

Grove's Last Laugh

The Gender of Self-Representation in Frederick Philip Grove's *In Search of Myself*

All right, let it be, then, *In Search of Myself*, if that does not sound presumptuous: for who am I? That anyone should search for me? I believe I have done some honest work; but on the whole, as my wife says, I have done what I wished to do; and therefore, she says, I should be satisfied. The trouble is, I have not been able to provide for her in even the smallest measure.

—FREDERICK PHILIP GROVE, from a letter to Ellen Elliot (Pacey 489)

In his letter to Ellen Elliot from 1946, Frederick Philip Grove—alias Felix Paul Greve—points to two issues that have since occupied his critics in examining his autobiography, *In Search of Myself* (henceforth *ISM*): his failure to gain recognition as a Canadian writer and the irony of his representation of himself as an “honest” worker.¹ I find a different issue emerging from Grove’s letter. He believes his failure to achieve recognition is economically gendered; therefore he focuses on his inability to “provide” for his wife “in even the smallest measure.” In her introduction to the 1991 collection, *Autobiography and Questions of Gender*, Shirley Neuman suggests that both humanist and post-structuralist theorizations of the autobiographical subject and its representation have lacked a “self-consciousness about, or differentiation of, what in western cultures is a fundamental aspect of our ‘identity’ or ‘subjectivity’: our identity as a man or a woman.” She notes that, although gender has been explored a great deal in relation to women’s writing, one of the “major gaps in our theorizing of a poetics of gender in autobiography is the category in relation to which ‘generic difference’ [sic] has implicitly been defined: masculinity” (1-6). Masculinity is as much a de/constructable factor in self-representation as femininity, and the gendering of Grove’s failure and its connection with the fabrications of his text are subjects as yet insufficiently explored in the critical literature on

his autobiography. The assertion that Grove saw failure not just in terms of a lack of fame but also as a lack of masculinity is corroborated throughout *ISM* by the author's consistent questioning of his own gender identification, and by his constant representation of himself as barred from accession to phallic power. As we shall see, Grove's own de/constructions of his gender identity culminate in his appropriation, by default, of another kind of creative power, the maternal, as a means of making himself heard by Canadian audiences.

On the surface at least, Grove's ideal of selfhood is a traditionally humanist one relying on the stability of the individual as a unique and coherent entity who exists outside of and prior to the creation of the autobiographical text. Such an ideal is apparent early in Grove's text:

If, in a state of prenatal existence, human beings-to-be could deliberately choose those to whom they wished to be born, taking into account, of course, what they intended to do with their earthly lives, then a future writer like myself could hardly, according to outward appearance, have chosen better than the determining destiny did choose for me in the matter of parents. To what extent reality bore out this appearance is the subject of the first part of this book. (*ISM* 15)

Grove here posits a notion of pre-constituted selfhood of what he calls unborn "human beings-to-be" and particularizes himself as a "future writer," a self governed by "determining destiny." With this notion of selfhood as pre-scripted and available for translation into the subject of a book, Grove's text appears to exemplify Georges Gusdorf's enunciation of the autobiographer's task as the "strain[ing] toward a complete and coherent expression of his entire *destiny*" (35; emphasis added). Indeed, *ISM* provides us with a retrospective glimpse of Grove's sense of selfhood, "reconstituted" in the present by the author to display "his special unity and identity across time" (35). An initial reading of *ISM* suggests that, for a writer such as Grove, there seem to be "no agonizing questions of identity, self-definition, self-existence, or self-deception" (Olney 20). The text is an accounting of the author's life, as seen in the chronological progression through the life of the subject, from the "Prologue," which details the "conception" of the text, through "Childhood," "Youth," "Manhood," "And After."

As illustrated by these section headings, however, destiny also determines that Grove will identify himself in terms of gender, and that on his way to becoming a writer he must attain "manhood" by first successfully navigating the worlds of "childhood" and "youth." As suggested by Kaja Silverman, the "ideological reality" of Western society upholds a "dominant fiction"

which “functions to construct and sustain sexual difference” and which aligns phallic power with physical possession of the penis (1-8). That “dominant fiction,” says Silverman, “calls upon the male subject to see himself, and the female subject to recognize and desire him, only through the mediation of images of an *unimpaired* masculinity” (42; emphasis added). A child’s indoctrination into performance of this “dominant fiction” begins at the moment of birth into the family unit and achieves its greatest impetus in the “positive Oedipus complex,” which acts as the “primary vehicle of insertion into that [ideological] reality” (2). In order to take up a “normal” subject position within a heterosexual society, the male child must emerge from this seminal phase of development with a “preponderance in him” of the masculine “sexual disposition,” thereby allowing for a “father-identification” which “will preserve the object-relation to the mother which belonged to the positive complex” (Freud, *The Ego and the Id* 640-41). According to such a scenario, the “dissolution of the Oedipus complex would consolidate the masculinity in a boy’s character” (640). Where this successful emergence of the father-identified male occurs, the Oedipus complex can be said to have “produced and sustained a normative masculinity” (Silverman 16), a masculinity through which “the subject is accommodated to the Name-of-the-Father” (34) and the privileges of the phallus.

A careful reading of *ISM* reveals Grove’s sense of his own failure to thus achieve and sustain a state of “normative masculinity”; indeed, the “Prologue,” the conceptional moment of Grove’s “avowedly autobiographic” text (11), sets a decidedly bleak tone:

It was a dismal November day, with a raw wind blowing from the north-west and cold, iron-grey clouds flying low—one of those Ontario days which, on the lake-shores or in a country of rock and swamp, seem to bring visions of an ageless time after the emergence of the earth from chaos, or a foreboding of the end of a world about to die from entropy. (1)

It is in this foreboding setting that the reader is introduced to a mature Grove in the November of his days. Grove is plagued by his inability to make his mark in the world; to realize the praise which had flown about him in the academic circles of his manhood; to live up to the status of one “of whom great things were expected” (3). Grove represents himself in contrast to those “famous men” of Europe, the friends of his youth, who are “known throughout the civilized world, having left, by this time, the

impress of their minds upon their age" (10), and measures himself in contrast as existing in a world "about to die from entropy" (1). In a world wherein "to wield a pen is a masculine act" (Friedman 371), Grove, having "lived and worked in obscurity" (*ISM* 4), conceives of a literary work as a means of explaining his "defeat," his "failure" to achieve the recognition—literary and economic—for which he felt himself destined (7-11). In fact, he posits his "failure" as inevitable, thereby aligning himself with the young girl whom he is attempting to retrieve from beyond a rutted and washed-out road, and who is meant to perform the "Sisyphus tasks of a household drudge" (1). Like the figure of Sisyphus, who in Greek mythology was "condemned for his misdeeds to Hades where his eternal task was to roll a large stone to the top of a hill from which it always rolled down again" ("Sisyphus"), Grove notes of his own aspirations to achieve the Olympian heights of literary success that his "struggle had been such as to make defeat a foregone conclusion" (*ISM* 6).

