoinette de Mirecourt was published, "Canada" referred not to a country but to two parts of a British colony--Canada West, now Ontario, and Canada East, now Quebec. That same year the founding fathers met in Quebec to debate the union of the two Canadas. While those two events were probably coincidental, Leprohon likely knew about the "Annexation Manifesto" suggesting that the British colony unite with the United States which had been published in the Montreal Gazette

in 1849; she lived in Montreal and would have been twenty years old at the date of publication. As a merchant's daughter, she probably also knew that Montreal and Toronto merchants were amongst the foremost advocates for a union of Canada East and Canada West during the 1860s. So, while Antoinette probably was not written in relation to the talks going on in Quebec City that year, its "horizon of expectations" included awareness of two conflicting possible movements--union with the United States and union of the colonies as a new "nation." Leprohon responded by uniting French Canada and Britain through her characters Antoinette and Colonel Evelyn.

The Golden Dog, on the other hand, does not attempt any union. During the period when Kirby worked on the novel, 1865 to 1873 (Pierce Portrait 1929, 247), Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia joined to form the Dominion of Canada.¹² The novel was first published in 1877--ten years after Confederation. However, the intervening decade was an unsettled time for Canada. The first Riel rebellion occurred in 1869 and though the Manitoba Act (1870) temporarily gave the new province most of what it wanted--language and religious freedom--Louis Riel himself was forced to flee the country. Riel was both a hero to the French and a villain to the English; thus relations were strained between the two largest provinces in Canada. Furthermore, the decade was one of economic hardship so that many Canadians were forced to go to the United States to find work. Even the "Canada First" movement was divided into continentalist and imperial federation factions.

¹² "Dominion" was a term coined to indicate that Canada was no longer a colony but still legally tied to Britain in many ways.

Once again a tension can be seen between French and English Canada and between those who wanted ties primarily with Britain and those who wanted stronger ties with the United States; Kirby responded with a portrayal of an Edenic Quebec, one filled with angels and devils, perhaps to remind English Canada that Quebec did have intrinsic value. Or, perhaps, he simply appropriated Quebec history for his story because it most closely fulfilled the requirements of the historical novel as demonstrated by Sir Walter Scott.

The events of the years from 1877 to 1906 included the publication of The Golden Dog (1877), Rosanna Leprohon's death (1879), the completion of the transcontinental railway (1886), the second Riel Rebellion (1885) (the former physically united British Columbia and the rest of Canada while the latter caused a rift between the French and English speakers in the country), the banning of French in Manitoba schools (1890), the discovery of gold in the Yukon (1896), the Boer War (1899-1901), the Alaska border debate (1903), the creation of the provinces Saskatchewan and Alberta (1905), and Kirby's death (1906).

However, while the "horizon of expectations" changed extensively in terms of Canada, the view of woman stayed essentially the same--Victorian and restrictive. As Helsinger et al suggest (see my p. 8), many of the reviews of Antoinette praise Leprohon for her knowledge of the domestic sphere (the proper place for a woman) while sometimes subtly suggesting that sphere is of little importance. There is also some indication that her intended audience, young women, had little prestige as well. Even the language used to describe Antoinette is different, more "feminine" and

"genteel" and less serious than that used to discuss Kirby (as Ellmann suggested, see my p. 8).

Another bias was toward the novel form itself. As Carole Gerson points out, the Victorian Canadian's attitude toward fiction "resembled the attitude toward alcohol: nearly everyone indulged, but the practice was officially condoned for medicinal purposes only" ("Reception of the novel" 1988, 96). One sees this attitude throughout the reviews; thus Antoinette is dismissed as "light" entertainment redeemed only by its moral and nationalistic content, while The Golden Dog is repeatedly presented as an historical text. Most interesting, however, is the repetition of Leprohon's deprecating attitude toward Antoinette evinced in her preface. A number of scholars have investigated the role of the literary preface and they agree that the primary function of the preface is to direct the reading of the work (Michon 1990; de Zepetnek 1990; MacDonald "Reading Between the Lines" 1990; Purdy 1990; Simon 1990). MacDonald further notes that nineteenth-century Canadian prefaces tend to emphasize the nationalistic aspects of the work (30), and Gerson finds that women authors of that century use a diffident tone when discussing their abilities as writers ("Presenting Face" 1990, 57-8). Leprohon's preface is therefore a fairly typical example of one written by a nineteenth-century Canadian woman author; more significantly, her position is echoed in the reviews to an extent which is not explained by "horizon of expectations" alone.¹³ On the other hand, Kirby's

¹³ Though the studies I mention all express the idea that the role of the preface or introduction is to direct the reading of the work, none that I have found investigate the extent to which that direction is followed in documented readings such as reviews.

dedication could be seen as a proclamation of value which was also echoed by his reviewers.

Antoinette's Preface and Early Reviews in English

Leprohon's preface, in its entirety, reads as follows:

The simple Tale unfolded in the following pages, was not originally intended to be issued with any prefatory remarks. Advised, however, that it is usual to do so, the author, having no wish to deviate from the established custom will merely say:

Although the literary treasures of "the old world" are ever open to us, and our American neighbours should continue to inundate the country with reading-matter, intended to meet all wants and suit all tastes and sympathies, at prices which enable every one to partake of this never-failing and ever-varying feast; yet Canadians should not be discouraged from endeavouring to form and foster a literature of their own.

More than one successful effort towards the attainment of this object has been made within the last few years, and more than one valuable work, Canadian in origin, subject, and sympathies, has been produced and published among us. To every true Canadian this simple fact must afford no little gratification, and any fresh contribution will not prove unwelcome. Therefore, remembering that the smallest stone employed always helps a little in the construction of even the loftiest building, the author, not altogether without some hope of a favourable reception, ventures on introducing to the public this work; satisfied that if ANTOINETTE DE MIRECOURT possesses no other merit, it will, at least, be found to have that of being *essentially Canadian*" (my italics [1864] 1989, 1).

Leprohon begins by proclaiming her novel a "simple Tale." She then reveals herself to be uncertain about the ways of publication since she had to be advised to write prefatory remarks. At first glance this statement sounds ironic since Antoinette is not Leprohon's first published work or even her first novel; however it is one of the few published in book form rather than serialized and the only one with a preface. Later she compares her novel to "the smallest stone" used in building and

finally repeatedly names as the novel's strength the fact that it is Canadian: even if it "has no other merit, it will, at least, be found to have that of being essentially Canadian" (1). I repeat, these aspects are not uncommon to prefaces of the nineteenth century but they are particularly important given the fact that the reviewers of Antoinette echo Leprohon's view.

This trend can be seen even in the first review to be discussed, The Quebec Morning Chronicle (29 Mar. 1864: 2), which preceded the actual publication of Antoinette. The reviewer begins the article with the statement that "The English reading public of Canada will soon have to thank the talented authoress of which Montreal is proud for a thrilling tale of Canadian life." He¹⁴ later notes that, "Mrs. Leprohon, despite her name, is, as everyone knows, an English lady, whose graceful pen has contributed in no inconsiderable degree to Canadian literature" (2). It is intriguing that the reviewer feels it necessary to remind the readers what "everyone knows;" obviously whether one is English-Canadian or French-Canadian matters, at least to this reviewer. This short article also piques the reader's sense of adventure (it's a "thrilling" tale), proclaims the refinement of the novelist and the novel ("graceful" pen and "most attractive" novel), and even promotes snobbishness (the "best known citizens" are on the subscribers' list). But never is the novel discussed as a serious work of literature, and when a work is not discussed for its literary merits one tends to assume that the work has none.

¹⁴ Given that few women wrote reviews at this time, I feel that it is safe to assume that the writers are male and shall refer to them as "he" unless there is evidence to the contrary.

The other English reviews follow the same pattern; for example, the review in The True Witness and Catholic Chronicle runs as follows:

The object of the *amiable* and accomplished writer of this *pleasing* story is to do her part towards fostering and encouraging a *Canadian* literature, racy of the sod [soil?]¹⁵--and she has done her part well.

Antoinette de Mirecourt is an interesting well-told story, and we heartily commend it to the notice of our readers, trusting that Mrs. Leprohon will not desist from her literary labors. (my italics, 8 July 1864: 5)

This review mostly promotes the Canadian aspect of the novel and seems to be encouraging; the reviewer points out that the novel is interesting and well-told, statements which indicate a dignified analysis of a work, but he also found it necessary to point out that Leprohon is "amiable." And while "pleasing" is not negative, it is not a strong recommendation either. Nor is the reference to Leprohon as the author of "so many pretty poetical compositions" in the review in the Journal of Education for Lower Canada (8 July 1864: 99). However this reviewer also notes another frequently-mentioned facet of the novel, its morality: "the moral of the tale is quite as applicable to our own days as to the historic times in which the scene is supposed to be enacted" (99).

One review of Antoinette in English makes direct reference to Leprohon's preface; the reviewer states: "This 'Simple Tale' as the authoress modestly styles it in the little preface which ushers in the book . . ." (Montreal Gazette 13 Sept. 1864: 2). Thus he combines "simple," "modest" and "little" in the same sentence to evoke

¹⁵ The original article is blurred and so I am not sure if the word is "sod" or "soil." However, the phrase, "racy of the sod (or soil)" derives from the French word *racine* meaning root, and therefore the critic is commenting on the Canadian-ness of the novel's subject matter.

a diminutive image which goes beyond Leprohon's own self-deprecation. The review, which is quite long, includes a number of phrases which are subtly denigrating. For instance, the reviewer points out that the novel has "no bewildering plot to puzzle the fancy or addle the reader's brain" implying either that reader's brains are easily addled, or that the novel is perhaps too simple. The reviewer follows by saying that "the work is not only pleasantly readable, but highly interesting. Youth especially will find it so." "Highly interesting" sounds very positive, except when it is coupled with "pleasantly readable" and associated with the presumably less discerning tastes of "youth." He goes on to associate this work by implication with "the mass of sensation novels" (of which this is a better than usual example), but his bias becomes clearer when he reveals that the novel is not meant to be interesting just to any youth, but to "the generation of girls now budding into womanhood, or about venturing [sic] on this world's busy life." This "pleasantly readable" but not "addling" tale is most appropriate for girls. Thus the reviewer reveals his low opinion of the readership as well as the novel.

The closing statements encapsulate his attitude which is similar to that of the other reviewers of the novel. He states that:

It is just the book for a nice little gift, a pleasant trip, or holidays in the country. . . . We believe--at least we sincerely desire and hope--that this story will become popular, and that the publication may have such a full measure of success as will tend to stimulate Canadian authorship, and to encourage the fair authoress to further efforts with her facile pen. (2)

Again, the use of diminutive adjectives like "nice little" gift, and "facile" pen, while sounding positive, signals that this novel is not to be confused with "Literature."

Finally, I wish to point out that this reviewer, like the others, values the work for its contribution to Canadian literature. However, in this case the reviewer hopes that the success of the novel will serve as a stimulus to other authors first, and then to Leprohon's continued writing.

The review in The Saturday Reader (9 Sept. 1865: 4) has the dubious honour of being the most jaundiced of all the reviews of Antoinette. The title chosen to head the review, "The Old Thing," indicates the reviewer's attitude toward the novel. The review opens as follows:

Having a bad memory for names and dates, we are unable to say who wrote the first romance, and, in like manner, we cannot tell our readers the particular day of the week, and year on which it was issued. We are also unable to say whether it was the first, second, or third novel that contained the story of a Secret Love, a Secret Marriage, a Duel and a Wedding. Certain it is that very early in the history of written romance, Secret Love, Secret Marriages, Secret Duels and Public Weddings became staple commodities in the world of fiction; and with due respect for ancient custom, Mrs. Leprohon has travelled upon the beaten track with commendable rectitude.

Antoinette de Mirecourt is a historical romance. It is purely Canadian, treating of Canadian persons and places, appealing to Canadian sympathy.

(4)

Again, the reader is given a concatenation of dismissive comments along with an emphasis on the book's Canadian-ness. Here, however, the repetition of "Canadian" three times in a single sentence makes it sound as if that nationalism was yet another limiting feature, which contradicts most of the other reviewers who saw the novel's Canadian-ness as one of its saving graces. The article proceeds in the same tone as it began. For example, the reviewer's description of the characters is quite sarcastic; Louis Beuchesne is called "This convenient decoy duck," and Antoinette's second

husband, Colonel Evelyn, is introduced as "Colonel Cecil (Cecil of all names, how sweet) Evelyn (Evelyn of all names, how original!) a stoical member of the British aristocracy, who was disappointed in love" (4).

Given the reviewer's attitude so far, it is difficult to know how to read his statement that "we can confidently call it our best Canadian novel, *en attendant mieux*" (4). But not content to end on this very dubious note, the reviewer then praises the quality of the translation into French by M. Genand, summarises the novel as "a lesson against foolish and inexperienced young girls forming senseless attachments with any handsome young fop they may meet," and ends with a complaint that "the romantic young reader" will not see the true message because Antoinette marries the man she loves in the end. Overall, this reviewer does not seem to find much to like about the novel or its readership.

The Golden Dog's Dedication and Early Reviews in English

Kirby, unlike Leprohon, did not write a preface but only a dedication.¹⁶

Furthermore, he dedicated The Golden Dog to a woman whose name and work would be known only to a relatively small number of people, Miss Rye¹⁷ (though that

¹⁶ The Page edition (1897) does include a preface signed by Kirby but he wrote it at the insistence of the publisher (who wanted to avoid copyright problems) and under false pretexts; Page promised not to make any changes but in fact cut the novel considerably without Kirby's knowledge or approval (Brady "Bibliographical Essay" 1976, 36-37; Pierce Portrait 1929, 253-255). Since Kirby did not write the preface of his own volition I do not include an analysis of it.

¹⁷ Miss Rye dedicated her life to bringing destitute children from Britain to Canada where they were adopted into Canadian families supposedly to the benefit of

dedication is specifically referred to in the review in the Montreal Daily Witness 9 Mar. 1877: 2). The very lack of a preface to tell the reader how or why to read this novel announces the author's opinion that no such explanation is necessary, and that proclamation of worth is picked up by the reviewers just as Leprohon's statements had been echoed in the reviews of Antoinette. For instance, The Golden Dog is, from the earliest reviews, treated like a source of historical facts; the review in the Toronto Mail (4 Apr. 1877: 2) expects that The Golden Dog "will be considered to be not without its uses as an historical study." Moreover, instead of discussing Kirby's background or the list of his subscribers as did the reviewer of Leprohon in the Morning Chronicle (29 Mar. 1864: 2), this reviewer discusses the novel as a serious work; it is "interesting," shows "good insight," and could be useful as "an historical study" as well as being a "creditable" romance.

The Quebec Morning Chronicle's review of The Golden Dog (7 Apr. 1877: 1) focuses on the novel's literary merits as well.¹⁸ LeMoine also discusses the historical accuracy of the novel and adds some comments on Kirby's characterization: "Though gifted with much imagination, a graceful pen¹⁹, rare descriptive powers, instead of creating entirely ideal beings, he has preferred calling forth from the page of history men and women of the past, in flesh and blood." LeMoine adds that "The

the children (Pierce Portrait 1929, 242-3).

¹⁸ Though unsigned, the review has been attributed to James LeMoine, a friend of Kirby's (Hayne "Le May's French Translation" 1981, 51).

¹⁹ This is one of the rare instances when such a "feminized" term is applied to Kirby.

great value of the Chien d'Or, consists in being an elegant compendium of Canadian customs and Norman and Brittany usages transplanted here, artistically woven with historical incidents," speaks of "the masterly skill" of Kirby's characterization and "his magic touch," and ends by mentioning the debt that Quebec City owes and will continue to owe Kirby for the "flood of tourists" sure to come and spread "gold dust." Only that last sentence with its appeal to the mercenary seems out of place in a serious discussion of a work of literature unless one remembers that during the nineteenth century "tourists" tended to be aristocratic (or at least middle-class) individuals who visited historical and picturesque locales to complete their education; from this point of view, the promotion of Quebec City as a stop on the North American "Grand Tour" gives the city prestige.

The next review, also unsigned, has been attributed to the editor of the magazine and another friend of Kirby's, the Rev. William Henry Withrow (Hayne "Le May's French Translation" 1981, 52). Thus it is not surprising that The Canadian Methodist Magazine (Apr. 1877: 378-380) devoted a great deal of space to its review of The Golden Dog, or that the novel is highly praised. I would like to note at this point that Kirby's novel is being consciously promoted by his friends (two of the most favourable French reviews are also written by friends) in unsigned pieces which would be taken as "objective" reviews, while the only reviewer associated with Leprohon is her nephew-in-law de Bellefeuille who, it will be shown, was not swayed by family ties.

Withrow's agenda to promote the novel is shown by his comments; he notes that

"Mr. Kirby writes in hearty sympathy with that brave French population"²⁰ and that Kirby "portrays with graphic vigour" the acts of Intendant Bigot. This, Withrow announces, is a novel to be taken seriously. He furthers that impression by discussing the historical detail which is incorporated into the novel: "The amount of recondite learning, the familiarity, for instance, with the technicalities of French legal and astrological lore, is quite extraordinary" (378). Withrow also refers to the "extreme beauty of the literary style" which proves that "it is a work of no ordinary genius" (379). Rather than being praised for having no "addling" plot as was Antoinette, Kirby's novel is commended for its digressions (379). Furthermore, Kirby's characterization is discussed in the most glowing terms: "We know few things in literature more beautiful than the lovely character of Amélie de Repentigny, the gentle heroine of the story; few things nobler than her struggle for the soul of her misguided brother; and few things more profoundly touching than her early death in the convent of the Ursulines" (379-380). In fact, the only adverse criticism is that Kirby was too vivid and blunt in his description of "the wickedness of Bigot and his fellow villains" and of "the fair, false Angélique des Meloises--a creature with the cruel passions but without the courage of a Lady Macbeth" (380). The article ends with a quotation from the prestigious American historian, Francis Parkman, which underscores the idea that The Golden Dog is a serious piece of literature. The fact that the reviewer was a friend of Kirby's might have mitigated his praise if the article had been signed.

²⁰ This is ironic since by Kirby's own admission he did not think much of real French-Canadians (Pierce Portrait 1929, 384-5).

The quotation from Parkman is repeated in the review in the Quebec Daily Mercury (3 May 1877: 14); after the reviewer calls The Golden Dog "A Canadian historical novel of ample interest to the student and general reader of fiction" he quotes Parkman as follows:

‘I have but finished the Chien D’Or. It is based upon several Canadian traditions, skilfully combined and modified to suit the purpose of the story. The writer is familiar with Canadian life and Canadian history, and writes with vivacity and spirit. The work has unmistakably [sic] marks of talent, though parts of it are overstrained and sensational, but it contains scenes of genuine power, such, for example, as the death of Amélie de Repentigny. Several of the chief characters are admirably drawn. I shall be surprised if it does not attract a good deal of attention.’

Aside from the unusual balance of positive and negative criticism (most reviews are either one or the other), and the choice of a historian to review a novel, the other noticeable feature in this review is the emphasis on "Canadian." Since Kirby writes solely of Quebec, the litany of "Canadian traditions," "Canadian life" and "Canadian history" gives the impression that Quebec is Canada. The potential confusion concerning what the author means by "Canada" is amplified in the French-Canadian reviews.

The reviewer for The Canadian Monthly and National Review (May 1877: 564-565) is more specific; he writes that "Until within a comparatively recent period, the English portion of the Canadian population has signally failed to produce its fair share of the national literature" (564). In addition he praises both Kirby's writing and the accuracy of the novel, reinforcing the notion that this work is an historical text: "This admirable historical fiction deserves the warmest commendation, not merely for its lucid and flowing style, and the artistic construction of its plot, but especially for the

light it throws on the institutions of the old French *régime*" (564).²¹ The reviewer also reveals a nationalistic bias in his ending: "the work deserves to be read . . . more especially by those who love Canada and her traditions, and desire to foster and encourage native literature" (565). And, as well as repeating the praise of the novel for its historical accuracy, this reviewer also compares Kirby's work to that of Scott and remarks on his skill of characterization. The praise continues; the reviewer for The Spectator (26 Dec. 1877: 1) proclaims that "As a romanticist Mr. Kirby has succeeded in producing the best Canadian book of its kind. . . . it is a production of the highest merit, and should have a place in the library of every one who desires to know about the early history of the ancient capital."

One gets the sense that The Golden Dog is somehow "international" in part because of the comparisons to Scott and in part because of the fact that the Golden Dog was reissued by L.C. Page and Company (1885) in Boston as well as being frequently pirated by American and British publishers. The Page edition generated two reviews (that I could find) in the United States. The first appeared in the New York Times (4 Oct. 1885: 5) and in it William Drysdale, the reviewer, relates the entire story of Kirby's novel with only passing reference to Kirby's authorship. The second appeared after the release of a later Page edition in 1897 (Brady "Bibliographic Essay" 1976, 39) and includes a plot summary and excerpts from the

²¹ It is intriguing that The Golden Dog should so frequently be evaluated as "fact" when it is a novel; this treatment is consistent with the nineteenth-century Canadian critic's fascination with Sir Walter Scott to whom Kirby is often compared and could also be an attempt to counter the nineteenth-century Canadian's prejudice against novels noted by Gerson ("Reception of the Novel" 1988, 96) and Purdy (1990, 3-4).

novel (New York Herald 4 Sept. 1897: 13); the reviewer acknowledges that this is not a new book and repeats the notion that the book is valuable as an historical source.

The most intriguing aspect of the review is its ending:

As a writer of enthralling historical romances Mr. Kirby is certainly inferior to the gifted Frenchman [Dumas père] yet he, too, possesses the rare art of giving new life to the dead past, and hence he is entitled to high rank in this special field. In "The Golden Dog" he has given us a most ambitious and readable book, and I think the general verdict will be that his time in writing it was well spent. (13)

I find this passage interesting because it begins by noting how Kirby fails to achieve Dumas' status and then goes on to praise Kirby quite extensively.

