

Tracy Ware

Review Article

Notes on the Literary Histories of Canada*

Towards a Canadian Literature: Essays, Editorials, and Manifestos. 2 vols. Ed. Douglas M. Daymond and Leslie G. Monkman. Ottawa: Tecumseh, 1984. Pp. 600. \$34.95 each vol. Paper, \$24.95 each.

Canadian Literature in English. By W.J. Keith. Longman Literature in English Series. London and New York: Longman, 1985. Pp. xi, 287. \$37.40. Paper, \$17.40.

The Wacousta Syndrome: Explorations in the Canadian Langscapes. By Gaile McGregor. Toronto, Buffalo, and London: University of Toronto Press, 1985. Pp. viii, 473. \$45.00. Paper, \$18.95.

Gaining Ground: European Critics on Canadian Literature. Ed. Robert Kroetsch and Reingard M. Nischik. Western Canadian Literary Documents Series, Vol. VI. Edmonton: NeWest Press, 1985. Pp. 303. \$11.95.

Actually, it is hard to imagine that one could undertake a history of literature without inquiring first of all into its very being. Further, what, literally can a history of literature be if not the history of the very idea of literature? Yet this kind of historical *ontology*, bearing on one of the least natural values in the world, is nowhere to be found.

--Roland Barthes¹

Every historical narrative is dependent on what Hayden White calls "the fictions of factual representation". As White argues, however, "there has been a reluctance to consider historical narratives as what they most manifestly are: verbal fictions, the contents of which are as much *invented as found* and the forms of which have more in common with their counterparts in literature than they have with those in the sciences." White does not deny that a given historical discourse points towards a set of real events, but he insists that the discourse points as well towards a "generic story form to which it tacitly likens the set in order to disclose its formal coherence considered as either a structure

* The writing of this articles was made possible by the grant of a postdoctoral fellowship funded by the Killam Trust.

or a *process*.”² The virtue of such historiographical investigations resides in White’s realization that, since the historian’s task is necessarily interpretive, the “truths” of history are always formed in a linguistic, institutional, and ideological context. If he were interested in Canadian history, White would no doubt agree with Ross Woodman’s comment on A.R.M. Lower’s *From Colony to Nation* and George Grant’s *Lament For a Nation*: “The fictions they unintentionally constructed helped to constellate a reality that is not otherwise there.”³ Indeed, one benefit of Grant’s writings is to remind even those who do not share his metaphysics that the conventional, Whiggish account of Canada’s progress from British colony to North American nation is a myth. And the danger of myth, as Roland Barthes argues, is that “it organizes a world which is without contradictions because it is without depth, a world wide open and wallowing in the evident, it establishes a blissful clarity: things appear to mean something by themselves.”⁴

If the “truths” of history are rarely self-evident, the “truths” of literary history are endlessly problematic. It is the purpose of this review to examine the historical assumptions of four recent books of Canadian literary criticism in the hope of initiating a debate. For unlike Canadian politics, Canadian criticism now suffers from an unhealthy degree of uniformity, from the temporal equivalent of centralism. There is now, and has been since the early essays of A.J.M. Smith and W.E. Collin, a tendency to extend full sympathy to contemporary writers, while past writers are censured for not having performed what they never attempted. The most flagrant instance of this tendency, at present, is in the received opinion of Stephen Leacock as a novelist manqué, or even a Robertson Davies manqué. Strange to say, one of the most influential proponents of this attitude is Davies himself, whose contentious remarks have rarely been received in a critical spirit. Canadian criticism has now reached the stage at which we must ask the troubling questions that Barthes raises: what is literature? Why does one write? Did Leacock write for the same reasons as Davies?

Not to ask these questions is also to answer them, for it is to adopt the traditional notion of common sense (which is anything but historical) that a writer writes quite simply *to express himself*, and that the Being of literature is in the “translation” of sensibility and the passions. . . . The paradox is that historical criticism here rejects history; history tells us that there is no such thing as a timeless essence of literature, but under the rubric “literature” (itself quite recent, moreover) a process of very different forms, functions, institutions, reasons, and projects whose relativity it is precisely the historian’s responsibility to discern.⁵

And not only must the concept of "literature" be put into question, but so must its prefatory adjective "Canadian," for it too has changed its meaning throughout our history. The result of such an inquiry would be to eradicate another instance of essentialist thinking: the notion that the Canadian "identity" is something that can be described in such a phrase as "garrison mentality."