Dependent as Grove thus is on enunciating a personal history of inevitable failure, he speaks (to borrow Kaja Silverman's phrasing) from the "margins" of an ideal masculinity. If "classic male subjectivity rests upon the denial of castration" (Silverman 44), then Grove's presentation of himself as symbolically castrated—as a failed figure of masculine/literary achievement—makes no pretensions to the powers of the ideal. As to matters of gender identity, the history of Grove scholarship has been "unswervingly normatizing" on both "the sexual and the national" level, and what has been "particularly striking in this scholarship is the consistency with which homosocial (including, but not exclusively limited to, homosexual) elements in FPG's lives and works have been elided" (Cavell 12-13). By providing a sustained exploration of the representation of gender identity in *ISM*, I intend to illustrate that Grove deliberately constructs a feminized image for himself as a means to explain his failure to achieve "normative masculinity" and to ultimately present an ironic challenge to "conventional male subjectivity" (Silverman 1).²

Grove's intention to speak from the margins of a society characterized by "heteronormativity" (Cavell 18) is apparent even in the "Prologue" and in his reflections on one particular friend from his past. In his enunciation of the reasons for writing *ISM*, Grove notes his memory of a "young Frenchman" of his youth: as he states it, "for years we had been inseparable, so much so that old-fashioned and benevolent people . . . had teasingly

called us Castor and Pollux" (3). The nature of Grove's friendship with the "young Frenchman," significantly characterized in terms of Greek mythology,³ quickly takes on the tone of a decidedly homosocial relationship:

As they came back to me, I had told anecdotes of our ardent association; and I had given expression to my unbounded youthful admiration for the young Frenchman who, a year or two older than myself, had been one of the determining influences in overcoming my own immaturities. (3)

The memory of the Frenchman, who was once the author's "mentor" and who here elicits such adjectives as "ardent" and "unbounded," causes Grove to rise and "pace the floor of the room in a state of *intense excitement*" (emphasis added). The unnamed Frenchman is clearly drawn from one or more of the members of the homosocial milieu with which Grove was associated while attending university in Germany and which was dominated by such people as Stefan George, André Gide and Oscar Wilde.

Following Grove's initial memory, however, is what appears to be a re-assertion of heterosexist proscriptions on gender behaviour, for the nature of Grove's relationship with this Frenchman, who has managed to "earn the distinction of seeing his biography published within his lifetime" and to have "achieved things which had focused on him the eyes of a world," has altered in the years since their youth:

And another memory had arisen. On one of my four or five trips back to Europe, undertaken during the years when, on this continent of America, I had lived as a farmhand, I had, on one single occasion, once more met that young Frenchman, no longer quite so young, by previous appointment. We had had dinner together in one of the great, famous restaurants of Paris; and, tragically, we had found that we had nothing any longer to say to each other. . . . (5)

A surface reading suggests that, in addition to the passage of time, a difference in economic achievement is a factor in the breakup of the relationship; that is, Grove's work as an itinerant farmhand "on the lonely prairies of western Canada" makes him unsuitable for meetings with successful men from "the crowded capitals of Europe" (4). Grove and the "no longer quite so young" Frenchman now exist in different worlds. But there is a subtext to this passage, especially if we accept Cavell's assertion that "the pioneer world is by definition a homosocial one" (37). Whereas Grove has entered a world which reinforces close relationships between men—as seen in his "attachment" to a "pardner" who rather ambiguously "facilitated many operations" (*ISM* 205)—the Frenchman has moved beyond the relation-

ships of his youth and appears no longer to view Grove as “the most lavishly endowed” of young men (5).

Grove’s sometimes subtle allusions to homosocial relations are elsewhere problematized by an apparent need to re-affirm the attitudes and prejudices of a heterosexual culture. For example, in the “Youth” section of the book he details his relationship with the young Frenchman and makes the following avowal:

I went through one strange experience. A young man, very slightly my senior in years, was, in certain small circles, already regarded as a coming light. While first avoiding and even discouraging my advances, he suddenly veered around and, incredibly, subordinated himself to me. It is true, in public he acted more or less as my mentor; but in private he professed that he was nothing, I everything. It was only in the course of weeks or even months that I began to realize with dismay the nature of my attraction for him. When my eyes were opened, I saw clearly that a not inconsiderable fraction of these new, artistic friends of mine . . . suffered from the taint of homosexuality. (161)

Grove later goes on to assure his readers that “the thing itself meant nothing to me; it means nothing to me today” and that, “if [he] had not always been so, [he] had become definitely, finally heterosexual” (161-62). Here, as elsewhere, Grove’s comments are highly ambiguous, so that the reader is never quite sure whether she should allow more emphasis to be given to the fact that it was the “young man” who “subordinated himself” to Grove’s “advances,” or to Grove’s professed “dismay” at discovering the “taint of homosexuality.” Given, however, that it is precisely the author’s memory of his early relationship with the young Frenchman which serves as an impetus to his decision to document his failure to become one of the “famous men” of Europe, Grove appears to be deliberately opposing himself to the dominant conception of masculinity as being inherently heterosexual. Unlike the successful (and now less than ardent) Frenchman, Grove, as he tells his audience at the beginning of his “Childhood” section, has a “constitutional disinclination to conform” (15). In the light of Grove’s assertions to his readers (made over and over again) that he “[has] come to look upon [his] life as essentially wasted, as essentially a failure” (222), that he is “a failure, utter and absolute” (231), and that “this book is the record of a failure; and its explanation” (409), the focus in the “Prologue” on Grove’s homosocial experiences marks his intention to speak from the margins of heterosexual conceptions of masculinity in partial explanation of his failure to achieve literary success.