The salient feature of the review in The Week (3 Feb. 1887: 159) is that it focuses on Lord Tennyson's purported enjoyment of the novel; this is an interesting contrast to the Morning Chronicle's review of Antoinette which could only boast the "best-known citizens" of Montreal among her readership. The fact that Kirby's novel was read and endorsed by famous Britons²² may account for some of its continued popularity in Canada, while Antoinette's reputation could have been handicapped by the limited range of its readership.

Antoinette and Early Reviews in French

The same pattern of treating Antoinette less seriously than The Golden Dog recurs in the French-Canadian reviews with the addition of some confusion as to the meaning of "*canadien*." Though one does not get the sense that nineteenth century

²² According to Pierce, Kirby's biographer, Queen Victoria and her family read and enjoyed his novel (1929, 431).

French-Canadian writers had Mailhot's (1987) sense that (direct) translation from English into French was a basic attack on their identity (see my pp. 11-12), one does get the sense that their definition of "*canadien*" is not the same as their English compatriots' "Canadian." This desire to remain separate can be seen in the earliest review of Antoinette written by her nephew-in-law, Joseph-Édouard Lefebvre de Bellefeuille (Revue Canadienne 1 [juillet 1864]: 442-444). This article could be considered the definitive *canadien* view as it was quoted in Leprohon's obituary (Opinion Publique 2 oct. 1879: 469), in Lareau's Histoire de la Littérature Canadienne (which will be discussed in more detail in Chapter Two; 1874, 307-309), and in other reviews. All of de Bellefeuille's hesitancy towards the idea of French and English Canadians merging is revealed in the opening paragraph:

la scène du livre aujourd'hui devant le public [Antoinette] est placée au moment intéressant . . . où l'on voit deux peuples naguère ennemis, naguère rangés en bataille, les armes à la main l'un contre l'autre, appelés à se donner le baiser de paix, à fraterniser, à vivre ensemble et à ne plus former qu'une seule nation, *si toutefois un seul gouvernement indique une seule nation*. (my italics, 442).

The doubt expressed in the phrase I have italicized is emphasized when de Bellefeuille twice criticizes Leprohon for marrying Antoinette to two Englishmen: "Il est vrai que le Col. *Evelyn*, le second mari d'*Antoinette*, était catholique; c'est quelque chose, mais ce n'est pas tout ce que je désire voir dans l'époux d'une de mes jeunes compatriotes: il n'était pas Canadien" (his italics, 444), and, "Si je devais trouver un défaut dans le livre de Mme. Leprohon, ce serait peut-être d'avoir fait marier successivement son héroïne . . . avec deux officiers anglais" (444). This underscores

the concern of the *canadien* reviewers--they do not want to "marry" with the English.²³ It seems clear that Antoinette has nationalistic (nation-building) repercussions for Bellefeuille and that he does not like the assimilationist solution that the novel promotes.

Though his definition of "Canadian" may be different from that of his English-speaking colleagues, de Bellefeuille's analysis of the novel's literary merits is similar; he places praise for the novel alongside less complimentary statements, giving an overall sense of the novel as a slight piece of work. For instance, he states that "Mme. Leprohon possède à un haut degré le talent des personnages; elle donne à ses héros des caractères tranchés, distincts, dont elle présente tous les traits sous des couleurs vives et bien marquées. *Vous ne confondrez jamais un des acteurs de son drame avec un autre*" (my italics, 443). I have italicized the last sentence because it seems to me that there is something especially patronizing about pointing out that one never gets the characters confused; it certainly undercuts the positive sense of the novel expressed in the preceding sentence.

After praising Leprohon's talent which "puise de préférence les sujets de ses travaux dans les scènes de la vie sociale et élégante, dans les moeurs du grand monde, dans les accidents et les aventures des gens heureux" (442), de Bellefeuille acknowledges that "Le mérite du livre de Mme Leprohon, comme celui de bien des oeuvres de ce genre, n'est donc pas dans la complication de l'intrigue et dans les

²³ This seems particularly significant when one remembers that the review was written the same year as the conference in Quebec during which the creation of the Dominion of Canada was being debated.

difficultés de la solution" (443). The latter statement reminds one of the reviewer who noted that Antoinette had no confusing plot which might "addle" the reader's brain (Montreal Gazette 18 Sept. 1864).

The lengthy review in the "Bibliographie" in the 12 déc. 1864 issue of L'Ordre (2) echoes de Bellefeuille's dissatisfaction with Antoinette's marriage to Colonel Evelyn: "seulement, on regrette, qu'instruit par cette cruelle expérience, le coeur de notre chère héroïne ne choisisse pas parmi ses compatriotes l'homme destiné à lui servir d'époux." The reviewer opens his article with a comment on the importance of the novel to Canadian literature: "La littérature canadienne ne compte puis assez d'éléments, pour que celui-ci, qui en est un des meilleurs, soit laissé de côté, sous le prétexte qu'il est écrit en anglais" (2). But this reviewer also objects to the "tendances d'anglomanie . . . [qu'on remarque] trop souvent chez quelques unes de nos familles Canadiennes" which implies that for him, like de Bellefeuille, "Canadian" and "*canadien*" are not the same. These statements further suggest that the reviewer rejects Leprohon's suggested marriage between the two cultures.

After an extensive report of the plot, the reviewer makes a comment addressed to "nos amiables lectrices"--he, like the English Canadian reviewers, targets the female population as the novel's readership. This is not in itself negative, but remembering the lack of respect afforded "lady readers" by other reviews, one is led to expect the same from this one. Of the novel itself, the reviewer follows the pattern of combining praise with subtle denigration of the work. For instance, he notes that, "Madame Leprohon a su tirer un grand profit de toutes les situations fausses et

dramatiques qui se rencontrent dans cette phase de son roman [the depiction of Antoinette's sorrows]." To say that she is able to pull together the false and dramatic (perhaps melodramatic?) scenes that she has written does not sound very positive. The review ends with quotations from the de Bellefeuille article and from Morgan's Canadiens célèbres which emphasize Leprohon's past contributions to Canadian literature. Once again one finds the tension between valuing the novel as a "Canadian" (whatever is meant by that term) artifact, and devaluing it as written by a woman for female readers. Finally, the reviewer comments on Leprohon's abilities as a writer: "Son style est simple, gracieux, et respire ce charme, cette délicatesse de sentiment qui sont le cachet des coeurs nobles et sympathiques. Jamais la moindre trivialité, jamais le moindre détail qui puissent blesser le lecteur le plus délicat." The comments are very reminiscent of those of the English Canadians--Leprohon is praised for writing like a "lady."

The majority of the remaining French-Canadian reviews of Antoinette (there are eleven more) focus on the quality of the translation rather on the novel itself. Of the three which do comment on the novel, the Courrier de St. Hyacinthe (9 mai 1865: 3) calls the novel "délicieux," Le Pionnier de Sherbrooke refers to it as the "charmant petit roman" of Mrs. Leprohon (20 oct. 1866: 2), and the Gazette des Campagnes (14 juillet 1881: 399), without acknowledgement directly quotes the part of de Bellefeuille's article which praises Leprohon for avoiding "la complication de l'intrigue . . .". Overall, the number of French reviews suggest that the novel was popular while the content of these reviews reveals a dismissive attitude.

The Golden Dog and Early Reviews in French

In French Canada, as in English Canada, The Golden Dog is generally treated more seriously than Antoinette. The first review, released before the novel was translated in 1884, states that Kirby has "le talent de rendre aussi bien les plus pures émotions que les horreurs du meurtre et de la trahison" (La Revue Canadienne 14 mars 1877: 227). The article also commends Kirby for his historical accuracy and notes that "Le sujet est tout canadien-français." Now, ten years after Confederation, the reviewer specifies that the topic is not Canadian, but "canadien-français;" the French-Canadians are still resisting a union with English Canada.

The review of Kirby's novel in Le Journal de Québec (4 avril 1877: 2), as well as that in the Quebec Morning Chronicle (7 Apr. 1877: 1) discussed earlier (see my pp. 24-25), has been attributed to Kirby's friend LeMoine (Hayne "Le May's French Translation" 1981, 51); here LeMoine continues the elaborate praise noted in his other review. LeMoine states that Kirby "a certainement un grand talent comme écrivain, une imagination féconde et gracieuse, une connaissance rare de notre histoire et des lieux: Il possède au parfait son vieux Québec" (2). Benjamin Sulte, another friend of Kirby's, wrote an extensive article on Kirby in L'Opinion Publique (3 mai 1877: 208) which opens: "Saluons un Anglais qui a étudié l'histoire de la Nouvelle-France. Saluons l'un des meilleurs romans canadiens qui aient été écrits en langue anglaise" (208). Sulte also states that Amélie and Angélique are "deux caractères traités de main de maître." However, much of his positive attitude toward Kirby is mixed with a message to some of his compatriots. For instance, part of his

praise of Kirby is used to denounce those who said that Canada had no history worth writing about.²⁴ Furthermore, his closing statement seems to have nothing to do with the novel and a great deal of importance for the *canadiens*; The Golden Dog is being used to raise other issues:

Notre race canadienne-français n'a fait que traverser des jours difficiles depuis plus de deux siècles; c'est de l'histoire cela, ce sont des états de services que ces guerres, ces défections de la mère-patrie, ces persécutions de plus d'une sorte, ces luttes politiques qui n'en finissent pas; cependant, lequel de nous voudrait que nos n'ayons pas d'histoire, pas de place conquise et noblement maintenue au soleil des nations? Tant que nous resterons ce que nous avons été, tout ira bien, en notre honneur. (208)

Again, one sees that a "*canadien*" is not the same as a "Canadian" and that the *canadien* reviewer's idea of nationalism is therefore different, a contrast which could also partially explain the apparent preference for The Golden Dog over Antoinette; Kirby's novel is wholly of Quebec and does not attempt any difficult political merger as does Leprohon's. Given that even in 1864 the *canadiens* objected to her "marriage" of the two cultures, one could see how post-Confederation tensions like those resulting from the first Riel Rebellion in 1870 could lead to the rejection of both Leprohon's solution and her novel. The surprise is that a French version of Antoinette reappeared in book form 1881, was serialized in 1886-1887, and was

²⁴ Perhaps Sulte is reacting to Durham's infamous remark that French-Canadians "are a people with no history, and no literature" ([1839] 1905 rpt, 218). Durham's statement reflects (as well as a bias against French-Canadians) what seems to be a nineteenth-century equation which recurs in most of the reviews of The Golden Dog; that is to say, he, and the critics, seem to assume that to be a nation one must have a literature and to have a literature one must first have a history. This may explain in part the enthusiasm with which Kirby's novel was received since it proved that Canada did have a history which could be turned into a national literature.

adapted for the stage in 1901 with some success according to "Soirées de Famille" in La Patrie (21 fév. 1901: 6; 22 fév. 1901: 5). Perhaps this indicates that the novel's general readership was less bothered by its political implications than were its critics.

I have chosen to include here Pamphile Le May's preface to his translation of The Golden Dog (1884) entitled, "Pourquoi Le Chien D'Or Traduit en Français" (in Rousseau 1970, 75); in effect he reviews Kirby's novel while justifying his decision to translate it, thus it belongs in this section though it is not technically a "review." Le May lists three reasons for translating the novel. First, because it is "un superbe hommage rendu aux ancêtres des Canadiens-Français, hommage d'autant plus précieux qu'il vient d'un homme appartenant par le sang et les croyances à une nation qui fut l'ennemie séculaire de notre race." In other words, part of the novel's value to *canadiens* lay in the fact that it was written by a Protestant and an Englishman. On the surface, neither of those factors would seem to have anything to do with the quality of the work. The second reason is almost the same as the first but worded differently: "Nous avons voulu faire apprécier par nos littérateurs l'admirable parti qu'un homme, qui pourtant n'a ni notre foi, ni *nos sentiments nationaux*, et dont la langue maternelle est la langue anglaise, a su tirer d'une courte période de notre histoire" (italics mine, 76). Once again the writer reveals a sense of having a separate history and separate desires from his English-speaking compatriots. The third reason supports this idea: Le May states that the novel should be translated into French because it is an example of how one can write about the Catholic faith without looking like either a hypocrite or a fool (76-78). This reason would seem to be the

most important to Le May because he concentrates most of the article on it. He, like Sulte, uses the novel for his own purposes and reveals that his motivations, and perhaps those of *canadiens* in general, are not the same as those of his (English-) Canadian compatriots.

In summary, Kirby's The Golden Dog was reviewed more frequently in English magazines and newspapers and in greater length and more seriously in both English and French periodicals than Leprohon's Antoinette. Furthermore, Kirby was commended (often by his friends) for the skill of his writing, his characterization, his historical accuracy, and his resemblance to Scott. On the other hand, Leprohon was consistently dismissed and slighted by being evaluated in "genteel" terms while she was usually praised for contributing to Canadian literature. One wonders about the attitudes of the reviewers toward Canadian literature as a whole if one of the few promising things they could say about Antoinette is that it contributed to that body of literature.

CHAPTER TWO: SURVEYS

The second stage in the process of canonization involves keeping the work visible. Part of this process is republication, and the various republications of The Golden Dog and Antoinette will be dealt with later. The survey or literary history is the format which kept the reading public aware of these novels (and this is especially true for Antoinette), and, quite possibly, contributed to their being republished. Surveys have been published as early as 1913 and as recently as 1989, but most were produced during the 1920s and again during the 1960s; both were times of economic prosperity and increased nationalism.²⁵ For example, during the 1960s "O Canada" became the national anthem (1964), the Maple Leaf flag was adopted (1965), and the Centennial of Confederation was celebrated (1967).

There are a number of studies which address the importance of anthologies and surveys in the formation of the canon. For instance, Jane Tompkins traces the progressive valorization of "standard" American canonical figures especially Hawthorne through various anthologies (1985). Specifically, she locates in the history

²⁵ That is not to say that nothing of importance occurred during the intervening decades. In 1931 the Statute of Westminster which guaranteed all Dominions equal status in the Commonwealth was passed. Canada increasingly loosened its ties to Britain. The 1930s were also characterized by the Great Depression and the establishment of the CBC (radio)--the first government-sponsored attempt to counteract American influence on Canadian culture. During the 1940s Canada came into its own and declared war on Germany separately and after Britain, and further government intervention in culture took place with the creation of the Canada Council, the establishment of a national television network under the CBC, and the expansion of the National Film Board. Finally, the New Canadian Library series began publication in 1957.

of American anthologies a tendency to reproduce more works by fewer authors which places greater emphasis on the authors who continue to be listed until they are left the undisputed "Major" figures (187-195). In addition, Paul Lauter investigates anthologies and how they have contributed to the erasure of Black and women writers from the American canon again by the gradual omission of such writers (1983). These processes are at work in other countries as well; Edward Mullen (1988), focusing on Cuba, points out how "Negro verse" has been gradually removed from the anthologies of Hispanic poetry in that country.

The masculinization of the canon noted in my introduction (Gerson, Weir, etc.) is very visible in this phase. For example, of sixteen surveys written in English and five written in French, only one was authored by a woman. Furthermore, Gerson notes the tendency of the male elite to reproduce their own "distinctly masculine . . . gender and taste" ("Canon Between the Wars" 1991, 47), which by definition excludes or minimalizes the works by women. In addition, both Lorraine Weir (1988) and Margery Fee (1981) have analyzed specific surveys; the former exposes the biases of survey writers which at their worst indicate "misogyny and Aryanism" (31) while the latter explores the Romantic idea of "nation" and how it directs the critics' judgement of works of literature. Dermot McCarthy (1991) places the surveys in terms of their authors' and editors' desire to manage "the imaging of the nation and the articulation of the spirit of the people" (40). And of course, since the majority of those authors and editors are men, the image those editors and authors tend to see and the spirit they articulate are cast in their own image and therefore male.

This masculinization of the Canadian canon recurs in each of the surveys²⁶ (even the one by a woman) from Thomas Guthrie Marquis' English-Canadian Literature (1913) to W.H New's A History of Canadian Literature (1989) and reinforces the implicit and explicit preference for William Kirby's novel, The Golden Dog, over Rosanna Leprohon's novel, Antoinette. This preference for The Golden Dog over Antoinette is revealed in details as small as the amount of physical space given to the discussion of each work (Kirby is always allotted more space than Leprohon) and in aspects as obvious as the language employed; the surveys tend to utilize the same sort of "feminized" language found in the reviews for the discussion of Leprohon and Antoinette. Finally, the full import of the evaluations of the novels found in surveys can only be realized by placing these evaluations beside the authors' or editors' stated and implicit intentions for their surveys. Given that (as discussed in the previous chapter) the role of introductions is to direct the reading of a work, a claim to study the "best" Canadian literature can make the impact of a slighting evaluation of Antoinette even worse.

Surveys in English

The earliest English-Canadian²⁷ survey in which I found extensive discussion of either Antoinette or The Golden Dog is Thomas Guthrie Marquis' survey published in

²⁶ There are many more survey articles in magazines, but due to space considerations I shall limit myself to books.

²⁷ As in my previous chapter, the works done by French-Canadians will be reviewed separately to acknowledge their separate concerns.

1913.²⁸ Marquis states that his intention in writing English-Canadian Literature is to study the writers of Canada "as English and American writers are studied" (495). In other words, there are enough works that can be called both "Canadian" and "Literature," and therefore the time has come to discuss those works in terms of inherent literary value. Marquis goes on to note how various "birds of passage," or non-indigenous writers must be included if they "received their inspiration and did their work in Canada" (495). This makes it possible to include Kirby (among others), whom Marquis calls, "a thorough Canadian" (547).²⁹ Kirby's emigration to Canada with his family in 1832 is submitted as further "proof" of his Canadianness. Unfortunately, Marquis has the wrong date (547 - See Appendix A).³⁰

²⁸ G. Mercer Adam's Outline History of Canadian Literature (1887) precedes Marquis' survey, but Adam makes only brief references to writers of fiction such as Kirby (212, 228) and Leprohon (228) within a inventory primarily of non-fiction.

²⁹ The attempts of Marquis and others to "Canadianize" Kirby seem ironic in light of the fact that when it came time to publish his novel Kirby's first impulse was to submit it to a British publisher, and only after it was rebuffed did he consider a Canadian publisher (Pierce Portrait 1929, 247).

³⁰ Many of the early survey writers and editors claim that Kirby emigrated to Canada in 1832 rather than 1839. By doing so, they are able to claim that he arrived while an impressionable young man rather than the adult that he was. Some also tend to omit or underplay the fact that Kirby was educated in Cincinnati. I checked the biographical data and found that Henry Morgan seems to be the source of the error; both his Bibliotheca Canadensis (1867) and Canadian Men and Women of the Time (1898) state that Kirby emigrated to Canada with his parents in 1832. In the latter work, there is mention that Kirby "received a portion of his education in Cincinnati," but no indication that Kirby was living in that city during his education (541). The Dominion Illustrated (11 May 1889: 298) may also be partially responsible since the writer of the article does not make clear that Kirby resided in the U.S. for a number of years prior to his emigration to Canada. Furthermore, a typographical error in that article has Kirby arriving in Canada in 1829, or three years before he even emigrated from Britain. And while there are other sources like Frank Yeigh's article "Canada's Oldest Living Novelist: William Kirby" (Globe [Toronto] 25 Feb. 1905: 5) which

In light of Marquis' statement that he will be analyzing works in terms of their inherent value, the fact that his entire discussion of Antoinette consists of three sentences indicates his low opinion of that work as does his statement that: "The simple, kindly lives of these people [of Quebec] are sympathetically portrayed; their quaint, homely manners and customs are given with fulness and exact knowledge" (543). The patronizing tone used to describe the people of Quebec also reflects on Leprohon herself who has "exact knowledge" which suggests that she is equally "quaint" and "homely" and does not invoke respect for the author, her novel, or the people who were the models for her characters. Marquis also states that "From a Canadian point of view" Antoinette is one of Leprohon's best works (543) which implies that the novel could not survive an examination from any other point of view. Ironically, this contradicts his stated intention to review a work in terms of its inherent value aside from nationalism (495).

Kirby's novel is treated with more respect. Marquis calls The Golden Dog "a great book," and includes as an indication of its greatness the fact that it has "turned the feet of thousands of pilgrims towards Quebec" (548). That is to say, the novel improved the tourist trade in Quebec City.³¹ Marquis does acknowledge that the

have the information correct, those sources may not have been as easily accessible.

Morgan also seems to be the source of the error concerning the translator of The Golden Dog; Morgan claims that the novel was translated into French by both Pamphile Le May and Louis Fréchette (Men and Women, 541); though both men discussed translating the novel, only Le May did so (Pierce Portrait 1929, 251-2).

³¹ This echoes the review of The Golden Dog in the Quebec Morning Chronicle (1 Apr. 1877: 1).

novel has some faults, but only in the accuracy of the portrayal of actual historical people and events, not in any aspect of its writing as a fiction. This "criticism" indicates that Marquis is applying at least one of the same criteria to the novels as its early reviewers. Marquis goes on to praise Kirby's characterization, calling Count Philibert "probably the best-drawn and best-sustained character in Canadian fiction" (548). Leprohon's characters are not even mentioned individually. It is also interesting that Kirby's inhabitants of Quebec, "governors and intendants, officers and merchants, noble ladies of New France and the humble habitants" (548) somehow avoid having the "quaint, homely manners and customs" of Leprohon's characters, one of whom is just as much a "noble lady of New France" as Kirby's Angélique des Meloises or Amélie de Repentigny.

Ray Palmer Baker's survey ([1920] 1968) attempts to "show the intellectual continuity of the English-speaking peoples and the fact that, in spite of their differences, they are inescapably one" (Preface). Baker claims that Leprohon's work is "the direct result of the nationalistic movement in literature" and that she "was recognized as the leader of a distinct Canadian School" (139). He also accepts as an "index of her sympathy and taste" the fact that Antoinette and The Manor House of De Villeraï was "as popular in French as in English" (139). Finally, Baker extends Fenimore Cooper's influence from Richardson (whom he calls "fully as American as Cooper") to Leprohon, Kirby and Gilbert Parker so that Baker can then claim that their works are "closely connected with the literature of the United States" (182). He reveals his American academic training when he goes to such great lengths to connect

Canadian writers with an American tradition (especially after he claims Leprohon as the "leader of a distinct Canadian School").

