should be encouraged and supported. Ruth Panofsky does superlative work within the available format. Adele Wiseman: An Annotated Bibliography is a provocative and compelling guide equal to its subject. Panofsky's felicitous prose and thorough research enhance a worthy publication, which, despite my quarrels with her publishers, is a welcome addition to the libraries of high schools, colleges, universities, and scholars' shelves.

LORNA KNIGHT
National Library of Canada


Donald Stephens's 'Editor's Introduction' to his CEECT edition of The Canadian Brothers states the novel's claims to our attention in a concise manner: 'the personal and the public combine to provide a vision of a fallen, sinful world where individuals, families, and nations are doomed by ancient actions and old wrongs to murder, fratricide, and war' (p. xxxvi). What enabled John Richardson to come up with a vision of this historical and psychological breadth?

Stephens observes the author's dependence upon personal experience for his fictional material. In fact, the exhaustion of this material helps to explain Richardson's decline as a writer after the appearance of this novel. Yet he also exploited personal experience in producing two earlier works, Écarté (1829) and Frascati's (1830). Their depiction of demi-mondaine Restoration Paris bears only archival significance today. The Canadian Brothers, however, completing as it does Richardson's Lawrentian sequence, continues to engage serious students of Canadian literature. Why?

James Reaney's brilliant 'Tales of the Great River: Aubert de Gaspé and John Richardson' found in Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada, 4th Ser. 17 (1979): 159–71, tells us everything that we need to know about the importance of Richardson's public vision. Following Stephens's lead, I want to speculate here about the personal experience that looped the writer into a set of materials and concerns whose relevance extended into the realm of the communal.

We naturally assume that a writer's métier comes to him inevitably, and that he or she must duck to keep from being hurt by this matter that falls out of the sky. Not so in Richardson's case! He first publishes an anonymous prose narrative of his war experiences, and then an exuberantly bad epic about Tecumseh that is based on them. Rather than build upon this foundation of frontier material, the material that will make his name endure, the writer instead turns out those two
novels mentioned above, as well as a topical satire, *Kensington Gardens in 1830*. Even after the 1832 appearance of *Wacousta*, his finest work, he will spend precious time grinding out two polemics that masquerade as history. The rehashing of bygone personal quarrels marks his account of his service as a soldier of fortune with a right-wing British mercenary force engaged in a Spanish civil war. [History does repeat itself; in this case, the first time as farce, the second as tragedy.]

Not until the appearance of *The Canadian Brothers* can we, with hindsight, confirm his authorial vision. The war that confirmed the existence of British North America becomes the setting for the sequel to the family tragedy set in the earlier war that helped found British North America. Then does the vision appear.

If we now take it as a truism that a writer delivers autobiography before he discovers his genius at fiction, then this is certainly true of Richardson's early career. Even in producing *Wacousta*, he admitted, his inspiration came alike from the recollections of his grandmother and his own three-time reading of James Fenimore Cooper's *The Last of the Mohicans*. Two varieties of vicarious experience, one personal, the other imaginative, drove him to his compelling account of a revenge tragedy offering oblique resemblances to the historical conflicts that produced his birthplace. *Wacousta* is colonial fiction. Yet its portrayal of the ruthless, acquisitive, obsessive military commander who does so much to provoke the catastrophe that overwhelms him, delivers as a kind of post-colonial critique. This in turn helps account for its present interest, and its use as a cultural talisman in Marian Engel's *Bear* [1976].

The relationship between personal material and *The Canadian Brothers* may at first seem simple: Richardson fought in a war and then wrote a novel about it. Q.E.D. That leaves us still to account for his inclusion of the lurid events of the so-called Kentucky Tragedy [*a crime passionel* that happened a decade after the novelist's stay there as a P.O.W.] within his work. Certainly it would not stretch the bounds of credibility to attribute this to sheer opportunism. The crime was widely known. Richardson knew its setting and therefore would have little trouble in 'working up' the material. Wherever his idea of including this event originated, it transforms the novel from a fictional war memoir to a political allegory on the dilemmas of British North Americans. Matilda Montgomerie stands for all the seductiveness that a triumphant America exerts over the innocent simplicities of colonial boys. Yet to lie with her is to lose the truth of selfhood.

When Richardson sold the rights to his novel to an American publisher, and saw (or perhaps himself assisted in) it Americanized through excision, alteration, and emendation, the work appeared under the name of its villainess. That second text, as Stephens demonstrates, is really another novel. Merely another Gothic thriller, *Matilda Montgomerie* demonstrates that Richardson's historical vision is the central organizing principle of *The Canadian Brothers*. By prostituting his vision, he showed how compelling it had been.

Thus we return to the curse that afflicts the De Haldimar family and its descendants, a curse that both originates in and reinforces a spectacle driven by the forces of aggressive nationalism, imperialism, and war. Thus originates the
myth of the primal curse accompanying the European settling of North America, cruising along the St. Lawrence long before it ambled down another great river to fetch up in Yoknapatawpha.

No reader will fault, and the serious will thank, the editor for his meticulously detailed introduction and explanatory notes. It is really necessary, however, to include a verse of 'Old King Cole' among the latter? Must we really allow for that benighted a generation of future readers?

Since I am not a bibliographer, I only note rather than evaluate the thorough and elaborate procedures for text-establishment that mark the CEECT series. They are in force here as well. At times, the essential fascination of the origins, publication, and reception-history of the novel gets submerged beneath the many details that the introduction marshals. But the 'overkill' can be easily neutralized, particularly when the reader realizes that virtually everything that one needs to know about the circumstances of publication rests at one's fingertips. 'Virtually': this reader would have liked to have seen some speculation on the effect of the American publisher's anti-Catholic ideology upon the Gothicizing of Matilda Montgomerie, though that is no more than a quibble.

Important, far more important, to express is the sense of gratitude every student of Canadian literature must feel at the CEECT's splendid refurbishing of John Richardson's two major claims upon our critical attention.

DENNIS DUFFY
Innis College, University of Toronto


In the past decade, materials about Canada's native peoples, Indians, Métis and Inuit, have proliferated. In early 1992 a group of people working in native studies