Of key importance to the gender de/construction in Grove's text is the first, most fully fictionalized, half of the book. In recent years, the desire for "biographical facticity" (Smith 4) in autobiographical texts has been eschewed in favour of the critical axiom that "lying" in autobiography "is a highly strategic decision, especially on the part of literary autobiographers," and that "narrative truth and personal myth are more telling than literal fidelity" (Adams x). The fabrications which permeate Grove's text represent the author's attempt to construct a self and a life which would emerge from the "obscurity" of mere biographical truth and help Grove to "compensate for the failure to have made [him]self heard so far" (*ISM* 4, 11). That Grove had a personal belief in the facility of self-(re)construction is already evident from the fact of his disappearing act when he emigrated from Europe to North America. Yet the strictly chronological layout of *ISM* and the invocation of a "determining destiny" (15) of selfhood at the outset of the section titled "Childhood" suggest that Grove felt it necessary to adhere to a more conventional pattern of public self-representation. Grove's text, unlike those of such modernist writers as Gertrude Stein, who published *The Autobiography of Alice B. Toklas* in 1933 (five years before Grove began writing *ISM*), is not an overtly self-reflexive acknowledgement that "telling the truth about oneself on paper is virtually impossible" (Adams 9). Given that readers of Stein's "Autobiography" were frankly hostile at her disregard for "minute factual details" (Adams 17),⁴ it is perhaps no wonder that Grove favoured a design which would promote the referential nature of the self and life represented in his text.⁵ Grove thus participates in a tradition of autobiographical intention identified as the author's "confrontation with himself, his attempt to make himself the subject of his own book in ways consonant with his own ideas about subjectivity and its literary representation" (Jay 21). The contradictory nature of selfhood—the simultaneous penchant for textual self-(re)construction on the one hand and the apparent conformity to traditional standards of referentiality and truth on the other—apparent in the life and work of Grove can be explained by his attempt to negotiate a space of self-representation between the private reality of his own lived notion of subjectivity and the "received models of selfhood in the surrounding culture" (Eakin 7). Grove needs to explain his failure as the inevitable result of circumstances; he needs to construct a unifying principle of failure onto the chronology of his life by fabricating a past which will explain his present subjectivity. This, I would argue, is Grove's main "impulse to self-invention" (7).

It is clear that when Grove came to writing his final text, he was facing a “decay of the mental and emotional qualities” and felt himself “fad[ing] into the twilight of a coming senescence” (*ISM* 11, 457). In addition, “at no time was Frederick Philip Grove’s career at a lower ebb than just before he began his autobiography in the summer of 1938” (Hjartarson 80). Given such circumstances, I would assert that *ISM* served a very specific function for Grove’s psyche, for there is an explicit connection to be made between autobiographical writing as self-analysis and Freud’s “talking cure,” with an emphasis on “retrospection” of the past as aiding “introspection” in the present (Jay 22-24). According to the psychoanalytic model, the memories or “scenes” of childhood

are not reproductions of real occurrences, to which it is possible to ascribe an influence over the course of the patient’s later life and over the formation of his symptoms. It [our view] considers them rather as *products of the imagination*, which find their instigation in mature life, which are intended to serve as *some kind of symbolic representation* of real wishes and interests, and which owe their origin to a regressive tendency, to a turning-away from the tasks of the present. (Freud, “Wolf Man” 418; emphasis added)

These “scenes,” then, are “for the moment the bearers and possessors of the interest which we want to set free so as to be able to direct it on to the tasks of the present” (418). One example of a text which functions as self-analysis is James Joyce’s *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* (1916), which is an example of the “literary-psychological theory of composition” wherein “the autobiographical work has come to be based on conscious forgetting rather than on careful remembering and on fictional re-presentation rather than on historical presentation” (Jay 36). Surely another example of this type of text is Grove’s *In Search of Myself*, which is itself a fictionalized “portrait of the [failed] artist as a young man.” In Freudian terms, the ageing Grove recognizes himself as a failure in his “present task” of achieving literary fame, so he “turns away” from that task and imaginatively constructs a life story for himself as a “symbolic representation”/explanation of that failure. Indeed, Grove’s affinity for psychoanalysis is evident when he states that

interpretation of the past is teleological; it is meant, *it is constructed* as an explanation of that which is. No matter what has happened in the past, its importance is solely determined by its share in moulding the present. (*ISM* 426; emphasis added)

The self-analytical process of *ISM* results in Grove’s ultimate success at his “present task,” for (a point I will return to later in this essay) it is precisely

this text which garners Grove the measure of recognition for which he had laboured so long.

The “failure” which Grove seeks to “cure” through *ISM* revolves around issues of gender, sexuality and literary production. Indeed, Grove suggests that part of his failure to achieve literary dominance lies in the copulative nature of literary production when he states that “the effect of a book is the result of a collaboration between writer and audience,” then brings attention to his own feeling of impotence in this regard when he states, “that collaboration I had failed to enforce. . . .” (6). He laments his failure to achieve fame after years of wielding his pen and asserting himself with “titanic endeavour” (4)⁶ and emphasizes the masculine nature of the collaboration by figuring it as something the writer must “enforce.” For example, in the section titled “And After”—which appears after “Manhood”—Grove reflects on his early efforts struggling to write *Settlers of the Marsh* (1925) and laughs at himself for having wanted “to be able to project the whole vision as it were by a single flash of lightning struck out of my substance by some divine steel” (372). In order to explain his failure, Grove chooses memories of his childhood and youth which will allow him to undergo a gradual process of “phallic divestiture” (Silverman 160) within the text. Given the importance of the Oedipal complex in upholding the “dominant fiction” of sexual difference, it is significant that Grove centres his de-masculinization efforts within his family of origins. The first thing which we are told of Grove’s existence is that he was “born prematurely” (*ISM* 15), immediately implying a sense of weakness. The portrait of Grove’s upbringing develops into a world in which the author’s childhood and youth is dominated by female figures and characterized by a distant and unapproachable father. Grove notes having suffered an “embarrassment to [his] masculinity” as a result of having to wear “long, embroidered, belaced, and beribboned” dresses (17) and having lived in a household with “seven older sisters” (19), a figure which seems to be inflated solely for dramatic effect as, in fact, he only had one older sister, Henny, who “apparently . . . died before reaching maturity” (Spettigue, *FPG* 37-38).

As the only boy child in the family, as well as the only child who is taken along when his mother, Bertha Rutherford Grove—alias Bertha Reichentrog Greve—leaves her husband and an unhappy marriage, Grove soon finds himself the focus of a female tug-of-war between his nurse, Annette, and his mother, two domineering women. Annette, who “adopts”

the young Grove “into her affections as if [he] had been her, not her mistress’s, child” and who “manages” Grove’s mother and the other servants as well, maintains a great deal of influence over the early psychological development of the boy:

What she told me, vividly and in ever-repeated detail, dominated my inner life throughout my early years: it always started with the words, “Once upon a time there was a little boy.” It dominated my life so completely that to this day I cannot distinguish my actual memories from the reflected ones. (*ISM* 16)

Besides providing the reader with a hint as to the fictional nature of Grove’s autobiographical narrative, this passage also suggests what will become, in this text, Grove’s representation of the inability of the young male to individuate from the world of women and make his entrance into the world and language of masculinity. Indeed, when Grove represents the breaking of the nurse’s power it is Grove’s mother who breaks “her own thralldom to Annette,” not the boy-child, who remains under the “management” of his nurse (19). During visits back to the family home, Grove lives “at the knees of [his] mother” for, as he states of the difference between himself and his sisters, “they were my father’s daughters; I was my mother’s son” (22-23). Later in the text, his mother seeks to consolidate the exclusivity of her bond with Grove by forever “warning [her son] against women,” extorting from him an “exchange of confidences,” an oath that he would “never marry,” and by “paint[ing] for [him] her ideal of a happy old age for herself: she would be living with me, directing my household . . . I should be a middle-aged man, then, . . . beyond the temptations of early manhood” (94).

