

# THE "CANADIAN BOOKMAN" AND LITERARY NATIONALISM

James Mulvihill

**B**UY CANADIAN GOODS is the phrase which most readily comes to mind whenever the *Canadian Bookman* is mentioned. Which is not often, for while its backfiles cover two decades from 1919 to 1939 — no mean run for a literary magazine in this country, even today — the *Bookman* is invariably held up as a particularly aberrant example of Canadian literary nationalism between the wars, and then dismissed. Desmond Pacey's has been the authoritative account. In the *Literary History of Canada*, Pacey characterizes this periodical as "the organ of the new spirit of uncritical self-confidence and 'boosterism'," a judgement clearly echoed by Wynne Francis, in the *Oxford Companion to Canadian Literature*, who associates the *Bookman* with a "noisy boosterism that favoured quantity over quality and patriotism over literary worth."<sup>1</sup> Indeed, a tendency to view the period of the *Bookman*'s run as one of conflict and polarization has had the distorting effect of placing this and other journals of the time in either of two opposing camps, which might be termed the "uncritical" and the "critical." As early as 1922 E. K. Broadus, writing in *Canadian Forum*, observed that "it is customary in the West, and perhaps in a measure in the East, to group mankind in two and only two classes — the boosters and the knockers. If you are not a booster, you are a knocker — and a knocker is the most unhallowed thing on God's earth."

Of course, Broadus presented a rather weighted view of the situation, speaking as he did from one of these seemingly opposing camps. His thesis in "Criticism — or Puffery?" was that without rigorous standards there could be no Canadian literature of note and, he found, there were no rigorous critical standards at present: "Generally the idea seems to prevail that literary criticism, or at least printed comment on Canadian books, must be a boost" (October 1922). Broadus did not name names but he might well have been thinking of the *Canadian Bookman*. Pacey remarks that "to the editors of this magazine, a Canadian book was *ipso facto* a good book,"<sup>2</sup> and it must be admitted that even a cursory survey of the *Bookman*'s files will yield evidence of such an attitude. If this journal's founding purpose, "to cause two books to be read where one was skimmed before," is exemplary enough, the qualifier, "and those two to be better books and

more Canadian books than was the one" (January 1919), does carry a strong suggestion of the "boost." A more commercial note is sounded in pieces like "Canadian Book Trade's Golden Era: 'Just Around the Corner, if Booksellers do their Part'" (April 1922).

If the editors of the *Bookman* did indeed believe a "Golden Era" to be just around the corner, they were not alone. The immediate post-war period, which saw the founding of the *Bookman* and of several other Canadian journals, such as *Canadian Forum* (1920- ), *Canadian Historical Review* (1920- ), and the *Dalhousie Review* (1921- ), was one of confident anticipation. It marked, according to an editorial opening the *Bookman's* first number, "a new era in the history of mankind, and, very particularly, in the history of Canada" (January 1919). Largely because of its efforts in the War, Canada saw itself as having come of age as a nation in the eyes of the world, while at home unprecedented economic expansion was proceeding apace. Was it not then a relatively simple matter of historical necessity that Canada should also come into its own in other, more rarefied, spheres? The editors of *Canadian Forum* thought so:

Too often our convictions are borrowed from London, Paris, or New York. Real independence is not the product of tariffs and treaties. It is a spiritual thing. No country has reached its full stature, which makes its goods at home but not its faith and its philosophy.

'The Canadian Forum' had its origin in a desire to secure a freer and more informed discussion of public questions and, behind the strife of parties, to trace and value those developments of art and letters which are distinctly Canadian. (October 1920)

"Distinctly Canadian" — the *Bookman* strove to express just such a quality of mind as this: "A new output of ideas by Canadians themselves, and a new belief in those ideas as being probably the best expression of Canadian requirements" (January 1919). From the start, the *Bookman* took a narrow focus. It was almost exclusively interested in literature, and that from a more restricted, more "Canadian," slant than was the *Forum*. Essentially apolitical in any overt sense, it remained so even when literature became more preoccupied with politics during the 1930's. And yet, it failed to take note of such trends — its relative neglect of "modernist" writing is a case in point — it did so with the consciousness of a broader historical purpose. Talk of "Canadian Literature and the National Ideal," to quote the title of a lead article by Lorne Pierce (September 1925), sounds grandiose today. Indeed, it seemed so at the time to many of the *Forum's* contributors and even to certain of the *Bookman's* own contributors. Nevertheless, as Leon Surette has recently observed, topocentrism — the notion that the literature of a nation is ultimately an expression of its collective genius, its national spirit — has traditionally characterized Canadian literary criticism.<sup>3</sup> This ten-

gency, if not by any means original with the *Canadian Bookman*, might still be said to be connate with it.