Archibald MacMechan's survey has closer ties to Marquis' than to Baker's; MacMechan either read the same sources as Marquis or took Marquis himself as his source because he makes the same errors in Headwaters of Canadian literature (1924). He too claims that Kirby emigrated to Canada "as a boy" (Kirby was born in 1817) and that The Golden Dog was translated by both Louis Fréchette and Pamphile Le May (136). More importantly, MacMechan makes no mention of Leprohon or Antoinette³² which is in itself a form of adverse criticism though he "lays no claim to being exhaustive and makes no apology for omitted names or works" (7-8). Yet Fee points out that "Like many Romantic nationalists MacMechan puts a great deal of emphasis on the writing of history" (1981, 293) and cites his statement that "a people unmindful of its past can have no future" (1981, 199); thus his omission of Antoinette, an historical novel, indicates that another agenda is at work. MacMechan continues by calling The Golden Dog "an ambitious historical novel on a large scale dealing with the death agony of New France. It has undoubted power; but it also has its *longueurs*" (author's italics, 136). That minor criticism, particularly when embedded in such glowing praise and delicately worded in French, seems to add to the value of the work. Also, most readers of this work would be ignorant of Leprohon's existence and therefore could only perpetuate the omission.

³² Susanna Moodie is one of the few women in MacMechan's survey and he focuses on her emigré status rather than her writing (eg. p. 100).

Fortunately, Leprohon is resurrected in J.D. Logan and Donald G. French's Highways of Canadian Literature (1924). In that work Logan (French contributed only three chapters) proclaims his intention to provide "teachers and students in education and readers in general with *a complete history of the Canadian literature extant in the English language*" (my italics, 5). The section I italicize is important because it sets up the work as an infallible source of all Canadian literature which in turn gives greater emphasis to any and all statements made within the survey. Logan also presents his analysis of Kirby and Leprohon within his aim to "disclose to Canadians the social and spiritual importance of their own literature and to determine its place or distinction in English literature" (8). This open acknowledgement of a nationalistic enterprise colours Logan's analysis of the novels.

There are a number of problems in this survey. For example, Logan and French have located Leprohon in the Post-Confederation (1887-1924) section even though she was dead by 1879 (Table of Contents). This placement suggests a lack of information or a careless attitude on their part, either of which possibilities raises questions about the accuracy of their other pronouncements. In addition, Logan uses only Leprohon's maiden name (Mullins) and while it is true that she published before she married as well as after, since she would be more likely to be known in 1924 by her married name, the use of her maiden name is perplexing. Finally, Logan repeats the erroneous date of Kirby's emigration to Canada.³³

³³ I keep mentioning this point because it reveals a continuity amongst the surveys; either they have all read the same incorrect reference work, or they have read the preceding texts. Either way, the fact that one can trace a connecting line

Furthermore, the language used to describe Leprohon's writing is again "feminized;" she is said to have a "finer pointed stylus," "more grace and a finer limning of character," and a "more engaging urbanity" than Richardson (93). Logan also repeats what Marquis implied, that it is Leprohon's nationalism rather than her "intrinsic literary merit" (93-4) which entitles her a place in this survey. For instance, he claims that "On the side of nationality [Leprohon] disputes with Kirby the right of primacy in calling the attention of later Canadian romancers . . . to the wealth of novelistic material that lay in the life and manners and culture of society under the old French *Régime*" (93). Then he immediately contradicts himself and argues that "it was Kirby's romantic fiction that opened the eyes of later Canadian novelists to the abounding material for novelistic treatment that lay in the social and political history of the Canadian past" (94). The repetition of the notion that Leprohon's Canadian birth is the sole point in her favour is detrimental to her reputation as a writer.

Logan is consistent with MacMechan and Marquis in their preference for Kirby's work over that of Leprohon. For instance, as stated in the quotation which opened my thesis, Logan claims that Kirby, born in England and educated in the United States is more "genuinely" Canadian than two writers born and raised in Canada, and it is because of this "essential genuine Canadianness" that his writings are to be treated more seriously than those of Leprohon and Richardson. What seems clear is that Logan finds something in Kirby's novel which is to his taste and which he then

from each work supports the idea that a canon is not simply a response to the "horizon of expectations" of a given time and place.

defends by calling Kirby a more "genuine" Canadian than two Canadian-born authors. Logan does admit that The Golden Dog has some flaws, and after listing a few of them (94), goes on to call the work "a genuinely great novel" both as an imaginative venture and as "the progenitor of the romantic fiction of Parker, Roberts, Campbell, Saunders and other creators of the native and national fiction of Canada" (95). Somehow, despite the fact that some definite flaws are found in The Golden Dog and none in Antoinette, Kirby's work is repeatedly presented as the better of the two works, and, ironically, Kirby is presented as the "better" Canadian.

Lorne Pierce's discussion of both Kirby and Leprohon is brief in An Outline of Canadian Literature (French and English) (1927)³⁴, but again more attention is given to the former. He repeats Logan's contention that while both Leprohon and Kirby utilized Quebec's history, Kirby's was the work which inspired other writers to draw upon that history (12). Incidentally, Pierce also clarifies the translation question-- Louis Fr chet te was interested in translating The Golden Dog into French, but only Le May actually did so (12).

Pierce's biography of Kirby (William Kirby: The Portrait of a Tory Loyalist 1929) appears to have been consulted by V.B. Rhodenizer for A Handbook of

³⁴ Chronologically, the next major survey to be discussed should be Lionel Stevenson's, Appraisals of Canadian Literature (1926). However, he discusses neither The Golden Dog or Antoinette. And since he claims that "any work [he has] considered worthy of mention has merits which outweigh its defects" (xii), one can only assume that, for him, their defects outweigh their merits.

Canadian Literature (1930); the dates of Kirby's emigration are correct (80).³⁵

However, Rhodenizer continues the process of devaluing Antoinette and Leprohon and valorizing The Golden Dog and Kirby. For instance, Leprohon is dealt with in slightly over a page while Kirby is given his own chapter. Furthermore, the evaluation of Leprohon includes statements which detract attention from her work; for example, Rhodenizer points out that Leprohon was educated at the same convent as Richardson's mother (77). If Richardson's mother was also a writer, the point to this comment might be apparent, but she was not. He also states that, "Without neglect of domestic, social, or religious duties, she [Leprohon] continued to contribute prose and verse to periodicals in the United States and in Canada, and wrote novels" (77). This statement implies that her "domestic, social and religious duties" were (and ought to be) more important than her writing. Taken with Rhodenizer's stated aim to allow his reader "to develop a discriminating appreciation of the forms of Canadian literature" (17), her work is further minimized.

This process of trivialization is aided by Rhodenizer's failure to name even one of her publications or works and by the language used to discuss Leprohon's writing. For instance, he states that:

Her humanitarianism is emotionally effective at times, even though it is occasionally the expression of a rather artificial Tennyson-like quarrel with the difference of rank as a barrier between lovers. Her poems of Canadian nature are her best. In these she comes nearest to freedom from her ever-present weaknesses, lack of metrical smoothness and of adaptation of verse

³⁵ Rhodenizer's statement that "Kirby has been called the last of the Loyalists" (79) supports my conjecture regarding sources since this is a term Pierce frequently uses in his biography of Kirby.

movement to lyric mood.

Her novels . . . show some narrative skill. . . . Historically, her novels are important because, from her residence in Montreal, she was able to re-create effectively the society of the French *Régime* and of the English Occupation, and because she was the first Canadian novelist whose work is the direct result of the nationalistic movement in Canadian literature. (77-78)

In other words, her good poetry is good only in relation to her bad poetry; her novels are not even worth the effort of naming let alone of evaluating; they are not the product of imagination but of habitation; and they are the result of a nationalistic movement, not its inspiration. Implicitly and explicitly, Leprohon and her novels are disparaged; even her nationalistic contribution is unnoted.

Kirby, on the other hand, wrote "the greatest Canadian novel" (86). In addition, any writers who had previously adversely criticized The Golden Dog are addressed by the assertion they have "confused melodramatic with [plausible] sensational writing" (85). Furthermore, while Kirby is placed between Richardson and Parker in the development of the romantic novel, and while Leprohon was introduced in relation to Richardson, she is not mentioned as one of Kirby's predecessors (84). Finally, more space is given to the plot of The Golden Dog and the story of how Kirby came to be inspired to write the novel than is given to the entire discussion of Leprohon (84-85). Again Leprohon is marginalized and Kirby is valorized.

There is a gap of almost thirty years between Rhodenizer's work and the next survey, Wilfrid Eggleston's, The Frontier and Canadian Letters (1957). Eggleston's only reference to Leprohon is to note that her first novel was published in serial form (87). However, his work is different from the others in that the three times that he mentions Kirby it is to note that Kirby is really an emigré, neither influenced by

Canada's environment, nor a true contributor to Canada's literature (3, 69, 126).

Both the predecessor of and successor to Eggleston's work, Desmond Pacey's Creative Writing in Canada (1964)³⁶ repeats many of the sentiments found in the earlier surveys. Pacey also claims Kirby as Canadian, defining him as "a Canadian by choice" (74); this suggests that the immigrant is a more "genuine" Canadian than the person who was simply born here. Furthermore, Pacey found much to praise in The Golden Dog; he called it "authentic," "moving," "a great achievement," and Kirby's "masterpiece" (76, 78, 187), and all this despite its acknowledged "weaknesses" (77-8). Leprohon, on the other hand, is given only passing mention as one of three writers who wrote historical romances (74), a fact which is even more damaging when placed beside Pacey's stated aim to "single out the most interesting work in each period" (vii).

Carl Klinck's aim for his Literary History of Canada (1965)³⁷ was different--he wanted no less than to "publish a comprehensive reference book on the (English) literary history of this country, and to encourage established and younger scholars to engage in a critical study of that history" (ix). In other words, this work is to be part of the repertoire of present and future canon-makers. Klinck further defines his goals for the work by stating that "this volume represents a positive attempt to give a

³⁶ This survey was first published in 1952 and was revised in 1961 and 1964. Though the page numbers on which Leprohon and Kirby were discussed changed in each edition, the content of the analyses did not. I am using the 1964 edition.

³⁷ Klinck was both General Editor of the Literary History and author of the chapter which discusses Kirby and Leprohon.

history of Canada in terms of writings which deserve more or less attention because of significant thought, form, and use of language. It also aims to contribute to criticism by offering reasons for singling out those works regarded as best" (xi). In light of those aims, Klinck's comments about Leprohon have far-reaching consequences. For instance, his statement that "[m]elodrama and tugging heartstrings she learned too well, but she also learned to write dialogue that was rarely lengthy, tedious, or pompous" (157) cannot help but influence his expected audience, the canon-makers, negatively; to say that her dialogue was "rarely lengthy, tedious, or pompous" is dismissive.³⁸ Kirby's novel, on the other hand, is called "a lively story, happily full of realistic detail" (159). In addition, Klinck states that Kirby "pre-empted the history of the *ancien régime*," and "spread his net wider, painted on a broader canvas, produced an eventful story rather than a social period piece, and addressed readers in whom the nationalism of the Confederation period had instilled more regard for history" than Leprohon (158-9). Thus, even the discussion of Kirby is used by Klinck to emphasize Leprohon's supposed flaws. This process is further aided when Klinck, like Rhodenizer, makes no mention of individual characters in Leprohon's works, but discusses Kirby's characters in some detail (159).

A. Charles von Guttenberg (1969) goes one step further and omits Leprohon altogether from his Early Canadian Art and Literature (1969). His entry on Kirby is mostly plot summary, but he does make one interesting point:

³⁸ Also, in light of Klinck's opinion of Antoinette as expressed here, one wonders why he was asked or agreed to write the introduction to the 1973 New Canadian Library of Antoinette.

Le Gardeur is a conventional figure, but credible enough. The modern reader, however, may find it difficult to accept Amelia [sic] as anything more than a Sunday-School heroine. Vice as the detective-story writers well know, is more interesting than virtue, and virtuous love is the most difficult of subjects for a novelist. In the passages of the novel which deal with Amelia's love for Pierre Philibert, Kirby is at his most dated and least convincing. (37)

Aside from the unnecessary anglicization of Amélie's name, von Guttenberg's point that the evil characters are more interesting than the good ones is repeated by Crawley in his introduction to the NCL edition of The Golden Dog and reveals a shift in the "horizon of expectations" since the first reviews.

The sole survey by a woman does not greatly differ from those of her male colleagues. Elizabeth Waterston's Survey: A Short History of Canadian Literature (1973) opens as follows: "When we begin a study of Canadian Literature we face two problems in those two key words 'Canada' and 'Literature'--and a third problem in the relation between the two" (1). It ends: "Readings in Canadian Literature can give some comparable growth in awareness, and a comparable answer to the question of national art" (3). Her evaluation of Kirby's novel is brief and ends with "The Golden Dog remains vivid, exciting, and hollow. Ironically, without any intimation of the reality of the menace implied, it fixed into English-Canadian memories the menacing couplet: 'The time will come which is not yet/When I'll bite them by whom I'm bit'" (39). Though Waterston's analysis of The Golden Dog is uncomplimentary, it is factually accurate. Her evaluation of Leprohon, on the other hand, reveals a number of errors:

Mrs. Leprohon, like Mrs. Brooke, was prolific and professional as a writer-- a determined producer of popular fare. She was also a specialist in stories

involving difficult decisions for intense, conscientious girls, for example, Antoinette de Mirecourt, whose sub-title is Secret Marrying--Secret Sorrowing. . . . Mrs. Leprohon's Antoinette de Mirecourt is also involved in romance with a soldier--two soldiers, in fact. Her great achievement consists in having a noble English Colonel love her sincerely, and disentangle her from her foolish secret marriage to a dashing but corrupt junior officer. The role of heroine here consists of submission to a father, passive acceptance of a hero's help, and resistance to a charming but unprincipled villain. This Canadian heroine will never be a Jane Eyre, defy propriety or feel swept by impetuous passion. Antoinette remains a proper lady, following a genteel code. (67)

Colonel Evelyn did not extricate Antoinette from her secret marriage, her childhood friend Louis Beauchesne did that by mortally wounding Antoinette's husband Sternfield. Also, Antoinette did "defy propriety" both by her secret marriage and by going to Sternfield's side once she learned that he was wounded in the duel with Louis. Finally, Antoinette is frequently "swept by impetuous passion." Any individual reading Waterston's evaluation of the novel who did not know the novel itself would be left with an erroneous impression of Antoinette. And though her evaluation of Kirby's novel is brief and somewhat dismissive, her analysis of Leprohon's novel is even more so.

One of the two major surveys published during the 1980s, W.J. Keith's Canadian Literature in English (1985) addresses only Kirby and his (Keith's) analysis is not unreservedly favourable. For instance, Keith states that:

The events in the story are filtered through Kirby's stiff but consistently dignified prose, and even when the willing suspension of disbelief is hardest, narrative interest is maintained. The principal characters may seem too good (or bad) to be true, but they nevertheless achieve a human individuality. For all its faults (especially conspicuous if we persist in invoking the hardly relevant criteria of realistic fiction), this is perhaps the most substantial narrative written in Canada in the nineteenth century. (44)

Keith is the only critic to suggest that applying the criteria of realistic fiction to an historical romance from the nineteenth-century is irrelevant, but in other ways he echoes his predecessors. For example, the closing statement to his analysis of Kirby reveals a nationalistic bias that has become very familiar: "'Canadian' emerges as a unique designation, and Canadian literature gradually, obstinately, impressively forms itself as the embodiment of a scattered and elusive people's communal vision" (9). Furthermore, his claim that "the Canadian literary tradition is now sufficiently established that it can be discussed in relation to the literatures of Britain and the United States without embarrassment and without any nagging sense of cultural inferiority" (4) is similar to that made by Marquis in 1913 (495).

W.H. New's A History of Canadian Literature (1989), the most recent survey to date, re-addresses questions raised by the earliest ones by attempting to define "Canadian literature" and even "Canada" (1-3). His analysis of Leprohon is patronizing in the familiar ways³⁹ and again the treatment of Kirby's novel is more detailed and more serious (93-95).

Overall, little changed in the treatment of Antoinette or The Golden Dog over the English surveys of seventy-six years. The former has always been given less attention, and less serious consideration than the latter. Yet the cumulative effect is

³⁹ New also erroneously states that "The moral centre in the work [Antoinette] derives from its Catholicism--the sinfulness of the unapproved *cohabitation*" (my italics, 76); Antoinette and Sternfield never cohabit in any sense of the word. This error raises the possibility that New based his evaluation of the novel on earlier discussions of it; if true, this fact, like the persistent errors in dates noted above, illustrates the accumulative nature of canon-making.

even greater than the effect of each critical work taken individually. For while Leprohon and Kirby still appear to be in much the same relative positions at this point that they occupied after the first spate of reviews, this position is more firmly entrenched in the canon and thus more difficult to change. In general the surveys indicate a lack of interest in domestic fiction, and even those authors who find Kirby's use of history admirable do not take notice of the historical aspects of Antoinette. Of course, my analysis of these surveys is that of an individual familiar with the novels; most of the students reading these works will take their authors at face value and therefore can only conclude that Antoinette has minimal value when compared to The Golden Dog. This means that the next generation of canon-makers may repeat the opinions of the previous ones and so the relative positions of the two novels will not change.

Surveys in French

The surveys written by French-Canadians, like those of their English-speaking compatriots, also elevate Kirby over Leprohon and in the same ways, by using space and language. Moreover, they too attempt to determine a "national literature," but there exists in the introductory statements of these writers the same ambiguity concerning nationalism that was first noticeable in the early reviews. That is to say, they write from within two nations, Quebec and Canada, and there is some confusion as to which is their nation. This disorientation is particularly evident when they

discuss Leprohon and Kirby.⁴⁰

For instance, the préface to Edmond Lareau's work, Histoire de la littérature canadienne (1874) betrays a tension between "Canadian" and "*canadien*." He opens with the statement that he dedicates his book to "tout le monde, [il] entend dire à tous ceux qui s'intéressent à ce coin de terre qui fut autrefois *la Nouvelle-France et qui s'appelle maintenant le Canada*" (my italics, iii). Though New France once covered a huge section of North America, what was "Nouvelle-France" and what is Canada (in 1874) are not the same; therefore despite Lareau's use of the name "Canada," when he talks of a "mouvement littéraire national," it is unclear of which nation he is speaking--Quebec or Canada. The confusion of identity is further expressed in his analysis of Leprohon. For instance he notes that "Ses opinions et ses jugements n'ont rien de blessant pour la nationalité canadienne française et en tous points elle sait rendre justice à nos compatriotes" (306-7). Here "nos" refers specifically to "les canadiens françaises," and yet Leprohon is said to have a place in "notre littérature nationale;" the two "nations" referred to do not seem to be the same.

Aside from the nationalism problem the review of Leprohon's work is familiar; praise and condescension are again mixed. For instance, Lareau notes that:

Au point de vue purement littéraire ses oeuvres se distinguent par une grande pureté de style et une agréable finesse d'idées et d'expression; elle réussit

⁴⁰ Despite the novels' original popularity in French-Canada, out of twenty-five surveys investigated which span the years from 1863 to 1989 only five made any mention of Kirby or Leprohon. However, given the tendency amongst critics in both languages to separate French- and English-Canadian writings, and the formation of *québécois* literature during the twentieth-century, it is to be expected that these authors would not appear in many French-Canadian surveys.

beaucoup mieux dans la peinture des passions douces; le récit est peut-être un peu simple, l'intrigue n'est pas toujours assez compliquée, on pourrait exiger plus de variété, de vie et d'entrain; mais tout de même, j'aime ces petites nouvelles si morales, si tendres, si imprégnées de sentiments nobles et élevés. (307)

The potential of the phrase "grande pureté de style" is immediately undercut by "agréable finesse d'idées," and the entire last clause ("j'aime ces petites nouvelles . . .") is patronizing. Furthermore, the inclusion of excerpts from de Bellefeuille's review, which is itself condescending,⁴¹ and analysis of his review as "peut-être un peu flattée, mais en général elle est assez juste" (307), conditions one to accept a low opinion of the novel.

Mgr. Camille Roy's book has the same title as Lareau's, Histoire de la littérature canadienne (1930), but Roy differs in that he separates Canadian and *canadien*; only twenty-eight pages of almost 300 are given over to "Littérature Canadienne-Anglaise" (267-295). Furthermore, Roy's statements such as his discourse on the characteristics which make *canadiens* unique (11-20), indicate that he is sure of his place as French-Canadian, and his three "caractères généraux de la littérature canadienne-française. . . Elle est d'inspiration française. . . Elle est d'inspiration nationale. . . Elle est d'inspiration catholique" (18-19) seem designed specifically to exclude any English-Canadian writers. Still, one might expect that Leprohon, Catholic, born and educated in Montreal, and married to a prominent *canadien* doctor, would be considered to

⁴¹ See Chapter One for my analysis of de Bellefeuille's "Bibliographie" from the Revue Canadienne (1 [juillet 1864]: 442). This continuity of opinion plus the nationalistic confusion demonstrates how repetition is inherent in the process of canon-formation.

fulfil these characteristics more ably than Kirby, yet Roy devotes more than two pages to Kirby⁴² (271-3) and gives him higher praise while disposing of Leprohon in three sentences at the end of the entry for Kirby (273). For example, he states that The Golden Dog "qui a l'air de reconstituer la vie sociale que l'on faisait à Québec au temps de Bigot, eut un énorme succès. Il y a dans ces récits, mêlés de défauts et de longueurs, de grandes qualités de style et de composition"⁴³ (273). However, his analysis of Leprohon and Antoinette, in its entirety, is as follows:

Mrs. Rosanna Leprohon (1832-1879) a voulu, comme William Kirby, exploiter la veine très riche de l'histoire et des légendes de notre régime français. Son meilleur roman a pour titre Antoinette de Mirecourt: or Secret Marrying and Secret Sorrowing: a Canadian Tale (1864). C'est surtout une peinture de la vie domestique. (273)

I find this statement particularly interesting for a number of reasons. First, Roy does not mention as he did for Kirby that Antoinette was translated into French and therefore leaves the impression that it was available only in English. Second, the wording implies that somehow Leprohon failed to achieve an important accomplishment--she may have wanted to exploit history as Kirby did, but all she was able to write was a domestic novel. Third, Roy implies that Leprohon follows Kirby chronologically rather than preceding him.