In terms of Grove’s relationship with his father, Charles Edward Grove—alias Carl Eduard Greve—at this early stage, the author positions himself in direct opposition to his father’s extreme brand of masculinity, as when he states, “I cannot give a portrait of my father as I came to know him without saying a word of myself” (20). Grove describes his father as being “six feet seven inches tall, a personable man, the very devil with women. He rode hard, ate hard, and drank hard” (19). Grove measures himself against this image of his father and exaggerates his own shortfall: “Even at that early age I gave no promise of ever exceeding my present height which is of a mere six feet two and a half inches; at best, when I stretch my old bones a little, six feet three” (19-20). Noting of his father that “to be weak or ill was, in his eyes, the unpardonable sin,” Grove admits his own susceptibility to both when he states that, as a child, he “showed a regrettable lack of the power to

resist infantile diseases: measles, scarlet fever, whooping cough, I caught them all; and I was thin, had a poor appetite, readily caught colds" (20). Grove rather succinctly sums up the relationship between these polar opposites when he admits of his father, with special emphasis, "*Me* he despised" (19).

In turning to the relationship between his parents, Grove manipulates certain details (as he did with the number of his sisters) in order to establish his parents' incompatibility, as when he asserts that his mother is "twenty years [his] father's junior" (19), while in fact she was really only eight years younger. Grove also figures the dynamics of the Oedipal triangle in such a way as to subvert the possibility of a positive resolution characterized by a "hetero-normative" father-identification. According to the Freudian model, the "normal" triangular relationship between male child and parents is as follows:

At a very early age the little boy develops an object-cathexis for his mother, which originally related to the mother's breast and is the prototype of an object-choice on the anaclitic model; the boy deals with his father by identifying himself with him. For a time these two relationships proceed side by side, until the boy's sexual wishes in regard to his mother become more intense and his father is perceived as an obstacle to them; from this the Oedipus complex originates. His identification with his father then takes on a hostile colouring and changes into a wish to get rid of his father in order to take his place with his mother. (*The Ego* 640)

This configuration presupposes some degree of sexual relationship between the parents, one which is perceived by the male child, who responds by identifying with the position of the father in that relationship. In *ISM*, Grove very clearly undercuts the possibility of such a typical scenario as there appears to be no dynamic between the parents of which the child can be jealous. Besides the fact that Grove's parents occupy separate apartments in the family home, the author also emphasizes that his father is routinely possessive of women other than his mother: in one scene in particular we see the young Grove, "in the early hours of the morning," going downstairs from his own bedroom and, significantly, "penetrat[ing] into the gallery in search of [his] mother," only to witness "a fine lady" in a "gorgeous, open dressing-gown which showed her silk nightwear underneath" leaving his father's room (27-28). Admitting that he "did not fully understand" the meaning of what he witnessed, Grove nonetheless asserts that he "understood enough to have lost all taste for snuggling into [his] mother's bed" (28). As an infant, Grove was kept from relating to his mother's breast as object-choice by the fact that he was attended by a "wet-nurse" (19), and in the above scene we see that, in the absence of a sexual relationship between

his parents, the young Grove is incapable of maintaining an Oedipal objectification of his mother which is “cathected with libido” (Freud, *Introductory* 336). The dynamics of Grove’s family situation, indeed, are presented in such a way as to suggest the young boy’s increasing identification with his mother: as Grove states, “whenever we were at home, my mother and I were very much closer to each other than when we were abroad . . . I felt that this was because we were facing a common enemy” (*ISM* 59-60). Grove constructs the circumstances of his childhood in such a way as to preclude his accession to the powers of the phallus. In fact, using phallic symbolism similarly to Virginia Woolf in *To The Lighthouse* (1927), Grove tells us that “on a point of land far to the north, practically on the horizon, there stood a lighthouse; and for years it had been my ambition to go there and to examine it” (36). Unfortunately, however, the small boat in which Grove sets out carries him *away from* rather than towards the lighthouse and his ambition is abandoned.⁷

The event which immediately results in the final breakup between the author’s parents further establishes Grove’s failure to achieve “heteronormativity.” One day, when Grove is “not yet fourteen,” he is given the chance to “drive [his father’s] hackneys alone” (55). With his father “critically looking after [him],” Grove feels “very important.” On the road, however, Grove loses control over the horses, who bolt and run so hard that their over-exertion shows on their sides in patterns of sweat. Upon Grove’s return home, his father, “sitting his huge Dane like a centaur” and obviously in “one of those black moods which made people tremble before him,” judges his son’s performance as follows:

He asked no question; he did not give me a chance to explain; he simply manoeuvred his horse alongside the democrat, reached over with one powerful hand, gathered my collar into his grip, lifted me bodily from the seat and laid me across his horse’s neck, where he began to belabour me with his riding-crop, within sight of two hundred people, grown-ups and children. (58)

Grove characterizes the effect of this scene upon him as a “crisis,” a “difficult situation—difficult at least for a boy” (60). There follows a private moment in which Grove tells his mother of the beating:

I told her exactly what had happened, without comment or adornment . . . I could readily see that, for the moment, she was more excited than I . . . no doubt my own rising tension as I approached the climax, clenching my fists in the effort to control my nerves, imparted itself to her; and she inferred that a proud

child's innermost feelings, his very spiritual chastity, as it were, had been outraged. . . .

When the climax came, I saw from the tail of my eye how she was stiffening herself to receive the shock. By that time I could not entirely suppress a sob. . . .

I felt that, for the moment, my mother and I were a unity; we revolted against a portion of the outside world in one common impulse of passionate rebellion.