A good deal of important historical material is provided in *Towards a Canadian Literature*, two volumes of "essays, editorials, and manifestos" edited by Douglas M. Daymond and Leslie G. Monkman. These volumes also show a bias towards the contemporary, as is evident in their ordonnance: Volume I concerns the years 1752-1940; Volume II concerns the years 1940-1983. But *Towards a Canadian Literature* is valuable because it includes more than any other anthology of Canadian criticism, and because it admits a remarkable diversity. Most interesting here are the controversies among certain selections. Thus William Douw Lighthall, sounding like a parodic precursor of the Margaret Atwood of *Survival*, argues that "the romantic life of each Colony also has a special flavour,—Australian rhyme is a poetry of the *horse*; Canadian, of the *canoe*" (I, p. 130). He is then soundly rebuked by the feisty William Wilfred Campbell, who states that in Lighthall's anthology Canada "is represented as a crude colony, whose literature, if it could be called by such a name, is merely associated with superficial canoe and carnival songs, backwoods and Indian tales told in poor rhyme, and all tied together by pseudo-patriotic hurrahs, which are about as representative of our true nationality as they are of literature" (I, p. 143). Various pieces on the Canadian Authors' Association are followed by Douglas Bush's attack: "As each Canadian Book Week or gathering of the Authors' Association recedes into the past and the echoes of mutual adulation roll comfortably from soul to soul, there rises insistently in one's bosom the impolite query: 'Do Canadians ever read anything?' " (I, p. 215) And Bush's article is in turn attacked by Watson Kirkconnell, to whom Bush responds. Daymond and Monkman have wisely included not only F.R. Scott's "Preface" and A.J.M. Smith's "Rejected Preface" to *New Provinces*, but also E.K. Brown's disgruntled review, "Canadian Poetry Repudiated."

The dialogues and disputes are too numerous to list, but as the second volume attests, the centre of the most controversy is Northrop Frye. Daymond and Monkman include Frye's two most influential articles on Canadian literature: "Canada and its Poetry," a 1943 review of Smith's *Book of Canadian Poetry*; and the "Conclusion" to the *Literary History of Canada* (1965). Also included are selections from two enterprises that owe much to Frye—James Reaney's *Alphabet*

and Atwood's *Survival*—as well as articles that are critical of Frye or of his influence: John Sutherland's "Critics on the Defensive" and Frank Davey's "Surviving the Paraphrase." And a criticism of Frye is implicit in Dennis Lee's "Cadence, Country, Silence: Writing in Colonial Space" and Robin Mathews' "Poetics: the Struggle for Voice in Canada." Such inclusions point to the fairmindedness of the editors, to their attempt to represent both the established and the dissident in Canadian criticism.

Yet for all that certain omissions are regrettable. Roberts in particular and the Confederation poets in general are not well represented, and neither is Louis Dudek. D.G. Jones, Malcolm Ross, and Milton Wilson are not represented at all. But most of all I regret that the editorial rationale is not more clearly established. How is *Towards a Canadian Literature* meant to stand in relation to such precursors as Dudek and Gnarowski's *The Making of Modern Poetry in Canada*, Eli Mandel's *Contexts of Canadian Criticism*, and Carl Ballstadt's *The Search for English-Canadian Literature*? These and other previous anthologies are neither challenged nor fully repeated by Daymond and Monkman, who evidently decided to keep all editorial comment to a minimum. Their preface is little more than two pages, their headnotes are frustratingly brief, and they shun footnotes. Most of the entries are grouped under the title of the journals in which they appeared, in order "to indicate in a limited way . . . the crucial impact of various newspapers, magazines and journals at various points in English-Canadian literary history" (p. 1). Perhaps it is good to be reminded again of the importance of the little magazines, but one's impression is that the various editorials and manifestos have crowded out some rather more interesting essays.