Almost forty years later, Clément Moisan continues to struggle with the issue of

⁴² Roy includes the right date of Kirby's emigration to Canada, 1839 (271), but since Leprohon's true birthdate was not available until Henri Deneau's thesis of 1948, it comes as no surprise that Roy uses the wrong date--1832 instead of 1829 (273).

⁴³ It is interesting to note that the French-Canadians tend to use the English name for the novel when it was equally well-known at that time as Le Chien d'Or.

identity in L'Age de la littérature canadienne (1969). For example, in his exploration of past and present authors to determine the future of "Canadian" literature, Moisan takes great pains to point out that the literatures of English- and French-Canada have evolved along similar paths (13) and that "Parler d'*une* littérature canadienne n'implique pas d'ailleurs qu'il faille postuler au Canada une seule littérature ou une seule culture. La vie canadienne démentirait cette affirmation" (author's italics, 14). Moisan's acceptance of the idea that literatures in the two languages in Canada followed a parallel evolution allows him to include a brief examination of two anglophones, Leprohon and Kirby (among others), in his survey.

Rosana [sic] Eleanor Leprohon (1832-1879) fut l'une des premières à écrire des romans historiques dans cette veine [pittoresque historique, idylles romantiques, brillante société aristocratique]. Elle était d'ailleurs qualifiée pour le faire, ayant vécu à Montréal en contact avec les vieilles familles françaises dont elle raconte la vie et les traditions. Comme The Golden Dog de Kirby (1877), ses romans témoignent d'un intérêt fervent pour le Canada français, et cela au moment précis où la Confédération naissante suscitait chez les Canadiens anglais un regain de nationalisme britannique. (40)⁴⁴

It is interesting that Kirby's work is named while Antoinette is mentioned only in a footnote (40). Furthermore Leprohon, despite the listing of her qualifications to write on French-Canadian life, sounds almost as much as an alien as Kirby; she is only noted as having been "en contact" with the old French families, not as having belonged to one of them.

Similarly, Maurice Lemire's work, Les grands thèmes nationalistes du roman historique canadien-français (1970), places Leprohon and her novel on the margins of

⁴⁴ Leprohon's birthdate is incorrect and since Deneau's thesis had been available for twenty-one years at this point, the error suggests faulty scholarship.

French-Canadian literature while accepting Kirby more completely. Lemire's project is to analyze the historical novel because "[il] a servi de véhicule à une certaine forme de nationalisme" (1) and includes certain writers who are not French-Canadian because,

Sans faire une étude exhaustive des contes et des nouvelles, nous avons glané çà et là des oeuvres marginales qui pouvaient enrichir notre sujet.

Pour la même raison, nous avons inclu dans notre étude des auteurs . . . canadiens-anglais (William Kirby, Mrs. Leprohon, John Lespérance). Comment ces étrangers peuvent-ils refléter notre sentiment national?" (xi).

It is interesting that, once again, Leprohon is considered to be just as much an outsider as Kirby. This notion is repeated later: "D'autres romanciers comme William Kirby, Eleanor [sic] Leprohon et John Lespérance ont vécu au pays⁴⁵, ont assimilé notre histoire et ont voulu en donner une expression en accord avec nos convictions nationales. Leurs oeuvres ne nous sont pas étrangères" (xi).

Yet these references to Leprohon mean little; Lemire claims that "c'est un anglophone comme William Kirby qui doit nous montrer comment romancer notre histoire (Le Chien d'Or, 1884 [sic])" (12). Leprohon is given no credit for her role in the popularity of the historical novel at all. It is also interesting to note that Leprohon's theme of uniting British and *canadiens* is not included among Lemire's "grands thèmes." In fact, while Kirby is discussed fairly extensively for his

⁴⁵ Actually, though Kirby visited Quebec when he first arrived in Canada, he never lived there. This statement could be taken as another example of the confusion as to what constitutes the "pays" Canada or Quebec; alternatively, this statement could reflect a tendency to claim Kirby as equally native to Quebec as Leprohon who was born there much in the same way as the English-Canadian critics tried to establish Kirby as more "genuinely" Canadian than Leprohon.

incorporation of Intendant Bigot in his novel (134-8), Antoinette is not discussed at all; except for the two statements quoted from Lemire's introduction, Leprohon is mentioned only as having given her novel Le Manoir de Villeraï "le cadre historique . . . [que] donne à son roman reproduit le double mouvement que nous avons trouvé dans les romans canadiens-français, à quelques variantes près" (132). In contrast, he says of Kirby that: "De tous les romanciers canadiens-anglais, il est seul à pénétrer aussi profondément la mentalité canadienne-française. Un point de notre psychologie a retenu son attention: notre complexe d'infériorité. Pas d'unité canadienne possible, selon lui, avant la guérison de ce traumatisme" (137-8). In fact, the entire chapter seems aimed to provide evidence that New France could never had been conquered if the leadership had not been corrupt (141) as Kirby suggests in his novel; nevertheless one wonders why, in 1970, Lemire feels it necessary to make this point.

Laurent Mailhot's La littérature québécoise (1974) would seem at first glance to be unequivocal--the title proclaims that only "québécoise" literature is to be discussed. However, that confidence is immediately undercut by the first sentence: "Un certain nombre de livres, écrits en français au nord des Etats-Unis, peuvent-ils trouver place en littérature? Et dans quelle littérature?" (5). Mailhot, like the early English-Canadian writers of surveys (and William New), is attempting to define a national literature, but his nation is Québec: "La littérature québécoise existe-t-elle, et comme littérature et comme québécoise?" (7).

Given that his agenda is to investigate *québécois* literature, one would not expect to find any discussion of English-Canadian writers like Leprohon or Kirby.

However, there is a brief mention of the latter: "En agençant dans The Golden Dog (1877) cette légende [de chien d'or] avec celles de la Corriveau et de Caroline, William Kirby contribuera presque autant que Garneau «à nous rendre à nous-mêmes, par le récit et la description de la vie d'autrefois»" (32). Once again, Leprohon, who would seem to be a more likely candidate for any analysis of an English-Canadian writer in this context, is omitted and yet Kirby is given a place; this is reminiscent of the early English-Canadian surveys and their writers' co-option of Kirby as more "thoroughly" or "genuinely" Canadian than Canadian-born Leprohon.

Before leaving the French-Canadian surveys I believe that a brief summary of the extent to which each includes English-Canadians is useful. For instance, as mentioned above, the fact that Mailhot accepts Kirby as the sole English-Canadian appropriate for inclusion in his survey is significant. The others all contain English-Canadians though in varying numbers; Lemire even includes Americans (Fenimore Cooper) and Europeans (Dickens and Dumas), but not Leprohon.

Altogether one does see parallels such as Moisan suggests; French- and English-Canadians both turn to literature to reveal and create a national identity. However, it is interesting that, from 1874 to 1974, though the French-Canadian critics discuss Leprohon and Kirby in much the same way as the English-Canadians, French-Canadians often do not mean the same thing as their English-speaking countrymen when using the term "Canadian." It is also interesting that the English and French critics are in agreement in that they always privilege historical fiction over domestic fiction and that the historical component of Antoinette goes unnoticed or is mentioned only in passing.

CHAPTER THREE: LATER EDITIONS⁴⁶

The surveys, later editions, scholarly articles and reference work entries overlap chronologically and interact in the trajectory of canon-making posited by Barbara Herrnstein Smith: citation (surveys, articles and reference works), re-production (later editions) and re-citation (later surveys, scholarly analyses and reference works). Furthermore, as noted in the previous chapter, surges in nationalistic sentiment tended to be accompanied by surges in the production of literature and literary endeavours (such as journals).⁴⁷ Thus the economic prosperity and increased independence from Britain in the 1920s and the adoption of formal symbols of nationhood like an anthem and a flag in the 1960s were accompanied by increased production of surveys and the re-production of Antoinette and The Golden Dog (among many other early literary works). The first classroom edition of The Golden Dog was published in 1931 under the aegis of the St. Martin's Classics [SMC], and the New Canadian Library (NCL) issued an abridged version of The Golden Dog in 1969 and a full edition of Antoinette in 1973. In addition, the introduction of Canadian Literature courses in secondary and post-secondary curricula during the 1970s (due in part to the NCL publications) parallels the founding of Canadian scholarly journals and reference

⁴⁶ This chapter focuses on editions which appeared in English after the authors' lifetimes. There appears to be only one later edition in French, a revised version of Le May's translation of The Golden Dog that came out in 1926 (Hayne "Le May's French Translation" 1981, 59).

⁴⁷ Margery Fee notes that university hiring practices have been influenced by nationalism and elitism ("Canadian Literature and English Studies" 1992-93, 24-27).

works; during the 1980s the majority of scholarly articles on Antoinette and The Golden Dog appear, and the Centre for Editing Early Canadian Texts (CEEECT) begins production.

The overt nation-building noted in the early reviews and the surveys seems to have disappeared at this point in the process; but if "'literature' is effectively what we teach in departments of English" (Fiedler 1982, 58) and "essential to national self-definition" (Fee 1981, 2), then the shift into classroom editions like those in the NCL and CEEECT series confirms that the novels are resurrected to help define Canada. Hence their existence is implicitly nationalistic. But because the passage of time and the change from entertainment to education has made the novels alien to their new audience--modern students--the novels require interpretation. As noted in my first chapter, introductions and prefaces are designed to tell the reader how to read the work; in later editions these instructions are supplied by editors.

Later Editions of The Golden Dog in English

Before investigating the classroom editions I would like to discuss the last "entertainment" version of The Golden Dog, the Musson edition which was first released in 1920 or 1921. According to Elizabeth Brady, the Musson edition is a truncated version of the original novel ("Bibliographical Essay" 1976, 47), and T.G. Marquis⁴⁸ explains that the cut of nearly one hundred pages was necessary because

⁴⁸ An educator familiar with the book trade (Macmillan Dictionary of Canadian Biography 1978, 559), Marquis also authored one of the surveys, English Canadian Literature, which was highly complimentary of Kirby's novel (1913, 547-8).

"The author gathered together a vast amount of information bearing on the period of his story and of his characters . . . [which] mar the flow of the story and weary the reader" (1941, vii). Moreover, Marquis promises that "nothing has been omitted that is essential to the narrative" (vii). The novel had been cut before, but Marquis is the first to openly claim that his comprehension of the story is better than that of the author (as revealed in his claim that nothing "essential" has been omitted).⁴⁹

This attitude of superiority recurs in the classroom editions, the St. Martin's Classics (SMC 1931) and the NCL (1969). Each subsequent version of the novel is even more severely truncated⁵⁰ than the Musson edition, and the editor of each claims to reveal the "true" story. In fact, the only reason not given for shortening Kirby's novel is the obvious practical one--it is too long for most classroom use. E.C. Woodley,⁵¹ editor of the SMC edition of The Golden Dog, opens his introduction with these words:

Kirby's great story is a *very long* historical romance--a tale of love and intrigue, passion and bravery, in the closing years of the French regime in Canada. Like *other and greater* novelists, Kirby has allowed his interest in

⁴⁹ The Musson edition also generated the last review of The Golden Dog to date (none were generated by the NCL versions). The review, printed in The Canadian Magazine, calls the novel "famous," a "classic," "perhaps the most widely read book on Canada every [sic] published, and it has held its place for many years in all parts of the Dominion" (57:4 [1921] 350).

⁵⁰ Leonard Vandervaart explores the connection between the abridgement of The Golden Dog and its increasingly less favourable reception in his thesis, "Abridgement as Criticism: A Textual Study of William Kirby's The Golden Dog" (1980).

⁵¹ Woodley, "educationist and author," served as "a special officer of the department of education for the province of Quebec" while teaching school in Westmount. He was also elected a fellow of the Royal Historical Society in 1944 (The Macmillan Dictionary of Canadian Biography 1978, 904).

the characters which crowd his pages to lead him into many bypaths which often carry him far from the main story he is seeking to tell.
(my italics, 1931, v)

Aside from the judgement implicit in cutting over half the novel, Woodley's ambivalence towards this novel as a work of literature is also revealed in the phrasing of his introduction. For example, his designation of the novel as a "very long historical romance" and comparison of Kirby to "other and greater novelists" (v) indicates a patronizing attitude toward the novel and its author.

Woodley goes on to claim that the novel is in fact made of two stories: "the story of the struggle between the forces of honesty and corruption in New France just before the conquest, which is *the real story* of the Golden Dog, and . . . the dark tragedy of Caroline of Beaumanoir (italics mine, v). He further states that "It is quite possible to separate these tales, and the editor of this volume has tried to do so. For this is only the story of the Golden Dog, the tale of the mutual hatred of Bigot and Philibert, and of the young lives broken by that hatred" (v). There is a contradiction in calling the novel a "great story" and then immediately showing how, in fact, much of the novel is extraneous to the "real" story that Kirby is trying to tell.⁵² Furthermore, Woodley's assumption that he knows "the real story" better than its author is both condescending and suspect.

Woodley further interprets the novel for the readers by placing himself in Kirby's mind: "Kirby lived with his characters, and the scenes he describes are as real to him

⁵² Given that this version is 220 pages and the original was 678 pages long, one can see that Woodley considers most of the novel to be unnecessary.

as the streets, homes and gardens of his *native* town" (italics mine, v); the transformation from emigrant to native which was attempted in the surveys has been completed here for, as an immigrant, no place in Canada was Kirby's "native" town. Woodley then utilizes the "editorial we" which coopts the readers into his own conclusions. Thus, when Woodley writes "as we read the pages of The Golden Dog, and give our imagination rein, we lose touch with the present and find ourselves in the old city of Quebec when the flag of the Bourbons still floated above its battlements" (vii), the reader rhetorically shares Woodley's impressions. The combination of placing himself in the author's mind and rhetorically including the reader of the introduction in Woodley's own reaction to the novel is a potent one. In effect, the devices force the reader to pre-experience the novel with and through Woodley's interpretation.⁵³ The effort to control the reader so completely raises the suspicion that Woodley considers the novel to be an inferior work and that only by manipulating the reader can Woodley convince him or her otherwise.⁵⁴ The editor's ambivalence towards the novel is also revealed by the fact that after making a number of explicit and implicit statements which suggest that The Golden Dog, as originally written, is not a particularly good book, he chooses to end his introduction with an excerpt from the novel itself which appears to validate both Kirby's writing and his text.

⁵³ This situation may account for the NCL's new system of "afterwords."

⁵⁴ Unfortunately, this control is only evident if a reader analyzes the introduction as I have done. The target audience--high school and undergraduate students--are more likely to accept the editor's opinions without question (assuming they read the introduction at all).

Derek Crawley, editor of the NCL edition, also manipulates the reader in such a way as to reveal his own ambivalence towards the novel. For instance, once again the novel is too long: "Kirby's romance lends itself to cutting, especially if we consider the tastes of the modern reader" and particularly when it focuses on "details of feasts, social entertainments and the niceties of decorous conversation[,] . . . [a character] whose presence has almost no relevance to the main story lines[,] . . . sticky love scenes between Amélie and Pierre[,] and some scenes involving Angélique's flirtation" (1969, vii). I would like to point out that Crawley too makes use of the "editorial we" and thus enfolds the reader in his own opinions. To Crawley, "The Golden Dog may be said to centre around the love stories of two women--Angélique and Amélie" (viii); of the two he finds Angélique the more convincing and more entertaining character (as does von Guttenberg in his Early Canadian Art and Literature 1969). In fact, Crawley is so enamoured of Angélique, that of his five-page introduction to the novel, half is given to a discussion of this character. Conversely, the reader is informed that he or she is not supposed to like Amélie: "Amélie and her love story are of much less interest than the involved and 'politic' affairs of Angélique" (x). Crawley's discussion of Amélie ends with the statement that "Amélie's death scene, has the sentimentality and vulgarity of the death of Little Nell," thus pairing her death scene with the exemplar of Victorian sentimentality.

Crawley also points out some writing deficiencies and positive attributes in The Golden Dog, but it is his closing statement that may be the most revealing: "It is not

difficult to see why The Golden Dog has appeared in over a dozen countries in English or French in Canada, United States and Great Britain. Love stories and murders when woven into a convincing historical background have appealed for generations and are likely to continue to do so" (xi). The claim that The Golden Dog survives because of some quirk in human beings who ask only for a "convincing historical background" to their stories of love and murder reveals Crawley's low opinion of the novel and its readership. This condescension towards the readers echoes his earlier statement to the effect that since the novel has been cut "substantially," "there is little excuse for leaving this famous Canadian story unread" (vii) which is striking for its implication that readers are lazy. Like Woodley, Crawley not only interprets The Golden Dog for the reader, he does it so authoritatively and restrictively that other possible interpretations are obstructed. And as with Woodley, the very strictness of the control over the reader suggests that Crawley himself does not see much to value in the novel.

Crawley makes a parenthetical comment about Leprohon in relation to Kirby that is worth noting. He claims that:

Although Canadian writers of Kirby's day were fond of writing about old Quebec, none had either his knowledge of historical setting or his remarkable insights into the life of that period. Writers such as Julia Hart (The Nun of Canada), Rosanna Leprohon (Antoinette de Mirecourt) and Jean-Talon Lesperance (The Bastonnais)--and others--were often simply trying their hands at love intrigue in a romanticized setting that could so easily be linked with traditional accoutrements of the Gothic novel, or could reflect biases against the Roman Church, the Americans or what have you. (vii-viii)

As in the surveys, Kirby is again shown somehow to have more knowledge and insight about a place and culture than Leprohon who lived in Quebec among the French-Canadians.

Later Editions of Antoinette

Even Carl Klinck, General Editor of the survey, Literary History of Canada (1965) and author of the section on Leprohon and Kirby, is ambivalent towards Antoinette and its author. For instance, while he begins his introduction to the NCL edition by stating that Antoinette "deserves much more recognition than it has received" (5), the focus of the introduction is not on Antoinette but on Leprohon's works in general and her personal life. The ambivalence is furthered when Klinck's positive comments on the wit and irony of Leprohon's dialogue are followed by a convoluted statement about her characters:

There is no proof of imitation in the fact that Mrs. Leprohon's principal characters could be described in terms of Thackeray's in Vanity Fair (1847-8). The heroine, Antoinette, is not a Becky Sharp; she is a rich heiress, not an enterprising governess. Indeed, she is rather like Amelia. Mrs. D'Aulnay could have played the role of a younger Miss Crawley, and Major Sternfield that of Captain Rawdon Crawley. Yet the characters in Antoinette seem to prove themselves as people of Mrs. Leprohon's observation and imagination because her plot is so definitely home-made out of moral and religious elements in her own nature. (10-11)

After raising the possibility that Leprohon imitated Thackeray, Klinck rests his contradictory argument that the characters are her own creation on the fact of her Catholicism rather than her imagination: "Antoinette's story, therefore, is more than a conventional tale of the conflict of love and duty: the heroine's mistake is blown up to tragic proportions because Mrs. Leprohon⁵⁵ regarded it as a sin against God" (11).

⁵⁵ It is interesting to note that while Thackeray is called by his surname as is traditional when discussing an author, Leprohon is "Mrs. Leprohon" or "Rosanna," a polite familiarity which suggests that she is not to be taken as seriously as a male writer.

To say that a situation is "blown up" connotes an unnecessary and artificial inflation, therefore the potential praise of calling the story "more than a conventional tale" is undermined.

After proving how the story and characters came out of Leprohon's Catholicism, Klinck goes on to note that de Bellefeuille (Leprohon's nephew-in-law and reviewer of Antoinette) "provided the crisis for the moral action of Antoinette when he presented his 'Thèse Sur les Mariages Clandestins'. . . . It was published in 1860, and, of course, came to Mrs. Leprohon's attention" (11). Thus Klinck simultaneously grounds the novel in an historical reality (which seems unnecessary since secret marriages were a staple of romantic fiction), and suggests that Leprohon needed help to create her plots. Furthermore, since Klinck does not allude to the relationship between Leprohon and Bellefeuille, he implies that she somehow was so obsessed with "sin" that anything written on the topic "of course" came to her attention.

Yet Klinck also makes a number of highly positive statements. For instance, he calls the novel "a parable of amicable relations" (9), and states that "The book earns the designation of a novel of social purpose" (12). Both these statements, as well as the fact of Antoinette's republication for the first time in over one hundred years, indicate that the novel is again found to be worthwhile. However, these positive statements, when coupled with the criticisms noted above, are contradictory and confusing. Somehow, Klinck says, despite its failings as a piece of writing, the novel works on a social level. As in a number of the surveys, non-literary criteria are being applied to the novel which suggests that Antoinette would not survive analysis

as a literary work.

The NCL edition did generate one review; Linda Shohet wrote a comparative review of Antoinette and Frances Brooke's The History of Emily Montague also released by NCL (Journal of Canadian Fiction 2:3 [Summer] 1973). Shohet notes that Leprohon "focuses more sharply on the political atmosphere" than Brooke, and that "[w]here Mrs. Brooke appealed to Reason in the matter, Mrs. Leprohon turns to religion" (103).⁵⁶ Shohet also states that Leprohon

doubtless wished for peaceful co-existence between the races, but the final marriage, even if read symbolically, must be qualified. . . . [because] despite Mr. de Mirecourt's admiration for Evelyn, he would never have sanctioned the match had his daughter not been disgraced and hence unlikely to find a husband among her own countrymen. (103)

This is true; however, M. de Mirecourt could have refused to allow Antoinette to marry at all. Furthermore, Shohet seems to overlook the fact that Antoinette gained, by her disobedience, what she had always wanted--the right to chose her own husband.