When I had finished, she sat speechless for a long while, pale and distraught. I knew my own crisis had become hers. I was desperately trying to keep a balance between her and me. (60-61)

On the surface, this highly sexualized scene suggests an erotic (heterosexual) symbiosis between mother and son. Indeed, immediately after this scene, Grove goes through the motions of asserting that he "felt [him]self very much a man," yet he feels "sorely troubled" (63) for now he must position himself as rival to his father by adopting a stance of "heteronormative" masculinity: as he states it, "metaphorically I had to draw my sword and to defend her" (63). He even begins to feel a "loathing" for his father. Grove's newly asserted manhood is quickly undermined, however, by the fact that his attempts to "imitate" his father, to parody "him and his pompous manner when he acted the conqueror," are nothing but the feverish delusions of a boy sick with "scarlatina" (64), a physical weakness which only pulls him back into a world of nursing women. Grove's apparent assumption of the privileges of the phallus is thus laid bare as a sham. Indeed, below the surface of the scene with his mother we see that it is the recounting of the experience of having been objectified by the father, an experience which Grove's mother clearly recognizes, which causes the sexual tension of the moment. The two come together, not in a literally sexual union, but rather in a union of "passionate rebellion" against the unforgiving judgement of the father. Mother and son bond in "common sympathy" (60). After this scene, Grove's mother determines to leave her husband, to protect her child from indoctrination into the world of manhood.

I earlier suggested a possible intertextual tie between Grove's text and Virginia Woolf's novel, *To The Lighthouse* (1927), in terms of the phallic image suggested in the title of the latter and the young Grove's own (literal) attempt and (symbolic) failure to reach a lighthouse. The pseudo-erotic scene between Grove and his mother makes that tie even stronger, I believe, as it corresponds to and contrasts with a scene in Woolf's text between Mr. and Mrs. Ramsay, in which the husband stands before his wife displaying his "exactingness and egotism" and representing the "arid scimitar of the

male, which smote mercilessly, again and again, demanding sympathy” (*Lighthouse* 38-39). As Mr. Ramsay—much like Grove in *ISM*—repeats over and over again that “he [is] a failure,” the narrator tells us that the “egotistical” father demands “to be assured of his genius, first of all, and then to be taken within the circle of life, warmed and soothed, to have his senses restored to him, his barrenness made fertile” (39). Similar to the position of Grove’s mother in *ISM*, Mrs. Ramsay responds to the needs of the male figure by “brac[ing] herself” and “looking at the same time animated and alive” (38). Once the moment has passed, Mrs. Ramsay sits “in exquisite abandonment to exhaustion,” but also emotionally “discomposed” by the scene (40). Meanwhile, the Ramsays’ young son, James, stands by watching the highly sexualized scene, as jealous of his father and possessive of his mother as the young Grove is not. It is almost as though Grove had adapted this scene from Woolf’s work, which is also an autobiographical fiction, as a supportive structure for his own text. Indeed, the similarities to be found between these two texts suggest Grove’s deliberate invocation of Woolf’s feminist agenda, in particular her attack in *To The Lighthouse* on the rigidity of gender roles in early twentieth-century society. That the image of the lighthouse and the focus on the Oedipal dynamics of the family unit may have been consciously invoked from Woolf appears highly possible. In a letter dated November 1, 1937 to Richard Crouch, Grove makes the following statement:

I am profoundly conscious of a gap in my knowledge of latter-day fiction. I have never read Virginia Woolf—nor anything of Gertrude Stein. What more natural than that I should turn to you? Could you help me out? Perhaps—I’m not sure—I can leave Gertrude Stein safely to one side. But Virginia Woolf, from what I have read *about* her? (Pacey 322)

Given that this letter was written just one year before undertaking his own autobiographic endeavour, one might well ask of Grove, why the sudden interest in these two women writers in particular? Ten days later he writes again:

I return, under separate cover, the 2 Virginia Woolf and the Gertrude Stein, fearing they may be asked for. I am very glad to have had an opportunity to see what sort of things these two women do. Neither seems to me of any fundamental importance, such as attaches to Joyce or Lawrence, let me say. (322)⁸

Grove’s subsequent dismissive attitude towards Woolf and Stein conflicts with his initial and implicit acknowledgement of their work as representative of “latter-day fiction” and, hence, worthy of filling the “gap” in his own literary knowledge. Despite Grove’s apparently ingenuous assertion that

Stein and Woolf lack *any* “fundamental importance” when compared to Joyce or Lawrence, a thoughtful consideration of Grove’s own autobiographical stylizations, including the images and thematic concerns which his text shares with Woolf, effectively gives the lie to his categorical rejection of the “sort of things these two women do.”

Once Grove’s mother leaves the family home and Grove begins his acquaintance with European social circles, he has little contact with his father: as he states, “I had seen the last of the man my father had been, the proud, imperious and magnificent, if brutal man” (*ISM* 67). In fact, Grove does not come under the influence of his father until after his mother’s death, when old age has rendered Mr. Grove “broken in body and spirit,” a severely diminished figure of patriarchal authority. If masculinity is characterized by a psychological “rigidity” of difference from that which is feminine (Chodorow 13), then, in terms of a physical symbolism of the psychological state, it is especially significant that, at this point in Grove’s text, the father who was formerly defined by his height and his towering presence on top of a horse, now appears with a “bent” spine and “no longer tower[s] over” his son (*ISM* 113). Significantly, once he is back at the family home with his father, Grove states that “even the ambition to write seemed pale and far-away” (122). The impotent image of masculinity which Grove’s father now represents—indeed, his father no longer seeks out the company of ladies (115)—is the only one which Grove himself ever achieves in the text, as reflected in the second half of the book and the focus on Grove’s own spinal problems. This broken down image of his father dominates the “Youth” section of the text, wherein we see Grove “at the age where a boy begins to pay attention to the other sex” and in a state “still ‘unsullied’” (124, 132), at least until he begins the affair with his professor’s wife. Grove represents this relationship as supposedly symbolic of his entrance into manhood, but the relationship between the author and Mrs. Broegler, who is, significantly, “childless” (138), seems only to replay the situation of his own familial Oedipal triangle. Once again we have the younger boy and the wife aligned against the unkind husband in a union which can only be characterized as an infantilization of the near adult male: as Grove states it, “she treated me like a child; she played with me; the moment her sensuality was appeased she became maternal . . . I wanted forever to remain with her; she laughed and sent me back to school” (138).

When it comes to the question of Grove’s career, his father takes control of the situation and dooms his son to failure. In contrast to the view that

ISM provides the story of an immigrant coming to Canada “as to a land of promise” (Spettigue, “Introduction” xi), the real situation of the text makes clear that it is Grove’s father who suggests that his son visit America, and then it is this very incapable man who effectively abandons his son in the wilderness of the “New World” upon his death. Grove’s early existence in Europe represents a state of dependence and irresponsibility as he remains unable to make a career decision. He is drifting across the continent of Europe and his father’s insistence that he leave and make his life decisions when he returns suggests that Grove is being made to leave Europe and go to America—to leave the motherland and go to a world of independence and liberty—as a means of enforcing separation-individuation of the young male. But Grove’s entrance into manhood is severely undercut by his father’s death and the fact that Grove cannot embrace his patrilineal inheritance, the estate of Thurow, because it is so laden with debt that it will cripple him for life. Once again we see that Grove has fictionalized a portion of his life as a means of making symbolically significant some aspect of his represented selfhood. In real life, Grove’s father, although having leased an estate called Thurow for a short term prior to the author’s birth, worked most of his life as a “tram conductor” and was paid a modest wage (Spettigue, *FPG* 32-36). In *ISM*, however, Grove renders his father a figure of economic privilege, a true patriarch in charge of his own feudalistic estate. By having his father lose that economic power and privilege, Grove further emphasizes his own lack of accession to patriarchal power, a lack which will result in his tenuous economic status in North America and his subsequent repeatedly failed literary efforts. Given such a situation, it is significant that, unequipped for economic independence in the New World, Grove decides to choose Canada as a place to live rather than the United States precisely because, as he states it, “Canada had never, so far, entirely severed the umbilical cord which bound it to England” (*ISM* 217).