Despite their editorial silence, Daymond and Monkman are not and cannot be neutral editors. They are obviously more interested in some types of material than others, and they are especially interested in twentieth-century criticism pertaining to Frye and his influence, nationalism, and the little magazines. Similarly, it is no complaint against W.J. Keith to say that his *Canadian Literature in English* is a verbal fiction, "the contents of which are as much invented as found." Barthes reminds us that "every criticism of literary creation, however objective, however partial it claims to be, can only be systematic. There is no reason to complain of this, but only to ask for the candor of the system."⁶ Keith has always candidly admitted his admiration of and indebtedness to F.R. Leavis: "Leavis' main critical principle is as follows: It is a critic's function to say 'This is so, isn't it?' The next critic's function is to say 'Yes, but . . .,' or perhaps, 'No, not at all. . . .'"⁷ I am less interested here in Keith's individual judgments than in his

very basis of judgment. The criteria that enable Keith to appreciate certain (Modernist) writers inhibit his appreciation of certain (Romantic, Post-modernist, or radical) others. As soon as we realize that no neutral perspective is possible, we will not reprimand Keith for his partiality. My intention is not to deprecate Keith or Modernism, but to prevent the confusion of a particular, historical way of reading with a "natural" way of reading. The virtue of Keith's book is that its judgments are roughly in accordance with the consensus of Canadian critics, especially with the influential criticism of George Woodcock.⁸ The danger of Keith's book is that its readers might say "Yes" instead of "Yes, but . . .," thereby transforming a consensus into a consolidation, and casting into neglect those writers who fail to fulfil the criteria of Modernism.

As he states in his preface, Keith believes that the best Canadian writers form a good—if not a "great"—tradition: "While attempting to survey all writing of continuing interest, this book concentrates on the main stream; it emphasizes authors who may be considered 'major' because they have dominated the country's literary language, shaped its consciousness, and so fostered the native tradition" (p. x). Two questions arise immediately: is there really a single "native tradition" in Canada? And what Canadian writer has ever "dominated the country's literary language"? When Malcolm Ross wrestled with these questions twenty-six years ago, he found that the Canadian poet's predicament is that he or she does not belong to a "native tradition":

Techniques have changed. But the changes have not really been ours—at least, we have not been the innovators The point is—the debt is assimilated now (as it was then [during the time of the Confederation poets] and therefore is *almost* paid back. Then as now the feeling for place checks and balances the feeling for time.⁹

Another problem with Keith's quest for continuity is that it leads him to make these dubious assertions of influence: Sara Jeanette Duncan's use of a colloquial narrative voice "must surely have influenced Leacock" (p. 49); "the energy in Kroetsch's work surely derives in some measure from Mitchell" (p. 165); Wiebe's *Temptations of Big Bear* "surely lies somewhere behind the method and achievement" of Ondaatje's *Coming Through Slaughter* (p. 169). Occasionally, Keith writes as if his "tradition" occurred in a socio-political vacuum. "In terms of influence from abroad, the pendulum has been swinging towards the United States for some time, but pendulums have a habit of reversing themselves; as soon as one extreme is reached, the attractions of the alternative direction become evident" (p. 116). The "alternative direction," of course, is towards Britain. For Keith, a "poised

balance between British and American models will ultimately be recognized as a quintessentially Canadian—and independent—stance” (p. 116), but for his reader, this faith in the future of Canadian independence is difficult to grasp.

Keith's history is Whiggish in that its celebration of the present outweighs its consideration of the past. As A.O.J. Cockshut observes, “the strategy of Whig dialectic is to exaggerate the amount of change that has already occurred in order to imply, but not to state, that not much more change is required.”¹⁰ Now it would be difficult for any Canadian literary history to avoid Whiggery, since everyone agrees that the sheer amount of good Canadian writing has increased in recent years. But we have a right to disagree when not only Leacock but also D.C. Scott, Pratt, and Laurence are treated as transitional figures (see pp. 25, 40, 53, 160); when Leacock is included in the opening chapter, “The Beginnings in Prose,” along with the explorers, McCulloch, Haliburton, Trail, Moodie, and others; and when the very word “Victorian” is used in a pejorative manner (as in the discussion of Lampman on p. 37). In his conclusion, Keith states that “Canadian literature was still in its infancy” in 1943 (p.211), thereby consigning the nineteenth-century writers to a prenatal limbo. A very different sense of our literary history informs the work of two of Keith's main predecessors, E. K. Brown and Desmond Pacey. One wishes that Keith had at least confronted their arguments, which remind us that Canadian fiction may be a recent development, but Canadian poetry is not.