Unfortunately, even the tenuous approval found in Klinck's introduction and Shohet's review is diminished by John Stockdale's preface and introduction to the CEECT edition of Antoinette. His preface begins as follows: "My first flirtation with Rosanna Eleanor Mullins Leprohon and her literary offspring Antoinette de Mirecourt (1864) took place in 1970" (1989, xiii). He continues this theme: "my two initial flirtations grew slowly into a full-fledged affair, a durable, long-term commitment of

⁵⁶ It is interesting that Shohet, perhaps influenced by Klinck's introduction, refers to Leprohon and Brooke as "Mrs. Leprohon" and "Mrs. Brooke" respectively.

a nature to drive most wives into a frenzy of jealousy" (xiv). Given that the CEECT "was established to prepare for publication scholarly editions of major works of early English-Canadian prose" (xi), Stockdale's terminology is particularly out of place. Thus, even before reading the introduction let alone the novel, the reader of Stockdale's preface is led to understand that this novel is not to be taken seriously; the introduction reinforces this impression. For example, Stockdale's focus on Leprohon's role as wife and mother (eg. xviii-xx) undercuts her role as writer. The difficulty rests not in his inclusion of information about Leprohon as a wife and mother, but in the type of information--if one accepted Stockdale at face value one would come to the conclusion that Leprohon did little but nurse sick children. While it is true that little information can be had from Leprohon herself,⁵⁷ Stockdale could have found passages in her husband's correspondence which more specifically address her writing.

Furthermore, while Stockdale's placement of the novel in its historical context (the American Civil War years) is helpful for an overall framework, his insistence on finding an historical event to explain every main action in the novel, including that standard of romantic fiction, the duel (xxxi-xxxiv), leaves nothing to Leprohon's own creativity--everything is merely a recitation of an historical reality. Stockdale, like Klinck, also attributes the idea of the secret marriage to de Bellefeuille (xxiv-xxx),

⁵⁷ There do not seem to be any surviving documents by Leprohon other than her literary works. Even Henri Deneau's thesis, the most exhaustive investigation of Leprohon's life to date, has to rely on quotations from her poetry and other people to supply information on her feelings (1948, 2-16).

and, like Klinck, tends to refer to Leprohon as either "Rosanna" or "Mrs. Leprohon" (eg. xv, xvii, xviii, xx, xxi). Stockdale may do so because he often speaks of her in relation to her husband and does not want to cause confusion, but he could have referred to Leprohon's husband as "Doctor Leprohon" or "her husband" and reserved the surname for her.

Also, Stockdale, again like Klinck, attributes Leprohon's characters to other works of fiction; he discusses them in relation to Balzac's novel La Femme de trente ans (xxxiv-xxxv) and suggests that the name Antoinette was taken from Ninon De Lenclos one of whose characters (Anne-Antoinette Ligier de la Garde) is similar to Antoinette de Mirecourt in that they are both young and (eventually) reject frivolous novels (xxxvi).

Stockdale devotes the rest of his introduction to references to some of the reviews and anticipatory notes about the novel (xxxvi-xli), Genand's translation of the work into French (xli-xlv), other translations into French (xlv-xlvii), the play version (xlviii-xlviii), various reference works which contain mention of Leprohon and her works (xlviii-xlix), and "sustained analyses" of the novel (l). Of the entire forty-three pages of preface and introduction written by Stockdale, only two (xxv-xxvi) deal solely with the novel, and those two pages are plot summary. Moreover, Stockdale suggests that Leprohon's survival as a writer depended on her "long-standing connection with John Lovell" during her lifetime and in Henri Deneau's M.A. thesis after her death (xlix). he signals the reader that this is a slight work by giving the reception of the novel and historical facts precedence over the work itself. However, the introductions for the

CEECT editions of John Richardson's Wacousta (Cronk 1987, xvii-lvi) and Catharine Parr Traill's Canadian Crusoes (Schieder 1986, xvii-lv) also place a great deal of emphasis on historical events and on the personal lives of the authors; this suggests that Stockdale's organization of his introduction to Antoinette is in accordance with CEECT guidelines, a fact which does not alter the effect of such a format when combined with his choice of phrasing.

It is probably this effect that Gaile McGregor is reacting to when she reviews the CEECT edition of Leprohon's novel in The Canadian Historical Review (72.4 [1991] 599-601):

one must query the editor's whole sense, as conveyed in the background facts he chooses to impart, of what is "important" about this book. It's all very interesting to know the "real" incidents--secret marriages, duels, and the like--that may have inspired Leprohon, but surely the true value of a novel lies in its relationship not with social but with literary history: its place in the author's oeuvre, its links with the canon, its aesthetic claims. Of this Stockdale tells us virtually nothing. So the question remains: Was all the work and expense really justified? Personally, I'm inclined to doubt it. (601)

In general, McGregor's review is unnecessarily harsh,⁵⁸ but in this final statement at least she has a point--Stockdale's emphasis on historical fact (even if part of CEECT requirements) makes it difficult for any reader to take the novel seriously as a literary work.

Hers is not the only response to the CEECT edition; Mary Lu MacDonald also reviewed the novel ("A Canadian Tale" Matrix 32 [1990] 77-8). MacDonald is much

⁵⁸ There is also at least one error. She states that Antoinette is of the age "that spawned the like of Clarissa" (600), which was, of course, written and published during the eighteenth century not the nineteenth.

more detached in her approach as she addresses various points like the editor's role as interpreter for a contemporary audience, the difficulties Stockdale faced in trying to compile a biography of Leprohon, and his attempts to explain the story in terms of actual historical events (which she, like McGregor, rejects) (78). However, most interesting is her reminder that Leprohon (née Mullins) was of Irish heritage and likely had Irish influences:

The most serious omission from the list of possible influences on the novel is Irish literature and legend. . . . The Irish in Montreal did not mix with the English, they retained their own cultural ties--and one aspect of Irish culture, particularly among Catholics like the Mullins family, was a dislike of anything having to do with England. Catholic Irish also resented French domination of the Roman Catholic Church, so as a result, they tended to stand apart from both English and French. (78)

Given this information, Leprohon's resolution to marry English to French could be taken as either extremely generous or ironic, a joke on both cultures; the novel suggests the former.

The Golden Dog and its Later French Edition⁵⁹

To this phase there is only one contribution from French-Canada; a new translation of The Golden Dog was begun by Pamphile Le May and completed by Benjamin Sulte after Le May's death (Hayne "Le May's French Translation" 1981, 59). Le May is given credit as translator while the preface is signed by Sulte. The preface begins with a quotation from Le May's original translation which Sulte claims

⁵⁹ According to David Hayne ("Le May's French Translation" 1981, 59), this release generated two French reviews. Unfortunately, I have been unable to access them.

was prophetic: "Ce que la préface de l'édition de 1884 faisait prévoir, s'est réalisé; le Chien d'Or se range, dans notre bibliothèque nationale, à côté de nos meilleures sources de renseignements" (10). Sulte further notes that one of the positive effects of The Golden Dog is that "les lecteurs de langue anglaise . . . ont éprouvé à notre égard, par l'effet de ce livre, une transformation qui nous est favorable" (10). This statement is important because it is the first which suggests that the attitudes of English-Canadians are of any concern to the French-Canadians. Perhaps Sulte is reacting to prevalent attitudes toward French-Canadians; in 1916 (when Sulte wrote the preface), Ontario and Manitoba were imposing restrictions on French in the public schools and French-speaking volunteers during World War I were usually placed in English-speaking units, thus being forced to assimilate. Sulte includes a biography of Kirby, an account of how the novel came to be written and the source of the golden dog legend (11-20) which he asserts "a imprégné de merveilleux l'admirable roman historique de William Kirby" (20). Despite the praise, the fact that the novel is embedded in the legend suggests that the novel's value is secondary to the legend.

On the whole, despite recent re-productions of Antoinette and The Golden Dog, the novels are taken increasingly less seriously. The introductions are coloured by the contemporary sensibilities of their writers who treat the novels as if Victorianism is a less mature form of literature, and evince a continuous tone of condescension.⁶⁰ In

⁶⁰ Even the blurbs on the book jackets, after making the books sound as exciting as possible, emphasize the "flaws" of the original. For instance, the blurb on the 1941 Musson edition jacket praises The Golden Dog for its historical topic and promotion of tourism to Quebec. The 1969 NCL edition blurb notes that "Derek Crawley has cut The Golden Dog to half its original (and somewhat alarming) length

the case of The Golden Dog, the editors' strict control of the readers' responses to the novel reveals an ambivalence towards it, implying that if left to their own devices readers would question the value of the novel. Thus, the readers of these editions of the novels--students who will be the next generation of critics--are left with a contradiction; the existence of the SMC, NCL and CEECT editions in the classroom is supposed to indicate that the novels are "literature," while the introductions suggest the opposite. Moreover, the relative positions of The Golden Dog and Antoinette are unchanged; for, pleasant as is Klinck's praise of Antoinette and devastating as is the abridgement of The Golden Dog, the reduction of the latter is no more destructive than Stockdale's "flirtation" with Antoinette. Though little overt mention is made of nationalism, it must be remembered that historically a nation has been considered to be defined in part by its literature, and that the various editions coincide with surges in nationalist sentiment. Furthermore, if these novels are not "literature," as their editors suggest, the only reason they are being taught is because they are Canadian which, if true, reinforces the notion that Canada has no real literature.

of 678 pages, without losing any of its essential tempo and colour" and the later NCL covers repeat this idea. As for Antoinette, the 1973 NCL cover focuses on its "bilingualism and biculturalism," and the CEECT edition gives as much space to a note on Stockdale as it does to Leprohon. Thus, even a reader who might pick up the books randomly is signalled that the original The Golden Dog is so flawed that the removal of half the text does not affect the story, and that the editor of Antoinette is as important as the author.

CHAPTER 4: ENTRIES IN REFERENCE WORKS

I have included entries in reference works because, despite their brevity, they are potentially powerful directors of reading. Reference works are "intended to be, or [are] suitable for being, referred to or consulted"; dictionaries, lexicons and encyclopedias are examples of reference works (Oxford English Dictionary 1961 rpt, 338). Implicit in this definition is the idea that reference works contain facts and thus entries in such works have an aura of unquestionable authority. Furthermore, like surveys and introductions these entries are designed to promote a single reading of a work, and their brevity forces those readings to be even more restrictive than either the surveys or introductions. Chronologically, (except for Morgan's two works), most reference works appeared during the 1970s and 1980s following the same "surge" that led to the creation of new scholarly journals and the NCL publications. In addition, for the first time, there is no clear separation between English-Canadians and French-Canadians. Indeed, the entries for Antoinette and The Golden Dog in the Dictionnaire des oeuvres littéraires du Québec (1980) are both authored by bilingual scholars whose first language is English--John Stockdale and David Hayne respectively.⁶¹ Therefore these entries are integrated chronologically with the ones in English.

Given that it would be impossible to analyze every reference work which has an

⁶¹ David Hayne writes in French and English; John Stockdale's entry in the Dictionnaire was likely translated for him.

entry on Leprohon, Antoinette, Kirby, or The Golden Dog, I have chosen to restrict myself to the most accessible and therefore most commonly consulted reference works. Henry Morgan pioneered the field of literary reference works in Canada with Bibliotheca Canadensis (1867) and The Canadian Men and Women of the Time (1898). The impact of Morgan's work can be seen by the fact that an error he makes, the date of Kirby's emigration to Canada (Bibliotheca 212), is repeated in the surveys for decades (as noted in Chapter Two) and in some of the later reference works.

Morgan's opinion of Leprohon is as follows:

She has aimed principally, in some of her best known works, to depict the state of society which existed in Can. prior to, and immediately after, the Conquest, and by her often graphic descriptions of the refinement and chivalry of that period, has sought to exert a salutary influence over the present matter of fact and "hard money" world in which we live. Her pictures are lively and well-drawn. (Bibliotheca 1867, 224)

While it is a fact that Leprohon's three most famous novels (of which Antoinette is one) all deal with the issue of the Conquest's effect on French-Canadians, Morgan's statement that Leprohon "has sought to exert a salutary influence" is an opinion as is his assertion that "her pictures are lively and well-drawn" (Bibliotheca 224).

However, by presenting the fact first, the two opinions that follow it read like facts too and are thus rendered more authoritative.

Morgan follows his entry on Antoinette with excerpts from two reviews, and intriguingly chooses excerpts which relay an ambiguous message about the quality of the novel. For instance, the first quotation includes the following statement: "'all, or nearly all, is natural and life-like. With no bewildering plot to addle the brain . . .'"

(Gazette qtd Bibliotheca 224). The second, in its entirety is as follows: "'We can confidently call it our best Canadian novel, *en attendant mieux*'" (Saturday Reader qtd Bibliotheca 224). So, without actually stating an opinion, Morgan reveals his estimation of Antoinette. Morgan also exposes his judgement of Leprohon's works by not discussing them in Canadian Men and Women of the Time (1898) where Leprohon herself is noted only as "a gifted Can. authoress" at the end of her husband's entry (578). While it is true that Men and Women of the Time includes only individuals who were alive at the time of publication, Morgan could have easily listed at least her most famous works.

Bibliotheca does not contain any reference to The Golden Dog since the novel was not published until ten years later, but though Morgan does not attempt to make any judgements about Kirby's novel in the entry in Canadian Men and Women (1898), he still manages to convey his high opinion by citing those of others'. For instance, Morgan paraphrases a letter from Lord Tennyson in his entry on Kirby which imbues the work with a sense of value; a person of 1898 reading "'few novels had given [Tennyson] more pleasure than [The Golden Dog], and . . . he would like to write a poem on the subject'" would accept the novel as having merit.

Furthermore, to emphasize the point, Morgan chose to reprint excerpts from highly complimentary reviews: "'No better pen; no more able writer'" (Week qtd Men 541); "'None of our writers have displayed greater powers in delineating native character than he'" (Mail and Empire qtd Men 541); "'He has celebrated in Wordsworthian verse the glories and the goodness of the United Empire Loyalists'" (John Lesperance

qtd Men 541). Here one gets the impression that the "*mieux*" referred to in the review of Antoinette has arrived.

After a gap of almost seventy years during which (apparently) surveys alone provided information on Kirby, Leprohon and their novels, another reference work appears: Norah Story's The Oxford Companion to Canadian History and Literature (1967). The inclusion of "Oxford" in the title cues the reader that this is a work of prestige and authority; however the entry on Leprohon opens with an error: her birthdate is listed as 1832 (451). By this point Henri Deneau's thesis which provides the correct date is available and relatively easy to access. This error could lead one to question the accuracy of Norah Story's⁶² other statements except for the fact that few people would know that she is in error. Thus her proclamation that "A certain artificiality of setting mars" (452) Antoinette would be accepted as fact.

Story's entry on Kirby is better researched; she has the correct date of his emigration and notes that while Fr chet te was mentioned in connection with a translation of the novel he never did one. This fact alone, that she researched Kirby more carefully than Leprohon, indicates a value judgement.⁶³ But again, few readers would know these details. Her entry on the novel itself reads quite neutrally. For instance, Story states that the novel "was the fruit of eleven years' study. . . .

⁶² Since Norah Story is the only author listed for the book, I have to assume that she wrote the entries that I analyze.

⁶³ Story does make the mistake of claiming that the 1896 version of The Golden Dog was approved by Kirby, since, as the letters in Pierce (whom she also cites) make clear, Kirby was happy with none of the versions which came out during his lifetime.

Into this historical background and the romance that he based on ambition and cupidity, Kirby wove a popular version of the legend" of the golden dog, Caroline and La Corriveau (406). However, the seeming neutrality of Story's entry on The Golden Dog only emphasizes the negative valuation of Leprohon's novel when they are viewed together.

The Dictionary of Canadian Biography entry on Kirby has not yet appeared; that volume is still in preparation. The entry on Leprohon ("Mullins" X: 1972) includes fairly detailed information on her husband which gives the impression that there is not much to say about her alone. Stockdale, the author of the entry, has a poor opinion of her work⁶⁴; Antoinette is referred to as "a romantic, stilted novel, the worst of the later group" (537). He also makes the claim that "though her novels have little appeal now, they retain some of their charm if taken for what they were: amusement for women readers of early Canada. They are readable, if not believable, episodic (because of publishing demands), but not boring" (537-8). This sounds very like Leprohon's early reviewers who expressed a low opinion of Antoinette and its readership alike.

Stockdale's entry is also interesting for his comments about Leprohon herself. For instance, he notes that strained marriages recur in her fiction repeatedly after her own marriage, thus implying that her domestic life was difficult. Also the author of the entry on Antoinette in Dictionnaire des oeuvres littéraires du Québec (hereafter

⁶⁴ Stockdale refers to this entry and the change in his opinion of the novels in his preface to the CEECT edition of the novel (1989, xiii).

referred to as the Dictionnaire. 1: 1978), he states that, "Fondé sur une intrigue romanesque inutilement compliquée, ce roman de madame Leprohon apparaît comme l'un de ses ouvrages les moins réussis" (34). Leprohon is referred to as "madame Jean-Lucien Leprohon" in this entry (34).

At this point I would like to mention briefly another aspect of reference works which is relevant--their tendency to remain unchanged even in later editions. For example, despite other revisions to the Dictionnaire (1978; 1980), Canadian Encyclopedia (1985; 1988) and John Moss' A Reader's Guide to the Canadian Novel (1981; 1987), the entries on Antoinette and The Golden Dog in the later editions are identical to those in the earlier versions except for the page numbers (I cite from the more recent of the works). This continuity of opinion adds to the aura of factuality; like a dictionary of language, the entries are slow to change and are therefore expected to be equally accurate.

David Hayne's entry on The Golden Dog for the Dictionnaire begins: "L'oeuvre littéraire de Kirby est abondante et variée. . . . Pourtant aucun de ses écrits n'est plus connu ni plus estimé que son roman historique The Golden Dog, le meilleur exemple du genre dans la littérature anglo-canadienne due XIXe siècle" (1: 1980, 115). The contrast with Stockdale's opinion of Antoinette is immediate, but there is also a direct connection made between the two novels; Stockdale in the DCB (X: 1972, 538) and Hayne here (115) acknowledge that Leprohon's works were precursors to those of Kirby, but Hayne continues by claiming that Kirby was the first to "reconstitua dans un roman anglo-canadien l'atmosphère du Régime français" (116). As in the surveys,

the Anglophone Kirby is said to be better at making his novel seem French than Leprohon who was educated and lived among them. Technically, Hayne is correct since Antoinette is set in the post-Conquest era and hence cannot be said to be a description of the "Régime français"; I would argue, however, that Kirby's characters cannot be said to seem any more French than Leprohon's and are in fact less realistic.

Mary Jane Edwards' entry on Leprohon for William Toye's The Oxford Companion to Canadian Literature (1983) is more favourable. She calls the novel one of Leprohon's "most significant" (449) and claims that it explores "the psychological problems facing the 'old French' who stayed in 'their country' after 'it had passed under a foreign rule,' and love between people of different national, religious, and social backgrounds" (450). Edwards further asserts that Leprohon "developed these themes with *some* complexity" (my italics, 450); the compliment is modified by "some." The critics' views that Edwards chooses to cite, though unfamiliar to me, are more wholly positive: "Critics have pointed to her [Leprohon's] gifts as a storyteller, her realistic portrayal of French-Canadian life and French-English relations, and her conservative but nevertheless feminist views on the education of women and on marriage as a partnership" (450).

This favourable approach is repeated in Carole Gerson's entry on Leprohon, Agnes Maule Machar and James De Mille in the ambitious, ten-volume fiction series, Canadian Writers and Their Works⁶⁵ (1: 1983). The format is highly structured but

⁶⁵ This series was difficult to place in my categories given that it could just as easily be considered a multi-volume survey. However, the rigidity of the format and inclusion of biographical information led me to place the series here with the

there is room for analysis in the "Works" section. For example, Gerson reviews each author's use of the romance genre (220-3), the consequences of reading the "wrong" sort of literature (223-4), the moral structure of Leprohon's and Machar's works (224), and the way in which all three authors use historical information (226). She also discusses the political implications for French-English relations in Antoinette (240).

Comparing the above with Margot Northey's entry on William Kirby for the series (2: 1989)⁶⁶ one immediately notices that Kirby has his own chapter while Leprohon shares space with two other writers. However, in terms of the content of the entry, Northey's observations are fairly neutral. She notes, as have others, that Kirby takes "poetic licence" with historical fact (95), and claims that "what constitutes good and evil in Kirby's case largely reflects his predilection for order over disorder" (97-8). In fact, she sees Kirby's predilection in every aspect of his novel: his descriptions of the Quebec wilderness (98), his characterizations (98), and the society he created for Quebec (99).

Some criticisms are directed equally at The Golden Dog and Antoinette. For instance, Stockdale finds the romantic structure of Antoinette to be a disadvantage (DCB X: 1972, 537) and Dennis Duffy makes a similar comment about The Golden Dog in his entry The Oxford Companion to Canadian Literature (1983): "it is imbued

reference works.

⁶⁶ I would like to mention in passing that Northey repeats the opinion found in some of the surveys, namely that Kirby "was a Canadian by choice" (90). Furthermore, she, like the survey writers, weights this fact quite heavily.

with conventions of the European Gothic novel that make it highly romantic and unrealistic, though one can admire its emotional complexity and ambitious conception" (409). Obviously, one is not supposed to be able to admire the romantic aspects, which is in agreement with the typical modernist distaste for Victorianism found in the later surveys and introductions to the later editions as well.

Furthermore, the entry is a precursor to Duffy's books, Gardens, Covenants, Exiles: Loyalism in the Literature of Upper Canada/Ontario (1982) and Sounding the Iceberg: An Essay on Canadian Historical Novels (1986) which will be discussed in the next chapter. Here he states the ideas which he will later develop more fully: loyalty and loyalism in Kirby's works. Duffy claims that in The Golden Dog Kirby "extended the concept of loyalty so that it became the principal moral attribute of French as well as English Canada" (Companion 1983, 410).