The way in which Grove characterizes his parents, as well as the way in which he constructs his relationship with each of them, represents a deliberate attempt to illustrate “to what extent reality bore out th[e] appearance” that he could hardly have “chosen better than the determining destiny did choose for [him] in the matter of parents” (15). Having foregrounded his failure at literary achievement in his “Prologue,” Grove goes on to provide at least a partial explanation of that failure in the “Childhood” and “Youth” sections of the text by focusing on the relatively weak subject positions

available to him through the Oedipal dynamics of the family unit. Grove first identifies himself with the object position of the mother and, after his mother's death, with the image of a less than virile father. Neither position is particularly conducive to the achievement of an "unimpaired masculinity" (Silverman 42) and the privileges of the phallus, including the privilege of literary success. The fabrication of certain facets of his life in the early sections of *ISM* illustrates that his parents were unable to provide an environment necessary for masculine achievements, a "fact" which he uses to (at least partially) explain his literary failures when he states, "this is the story of a writer; and a writer's concern is everlastingly with his soul. Circumstance concerns him only in two ways: inasmuch as it gives him a viaticum on the way, such as is implied in his descent or in the heritage he has received; and inasmuch as it impedes or furthers the growth of what he has thus received" (155-56). Having established for himself a fictional "viaticum" which asserts his lack of identification with "heteronormativity," Grove goes on to use that fabrication to further inform the Canadian part of his life as an experience of marginality.

The circumstances experienced in his family of origins certainly make themselves felt in his own family in Canada, in details such as that his wife Catherine is twenty years his junior (281), which recalls for the reader the difference between his parents' ages as a means of suggesting an equally physical distance between Grove and his wife, and that "[Catherine] and the little girl had, in this cottage, a separate bedroom" (361).⁹ What Grove foregrounds about his relationship with his wife—whom he married on August 2, 1914—is its apparent unconventionality: Catherine Grove is represented as the chief breadwinner of the family, an arrangement most men of the period would not have wanted to stress in public. Although World War One resulted in a "wider acceptance of *single* women in paid employment, women were only to work at jobs for a few years before marriage" (Prentice 219; emphasis added). Besides the fact that he affects a rejection of monetary pursuits (279), Grove's own physical shortcomings keep him from performing the economic maintenance of his family: as he states it, "every now and then, during the years to come, I was to have a breakdown, accompanied by a sudden paralysis of my lower limbs" (325). It is important to note that Grove's spinal problems and overall health seem to fluctuate according to what level of hope he holds out for his success as a writer. At first, he seems to feel worse when he is unable, and better when he is able, to write,

which suggests that Grove's sense of masculinity is derived from his ability to produce texts. Nevertheless, this pattern appears to change at some point, for gradually it is when he becomes weaker and weaker that he "flourish[es] amazingly" as a writer (332). Further reminiscent of the gender dynamics of Woolf's *To The Lighthouse*—wherein Mr. Ramsay considers himself a failure, seeks sympathy from his family audience and appropriates the "delicious fecundity" of the mother as a means to have "his barrenness made fertile" (38-39)—the fluctuation in both Grove's health and his desire to write seems to match his switch from a phallic to a maternal metaphor of artistic creation.

Initially, Grove posits his creative function in a traditionally masculine way, as when he makes the following statement:

Every human being born can, in a way, be regarded as a seed; the seed, too, has its viaticum; once released from the parent plant, it has to seek, or rather to find, its soil, there to grow or to perish. Considering myself as a seed, then, it strikes me now, as it struck me then, that Siberia had come very near to giving me the soil I needed. The wind picked me up and bore me aloft. It is significant that, not until I found a similar soil, did I strike root. (*ISM* 156)

Once again, Grove's metaphors are complex. On the one hand, he figures himself as a seed wanting to embed or root itself in the "barren belts" of Siberia (149)—a northern region of what was then the USSR. On the other hand, the characterization of the landscape as "barren" and Siberia's reputation as "a place of exile for offenders" against society ("Siberia") result in another level of meaning for Grove's chances of literary achievement in Canada, a landscape which Grove equates with Siberia. Searching for a cultural environment in which to embed the seed of his literary genius, Grove ineffectually decides upon a landscape which will only ensure his failure and marginalization. However, slowly but surely there comes a change in Grove's metaphor for artistic creation, as seen when he says, "as far as my literary activity went, it seemed to me I was lying fallow" (*ISM* 253, 419). No longer is he the seed, but rather the field in which (textual) life will gestate and grow. Indeed, he says, "I had, by the way, *withdrawn* all my manuscripts from circulation among the publishers . . . I felt that a new chapter had opened in my life. I should want to work all my older books over again—to refashion them, to bring them into accord with my widening outlook" (257; emphasis added). The emphasis on the need for "withdrawal" is apparent again in the following significant passage in the section titled "And After":

Among the three books which satisfied my own standards and which were written during the seven years was *Felix Powell's Career*. It is a serious book which deals with a sexual problem; and it is written with a savage sort of frankness which should have convinced everyone of the sincerity of its purpose. I offered it. Publishers and agents alike failed to see its true import; they put it down as pornography. From that moment on I ceased offering my work; one or two manuscripts were still travelling about. I withdrew them. (439)

The unpublished text referred to here, which bears Grove's own first name in the title, delineates a "sexual problem" and presents a male character who "is said to have been a cad in his dealing with women" (Spettigue, *FPG* 137). Although the male sexuality of the text is put forth with a "savage sort of frankness," *Felix Powell's Career*, like many of Grove's texts, results in failure and it is finally "withdrawn."