In 1919, Canada stood at a watershed in its history. Although the realization of the nation's potential lay in the future, the seeds were in the past and present, and the temptation to discern historical pattern in all of this was irresistible and natural. In the *Bookman* article just cited, Pierce enumerated the high points in this pattern "from 1776 to the dawning of self-consciousness in 1812, to the days of constitutional 'growing pains' in 1837 to the age of majority in 1867, to the crowning hour of our full adulthood in 1914, to this very hour of self-supporting, self-conscious, independent nationhood" (September 1925). Similar historical rationalizations run throughout the files of the *Bookman*. In October 1922, Hugh S. Eayrs announced a "Renaissance in Canadian Life" stimulated by the War, while in another number the same year John Murray Gibbon compared this post-war renaissance to that in the U.S. following the Civil and Spanish American wars (November 1922). In "Canadian Poets of the Great War," W. D. Lighthall presented the Enlightenment historical thesis that "a period of intense national exaltation is usually followed by a period of intense literary activity" and concluded that "this is our Homeric Age" (April 1919). At any rate, it was in the midst of "this very hour" that the newly established journal found itself. Clearly its editors believed themselves equal to the circumstance. "The appearance of the Canadian Bookman at the very dawn of this new era is not a mere coincidence," stated the opening editorial. "The Canadian Bookman is itself one of the phenomena of the new era" (January 1919).

THE *Canadian Bookman* BEGAN publishing in 1919, under the general editorship of B. K. Sandwell, as "A Quarterly devoted to Literature, the Library and the Printed Book." As its subtitle suggests, the *Bookman* was a very specific kind of journal. It was not a university quarterly, like *Dalhousie Review* or *Queen's Quarterly*, or a journal of opinion in the manner of *Canadian Forum*. Certainly it was not a modernist organ like the short-lived *Canadian Mercury* (1928-29). In fact, it was a Bookman and, conceived to provide "a forum for the discussion of all bookish matters" (January 1919), it had affinities with the American and English Bookmen.<sup>4</sup> As its editors realized, however, the *Canadian Bookman* could not take for granted the extensive "bookish" readership enjoyed by its companion journals. From the start, it viewed its role as to an extent that of preceptor, not so much addressing a substantial "bookwise" audience as aspiring to one. A restricted coterie appeal was not what the *Bookman's* editors desired. Their aim, rather, was a much more broadly based book culture

such as they associated with older countries like England, Scotland and — with ever present qualification — the United States. In essence, the *Bookman* set out to encourage "not only the recognizing and supporting of literature made in Canada, but of literature in general, and the place of the book in the life of a people" (November 1923).

Still, this was a "Canadian" Bookman. An editorial in the January 1922 number, "Tilling a Narrow Field," admitted to such an exclusive emphasis, but made no apologies. The role of the *Bookman*, it stated, was that of a Canadian supplement to those journals treating "general literature": "The *Canadian Bookman* is something more, and something less, than a *Bookman* which happens to be edited in Canada. The adjective is not the result of geographical accident (January 1922). Nevertheless, it has frequently been claimed that the *Bookman* was all too conscious of geography in its critical judgements, and, moreover, that the "Made in Canada" label often disguised inferior wares. Writing in *Canadian Forum*, A. J. M. Smith characterized the "Canada conscious" strain in certain books and journals as a "mixture of blind optimism and materialistic patriotism, a kind of my-mother-drunk-or-sober complex that operates most efficiently in the world of affairs and finds its ideal action summarized in the slogan 'Buy Made in Canada Goods'" (April 1928). Like Smith, Douglas Bush did not explicitly name the *Canadian Bookman* in his well-known debunking of literary nationalism, "Making Literature Hum" (*Canadian Forum*, December 1926), although an observation of Bush's at one point in this essay, that "one learns on all sides that Canada is taking its permanent seat in the literary league of nations," could well refer to such a statement made the previous year in the *Bookman* by Lorne Pierce (September 1925). It is also tempting to speculate whether Bush had a particular journal in mind when he alluded to Dickens's *Martin Chuzzlewit* in an analogy between the Canadian literary scene and the New York of Jefferson Brick with its *Watertoast Gazette!*

Both Smith and Bush had as their immediate target the Canadian Authors Association and to some extent the *Bookman* was simply caught in the cross-fire. But far from being a mere innocent by-stander, it *was*, however briefly, an official organ of the CAA — for the period 1921-23 — and as such certainly reflected the CAA's aims and opinions.<sup>5</sup> The view that in forming such an affiliation the *Bookman* betrayed its critical function as a literary journal is a legitimate one, even if it fails to take much else into account. Having originally dedicated itself to serving the common interests of the book community at large, this journal now seemed to align itself exclusively with one of these interests. A lead article in the June 1921 issue attempted to downplay suggestions of a shift in allegiance, while at the same time betraying that a shift had occurred: "With this number, the *Canadian Bookman*, which has already made itself in its two years of existence a

sort of unofficial organ of the literary community, becomes the official organ of the makers of literature, organized in the form of the Canadian Authors Association." The sly modulation here from "literary community" to "makers of literature" was not lost on the sceptics, and almost immediately *Canadian Forum* set itself up in opposition to the CAA and, by implication, to the *Bookman*. What the *Forum* opposed was not so much the idea of a writers union — in fact, it praised the Association's "vigorous and timely stand on the question of copyright" (December 1921) — but the programme of literary propaganda to which the Association seemed increasingly committed and which found its most disturbing (to the *Forum*) manifestation in "Canadian Authors Week." Henceforth, the lines were drawn — on this issue, at any rate.