Dennis Duffy also wrote the entry on Kirby for The Canadian Encyclopedia (2: 1988) where again he emphasizes loyalty and loyalism (1139). However, his evaluation of The Golden Dog is both more varied and more favourable than in the earlier entry: "The Golden Dog is a swashbuckling historical romance. Based upon historic figures, the product of meticulous research, the novel depicts moral progress leading from the corruption of the last days of New France to French Canada's incorporation into the loyal, upright Canadian state" (1140). This point is interesting because it reveals that Duffy's opinion of the novel seems to have changed even in the two years (the first edition of the Encyclopedia was released in 1985) which have passed since the publication of The Oxford Companion (1983); anyone reading these

two reference works faces potentially conflicting entries written by the same person in what are supposed to be factual accounts.

That difficulty is bypassed in John Sorfleet's entry on Leprohon in the Canadian Encyclopedia (2: 1988, 1202) which is a listing of facts. In contrast, John Moss makes many judgements in A Reader's Guide to the Canadian Novel starting with his criteria for inclusion: a novel must be "significant" in some way (1987, xv-xvi). His technique tends to involve pairing positive and negative statements. For instance:

The plot is melodramatic, and Leprohon handles it with extravagance of language and sentiment. The novel nevertheless speaks resoundingly to the social problems of romantic intemperance. Marriage not for moral worth and practical suitability but for love was a notion quite alarming to Leprohon and her peers. Her novel would make delightful light reading under any circumstances, but with its historical implications on the bicultural experience in Canada, its determined sense of social responsibility, and its historical authenticity--combined with its revelations of sensibility of its own mid-Victorian times--it is an important novel. (231)

Aside from echoing Leprohon's first reviewers in his choice of language ("delightful light reading"), there is a slight misreading of the novel since Antoinette loves Colonel Evelyn as well as respects him. Moss evidently does not consider Antoinette to be a "good" book, yet is compelled to include it for its "significant" aspects. This emphasis on the value of the novel as an historical artifact is also reminiscent of what has been said before though it is unclear if Moss is referring to the era *from* which or *about* which Leprohon wrote when he claims that the novel has "historical authenticity." If the latter, then Moss becomes one of the few to actually comment on the historical nature of Leprohon's romance as more than backdrop for the love story.

Moss' entry on The Golden Dog contains the same combination of distaste for the

novel and acknowledgement of its place in the canon. For instance, he calls it "a potboiler of high order" and then comments on its "authenticity" (196). He ends by claiming The Golden Dog as "the best novel in English about Old Quebec/New France, and the best of its type written by a Victorian Canadian. It embodies much of the Victorian sensibility in its excesses, its odd sentiments, and its high moral purpose; but it is still a novel worth reading for its entertainment value alone" (197).

Patricia Monk's entry on Kirby in the Dictionary of Literary Biography (DLB 99: 1990) reveals a similar vacillation between claiming the novel as an historical artifact and a distaste for the actual work. For instance, she claims that Kirby, "without having any particular talent as a writer either of prose or verse, nevertheless managed to produce one of the most popular books of his time" (186). She repeats her evaluation of Kirby's lack of skill as a writer in reference to The Golden Dog (188-9). A brief listing of some of the words and phrases Monk uses to describe The Golden Dog will convey her overall opinion of it; she states that "Kirby *indiscriminately* incorporates history, legend, and pure fiction," that the novel is "loose in structure," "full of digressions," and "melodramatic in plot" while the "characters are idealized," "stereotyped" and "sentimentalized" and concludes that the novel is "quite readable" as "the vision of a passionate imagination that desired to share its vision and strove to do so to the best of its limited ability" (my italics, 189).

Mary Jane Edwards' entry for Leprohon in the DLB (99: 1990) presents information fairly neutrally except for one item of praise and one which sounds like adverse criticism. The praise is Edwards' statement that Leprohon is "a seminal

writer of fiction in English dealing with French-Canadian subjects" (207). The "negative" statement is that Leprohon's marriage "proved seminal for her development as a writer" (207); this suggests that despite being educated and raised among French-Canadians Leprohon learned nothing of their culture until after her marriage and detracts from her accomplishments (though it is undeniable that she did not write from a French-Canadian viewpoint until after her marriage). However Edwards also emphasizes the English-French relations in the novel (207) as she does in her scholarly analyses which will be discussed in the next chapter.

Finally, I wish to examine a pattern which recurs in these entries; there are always more details given of Leprohon's personal life than of Kirby's.⁶⁷ For example, all the entries name Leprohon's husband and those by Sorfleet (Can. Encyc. 1988, 1202), Stockdale (DCB X: 1972, 536-7) and Edwards note the fact that "they" had thirteen children and Edwards even includes the name of the church in which they married and that the first child died in infancy (DLB 99: 1990, 206). On the other hand, Story's entry on Kirby would lead one to believe he was a bachelor (1967, 405-6) as does Morgan's Bibliotheca Canadensis (1867, 212-3) while Morgan's Men and

⁶⁷ There is an exception to this pattern; in The Macmillan Dictionary of Canadian Biography (which is not included in my analysis of reference works because it only lists the novels and does not discuss them), the fact of Kirby's marriage and his two sons is noted (1978, 416), while no mention is made of Leprohon's children--her entry reads as if she was married but childless (1978, 458). This work is also interesting in that it has Leprohon's correct birthdate (458), but claims that Kirby emigrated to Canada in 1832 and that Louis Fréchette and Pamphile Le May translated The Golden Dog (416). This means that the errors first seen in Morgan's Bibliotheca Canadensis (1867) have survived and been reproduced in the academy for 111 years which indicates the tenacity of accepted knowledge and provides an insight into the constancy of the relative status of Antoinette and The Golden Dog.

Women (1898, 541) leaves the impression that Kirby was married but childless, and even then his wife is not named. Since both of Morgan's works were published after Kirby was married and all three of his sons were born, the oversight must be deliberate. While later entries do include more information such as his wife's name, there is never the same amount of detail as for Leprohon (except for the Macmillan Dictionary [1978] mentioned above).⁶⁸

Of course it is true that the fact that Leprohon bore thirteen children and lost four of them in infancy (Deneau 1948, 10-13) probably had a great influence on her life as did her role as a prominent doctor's wife. It is also true that for Morgan at least (given his Victorian sensibilities), her husband's fame as the founder of the first Canadian medical journal would overshadow Leprohon's achievements as a poet and novelist. However, the lack of information about Kirby's personal life gives the impression that it did not matter. Certainly the fact that Kirby's wife bore three children would have less of an impact on his life than Leprohon's bearing of thirteen children would affect her, but the loss of his first son in infancy did disturb him (Pierce Portrait 1929, 70) as did the loss of his wife and second son (Pierce Portrait 396-7).⁶⁹ Overall these entries perpetuate the notion that family life is a primary

⁶⁸ For example, Duffy's entry in Toye's Oxford Companion (1983, 409) names Kirby's wife but makes no mention of his children; Patricia Monk's contribution on Kirby for the DLB (99: 1990, 186) names his wife and notes his two sons who grew to adulthood, but makes no comment about the one who died in infancy (Pierce Portrait 1929, 70). Monk's entry also gives the impression that all of Kirby's family outlived him while in fact only one son did so (Pierce Portrait 396-7).

⁶⁹ Reading Pierce's biography one might get the sense that Kirby mourned the passing of Sir John A. Macdonald (who died two days after Kirby's wife Eliza) more

concern of women and almost irrelevant to men. The incorporation of so many details of her personal life with an evaluation of her writing diminishes Leprohon's achievements as a writer while those of Kirby, presented without distracting details about his home life, are accentuated.

than that of his wife (Portrait 396).

CHAPTER FIVE: SCHOLARLY ANALYSES

Of all the "phases" in the canonization process which I examine, the scholarly analyses are the most firmly based in the academy. The intended audience for most journal articles and books is other scholars (rather than students), and very few theses are likely to be read outside of the academy. In addition, these analyses provide the forum for the final academic "test" of a literary work's value--its ability to accommodate a variety of readings. Paul Lauter observes that literary studies shifted to the academy during the 1920s in the United States (1983, 441); in Canada, the shift occurred during the 1930s⁷⁰ but increased dramatically (for Antoinette and The Golden Dog) during the 1970s and 1980s, most likely due in part to the proliferation of new literary journals for Canadian literature. However even a brief glance at those analyses reveals that The Golden Dog is discussed more frequently and more diversely than is Antoinette (in the 1980s twice as many analyses examined Kirby's novel than Leprohon's). In addition, the approaches used to address Kirby's novel tend to be more "academic."

As in my previous chapter, the separation of works written in English from those written in French is no longer appropriate. In fact, it is difficult to determine what constitutes French-Canadian and English-Canadian in this phase; for instance, both Pierre-Georges Roy's article (1945) and that of von Guttenberg (signed as "de

⁷⁰ Margery Fee places the shift to the academy as early as 1907 ("Canadian Literature and English Studies" 1992-93, 22); I am, however, working from the date of the first classroom edition of The Golden Dog.

Guttenberg" here, 1954) are written in French and published in a Québec periodical, but von Guttenberg is European who also writes in English. Furthermore, two of the three theses from the Université de Montréal by French-Canadians are written in English (Deneau 1948; Deguire 1959). In addition, there is no discernable difference in attitudes between the language groups as there was in the earlier chapters; the solution seems to be to integrate the French works with those written in English.

Unfortunately, the multiplicity of forms (article, book, thesis) and topics makes it impossible for me to complete an adequate detailed investigation of each item in the space I have. Therefore I shall restrict my examination to a review of the major patterns⁷¹ relevant to my discussion of comparable canonical value rather than an investigation of the particular details of each item; this may result in some distortion of their authors' original purpose.

The first pattern is linked to the issue of historical accuracy; this issue has been debated since The Golden Dog was first published and two contradictory positions predominate: one treats The Golden Dog as if the history is of primary importance (Sandwell 1930; Roy 1945; Richard 1963; Lemire "La trahison" 1968); the other position is that Kirby's manipulation of fact is an indication of his skill as a novelist. P.V. Alexander's M.A. thesis, "French Canada in Fiction" (1951) is the earliest work to acknowledge Kirby's manipulation of history as a technique, but Charles de (von)

⁷¹ Nation-building might be expected to have no place in this phase; academic studies tend to attempt detachment. However, some overtly nationalistic works still do appear; the theses in particular tend to be nationalistic (eg. Greer 1937; Beyea; 1950; Edwards "Fiction and Montreal" 1969).

Guttenberg's article, "William Kirby" (1954) soon follows. Calvin L. Smiley, in his thesis, "Picturesque Past and Problematic Present," observes both the tendency of early critics to hold The Golden Dog as a model of historical accuracy and Kirby's actual manipulation of the facts to suit his story (1979).

Ironically, the same man who first acknowledged Kirby's skill in manipulating history saw nothing "especially historical" in Leprohon's novel (Alexander 1951, 27). Gilles Marcotte concurs with Alexander and concludes that the reality of Montreal is a "doux fantôme" in Antoinette (1992, 115).⁷² Even those scholars who comment on Chapter 5, the chapter which interrupts the love story in Antoinette to relay information about the effect of the Conquest on French-Canadians, tend to see the interruption as a writing technique rather than to discuss its historicity (Deneau 1948, 104-5; Beyea 1950, 142; McGaw 1991, 38-43). McGaw further speculates that the chapter provides parallels between Sternfield's domination of Antoinette and the British attempts to dominate the people of Quebec. The other aspect of Leprohon's writing which is recognized is her use of the French characters as representations of attitudes toward the English and the Conquest (Deneau 104; Edwards "Essentially Canadian" 1972, 19).

Kirby's novel, on the other hand, is typically examined in terms of "larger" ideas

⁷² Marcotte goes on to raise the interesting point that, in "Clive Weston's Wedding Anniversary" at least, Leprohon reveals herself to be an "anglais" who has access to "heights" that French Canadians did not: "Celle du Canada anglais se tient sur les hauteurs, celles de la ville et celles de la morale" (1992, 136).

like Loyalism (Duffy Gardens 1982; Sounding 1986)⁷³, the *lumpenproletariat* (Wiens 1989), and more general literary issues such as Lukacs' differentiation between historical fiction and historical romance (Sorfleet "Fiction and the Fall of New France" 1973), the issue of realism versus romance (Cogswell 1950), and Frye's definition of romance (Kuropatwa 1980). In contrast, the only "ideas" regularly applied to Antoinette revolve around the issues of morality and politics. For example, the novel is typically read as an exploration of French-English relations and the marriage of Antoinette and Colonel Evelyn is considered to be a union of the French and English (Deneau 101 & 104; Edwards "Fiction and Montreal" 1969, 133-4, "Essentially Canadian" 1972, 20). Hughes'⁷⁴ interpretation of Antoinette in "Le Vrai Visage du Antoinette de Mirecourt et Kamouraska," while still concentrating on politics, is unique; he reads the novel as a "socio-political *roman à clef*" which fictionally reenacts the 1837-38 Papineau rebellion (1977, 33-6) with each character corresponding to one of the participants (for example, Sternfield, Antoinette's secret husband, is read as "the opportunistic and fortune-hunting Canada West" 34). Armand Deguire applies a similar reading to The Golden Dog in his thesis, "The United Empire Loyalist"; he suggests that the good Bourgeois Philibert is in fact

⁷³ Duffy makes the same error about the novel in both works; he claims that Le Gardeur's beloved is Pierre's sister and therefore that he (Le Gardeur) kills his love's father (Gardens 1982, 38; Sounding 1986, 12).

⁷⁴ The French title of Hughes' article is misleading; the piece itself is written in English and published in an English-language journal.

Kirby (1959, 41).⁷⁵

Some of the other articles also make points worth noting more thoroughly. For instance, Soeur Katherine McCaffrey's PhD dissertation, "Le canadien français dans le roman canadien anglais" (1970), is one of the few recent works in French from Quebec which studies The Golden Dog or Antoinette in any detail, and as such deserves attention. Examining novels written in English to find the source of English-Canadians' images of French-Canadians, she finds The Golden Dog to be a more authentic "mirror" than Antoinette. McCaffrey claims that Leprohon provides an authentic image of the *québécoises* in only two features: Antoinette is "le prototype de la jeune fille canadienne" (21); and Leprohon has captured "avec perspicacité et justesse" the French-Canadian "tendance à ridiculiser par une mimique spontanée ce qui paraît affecté ou exagéré dans les manières d'un étranger" (23). Kirby, on the other hand, is a "[l]inguiste remarquable, [et son] connaissance du français, son amour de Québec, sa dévotion à l'unité canadienne, étaient autant de dispositions qui le déterminaient à entreprendre un roman historique destiné à fixer les grands traits du régime français" (33).

McGaw's thesis is intriguing in that she specifically notes that male critics tend to assess women writers and their works in terms which diminish the women (1991, 23-27), but does not apply her claim to an obvious target--Stockdale's preface to the CEECT edition of Antoinette. Deneau provides the only biography of Leprohon and

⁷⁵ In passing I would like to note that Deguire's thesis which was presented in 1959 still repeats the error that Kirby's novel was translated by Louis Fréchette as well as Pamphile Le May (18).

also her correct birthdate (1948, 3); Beyea reveals a blind spot in that he attributes Leprohon's decreased production after the Literary Garland ceased publication in 1851 (1950, 118) to the demise of that journal, but does not acknowledge that her marriage that year and increasing family⁷⁶ may have affected her output.

Brady's reaction to the morality in Antoinette in her article "Towards a Happier History" is worth citing too:

The morality of the novel is unflinchingly doctrinaire, often to the point of insensitivity. A virtual child is callously manipulated by a male-dominated family, Church, and society, but her victimization by these patriarchal forces never becomes a target for their condemnation or a plea for their revision. . . . Rosanna Leprohon writes from the rigid confines of a brutalizing Roman Catholicism which, rather than accommodating its laws to human (specifically female) needs, stolidly and consistently condemns the innocent transgressor for falling short in faithful and rigorous observation of those laws. Indeed, at times the vindictive tone which surrounds the various descriptions of Antoinette's misconduct approaches misogyny. (1975, 26-27)

This rejection of the novel for its Victorian values is reminiscent of Waterston's analysis in her survey (1973). Both women read the apparent acceptance of the status quo in the novel and thus reject Antoinette, perhaps because the novel, if taken at face value, seems to contravene feminist ideals. This reaction could explain in part why extensive changes in the "horizon of expectations" towards women as authors and readers have not resulted in any change of status for Antoinette; men have shown that they are not interested in the novel, so if Antoinette is dismissed by women academics too its status cannot improve. However, Waterston at least revises her reading of the

⁷⁶ Deneau notes that Leprohon had six children between 1852 and 1859 (10-13), the years which Beyea cites as evidence of the effect of the failure of the Literary Garland on Leprohon's productivity.

novel; her chapter, "Rosanna Mullins Leprohon: At Home in Many Worlds" (in Silenced Sextet 1992), written in collaboration with Lorraine McMullen, is the most recent contribution to date. The chapter is more accurate and more favourable toward Antoinette (36-38) than Waterston's survey had been (Survey 1973, 67). And, unlike Stockdale's introduction to the CEECT edition which so overwhelmed the reader with details of Leprohon's life that the writer vanished (1989), Waterston and McMullen incorporate facts of Leprohon's personal life with statements about her writing so that the two aspects complement each other (eg. 51). However, McMullen and Waterston still prefer the character Blanche from Leprohon's The Manor House of de Villeraï (1859), and Blanche's choice of independent spinsterhood (1992, 32-35) to Antoinette's marriage.

There are three approaches to Kirby which are also important to review: the novel spawned two bibliographical essays, one tracing the publishing history of The Golden Dog in English (Brady "Bibliographical Essay" 1976) and the other reporting on the novel's publishing history in French translation (Hayne "Le May's French Translation" 1981); Leonard Vandervaart's thesis, "Abridgement as Criticism," (1980) investigates the effect of the abridgement of Kirby's novel for the NCL edition on subsequent analyses and finds that the consistent decrease in the value of the novel parallels its abridgement; and L.R. Early examines the mythic aspect of The Golden Dog in "Myth and Prejudice in Kirby, Richardson, and Parker" (1979).

So, to summarize, Kirby has been examined in terms of his use of myth and mythic time (Early 1979; Gerson Purer Taste 1989, 127-128), historical fact (eg.,

Roy 1945; Alexander 1951), the gothic form (Northey "Decorative Gothic" 1976), his loyalism (Duffy Gardens 1982, Sounding 1986), and the various editions of The Golden Dog (Brady "Bibliographical Essay" 1976; Hayne "Le May's French Translation" 1981). On the other hand, politics and morality in Antoinette have provided the most frequent topics.

In addition, The Golden Dog has been directly compared with Gilbert Parker's The Seats of the Mighty (Sorfleet 1973), Dante's The Divine Comedy (Kuropatwa 1980), Eliot's Romola (Kröller 1984), and Thomas Raddall's Roger Sudden (Wiens 1989). Furthermore, as well as comparing Kirby to Dante, Kuropatwa draws parallels between The Golden Dog and King Lear (53); Duffy finds similarities between Kirby and Milton (eg. Sounding 1986, 11); and Kröller, in a single sentence, associates Kirby with Dante, Eliot, Shakespeare, Scott and the Bible (1984, 319),⁷⁷ and suggests in a note that an investigation of The Golden Dog in relation to works by Robert Browning would be profitable (34: 321). The list of Kirby's comparisons is almost endless; he is compared or associated with British and European writers Scott, Dumas, and the gothic writers "Monk" Lewis and Mrs. "Radeliffe" [sic] (von Guttenberg 1954, 343), Charles Dickens (Barnaby Rudge and A Tale of Two Cities, Wiens 1989, 64-65), George Eliot and Dickens (Duffy Gardens 1982, 39 & 41), and American writers Fenimore Cooper (via John Richardson), Edgar Allen Poe (von Guttenberg 1954, 343) and Hawthorne (Duffy Gardens 40), and Canadians John Galt

⁷⁷ Kröller also mentions that Eliot's work was frequently compared with that of Hawthorne (1984, 312) which indirectly associates Kirby with Hawthorne.

(von Guttenberg 343), François-Xavier Garneau, Philippe Aubert de Gaspé (père), and Joseph Marmette (Edwards "Essentially Canadian" 1972, 9).

In contrast, except for comparisons with Balzac (Edwards "Essentially Canadian" 22) and Virginia Woolf's A Room of One's Own (Brady "Towards a Happier History" 1975, 21)⁷⁸, Antoinette's lineage is almost wholly Canadian and mostly marginal--Agnes Maule Machar, James De Mille, Isabella Valancy Crawford, Frances Brooke, (and the clearly not marginal) Anne Hébert and Margaret Atwood. Antoinette is also associated with "Chevalier . . . de Boucherville . . . MacLennan, Aquin, Godbout, Jasmin, and Portal" (Edwards "Essentially Canadian" 22), Hémon's Maria Chapdelaine (Beyea 1950, 146), Phillipe Aubert de Gaspé and Susanna Moodie (Gerson Purer Taste 1989, 120 & 138), "the great Sir Gilbert Parker" (Deneau 1948, 129), Charles G.D. Roberts (Alexander 1951, 25-26), and Charlotte Fuhrer (Marcotte 1992, 140). And, of course, Leprohon's inclusion in Silenced Sextet (MacMillan, McMullen & Waterston 1992) implicitly places her in comparison with the other five "silenced" authors examined in the book--Margaret Robertson, May Agnes Fleming, Susan Frances Harrison, Joanna Wood and Marshall Saunders. Both Kirby and Leprohon are frequently mentioned in relation to Sir Walter Scott, John Talon-Lesperance and John Richardson.