Grove's new means of creative production—ironically adopted in the "Manhood" section of *ISM*—is highlighted in the following comment regarding the genesis of his novel, *Fruits of the Earth* (1933): "an explosion had followed in the nerve-centres of my brain because I had been ready for it. I had, for some time, been ready for the pains of birth" (260). The adoption of a maternal metaphor of creativity is not an unusual tactic for male writers: "Men as well as women have used the metaphor extensively, taking female anatomy as a model for human creativity in sharp contrast with the equally common phallic analogy, which uses male anatomy for its paradigm" (Friedman 371). Grove suggests of his writing technique, at least as it is presented in this text, "the birth of a figure has remained typical for all my work" (*ISM* 261). Such a statement implicitly includes, I would suggest, *In Search of Myself*, which represents delivery to reading audiences of the figure known as Frederick Philip Grove. Grove's use of the maternal metaphor of artistic creativity functions in this text in a Joycean manner: "if *Portrait* is autobiographical, it is autobiographical in just this way: Joyce's creation of Stephen represents a putting to death of his own past and his own past self, and yet at the same time it represents his rebirth as an artist" (Jay 144). If Grove considered himself largely an artistic failure prior to the writing of this text, then the very act of writing *In Search of Myself* is a "talking cure" to overcome that failure. In Grove's hands, the chronological narrative form and the use of autobiography as self-analysis become devices for representing the gestation period of a new creative entity, a fictional construct, beginning with its conception in the "Prologue" and ending with its death in the "Author's Postscript." Earlier I noted the resigned and gloomy

tone of failure which pervades the "Prologue," but that section of the text also marks the gestation period of a new life. Indeed, in the very last line of the "Prologue" Grove sets to work writing his text, thereby giving birth to his newly created self. That new self makes its way through the intervening phases of life and emerges at the end in the "Author's Postscript," which is significantly written in third person and past tense. On one level, the effect of the "Postscript" is to suggest the death of the subject of the text, so that this section becomes the inevitable conclusion to the chronological structure. At one point, Grove even calls *ISM* the "last will and testament of my life" (230). In fact, there is an eerie sense of premonition to the "Author's Postscript," as Grove died on August 19, 1948, not too long after the publication of his text. On another level, the switch to third person, past tense within a first-person discourse suggests that "the author speaks about himself *as if* another were speaking about him, or as if he himself were speaking of another" (Lejeune 29). In the "Postscript" Grove refers to "the author" represented in *ISM* as though he were a separate identity, or (an)other self, even going so far as to provide the reader with an update on "his" activities since the concluding events of the "above record" (*ISM* 458).

The irony of Grove's re-creation of himself in *ISM* begins with his demasculinized self-positioning as a means of representing his failure to garner fame and economic success in a heterosexual society and culminates in his adoption of the metaphoric language of female creativity as a means of producing his autobiographical explanation of that failure. Indeed, it is precisely the gender de/constructions in *ISM* which ensure Frederick Philip Grove's canonization as a successful Canadian author for, as a result of his record of failure, Grove won the Governor General's Award for Non-Fiction in 1947. That Grove measured literary achievement at least partly in terms of such critical recognition is evident from a letter which he wrote to Lorne Pierce while writing his autobiography, wherein he states the following: "I have once more taken up that autobiography of mine, trying to soften down such passages as my wife objects to. Friends of mine who have read the typescript call it a 'knock-out' of a book and talk of the Nobel Prize (!!!). I laugh" (Pacey 372). If we accept that "the contours of a canon are governed not by the inherent qualities of certain texts, but by the values attributed to them by those in power according to their current agendas and the particular configuration of national, aesthetic, and *sexual politics* that best serves their interests" and that one of the cultural "values" which governed the

creation of the Canadian canon in the first half of the twentieth century was “virility” (Gerson 46, 48; emphasis added), then the irony of the critical recognition of *ISM* and Grove’s subsequent inclusion in the Canadian literary canon, at least in light of my assertions regarding the gender instabilities to be found in his self-representation, cannot be ignored.

Thus, having achieved success as a canonized writer (if Governor General’s Awards are markers of success) through the construction of masculine failure in his personal life and the adoption by default of a feminized creative position in his public text, the last laugh, it would appear, is Grove’s, or at least that of Grove’s contemporary critic who is aware of the author’s de/constructing process. In this way, Grove becomes an example of a “complex, multiple, layered subject with agency in the discourses and the worlds that constitute the referential space of his or her autobiography, a self not only constructed by differences but capable of choosing, inscribing, and making a difference” (Neuman, “Autobiography” 225). Exploration of the gender of Grove’s textual self-representation allows us to add another “layer” to this enigmatic author’s subjectivity; it allows us to join (albeit uneasily) in Grove’s affected laughter as we note the motto of *In Search of Myself*: “Ça vous amuse, la vie?”

NOTES

- 1 In 1972, in “The Grove Enigma Resolved,” D.O. Spettigue made his announcement that the “autos” of Grove’s text is very much a fictional construct, a finding which Spettigue consolidated in his 1973 work, *FPG: The European Years*. In his introduction to the 1974 New Canadian Library edition of Grove’s text, Spettigue advises the reader that the autobiographical pact of “truthfulness” was broken and that “the facts. . . [of the author’s life] are curiously fragmented and re-constituted in new time and space relations” (ix). Spettigue had discovered that, although the Canadian half of Grove’s life suffered from only “minor alterations of detail or emphasis,” “Grove’s account of his birth, parentage, childhood, and education in Europe” had been greatly fictionalized (ix-x). In fact, *In Search of Myself* presents the reader with the life story of a human being who, strictly speaking, has no real-life referent, for “Frederick Philip Grove” was the figment of a creative imagination. As most people are now aware, Frederick Philip Grove was born Felix Paul Berthold Friedrich Greve on February 14, 1879 to German parents.
- 2 Like Richard Cavell, however, I want to assert that it is not my intention to examine gender representation in *ISM* in order to prove that Grove was a homosexual, a rather “reductive enterprise” (13) in any case. Instead, the purpose of this paper is to explore how gender is de/constructed by Grove and to what purpose.
- 3 Given that “male homosexuality . . . was a widespread, licit, and very influential part” of Greek culture (Sedgwick 4), Grove’s several invocations of Greek mythology appear to