Since Keith constantly writes of what an author “achieves” or fails to “achieve”, we must examine the standards that enable him to do so. Why is Douglas Lochhead given more attention than Sheila Watson? Stylistically, ethically, and politically, Keith's sympathies lie with conservative Modern writers. The cardinal stylistic virtues, for Keith, are clarity, poise, polish, and restraint. These very words recur in various combinations, as in the following passage: Ethel Wilson “brought to her art a polished mastery of the sanctioned conventions of the novel as well as a prose style of remarkable clarity and grace” (p. 143). No one would question the applicability of these virtues to the writers Keith favours, such as Wilson, Smith, Gallant, and Davies, but Keith's readers should remember that “clarity” is itself a metaphor, and that to eschew rhetoric is itself a rhetorical gesture. Given his criteria, Keith is inevitably uncomfortable with those writers who emphasize the inadequacy or exorbitance of language; it is therefore for other critics to defend the “pyrotechnics” of such writers as Buckler (p. 147), Klein (p. 155), McLuhan (p. 205). Aware that an entirely intrinsic criticism is neither possible nor desirable,¹¹ Keith is also willing to discuss literature in ethical terms; hence, in a revealingly redundant phrase, he calls

attention to the "moral seriousness" of Wiebe (p. 166). Keith's ethics are as conservative as his aesthetics, and the following passage reveals that the resemblance is not fortuitous: "Indeed, Wilson's omniscient control . . . suggests an overall meaning and purpose in the universe. She works, without ever falling into a narrow dogmatism, within a deeply felt Christian scheme of things" (p. 144). More alarmingly, similar standards are used to censure Alice Munro: "There is, of course, nothing wrong with a committedly secular viewpoint . . . , but it may be symptomatic of certain limitations" (p. 162). This passage says more about Keith's limitations than Munro's, and so does his statement that "one's sympathies [with Jake of *St. Urbain's Horseman*] are lessened because, throughout the novel, he responds to any sexual reference like one of Pavlov's dogs . . ." (p. 152; see also the discussion of the "distastefulness" of *Beautiful Losers*, p. 168). Similarly, while Keith does not object to political writing—he is very respectful of Grant—he is suspicious of radical writers: thus he argues that "there is little point in writing much about Milton Acorn here, since this is a book about the continuities of cultural tradition and Acorn's main concern is to challenge the established tradition whenever and wherever he encounters it" (p. 104); and thus he idiosyncratically prefers F.R. Scott's "introspective poetry" to his satirical poetry (p. 62). The virtue of Keith's criteria is that they lead to lucid judgments of a good many writers; the disadvantage is that they exclude other writers.

Finally, a word must be said about Keith's evaluative intentions. In such a short book, Keith is unable to provide the necessary evidence for many of his evaluations, and therefore he is forced to summarize too much in too little space. The formulaic phrasing of such descriptions as "a frail resilience" (in Carman, p. 36), "an impressionistic vividness" (in Knister, p. 59), and "a poised manysidedness" (in Nowlan, p. 105) does not always lead to enlightenment. More seriously, there are times when Keith's judgments remind one of Frye's remarks on "the great Northwest-Passage fallacy of criticism which always gets stuck in the ice of tautology." This fallacy occurs when a critic attempts to form universal criteria, then "invariably discovers these qualities in the writers he considers best, overlooking the fact that they are merely synonyms for his preferences."¹² Why else is it a liability for Lampman to be of his age (p. 37) when it is an asset for Smith to be of his? If Reaney's *Donnellys* trilogy is "virtuously biased" (p. 189), how can Wiebe's historical novels be exonerated? And when Keith suggests in his conclusion that the academic study of Canadian literature may be "offset by neglect of the masterpieces of world literature . . ." (p. 210), I am painfully reminded of Frye's warning that evaluative criticism would leave "Canadian literature a poor naked *alouette* plucked of

every feather of decency and dignity" (Daymond and Monkman, II, p. 460). None of these objections are meant to discredit *Canadian Literature in English*, which is an excellent introduction to its subject, and a valuable guide for specialists, as long as it is approached in a critical spirit. Keith's book also contains a helpful chronology and a biographical and bibliographical appendix.

Gaile McGregor's *The Wacousta Syndrome: Explorations in the Canadian Langscape* is a full-scale attempt to extend the kind of critical approach used by Atwood in her timely polemic, *Survival*. Atwood's back cover commendation of McGregor is inadvertently revealing: "Energetic, engaging, and essential reading for all those who purport to study the Canadian psyche as reflected in its literature." Those who read Canadian literature for other reasons, or who doubt the very existence of a Canadian "psyche," are unlikely to be engaged by this book. It may be that the voguish attacks on "thematic criticism" are overstated. Too often it is implied that we now have a "maturity" lacking in such earlier critics as Jones, Atwood, and Frye. Nonetheless, McGregor is not up to the standards of these previous critics, and she has little awareness that the moment of thematic criticism has passed. Her puzzling assertions that "Jung is more 'fashionable' in literary circles right now than Freud" (p. 370), and that Marcuse has had a "relatively greater success during the last decade" in the United States than in Europe (p. 448) suggest that her opinions were formed at least a decade ago. But why did the University of Toronto Press not demand corrections? In other ways, too, McGregor has not been well served by her publisher, for although her book has extensive references to the visual arts, it does not contain a single illustration.