The sheer number of prestigious authors and titles associated with Kirby

⁷⁸ This list includes only those works studied in this chapter; Gerson compares Leprohon with Jane Austen in "Three Writers" (eg. 224), and as noted in Chapter Three, Klinck associates Leprohon with Thackeray (Introduction to NCL ed. of Antoinette 10).

compared to Leprohon almost forces one to believe Kirby to be the "better" writer. For, though McGaw contends that Leprohon's (and De Mille's and Crawford's) "texts were inflicted with comparative criticisms which necessarily diminished their stature next to the 'great traditions' of England and America" (1991, 128), I find that the opposite effect occurs. For example, Kirby's association and comparison with works like Dante's The Divine Comedy and writers like George Eliot raises the status of his work even when he does not show the same measure of achievement. And, as can be seen from the direct comparisons alone, Kirby's work is given a more aged and prestigious comparative lineage than Leprohon's.

However, there are some flaws in this argument. For instance, while the reference to Dante in The Golden Dog certainly invites a comparison of the two works, the attempt to find common features in Kirby's and Eliot's works seems a bit stretched. Moreover, the fact that scholars tend to discuss Antoinette solely in terms of politics and morality does not mean that there is nothing more to be said about the novel; Leprohon's insertion of an entire chapter of digression (Chapter 5) is an important aspect of her technique (Deneau 1984, 104-5; Beyea 1950, 142; McGaw 1991, 38-42) as is her shifting between French and English (McGaw 1991, 48-49). Furthermore, Gilles Marcotte's notion that Leprohon wrote "Clive Weston's Wedding Anniversary" from "English heights" (1992, 136) suggests that an examination of class relations in her novels might be of value. In addition, as Mary Lu MacDonald suggests in her review of the CEECT edition (1990, discussed in Chapter Three), Leprohon's place in Quebec as the child of Irish immigrants and her Irish influences

could prove illuminating. A feminist analysis of Leprohon's subversion of the novel of conduct (Antoinette gained by her disobedience as well as suffered from it) could prove profitable as well.

I would like to mention one more aspect of the scholarly enterprise that is evident here; the current academic practice of situating one's own project in relation to the work of others.⁷⁹ Thus, for example, Joy Kuropatwa notes the work done by Northey and Sorfleet (1980, 51); David Hayne opens his bibliographic essay by mentioning Elizabeth Brady's (1981, 50); Duffy refers to his own earlier book (Sounding 1986, 21); and Northey refers to Duffy's work as well as her own earlier work ("William Kirby" 1984, 89). The effect of this strategy, as with the immensity of the list of Kirby's literary associates, is to give weight to the sense that The Golden Dog is more important than Antoinette.

In conclusion, Barbara Herrnstein Smith's theory of the process of canon-formation (citation, re-citation, production, re-production) is a useful tool, but I have located a number of features of canon-formation not explained by her theory. For instance, as the above list demonstrates, the Canadian critical community is a closed system; furthermore, it always has been--Kirby's friends reviewed his novel and Leprohon's nephew-in-law reviewed hers (though less forgivingly than Kirby's friends); Marquis edited one version of The Golden Dog and authored a survey; Klinck also edited a survey and wrote the introduction to the NCL edition of

⁷⁹ The Lecker series required that every author be situated in his or her "Critical Overview and Context;" the other references are in accordance with the "rules" of academic writing.

Antoinette; Mary Jane Edwards wrote favourably of Antoinette in her PhD dissertation and an article ("Essentially Canadian"), and shortly after she became General Editor of the CEECT series they released an edition of the novel. There are numerous other links as well; currently the same names recur in the area of nineteenth-century Canadian literature--Carole Gerson, Margot Northey, David Hayne, John Sorfleet, John Stockdale, Dennis Duffy, Elizabeth Waterston and Mary Jane Edwards, for example. This means that, while every individual changes, an extremely limited number of opinions are going to be expressed in this field. Moreover, as the scholarly analyses reveal, it is difficult to see a work in a truly "new" way (thus Antoinette is repeatedly analyzed in terms of politics and morality) though one is forced to with a long-standing canonical work (like The Golden Dog). Additionally, the same errors are repeated; for example, Morgan wrote in his Bibliotheca Canadensis (1867) that Kirby emigrated to Canada in 1832 and that Louis Fréchette and Pamphile Le May translated The Golden Dog, and though these errors were corrected in Pierce's biography of Kirby (Portrait 1929), the misinformation persists even to 1978 (The Macmillan Dictionary of Canadian Biography). Also, Leprohon's birthdate is given as 1829 (the correct date) or 1832, depending on which other works the critic had read. Certain ideas recur as well; the early survey writers claimed Kirby as more "genuinely" Canadian than Leprohon because he emigrated to Canada and she was merely born here (eg. Logan and French 1924, 94), and Margot Northey makes a similar claim in her chapter on Kirby for Canadian Writers and Their Works (1984, 90). Thus, over the last 130 years, despite massive changes in

the physical shape and politics of Canada, and despite the women's movement, little has changed for these two novels--critics still tend to investigate Antoinette less seriously than The Golden Dog. Waterston and McMullen's chapter (1992) and McGaw's M.A. thesis (1991) may be a signal that Antoinette is beginning to be reevaluated, and that its status will improve during this decade; unfortunately, it is too early to be sure.

This thesis has also raised a number of questions for me; for instance, is the nationalistic enterprise of literary critics unique to Canada or is it a symptom of colonialism? Nina Baym ("Melodramas of Beset Manhood" 1985) notes a similar trend in the United States, so perhaps an investigation of the criticisms of various "nations" would prove illuminating. Also, a comparative analysis of the introductions to the various CEECT editions might reveal an interesting pattern; are all the novels adversely affected or only Leprohon's work? An examination of recent works on women writers by women scholars could also prove interesting; are works being rejected because they are not in line with a particular feminist agenda? Any Canadian work of the nineteenth-century, and particularly those authored by women, could benefit by a detailed analysis such as I have done here; for, as I have shown, the adverse criticism expressed for over 130 years is difficult to refute.

Francess Halpenny muses:

One wonders about influences upon [Leprohon's] work and about the details of publication history and reception in English and French. One also wonders what personal, social, and literary insights would be revealed in a close analysis of the works themselves by a woman critic, someone who knows the Quebec that appears in the settings of Mrs. Leprohon's novels. Romantic fiction would remain romantic fiction, but *is there more to be said*

about the writer and her work?"

(my italics "Research--Problems and Solutions" 1990, 41)

Yes there is.

APPENDIX A: Biographies of Leprohon and Kirby

Rosanna Mullins Leprohon

Contrary to popular tradition which claims 1832 as the year of Rosanna Mullins' birth, she was born in 1829 in Montreal of Irish emigrant parents. Her father was quite successful as a merchant and sent her to convent school where one of the nuns encouraged her to write. Rosanna began contributing verse and novels (serialized) to the Literary Garland which were popular. In 1851 Rosanna married French-Canadian surgeon, Jean-Lucien (or Lukin) Leprohon. She bore thirteen children before her death in 1879 at the relatively early age of fifty; nine of her children survived her. After her marriage, Rosanna produced three of her best novels (of which Antoinette is one), and much fugitive verse.

(See Henri Deneau's M.A. thesis, "Life and Works of Mrs. Leprohon née R.E. Mullins" 1948 for more details.)

William Kirby

William Kirby was born in England in 1817. His family moved to the United States in 1832 where William received his education from Alexander Kinmont in Cincinnati. Disturbed by the republicanism of America, Kirby moved to Canada in 1839, and after some travel in Quebec settled in Niagara-on-the-Lake, Ontario. Despite his poor financial state (he was employed as a tanner) he married into one of the most prestigious Loyalist families in the area. His wife, Eliza (née Whitmore), gave birth to three sons; the eldest died in infancy and the youngest died in the North West Territories as a young man leaving a widow and son. Eliza died in 1891 and Kirby in 1906.

(See Lorne Pierce William Kirby: Portrait of a Tory Loyalist 1929 for more details.)

APPENDIX B: Publishing History of Antoinette and The Golden Dog

Antoinette: English

- 1st Ed.: 1864, Lovell ed.; photographic reprint, University of
Toronto Press 1973
2nd Ed.: 1973, NCL ed.; rpt 198[?]
3rd Ed.: 1989, CEECT ed.

Antoinette: French

- 1st Ser.: 1865, Josèphe-Auguste Genand trans., serialized in L'Ordre 31
Mar. to 4 Aug. 1865
1st Ed.: 1865, Beauchemin & Valois ed. (from plates of above)
2nd Ser.: 1866-67, serialized in Pionnier de Sherbrooke 20 Oct. 1866
to 4 Oct. 1867
2nd Ed.: 1881, Rolland & Fils ed., trans. unnamed
3rd Ser.: 1886-87, serialized in Nouvelles Soirées Canadiennes 1886-87
1st Adapt.: 1901, adapted for stage

(See CEECT ed. 261-65 [various editions] and xlvii-xlviii [adaptation for stage] for more details)

The Golden Dog: English

- 1st Ed.: 1877, Lovell, Adam & Wesson ed.
rpt 1878, [1884], [1890], 1891, 1894, [1896] - two
impressions, three more impressions - date unknown
- 2nd Ed.: 1897, Page ed.
rpt [1897], [1899], 1900 - two impressions, 1903,
1908 - two impressions, 1911, 1913, 1914, 1916, 1917,
1926,
1927, 1936, [n.d.]
- 3rd Ed.: 1922, Musson ed.
rpt. three impressions, date unknown
- 4th Ed.: 1925, second Musson ed.
rpt three impressions, date unknown but no later than 1928,
c1929 - three impressions, c1941, three impressions [n.d.]
- 5th Ed.: 1931, St. Martin's Classics (SMC) ed.
rpt 1932, 1935, 1937, 1938, 1939, 1940, 1942, 1943, 1944,
1945
- 6th Ed.: 1969, NCL ed.
rpt 197[?], 1989

(See Brady "A Bibliographical Essay on William Kirby's The Golden Dog 1877-1977" 1976 [sic] for more details.)

The Golden Dog: French

- 1st Ser.: 1884-1885, Pamphile Le May trans., serialized in L'Etendard
from 30 Aug. 1884 to 16 Feb. 1885
- 1st Ed.: 1884, L'Etendard ed.
- 2nd Ed.: 1926, Le May and Benjamin Sulte trans.
photographic rpt 1971

(See Hayne The Golden Dog and Le Chien d'or: Le May's French Translation of Kirby's Novel" 1981 for more details.)

APPENDIX C: The Early Reviews

Reviews of Antoinette

"A New Canadian Book in Press." Quebec Morning Chronicle 29 Mar. 1864: 2.

"Faits Divers." L'Ordre 1 avr. 1864: 2.

"Faits Divers." L'Ordre 23 juin 1864: 2.

de Bellefeuille, Joseph-Édouard Lefebvre. "Bibliographie."
Revue Canadienne 1 (juillet 1864): 442-4.

Journal of Education for Lower Canada 8 July 1864: 99.

The True Witness and Catholic Chronicle 8 July 1864: 5.

"New Books." Montreal Gazette 13 Sept. 1864: 2.

"Bibliographie." L'Ordre 12 déc. 1864: 2.

"Notre Feuilleton." L'Ordre 16 jan. 1865: 2.

"Notre Feuilleton." L'Ordre 29 mars. 1865: 2.

"Notre Feuilleton." L'Ordre 31 mars. 1865: 3.

"Nouvelles et Faits Divers." Courrier de St. Hyacinthe 9 mai 1865: 3.

"Notre Feuilleton." L'Ordre 10 mai 1865: 2.

"Notre Feuilleton." L'Ordre 28 juillet 1865: 1.

"Publications." Courrier du Canada 14 aout 1865: 3.

"The Old Thing." Saturday Reader 9 Sept. 1865: 4.

"Notre Feuilleton." Le Pionnier de Sherbrooke 20 oct. 1866: 2.

"Bibliographie." Gazette des Campagnes 14 juillet 1881: 399.

"Soirées de famille." Rev. of Antoinette (play). La Patrie 21 fév. 1901: 6.

"Soirées de famille." Rev. of Antoinette (play). La Patrie 22 fév. 1901: 5.

Reviews of The Golden Dog

"Reviews." Montreal Daily Witness 9 Mar. 1877: 2.

P.H. Revue Canadienne 14 (mars 1877): 227.

"Book Notices." Canadian Methodist Magazine (Apr.) 1877: 378-80. (attributed to William Henry Withrow)

Le Journal de Québec 4 avr. 1877: 2. (attributed to James LeMoine)

"New Publications." Toronto Mail 4 Apr. 1877: 2.

Quebec Morning Chronicle 7 Apr. 1877: 1. (attributed to James LeMoine)

The Quebec Daily Mercury 3 May 1877: 14.

Sulte, Benjamin. "Le Chien d'Or." L'Opinion Publique 3 mai 1877: 208.

The Canadian Monthly and National Review XI (1877): 564-65.

"The Special Column." The Spectator 26 Dec. 1877: 1

L'Opinion Publique 1 aout 1878: 365.

"Patriote." "Une oeuvre nationale." L'Etendard 15 oct. 1884: 2.

Drysdale, William. "The Gold Dog of Quebec." New York Times 4 Oct. 1885: 5.

Duncan, Sara Jeannette. "Afternoon Tea." The Week. 3 Feb. 1887: 159.

"Stirring Romance of Canadian Life." New York Herald 4 Sept. 1897: 13.

"New Edition of Kirby's Golden Dog." The Canadian Magazine 57.4 (1921): 350.

Le May, Pamphile. "Pourquoi Le Chien D'Or traduit en Français."
Préfaces des romans québécoises du XIXe siècle. Ed. Guildo Rousseau.
Montréal: Cosmos, 1970. 75-78.

WORKS CITED

- Adams, G. Mercer. "Outline History of Canadian Literature." An Abridged History of Canada. William H. Withrow. Toronto: William Briggs, 1887.
- Alexander, P[eter] V[incent]. "French Canada in Fiction." M.A. Thesis. U of Toronto, 1951.
- Anderson, Benedict. Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism. London: Verso, 1983.
- "Annexation Manifesto." Montreal Gazette. Oct. 1849 & Dec. 1849.
- Atwood, Margaret. Survival: A Thematic Guide to Canadian Literature. Toronto: House of Anansi, 1972.
- Baker, Ray Palmer. A History of English-Canadian Literature to the Confederation. 1920. New York: Russel & Russel, 1968.
- Baym, Nina. "Melodramas of Beset Manhood." The New Feminist Criticism: Essays on Women, Literature and Theory. Ed. Elaine Showalter. New York: Pantheon, 1985. 63-80.
- . "Women in American Literature, 1790-1870." What Manner of Woman: Essays on English and American Life and Literature. Ed. Marlene Springer. New York: New York UP, 1977.
- de Bellefeuille, Joseph-Édouard Lefebvre. Rev. of Antoinette de Mirecourt. By Rosanna Leprohon. "Bibliographie." Revue Canadienne 1 (juillet 1864): 442-44.
- Bennett, Donna. "Conflicted Vision: A Consideration of Canon and Genre in English-Canadian Literature." Canadian Canons: Essays in Literary Value. Ed. Robert Lecker. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1991. 131-49.
- Beyea, George P. "The Canadian Novel Prior to Confederation." M.A. Thesis. U of New Brunswick, 1950.
- "Bibliographie." Rev. of Antoinette. Gazette des Campagnes 14 juillet 1881: 399.
- "Bibliographie." Rev. of Antoinette. L'Ordre 12 déc. 1864: 2.

- "Book Notices." Rev. of The Golden Dog. By William Kirby. Canadian Methodist Magazine (Apr.) 1877: 378-80. (attributed to William Henry Withrow)
- Brady, Elizabeth. "A Bibliographical Essay on William Kirby's The Golden Dog 1877-1977." Papers of the Bibliographical Society of Canada 15 (1976): 24-48.
- . "Towards a Happier History: Women and Domination." Domination. Ed. Alkis Kontis. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1975. 17-31.
- Broadus, Edmund Kemper. "Criticism--or Puffery?" The Canadian Forum 3.25 (1922): 20-22.
- Bush, Douglas. "Is There a Canadian Literature?" Commonweal 6 Nov. 1929: 12-14.
- Centre for Editing Early Canadian Texts. Newsletter New Series 3 [1992].
- Cogswell, Fred. "The Canadian Novel from Confederation until World War One." M.A. Thesis. U of New Brunswick, 1950.
- Crawley, Derek. Introduction. The Golden Dog. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1969. vii-xi.
- Cronk, D.R. Introduction. Wacousta. By John Richardson. Ottawa: Carleton UP, 1987. xvii-lvi.
- Davey, Frank. "Reading upon Reading: The Preface in English-Canadian Literary Criticism." Prefaces and Literary Manifestoes/ Préfaces et manifestes littéraires. Eds. E.D. Blodgett and A.G. Purdy. Edmonton, Alta: U of Alberta, 1988. 127-145.
- Deguire, Armand (Brother Marcel Lambert). "The United Empire Loyalist William Kirby." M.A. Thesis. U of Montréal, 1959.
- Deneau, Henri (Brother Adrian). "Life and Works of Mrs. Leprohon, née R. E. Mullins." M.A. Thesis. U of Montréal, 1948.
- Drysdale, William. "The Gold Dog of Quebec." Rev. of The Golden Dog. New York Times 4 Oct. 1885: 5.
- Duffy, Dennis. Gardens, Covenants, Exiles: Loyalism in the Literature of Upper Canada/Ontario. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1982.

- . "Kirby, William." The Canadian Encyclopedia. 2nd ed. Vol. 2. Edmonton: Hurtig, 1988. 3 vols. 1139-40.
- . "Kirby, William." The Oxford Companion to Canadian Literature. Ed. William Toye. Toronto: Oxford UP, 1983. 409-10.
- . Sounding the Iceberg: An Essay on Canadian Historical Novels. Toronto: ECW, 1986.
- Duncan, Sara Jeannette. "Afternoon Tea." Rev. of The Golden Dog. The Week. 3 Feb. 1887: 159.
- Durham, Earl of. The Report of the Earl of Durham. 1839. London: Methuen, 1905.
- Early, L.R. "Myth and Prejudice in Kirby, Richardson, and Parker." Canadian Literature 81 (1979): 24-37.
- Edwards, Mary Jane. "Essentially Canadian." Canadian Literature. 52 (1972): 8-23.
- . "Fiction and Montreal, 1769-1885." Diss. U of Toronto, 1969.
- . "Leprohon, Rosanna." The Oxford Companion to Canadian Literature. Ed. William Toye. Toronto: Oxford UP, 1983. 449-50.
- . "Rosanna Eleanor Leprohon." Dictionary of Literary Biography. Vol. 99. Ed. W.H. New. Detroit: Gale Research, 1990. 206-08.
- Eggleston, Wilfrid. The Frontier & Canadian Letters. Toronto: Ryerson, 1957.
- Fee, Margery. "Canadian Literature and English Studies in the Canadian University." Essays on Canadian Writing 48 (Winter 1992-93): 20-40.
- . "English-Canadian Literary Criticism, 1890-1950: Defining and Establishing a National Literature." Diss. U of Toronto, 1981.
- Fiedler, Leslie. What Was Literature? Class Culture and Mass Society. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1982.
- Gerson, Carole. "The Canon Between the Wars: Field-notes of a Feminist Literary Archaeologist." Canadian Canons: Essays in Literary Value. Ed. Robert Lecker. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1991. 46-56.

- . "The Changing Contours of a National Literature." College English 50.8 (1988): 888-895.
- . "The Presenting Face: Prefaces to English-language Poetry and Fiction Written by Women in Canada, 1850-1940." Prefaces and Literary Manifestoes/ Préfaces et manifestes littéraires. Eds. E.D. Blodgett and A.G. Purdy. Edmonton, Alta: U of Alberta, 1990. 56-71.
- . A Purer Taste: The Writing and Reading of Fiction in English in Nineteenth-Century Canada. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1989.
- . "The Reception of the Novel in Victorian Canada." Problems of Literary Reception/problèmes de réception littéraire. Eds. E.D. Blodgett and A.G. Purdy. Edmonton, Alta: U of Alberta, 1988. 93-101.
- . "Three Writers of Victorian Canada: Rosanna Leprohon/ James De Mille/ Agnes Maule Machar." Canadian Writers and Their Works. Fiction Series. Eds. Robert Lecker, Jack David and Ellen Quigley. Vol. 1. Downsview, Ont: ECW, 1983. 10 vols. 194-242.
- Gouin, Jacques. "La traduction au Canada de 1791 à 1867." Meta 22.1 (1977): 26-32.
- Greer, Reginald Thomas. "The Influence of Canadian Literature Upon the Growth of Canadian Nationality to Confederation." M.A. Thesis. U of Ottawa, 1937.
- von Guttenberg, A. Charles. Early Canadian Art and Literature. Vaduz, Liechtenstein: Europe Printing Establishment, 1969.
- . "William Kirby." La Revue de l'Université Laval IX.4 (1954): 337-345.
- Halpenny, Frances G. "Research--Problems and Solutions: Problems and Solutions in the Dictionary of Canadian Biography, 1800-1900." Re(Dis)Covering Our Foremothers. Ed. Lorraine McMullen. Ottawa: U of Ottawa P, 1990. 37-48.
- Harris, Wendell V. "Canonicity." PMLA 106 (1991): 110-121.
- Hayne, David M. "Le Chien d'Or." Dictionnaire des oeuvres littéraires du Québec. Ed. Maurice Lemire. Tome 1. Montréal: Fides, 1980. 3 tomes. 115-119.
- . "The Golden Dog and Le Chien d'Or: Le May's French Translation of Kirby's Novel." Papers of the Bibliographic Society of Canada 20 (1981): 50-62.

Helsing, Elizabeth K., Robin Lauterbach Sheets and William Veeder, eds. The Woman Question: Society and Literature in Britain and America, 1837-1883. Vol. 3. New York & London: Garland, 1983. 3 vols.

Hughes, Kenneth J. "Le Vrai Visage du Antoinette de Mirecourt et Kamouraska." The Sphinx 2.3 (1977): 33-39.

Hutcheon, Linda. As Canadian as . . . possible . . . under the circumstances! Erin, Ont.: York UP, 1990.

Iser, Wolfgang. The Act of Reading: A Theory of Aesthetic Response. no trans. named. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1978.