- reflect the homosocial nature of his textual self-representation. Indeed, the Greek language, “whose resonances went far beyond the linguistic” (Cavell 14), was one focus of study for Grove while attending school in Germany.
- 4 In fact, “for many readers in 1933, *The Autobiography of Alice B. Toklas* was seen, not as a clever literary device, but as a hoax, a deliberate manipulation that produced confusion, anger, and charges that the author, whoever she was, was a liar” (Adams 17). In a letter dated November 12, 1937 to Richard Crouch—to which I will return later in this essay—Grove expresses an interest in and does read at least one text by Stein, although the work remains unnamed (Pacey 321-22).
 - 5 That readers of autobiography have continued to value “biographical facticity” is evident in the fact that Spettigue, in his introduction to the 1974 New Canadian Library edition of *ISM*, assures readers that the second half of the text, the “Canadian” half, is, “apart from minor alterations of detail or emphasis,” “accurate and verifiable from accessible sources and from associates, acquaintances, and relatives of Grove” (ix).
 - 6 It is interesting that Grove should figure his “endeavour” in this way, especially given that the ship Titanic was conceived of as being “unsinkable” and destined to achieve great things. Both Grove and the Titanic, however, failed to live up to these expectations, both sank into obscurity, yet both ultimately achieved, through re-constitutions of their failure (one through autobiography and the other through film), historical recognition.
 - 7 In fact, the young Grove’s inability to manoeuvre his boat towards the lighthouse in this scene from *ISM* contrasts sharply with Klaus Martens’s documentation of Felix Greve’s student years in Bonn and his prowess as both “rower and swimmer,” for Greve was “a veritable water creature” (24).
 - 8 As Pacey states in a footnote regarding the Woolf texts which Grove might have read, “I can only speculate on the identity of these books. The most recent novels of Virginia Woolf (1882-1941) were *The Years* (1937) and *The Waves* (1931)” (322), although we don’t really know which books Grove might have been given. As for a consideration of which of Stein’s works may have been available to Grove in 1937, Pacey asserts that three books appeared in the thirties: “*Three Lives* (1933), *The Geographical Lust [sic] of America* (1936), and *Everybody’s Autobiography* (1937)” (322). However, *Three Lives* first appeared in 1909, while *The Autobiography of Alice B. Toklas* was published in 1933.
 - 9 The fact that Grove and his wife conceived two children does not mean that Grove experienced an unproblematic heterosexual identification. Rather, I would suggest that, throughout his text, Grove appears to mediate between, on the one hand, an acceptable masculine image (marriage and children) and, on the other hand, his self-marginalization from a “heteronormative” subject positioning.

WORKS CITED

- Adams, Timothy Dow. *Telling Lies in Modern American Autobiography*. Chapel Hill: North Carolina UP, 1990.
- Cavell, Richard. “Felix Paul Greve, the Eulenburg Scandal, and Frederick Philip Grove.” *Essays on Canadian Writing* 62 (Fall 1997): 12-45.
- Chodorow, Nancy. “Gender, Relation, and Difference in Psychoanalytic Perspective.” *The Future of Difference*. Ed. Hester Eisenstein and Alice Jardine. Boston: G.K. Hall, 1980. 3-19.

- Eakin, Paul John. *Fictions in Autobiography: Studies in the Art of Self-Invention*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton UP, 1985.
- Freud, Sigmund. *Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis*. 1916-17. Trans. and ed. James Strachey. New York: Liveright Publishing, 1966.
- . "From the History of an Infantile Neurosis ('Wolf Man')." 1918. *The Freud Reader*. Ed. Peter Gay. New York: W. W. Norton, 1989. 400-26.
- . *The Ego and the Id*. 1923. *The Freud Reader*. Ed. Peter Gay. New York: W. W. Norton, 1989. 628-58.
- . "The Dissolution of the Oedipus Complex." 1924. *The Freud Reader*. Ed. Peter Gay. New York: W. W. Norton, 1989. 661-66.
- . *The Freud Reader*. Ed. Peter Gay. New York: W. W. Norton, 1989.
- Friedman, Susan Stanford. "Creativity and the Childbirth Metaphor: Gender Difference in Literary Discourse." *Feminisms: An Anthology of Literary Theory and Criticism*. Ed. Robyn R. Warhol and Diane Price Herndl. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers UP, 1991. 371-96.
- Gerson, Carole. "The Canon between the Wars: Field-notes of a Feminist Literary Archaeologist." *Canadian Canons: Essays in Literary Value*. Ed. Robert Lecker. Toronto; Buffalo; London: U of Toronto P, 1991. 46-56.
- "Governor General's Awards." *Canadian Author and Bookman* 22. 3 (September 1946): 18-19.
- Grove, Frederick Philip. *In Search of Myself*. 1946. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1974.
- Gusdorf, Georges. "Conditions and Limits of Autobiography." *Autobiography: Essays Theoretical and Critical*. Ed. James Olney. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton UP, 1980. 29-48.
- Hjartarson, Paul. "Design and Truth in Grove's 'In Search of Myself'." *Canadian Literature* 90 (Autumn 1981): 73-90.
- Jay, Paul. *Being in the Text: Self-Representation from Wordsworth to Roland Barthes*. Ithaca; London: Cornell UP, 1984.
- Lejeune, Philippe. "Autobiography in the Third Person." *New Literary History* 9 (1977): 27-50.
- Martens, Klaus. "Nixe on the River: Felix Paul Greve in Bonn (1898-1901)." *Canadian Literature* 151 (Winter 1996): 10-43.
- Neuman, Shirley. "Introduction." *Autobiography and Questions of Gender*. Ed. Shirley Neuman. London: Frank Cass & Co. Ltd., 1991. 1-11.
- . "Autobiography: From Different Poetics to a Poetics of Differences." *Essays on Life Writing: From Genre to Critical Practice*. Ed. Marlene Kadar. Toronto; Buffalo; London: Toronto UP, 1992. 213-30.
- Olney, James. "Autobiography and the Cultural Moment: A Thematic, Historical, and Bibliographical Introduction." *Autobiography: Essays Theoretical and Critical*. Ed. James Olney. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton UP, 1980. 3-27.
- Pacey, Desmond, ed. *The Letters of Frederick Philip Grove*. Toronto; Buffalo: Toronto UP, 1976.
- Prentice, Alison, et al. *Canadian Women: A History*. Toronto: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1988.

- Sedgwick, Eve Kosofsky. *Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire*. New York: Columbia UP, 1985.
- "Siberia." *The Oxford Encyclopedic English Dictionary*. 1991 ed.
- Silverman, Kaja. *Male Subjectivity at the Margins*. New York; London: Routledge, 1992.
- "Sisyphus." *The Oxford Encyclopedic English Dictionary*. 1991 ed.
- Smith, Sidonie. *A Poetics of Women's Autobiography: Marginality and the Fictions of Self-Representation*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1987.
- Spettigue, Douglas O. *Frederick Philip Grove*. Toronto: Copp Clark, 1969.
- . "The Grove Enigma Resolved." *Queen's Quarterly* 79 (1972): 1-2.
- . *FPG: The European Years*. Ottawa: Oberon Press, 1973.
- . "Introduction." *In Search of Myself*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1974. ix-xiv.
- Stein, Gertrude. *The Autobiography of Alice B. Toklas*. 1933. New York: Vintage Books, 1990.
- Woolf, Virginia. *To The Lighthouse*. 1927. London: Grafton, 1977.