Here is McGregor's explanation of the term "langscape":

The coinage "langscape," far from adventitious, is meant to underline the extent to which nature, like other aspects of reality, is not simply perceived but socially constructed. By mythicizing our environment we convert it into a body of symbols, a kind of code which—like all language—reveals the ability both to reflect *and* to coerce our experience of the world. (p. vii).

This is a fair enough premise, and its attractiveness is increased by an early—and apt—citation of Barthes (p. 11). But things soon begin to unravel, as when McGregor maintains that "the difficulties of achieving verisimilitude with the imported diction was not a problem that bothered, or even occurred to, the majority" of early Canadian writers (p. 34)—as if all diction were not imported, including McGregor's. Shortly thereafter she argues that rhetoric is useless to the colonist who "has to confront the *unmediated* reality of a prairie fire. . . ." (p. 36)—as if her very premise and coinage ("langscape") did not preclude the

possibility of confronting an "unmediated reality." McGregor's interest in the social construction of reality is further undermined by her dubious belief that "politics are incomprehensible" (p. 172). Perhaps if she had persisted in her reading of Barthes she would have become wise. As it is, she attempts to discriminate perception ("what one 'sees' ") from cognition ("how one assimilates it"—p. 40), thereby ignoring the argument (made by Barthes among others) that no such separation is possible, and that there is no neutral, innocent, or unmediated perception. Ultimately McGregor's allegiances are not to Barthes but to Frye and Atwood, and her "lanscape" is but another version of the "garrison mentality."

Although she makes some interesting points, McGregor is not really concerned with literary criticism in any known form. Her whole argument (and title) depends on the shaky assertion that Richardson's *Wacousta* is a paradigmatic Canadian novel, and that it differs from Cooper's Leatherstocking novels in ways that reveal the differences between Canada and the United States. But she neither provides a close reading of *Wacousta* nor attends to its many textual problems; she merely argues that unlike Cooper, Richardson avoids describing nature because his "problems—his inability to reconcile the emotional necessity of maintaining an absolute discontinuity between fort and forest with a literary form implying, even demanding, mediation between the two—were not idiosyncratic but symptomatic of the cultural setting out of which he wrote" (p. 10). From here she is off to discuss other works as national paradigms, including *The Heart of the Ancient Wood* (p. 21), *The Invention of the World* (p. 85), *The Last of the Crazy People* (p. 109), *The Nymph and the Lamp* (p. 144), and *Beautiful Losers* (p. 226). She is at her best with recent writers; indeed, the book would be much more valuable if it had been revised as a study in recent Canadian fiction, even if this meant that it had to be retitled.

The problem is not that McGregor lacks a sense of history: she insists at one point that "to be cut off from history is to be cut off from life" (p. 377). The problem is that her historical generalizations are too simplistic: thus she refers to a "general seventeenth-century world view, with its apocalyptic vision of human history . . ." (p. 67 n.4); to "the enervating sentimentality of the nineteenth century" (p. 72); and to the American's "rather distinctive attitude toward death. In short, he refuses to believe in it" (p. 116). As a result, we may be reluctant to accept her generalizations about Canada, especially the following: "it is questionable whether *any* kind of transcendence—religious, social, or merely 'symbolic'—is imaginatively viable in the context of the Canadian world view" (p. 82); "The Canadian as groundhog: here is where we find what is probably, after the sex inversion (to which it is,

of course, intimately linked), the key to one of the most crucial aspects of the national character" (p. 200); "... the fact is that the figure of the *Indian* seems almost always to be used in this country, intentionally or not, to illuminate, like the fool-saint, the exemplary submissive stance" (p. 216). Such writers as Avison, Crawford, Grant, Layton, Leacock, Livesay, D.C. Scott, F.R. Scott, and Smith, who do not fit these paradigms and generalizations, are either excluded or mentioned only briefly.