Jauss, Hans Robert. Aesthetic Experience and Literary Hermeneutics. Trans. Michael Shaw. Introduction by Wlad Godzich. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1982.

Kaplan, Carey and Ellen Cronan Rose. The Canon and the Common Reader. Knoxville: U of Tennessee P, 1990.

Keith, W.J. Canadian Literature in English. London: Longman Group, 1985.

Kirby, William. The Chien D'Or (The Golden Dog): A Legend of Quebec. New York: Lovell, Adam & Wesson, 1877.

---. The Golden Dog (Le Chien D'Or) A Romance of Old Quebec. Toronto: Macmillan, 1931.

---. The Golden Dog (Le Chien D'Or) A Romance of Old Quebec. Toronto: Musson, 1941.

---. The Golden Dog (Le Chien D'Or) A Romance of Old Quebec. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1969.

Klinck, Carl. Introduction. Antoinette De Mirecourt. By Rosanna Leprohon. Montreal: McClelland & Stewart, 1973. 5-12.

---, ed. Literary History of Canada. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1965.

Kröller, Eva-Marie. "George Eliot in Canada: Romola and The Golden Dog." American Review of Canadian Studies XIV.3 (1984): 312-321.

Kuropatwa, Joy. "Dante & The Golden Dog." Canadian Literature 86 (1980): 49-58.

- Lareau, Edmond. Histoire de la littérature canadienne. Montréal: John Lovell, 1874.
- Lauter, Paul. "Race and Gender in the Shaping of the American Literary Canon: A Case Study from the Twenties." Feminist Studies (Fall) 1983: 435-463.
- Le May, Pamphile. "Pourquoi Le Chien d'Or traduit en Français." Préfaces des romans québécoises du XIXe siècle. Ed. Guildo Rousseau. Montréal: Cosmos, 1970. 75-78.
- Lemire, Maurice. Les grands thèmes nationalistes du roman historique canadien-français. Québec: L'Université Laval, 1970.
- . "La Trahison de Bigot Dans le Roman Historique Canadien." Revue d'histoire de l'amerique française 22 (1968): 65-88.
- LeMoine, James M. "Le Chien D'Or: Son Origine--Son Histoire." L'Etendard 13 fév. 1886: 2.
- Leprohon, Rosanna. Antoinette de Mirecourt, or, Secret Marrying and Secret Sorrowing. 1864. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1973.
- . Antoinette de Mirecourt. 1864. Ottawa: Carleton UP, 1989.
- Lighthall, W.D. "William Kirby." The Dominion Illustrated 11 May 1889: 298.
- Logan, J.D. and Donald G. French. Highways of Canadian Literature: A Synoptic Introduction to the Literary History of Canada (English) from 1760 to 1924. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1924.
- MacDonald, Mary Lu. "A Canadian Tale." Rev. of Antoinette. Matrix 32 (Fall 1990): 77-78.
- . "Reading Between the Lines: An Analysis of Canadian Literary Prefaces and Prospectuses in the First Half of the Nineteenth Century." Prefaces and Literary Manifestoes/ Préfaces et manifestes littéraires. Eds. E.D. Blodgett and A.G. Purdy. Edmonton, Alta: U of Alberta, 1990. 29-42.
- MacMechan, Archibald. Headwaters of Canadian Literature. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1924.
- MacMillan, Carrie, Lorraine McMullen and Elizabeth Waterston, eds. Silenced Sextet: Six Nineteenth-Century Canadian Women Novelists. Montreal: McGill-Queen's UP, 1992.

"Madame Leprohon." L'Opinion Publique 2 oct. 1879: 1.

Mailhot, Laurent. La littérature québécoise. n.p.:puf, 1974.

---. "Traduction et «nontraduction» l'épreuve du voisin étranger dans la littérature québécoise." La deriva delle francofonie. Bologna: Cooperativa Libreria Editrice Bolgna, 1987. 13-60.

Marcotte, Gilles. "Mystères de Montréal." Montréal imaginaire: ville et littérature. Eds. Pierre Nepveu and Gilles Marcotte. Québec: Fides, 1992. 112-148.

Marquis, T[homas] G[uthrie]. English Canadian Literature. Toronto: Glasgow & Brook, 1913.

---. Introduction. The Golden Dog. Toronto: Musson, 1941. n.p.

Matthews, Lawrence. "Calgary, Canonization, and Class: Deciphering List B." Canadian Canons: Essays in Literary Value. Ed. Robert Lecker. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1991.

McCaffrey, Katherine, Soeur. "Le canadien français dans le roman canadien anglais." PhD Diss. U de Montréal, 1970.

McCarthy, Dermot. "Early Canadian Literary Histories and the Function of a Canon." Canadian Canons: Essays in Literary Value. Ed. Robert Lecker. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1991. 30-45.

McGaw, Danna. "A Re-Vision of the Reception of Three Nineteenth-Century Canadian Texts." M.A. Thesis. U of Calgary, 1991.

McGregor, Gaile. Rev. of Antoinette. The Canadian Historical Review. 72.4 (1991): 599-601.

McMullen, Lorraine and Elizabeth Waterston. "Rosanna Mullins Leprohon: At Home in Many Worlds." Silenced Sextet: Six Nineteenth-Century Canadian Women Novelists. Eds. Carrie MacMillan, Lorraine McMullen and Elizabeth Waterston. Montreal: McGill-Queen's UP, 1992. 14-51.

Metcalf, John. What is a Canadian Literature? Guelph, Ont.: Red Kite Press, 1988.

Michon, Jacques. "La fonction éditoriale de la préface." Prefaces and Literary Manifestoes/ Préfaces et manifestes littéraires. Eds. E.D. Blodgett and A.G. Purdy. Edmonton, Alta: U of Alberta, 1990. 111-126.

- Moi, Toril. Sexual/Textual Politics: Feminist Literary Theory. London: Routledge, 1988.
- Moisan, Clément. L'âge de la littérature canadienne. Montréal: HMH, 1969.
- Monk, Patricia. "William Kirby." Dictionary of Literary Biography. Vol. 99 Ed. W.H. New. Detroit: Gale Research, 1990. 127 vols. 186-90.
- Morgan, Henry J. "Kirby, William." Bibliotheca Canadensis. Ottawa: Desbarats, 1867. 212.
- ., ed. "Kirby, William." The Canadian Men and Women of the Time: A Handbook of Canadian Biography. Toronto: William Briggs, 1898. 541.
- ., ed. "Leprohon, Jean Lukin, M.D." Men and Women. 577-78.
- . "Leprohon, Mrs. Rosanna Eleanor." Bibliotheca. 224.
- Moss, John. "Rosanna Leprohon." A Reader's Guide to the Canadian Novel. 2nd ed. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1987. 229-30.
- . "William Kirby." Reader's Guide. 196-97.
- Mullen, Edward. "The Emergence of Afro-Hispanic Poetry: Some Notes on Canon Formation." Hispanic Review 56.4 (1988): 435-452.
- Nemoianu, Virgil. "Literary Canons and Social Value Options." The Hospitable Canon: Essays on Literary Play, Scholarly Choice, and Popular Pressures. Eds. Virgil Nemoianu and Robert Paul. Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1991. 215-47.
- "New Books." Rev. of Antoinette. Montreal Gazette 13 Sept. 1864: 2.
- "A New Canadian Book in Press." Rev. of Antoinette. Quebec Morning Chronicle 29 Mar. 1864: 2.
- "New Edition of Kirby's Golden Dog." Rev. of The Golden Dog. The Canadian Magazine 57.4 (1921): 350.
- "New Publications." Rev. of The Golden Dog. Toronto Mail 4 Apr. 1877: 2.
- New, W. H. A History of Canadian Literature. New York: New Amsterdam, 1989.

Northey, Margot. "Decorative Gothic: The Golden Dog." The Haunted Wilderness: The Gothic and Grotesque in Canadian Fiction. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1976. 27-32.

---. "William Kirby (1817-1906)." Canadian Writers and Their Works. Fiction Series. Eds. Robert Lecker, Jack David and Ellen Quigley. Vol. 2. Toronto: ECW, 1984. 10 vols. 78-104.

"Notre Feuilleton." Rev. of Antoinette. Le Pionnier de Sherbrooke 20 oct. 1866: 2.

"Nouvelles et Faits Divers." Rev. of Antoinette. Courrier de St. Hyacinthe 9 mai 1865: 3.

"The Old Thing." Rev. of Antoinette. Saturday Reader 9 Sept. 1865: 4.

Ohmann, Richard. Politics of Letters. Middletown, Connecticut: Wesleyan UP, 1987.

Oxford English Dictionary. 1961 rpt.

Pacey, Desmond. Creative Writing in Canada. rev. ed. Toronto: Ryerson, 1964.

P.H. Rev. of The Golden Dog. Revue Canadienne 14 (mars 1877): 227.

Pierce, Lorne. An Outline of Canadian Literature. Toronto: Ryerson, 1927.

---. William Kirby: The Portrait of a Tory Loyalist. Toronto: Macmillan, 1929.

Purdy, Anthony. A Certain Difficulty of Being: Essays on the Quebec Novel. Montreal: McGill-Queen's UP, 1990.

Rev. of Antoinette. Journal of Education for Lower Canada 8 July 1864: 99.

Rev. of Antoinette. The True Witness and Catholic Chronicle 8 July 1864: 5.

Rev. of The Golden Dog. The Canadian Monthly and National Review XI (1877): 564-65.

Rev. of The Golden Dog. Le Journal du Québec 4 avr. 1877: 2. (attributed to James LeMoine)

Rev. of The Golden Dog. Montreal Daily Witness 9 Mar. 1877: 2.

Rev. of The Golden Dog. The Quebec Daily Mercury 3 May 1877: 14.

- Rev. of The Golden Dog. Quebec Morning Chronicle 7 Apr. 1877: 1. (attributed to James LeMoine)
- Rhodenizer, V.B. A Handbook of Canadian Literature. Ottawa: Graphic, 1930.
- Richard, Raymond G. "Historical Accuracy and Inaccuracy Found in The Golden Dog." M.A. Thesis. Laval U, 1963.
- Roy, Camille. Mgr. Histoire de la littérature canadienne. Québec: Imprimerie de l'Action Sociale, 1930.
- Roy, Pierre-Georges. "L'Histoire Vraie du Chien D'Or." Le Cahiers des Dix 10 (1945): 103-168.
- Sandwell, B. K. "Debunking 'The Golden Dog'." Saturday Night 4 Oct. 1930: 5.
- Schieder, R.M. Introduction. Canadian Crusoes. By Catharine Parr Traill. Ottawa: Carleton UP, 1989. xvii-lv.
- Shohet, Linda. "Love and Marriage--Canada: 1760." Rev. of Antoinette. Journal of Canadian Fiction 2.3 (1973): 101-103.
- Simon, Sherry. "Volontés de savoir: Les préfaces aux traductions canadiennes." Prefaces and Literary Manifestoes/ Préfaces et manifestes littéraires. Eds. E.D. Blodgett and A.G. Purdy. Edmonton, Alta: U of Alberta, 1990. 98-110.
- Smiley, Calvin L. "Picturesque Past and Problematic Present: English-Canadian Fiction in Transition 1880-1920." PhD Diss. U of Toronto, 1979.
- Smith, Barbara Herrnstein. Contingencies of Value: Alternative Perspectives for Critical Theory. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 1988.
- "Soirées de famille." Rev. of Antoinette (play). La Patrie 21 fév. 1901: 6.
- "Soirées de famille." Rev. of Antoinette (play). La Patrie 22 fév. 1901: 5.
- Sorfleet, John Robert. "Fiction and the Fall of New France: William Kirby vs. Gilbert Parker." Journal of Canadian Fiction. 2.3 (1973): 132-146.
- . "Leprohon, Rosanna Eleanor." The Canadian Encyclopedia Vol. 2. Edmonton, Alta: Hurtig, 1985. 3 vols. 1202.
- "The Special Column." Rev. of The Golden Dog. The Spectator 26 Dec. 1877: 1.

Stevenson, Lionel. Appraisals of Canadian Literature. Toronto: Macmillan, 1926.

"Stirring Romance of Canadian Life." Rev. of The Golden Dog. New York Herald 4 Sept. 1897: 13.

Stockdale, J.C. "Antoinette De Mirecourt," in Dictionnaire des oeuvres littéraires du Québec. Tome 1. Ed. Maurice Lemire. Montréal: Fides, 1980. 3 tomes. 34.

---. Editor's Introduction. Antoinette. Ottawa: Carleton UP, 1989. xvii-lviii.

---. Editor's Preface. Antoinette. Ottawa: Carleton UP, 1989. xiii-xvi.

---. "Mullins, Rosanna Eleanora (Leprohon)." Dictionary of Canadian Biography. X, 536-38.

Story, Norah. "Kirby, William." The Oxford Companion to Canadian History and Literature. Toronto: Oxford UP, 1967. 405-6.

---. "Leprohon, Rosanna Eleanor." The Oxford Companion. 451-452.

Sulte, Benjamin. Préface. Le Chien d'Or. 3me ed. Trans. Pamphile Le May. Québec: Éditions Garneau, 1926. 9-20.

---. "Le Chien d'Or." Rev. of The Golden Dog. L'Opinion Publique 3 mai 1877: 208.

Surette, Leon. "Creating the Canadian Canon." Canadian Canons: Essays in Literary Value. Ed. Robert Lecker. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1991. 17-29.

Tompkins, Jane. Sensational Designs: The Cultural Work of American Fiction, 1790-1860. New York: Oxford UP, 1985.

Vandervaart, Leonard. "Abridgement as Criticism: A Textual Study of William Kirby's The Golden Dog." M.A. Thesis. U of Alberta, 1980.

Wallace, W. Stewart, Ed. "Kirby, William." Macmillan Dictionary of Canadian Biography. 4th ed. rev. by W.A. McKay. Toronto: Macmillan, 1978. 416.

---. "Leprohon, Mrs. Rosanna Eleanora, nee Mullins." Macmillan Dictionary. 458.

---. "Marquis, Thomas Guthrie." Macmillan Dictionary. 559.

---. "Woodley, Edward Carruthers." Macmillan Dictionary. 904.

Ware, Tracy. "A Little Self-Consciousness is a Dangerous Thing: A Response to Robert Lecker." English Studies in Canada 17.4 (1991): 481-93.

Waterston, Elizabeth. Survey: A Short History of Canadian Literature. Toronto: Methuen, 1973.

Weir, Lorraine. "The Discourse of 'Civility': Strategies of Containment in Literary Histories of English Canadian Literature." Problems of Literary Reception / problèmes de réception littéraire. Eds. E.D. Blodgett, and A.G. Purdy. Edmonton, Alta: U of Alberta, 1988. 24-39.

Wiens, E. J. "The *Lumpenproletariat* in The Golden Dog and Roger Sudden." Studies in Canadian Literature 14.2 (1989): 63-83.

Woodley, E[dward] C[arruthers]. Introduction. The Golden Dog. Toronto: Macmillan, 1931.

Yeigh, Frank. "Canada's Oldest Living Novelist." The Globe (Toronto) 25 Feb. 1905: 5.

de Zepetnek, Steven Tötösy. "Nineteenth-Century Canadian Novel Prefaces: Corpus and Literary System." Prefaces and Literary Manifestoes/ Préfaces et manifestes littéraires. Eds. E.D. Blodgett and A.G. Purdy. Edmonton, Alta: U of Alberta, 1990. 43-55.

Works Consulted
(Partial List)

- Adams, Hazard. "Canons: Literary Criteria/ Power Criteria." Critical Inquiry (Summer) 1988: 748-64.
- Altieri, Charles. "Canons and Differences." The Hospitable Canon: Essays on Literary Play, Scholarly Choice, and Popular Pressures. Ed. Virgil Nemoianu and Robert Paul. Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1991.
- . "An Idea and Ideal of a Literary Canon." Canons. Ed. Robert von Hallberg. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1984. 41-64.
- Berger, Carl. The Sense of Power: Studies in the Ideas of Canadian Imperialism. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1970.
- "A Celebrated Canadian." The Orillia Packet 16 Mar. 1899.
- Collins, J.E. "English Canadian Literature." The Week 28 Aug. 1884: 614-15.
- Curzon, S[arah] A[nne]. "Prominent Canadians. No. XLVII. William Kirby, F.R.S.C." The Week 19 Jan. 1894: 176-79.
- "Death of Mrs. Leprohon." Montreal Gazette 22 Sept. 1879: 4.
- "The Death of William Kirby." The Daily Standard 25 June 1906: 1.
- Edwards, Mary Jane. ed. The Evolution of Canadian Literature in English: Beginnings to 1867. Toronto: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1973.
- "Faits Divers." Rev. of Antoinette. L'Ordre 1 avr. 1864: 2.
- "Faits Divers." Rev. of Antoinette. L'Ordre 23 juin 1864: 2.
- Fish, Stanley. Is There a Text in This Class? The Authority of Interpretive Communities. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard UP, 1980.
- Flynn, Elizabeth A. and Patrocínio P. Schweickart. Gender and Reading: Essays on Readers, Texts, and Contexts. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1986.
- French, Donald G. "When the Critic Smiles" Canadian Magazine 53.6 (1919): 509-16.

- Friedman, Susan Stanford. "Post/Poststructuralist Feminist Criticism: The Politics of Recuperation and Negotiation." New Literary History 22 (1991): 465-490.
- Frye, Northrop. Conclusion. Literary History of Canada. Ed. Carl F. Klinck. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1965. 821-49.
- Gellner, Ernest. Nations and Nationalism. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1983.
- Gerson, Carole. "Anthologies and the Canon of Early Canadian Women Writers." Re(Dis)covering Our Foremothers: Nineteenth-Century Canadian Women Writers. Ed. Lorraine McMullen. Ottawa: U of Ottawa P, 1990. 55-76.
- Hayne, David. "The Concept of 'littérature' in Nineteenth-Century Quebec." Problems of Literary Reception/ problèmes de réception littéraire. Eds. E.D. Blodgett and A.G. Purdy. Edmonton, Alta: U of Alberta, 1988. 126-35
- . "Literary Translation in Nineteenth-Century Canada." Translation in Canadian Literature Symposium 1982. Ed. Camille R. La Bossiere. Ottawa: U of Ottawa P, 1983. 35-46.
- Homans, Margaret. Bearing the Word: Language and Female Experience in Nineteenth-Century Women's Writing. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1986.
- Houghton, Walter E. The Victorian Frame of Mind, 1830-1870. New Haven: Yale UP, 1959.
- Jauss, Hans Robert. Toward an Aesthetic of Reception. Trans. Timothy Bahti. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1982.
- Kenner, Hugh. "The Making of the Modernist Canon." Canons. Ed. Robert von Hallberg. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1984. 363-76.
- Kolodny, Annette. The Lay of the Land: Metaphor as Experience & History in American Life and Letters. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1975.
- Lecker, Robert. "The Canonization of Canadian Literature: An Inquiry into Value." Critical Inquiry 16 (1990): 656-671.
- Levy, Helen Fiddymont. Fiction of the Home Place. Jackson: UP of Mississippi, 1992.
- McKillop, A.B. "Nationalism, Identity and Canadian Intellectual History." Queen's Quarterly 81.4 (1974): 533-550.

- McLay, Catherine M., ed. Canadian Literature: the Beginnings to the 20th Century. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1974.
- de Montreuil, Gaetane. "Mme. Rosanna-Eleanor Leprohon," La Canadienne 5.1 (1922): 3.
- Morgan, Henry James, ed. Types of Canadian Women and of Women Who Are or Have Been Connected With Canada. Toronto: William Briggs, 1903.
- Moss, John, ed. The Canadian Novel. Beginnings: A Critical Anthology. Toronto: New Canada, 1980.
- "Notre Feuilleton." Rev. of Antoinette. L'Ordre 16 jan. 1865: 2.
- "Notre Feuilleton." Rev. of Antoinette. L'Ordre 29 mars. 1865: 2.
- "Notre Feuilleton." Rev. of Antoinette. L'Ordre 31 mars. 1865: 3.
- "Notre Feuilleton." Rev. of Antoinette. L'Ordre 10 mai 1865: 2.
- "Notre Feuilleton." Rev. of Antoinette. L'Ordre 28 juillet 1865: 1.
- Parker, Andrew, Mary Russo, Doris Sommer and Patricia Yaeger, eds. Nationalisms and Sexualities. New York: Routledge, 1992.
- "Patriote." "Une oeuvre nationale." Rev. of The Golden Dog. L'Etendard 5 oct. 1884: 2.
- Pierce, Lorne. "Who's Who in Canadian Literature: William Kirby, F.R.S.C." The Canadian Bookman 11.2 (1929): 35-39.
- "Poet and Novelist Dead." Toronto Globe 25 June 1906: 4.
- "Publications." Rev. of Antoinette. Courrier du Canada 14 aout 1865: 3.
- Rev. of The Golden Dog. L'Opinion Publique 1 aout 1878: 365.
- Riddell, William Renwick. William Kirby. Toronto: Ryerson, 1923.
- Sheffey, Rakefet. "The Concept of Canonicity in Polysystem Theory." Poetics Today 11.3 (1990): 511-22.
- Smith, Anthony D. Nationalism in the Twentieth Century. Oxford: Martin Robertson, 1979.

---. Theories of Nationalism. London: Camelot, 1971.

Sommer, Doris. "Irresistible Romance: the Foundational Fictions of Latin America." Nation and Narration. Ed. Homi K. Bhabha. London: Routledge, 1990.

Springer, Marlene, ed. What Manner of Woman: Essays on English and American Life and Literature. New York: New York UP, 1977.

Wallace, W. Stewart. The Growth of Canadian National Feeling. Toronto: Macmillan, 1927.

Waterston, Elizabeth. "Books and Notions: The Canadian Popular Novel in the Nineteenth Century." Canadian Review of Comparative Literature Special Issue. (Sept.) 1982: 437-48.

Yuval-Davis, Nira and Floya Anthias. Woman--Nation--State. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire, Eng: Macmillan, 1989.