latter could be an emendation, but if so, it is not indicated as such in the notes, and in any case the emendation would ruin the metrical regularity of the line. In line 194 of ‘The Depression Ends,’ all previous texts read: ‘In telling what thou mayst not know,’ the Toronto text alters this to ‘In telling what they may not know,’ which is grammatically impossible and clearly nonsense in the context of the surrounding lines.

[4] Unexplained or silent emendations: In all other editions, ‘The Highway’ ends with a question mark. In the Toronto text, it ends with an exclamation point. There may be a reason for this, but the editors do not bother to give it. Line 44 of ‘Sea Variations’ in the Toronto text reads: ‘As the gold and purple,’ the copy-text, however, has ‘As the gold and the purple.’ Here the emendation, if it is one, would seem to suit the metre of this section, but there is no indication given that the editors have authorized this change. In line 504 of The Witches’ Brew, all previous editions have the word ‘circles’ where the Toronto text has ‘circle.’ The singular might accord with the use of ‘ring’ two lines later, but again the editors do not indicate that the variant exists. Either they simply have not noticed the substitution, or they have failed to make a case for it. In contrast, the substitution of ‘resolve’ for ‘revolve’ in line 5 can be attributed to nothing other than careless typesetting and lax proofreading.

My examples have been chosen from Part I, but similar problems may be observed in the text of Part 2. A quick collation of Brébeuf and His Brethren turned up thirteen substantive variants between the copy-text (CP2) and the Toronto text. Not one of these could be a justifiable emendation. Some, like the substitution of ‘annoint’ for ‘anoint’ in line 2031, are obvious printer’s errors, but how to explain ‘merit’ for ‘win’ in line 1929 or ‘through the lakes’ for ‘through lakes’ in line 192? These changes disturb the regular metre of the poem and should have been noted immediately by the proofreaders. In lines 297-299, the editors have perversely followed the first edition of Brébeuf in altering the archaic (but contextually accurate) ‘Thou,’ ‘thy,’ and ‘thee’ to ‘You’ and ‘your’ but have left ‘Thyself’ in line 301. This change makes absolutely no sense at all, especially as in lines 841-848 they have retained the archaic pronouns used in CP2.

Space does not permit me to record the many other errors which mar this text, rendering it inferior to the 1958 Collected Poems for the purpose of citation in scholarly writings. As it seems very unlikely that we will see another edition of Pratt’s works in our lifetime, a corrected re-issue is obviously called for. Pratt is owed nothing less.

MICHAEL DARLING

(Michael Darling teaches in the Department of English at the University of Western Ontario. He is the author of bibliographies of Mordecai Richler and A.J.M. Smith.)


When Thomas Chandler Haliburton began contributing his sketches of Sam Slick to
Joseph Howe’s the *Novascotian*, he could not have anticipated the impact his work would have on the reading public of 1835. Sharp-witted Sam Slick, a Yankee clock peddler whose philosophy of ‘soft sawder and human natur’ won the interest of a wide and diverse readership, was among the most popular of nineteenth-century literary characters. Slick ensured the unprecedented success of *The Clockmaker*, first series (Halifax: Howe, 1837), the first Canadian book to enjoy a literary popularity in Canada as well as Great Britain, the United States, and Europe.

Richard A. Davies, who is professor of English at Acadia University, has performed a formidable task by collecting and editing Haliburton’s letters. Davies has been interested in the Nova Scotia Supreme Court judge and writer for at least twelve years. During that period he has published articles on Haliburton’s years in England, he edited the essay collection *On Thomas Chandler Haliburton* (1979), and he contributed to *The Thomas Chandler Haliburton Symposium* (1985, hereafter Symposium). *The Letters* represents the long-awaited result of many years of research and scholarly endeavour.

As a critical edition, Davies’ collection has clear strengths. First, and most obvious, the volume fills a previous void in Haliburton scholarship. Haliburton emerges from these letters as an energetic and enthusiastic individual, committed to his chief occupations as judge and author. Given the humour which characterizes much of his creative work, a reader would expect the odd glimpse into the comical side of Haliburton. Unfortunately, this is not the case. The letters reveal a serious man who maintains a close check on sensitivity, expressed only on rare and sombre occasions, such as the death of his first wife, Louisa Neville, or when trying difficult legal cases.

Second, Davies’ collection amends errors in letters which were previously published elsewhere. His text is based on historical research and a thorough knowledge and analysis of Haliburton’s hand. Although he says that he has not seen all of the available manuscript letters in their original state, he indicates when the source of his transcription is a photocopy of the original. A reader feels confident that the text he or she is reading accurately records the content of Haliburton’s manuscript letters. The book’s chronological development, sexpartite structure, and interesting illustrations are useful organizational tools, which assist in fostering that sense of confidence.

When the issue of editorial procedure is addressed, however, reader confidence is significantly undermined. Davies states elsewhere that he is ‘convinced that [G. Thomas] Tanselle’s argument against modernizing and in favor of a literal transcription of manuscript letters is a powerful one,’ and that he has ‘therefore sought to retain the nineteenth-century personality of Haliburton’s correspondence’ (*Symposium*, p. 26). This, however, is clearly not the policy he adopts in *The Letters*.