More encouraging developments are to be found in *Gaining Ground: European Critics on Canadian Literature*, a collection of essays edited by Robert Kroetsch and Reingard M. Nischik. Nischik tentatively argues that "perhaps the analysis of narrative strategies, or, more generally, of structural and technical rather than thematic aspects is a specific contribution of European scholarship to the accumulating criticism of Canadian literature" (p. 250). If this claim did not ignore the rhetorical criticism written in Canada, it would serve as an adequate summary of *Gaining Ground*. Waldemar Zacharasiwicz's "The Invention of a Region: The Art of Fiction in Jack Hodgins' Stories" is the sole unsatisfactory paper, and even it contains remarks that might have been properly developed in a fuller article than this five-page effort. The other papers are remarkably well-researched and fully argued. Two are outstanding: in "The Dubious Battle of Storytelling: Narrative Strategies in Timothy Findley's *The Wars*," Simone Vauthier compellingly demonstrates the virtues of combining a narratological with a generic approach; and in "Worlds Alongside: Contradictory Discourses in the Fiction of Alice Munro and Margaret Atwood," Coral Ann Howells discusses the supplementary interplay of fantasy and realism in a number of works. Although most of these contributions are (perhaps inevitably) on contemporary writing, those by Karla El-Hassan, Rudolf Bader, and Eva-Marie Kröller deal well with earlier periods. Nischik also provides a valuable bibliography of "European Publications on Canadian Literature." All in all, their recurrent emphases on Post-modernism and recent literary theory lead the contributors to *Gaining Ground* to consider Canadian literature rhetorically rather than thematically or evaluatively. In so doing, they remind us that, as George Bowering has argued, "Modernism could not last forever."¹³

NOTES

1. "History or Literature?" in *On Racine*, trans. Richard Howard (New York: Hill and Wang, 1964; *Sur Racine* was published in 1960), p. 161. Frank Lentricchia calls the title of this

- essay "a deliberate ironic posing of false alternatives"; see *After the New Criticism* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980), p. 136.
2. The quotations are from the following essays in *Tropics of Discourse: Essays in Cultural Criticism* (1978; rpt. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1985): "The Fictions of Factual Representation," p. 121; "The Historical Text as Literary Artifact," p. 82; "Historicism, History, and the Figurative Imagination," p. 106.
 3. "Building Jerusalem Here," Rev. of *The Arts in Canada: The Last Fifty Years*, ed. W.J. Keith and B.-Z. Shek, *Canadian Poetry: Studies, Documents, Reviews*, 7 (Fall/Winter 1980), p. 96.
 4. "Myth Today," in *Mythologies*, trans. Annette Lavers (London: Jonathan Cape, 1972; published in French in 1957), p. 143.
 5. "The Two Criticisms (1963)," in *Critical Essays*, trans. Richard Howard (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1972); pp. 250-51.
 6. "History or Literature?" p. 163.
 7. In his concluding remarks in *Taking Stock: The Calgary Conference on the Canadian Novel*, ed. Charles R. Steele, introd. Hallvard Dahlie (Downsview, Ont.: ECW Press, 1982), p. 147.
 8. See my "The Contexts of Canadian Criticism," forthcoming in *The American Review of Canadian Studies*, for a discussion of Woodcock's Modernism and its influence.
 9. Introd., *Poets of the Confederation*, ed. Ross (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1960), p. xi. For a provocative attack on the "integrity of Canadian culture," see Leon Surette, "Here is Us: The Topocentrism of Canadian Literary Criticism," *Canadian Poetry: Studies, Documents, Reviews*, 10 (Spring/Summer 1982), p. 44-57.
 10. *Truth to Life: The Art of Biography in the Nineteenth Century* (New York and London: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1974), p. 142.
 11. Even so conservative a theorist as E.D. Hirsch concludes that "there is no valid reason to preserve any affection for the empty shibboleth 'literature as literature.' Its success in the world has been a measure only of its delusiveness, of its logical meaninglessness." See "Privileged Criteria in Literary Evaluation," in *Problems of Literary Evaluation*, Volume II of the *Yearbook of Contemporary Criticism*, ed. and introd. Joseph Strelka (University Park and London: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1969), p. 33.
 12. "Contexts of Literary Evaluation," in *Problems of Literary Evaluation*, p. 19. For Frye, "the pursuit of values in criticism is like the pursuit of happiness in the American Constitution: one may have some sympathy with the stated aim, but one deplores the grammar" (p. 14).
 13. See his essay in Daymond and Monkman, II, pp. 524-30.