In fact, Davies’ editorial procedures are not clearly stated. For example, rather than explaining his own preference for retaining Haliburton’s characteristic use of the dash in his correspondence, he refers the reader to previous explanations given by editors John Lewis Bradley in *The Letters of John Ruskin to Lord and Lady Mount-Temple*, Van Akin Burd in *The Winnington Letters*, and Kathleen Coburn in *The Letters of Sara Hutchinson from 1800 to 1835*. Surely Davies’ decision to remain faithful to the original was made only after careful consideration of the unique
aspects of the body of correspondence in hand. The reader would like to be informed of those important factors which account for the final editorial decision.

Although Davies rejects editorial intervention and agrees with Tanselle that ‘to regularize is to modernize’ (*Symposium*, p. 26), he claims to have standardized Haliburton’s idiosyncratic use of capital and superior letters and double quotation marks. He also states that ‘Haliburton’s frequent omission of the dash at the end of the paragraph, and occasional lapses in the body of the letter itself have been silently amended’ (*The Letters*, p. xx). The inconsistency between editorial statement and editorial act is evident at once. There will be readers who appreciate the modernization of the text for its increased clarity and accessibility, while others will judge that modernization diminishes the integrity of the original. What is more objectionable is the silent altering of text which raises suspicion about the book’s general editorial policy.

This edition adopts two conventions used in the Susanna Moodie collection, *Letters of a Lifetime* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1985), but with less success. Each of the six sections of letters is prefaced with an introductory essay, and annotations follow each letter. The essays and annotations provide factual detail which facilitates a coherent reading of the letters. Otherwise, they offer little insight into the underlying dynamics of the correspondence. In terms of publishing history and Haliburton’s relationships with his main publishers, Joseph Howe of Halifax, Richard Bentley of London, and Carey, Lea and Blanchard of Philadelphia, Davies tells us little that is not already known. It is unfortunate that so few of the existing letters to his publishers add to our understanding of Haliburton’s publishing career. To assist in filling the obvious gaps in the correspondence, Davies could have referred to a letter written by Bentley to Howe, housed at the National Archives of Canada, and the controversial agreements between Bentley and Haliburton, housed at Harvard University.

The index is a useful and accurate guide, and, with the exception of two typographical errors, the text is clean. The reference to E. H. Eddis on p. 101 and 275 should read E. U. Eddis. The portrait painter’s name appears correctly on page 88 as Eden Upton Eddis. Davies’ hope that more Haliburton letters will surface is likely to materialize. This reviewer has located three letters not included in the collection: a letter signed Sam Slick, addressed to Watson, 25 February 1846; a letter to Howe, 15 March 1854; and a fragment of a letter in Haliburton’s hand, possibly written on behalf of Richard Bentley.

The vibrant personality which our cultural and literary history associates with Haliburton is significantly absent from this collection. One wishes Davies could have compensated for that absence with such insights as the following statement, offered by Judge James Stewart to Judge Peleg Wiswall, on the appointment of Haliburton to the Inferior Bench:

The Lawyers, [in the house] say what they will, are to a man, from the Speaker downward, rejoiced to have [Haliburton] out of their way, – Independent of his being on the road to the Chair, he was troublesome to many individual members who were afraid of his wit and his sarcasm, and they must feel
happy that he cannot come again among them. – Some think that the Governor appointed him to the office to get rid of him ... [5 October 1829. Public Archives of Nova Scotia, MG 1 vol. 980 reel 2]

It remains the task of the critic to explain the discrepancy between this portrait of Haliburton, Canada’s first international best-selling author, and the serious portrait which emerges from the letters.

RUTH PANOFSKY

(Ruth Panofsky is a graduate student in Canadian literature at York University where she is working on a bibliographical study of Thomas Chandler Haliburton’s The Clockmaker series.)


We have been waiting for this book for a long time. Although Roughing It in the Bush is one of the most important texts written from nineteenth-century Canada, the complications of trans-Atlantic publication and editorial intervention have until now impeded its appearance as it was originally conceived in 1852. The versions upon which Moodie has been judged (often harshly) by her modern critics have derived from the revised 1871 edition, which omitted most of Moodie’s poems and the contributions of other members of her family: her husband’s poems and chapters – ‘The Village Hotel,’ ‘The Land-Jobber’ and ‘Canadian Sketches’ – which supply the family and historical background to Susanna’s more impressionistic material, and her brother’s poetic and prose accounts of a ‘whirlwind.’ It is clear, from the text now reconstructed by Ballstadt, that Moodie did not initially perceive her book as a linear autobiographical narrative but as a sketchbook reflecting a communal experience; she used her formally structured poems to frame the more fragmentary prose selections that recount her psychologically shattering emigration, and balanced her own work with the writings of several other members of her family community.

In the absence of a manuscript, this CEECT edition represents the editor’s best effort to reproduce Moodie’s intended text as inferred from her own comments, from his familiarity with her style, and from corrections made to sheets within the two impressions issued by Richard Bentley in London in 1852. Ballstadt’s most significant change to the contents of the second impression is the addition of ‘Jeanie Burns,’ a chapter that failed to reach Bentley in time and was subsequently added to Life in the Clearings (1853). As Ballstadt has helpfully included as appendices two documents that situate Roughing It contextually – the publisher’s advertisement for the first edition and Moodie’s introduction to the 1871 edition – he might also have appended ‘Michael McBride,’ the chapter that Moodie withdrew after its appearance in Montreal in the Literary Garland had prompted the local Catholic press to accuse her of anti-Catholicism.