THE *Forum*'s STRICTURES on "Canadian Authors Week" make for entertaining reading. Of this "orgy of mutual congratulation," as he called it, Barker Fairley sarcastically allowed that "of course, certain results have been achieved":

The problem of Christmas presents has been somewhat lightened. More than that, we now know by heart the names of all the Canadian authors and run over the list in bed at night before dropping off to sleep, with the result that we awake next morning purged of pity and fear, and see things more clearly than we did a few days ago. Our verdict must be that the Canadian Authors Association has made a shockingly bad start from which it will take a long time to recover. (December 1921)

And indeed, five years later Douglas Bush would still note this annual celebration, complaining that "every year one hopes to hear the last of our windy tributes to our Shakespeares and Miltons, and every year the Hallelujah Chorus seems to grow in volume and confidence" (December 1926). What "Canadian Authors Week" suggested more than anything else to its critics was the sales pitch, the "boost," which led many to question both the allegiances and the aims of the CAA. Such a "violent method of publicity" — for so "Authors Week" seemed to the *Forum* — ran the danger of compromising Canadian literature and criticism alike. Barker Fairley, founding editor of the *Forum*, had been an early member of the Association and favoured its original role in protecting the rights of authors. It was the CAA's "new role," as exemplified in its sponsoring of "Authors Week," to which Fairley and others objected, pointing out that "criticism under the wing of the publisher never reads the same as criticism that is morally independent." "We all recognize the several rights of publisher, author, and critic," Fairley argued, "but we are apprehensive when we see them indiscriminately mingled, as they appear to be in the Authors Association" (December 1921).

How justified were these charges? The editors of the *Bookman* must have been

stung by the implication that they were somehow in the pockets of the publishers. They had originally intended to direct the *Bookman* at a readership which comprehended these various interests — the reader, the author, the publisher, the critic. But if in its first year the *Bookman* had complained that publishers and booksellers "are merely commercialists" (October 1919), now it featured a complete "Trade Section." Such articles appeared as "Individualize Your Window Display" and "Not High-Brow, But How They do Sell!", a piece on the superior selling points of books on teacup reading and dream interpretation. Long reviews became fewer, to be replaced by short book-notices, while publisher's ads, formerly occupying a few pages on the front and back pages, became more numerous and were now interspersed throughout the journal. Had, then, various interests been "indiscriminately mingled" to the detriment of the *Bookman's* credibility?

B. K. Sandwell was among those who responded to this criticism, and his defence of the CAA and its methods was, by extension, also a defence of the Association's official organ. Replying to Fairley's point that sales of books alone mean nothing if there is no "enlightened interest" behind them, Sandwell argued in a letter to the *Forum* that "enlightened interest must be preceded by attention," no easy matter in an age preoccupied with the phonograph and moving pictures. With this initial aim realized, however, and the Canadian public made aware of their native literature, perhaps then "enlightened interest" would be possible. "But we begin by trying to arrest its attention," insisted Sandwell. "With the help of a vigorous criticism (in which the *Canadian Forum* will bear a hand), the rest will follow" (December 1921). This is exactly the position which Sandwell would take in a number of *Bookman* editorials throughout 1922. In these pieces he walked a fine line, trying to balance the commercial with the artistic consideration, all the while denying charges of "boosting." He was successful only in part. It seems rather a simplification to claim, as Sandwell did, that Canadian literature is made when a Canadian with two dollars goes into a bookstore and buys a Canadian book (December 1921). Even insisting that it be a "good" Canadian book still begged the question. Sandwell was most convincing when he was at his most pragmatic. For example, estimating that sales of Canadian books accounted for less than one per cent of the business of Canadian bookstores, he asked what was the harm in attempts to raise that figure to three per cent (October 1922). An editorial opening the January 1922 number underscored the *Forum's* uncompromising stand by conceding that "economic factors will not produce literature just as they will not produce life; but economic factors can stifle literature which ought to be produced, just as they can and often do destroy life."

The nagging problem of critical standards still remained, however. In a May 1922 editorial, perhaps exasperated by the *Forum's* continuing assault, Sandwell flatly stated that "the Association is not an academy, and has neither the power

nor the facilities nor the desire to pass judgement on the literary merits of any Canadian writer." It is a moot point whether the official journal of an organization like the CAA could reflect objective standards of criticism (although no one seems to have suggested that the *Forum* was in any way compromised by its editorial affiliations with the CCF and the League for Social Reconstruction during the 1930's). Perhaps the safest route was to adopt a stance like that of the *Canadian Mercury*: "We have no affiliation whatsoever: we owe no allegiance to the Canadian Authors Association, the Canadian Manufacturers Association, the Young Communist League of Canada, the I.O.D.E., the Y.M.C.A., the U.F. of A. or the C.P.R." (December 1928). In any case, by the end of 1922 the *Bookman's* official connection with the CAA ceased and Sandwell resigned his editorship.

The *Bookman* was affiliated with the Authors Association for barely two years and yet during that time it had come close to abnegating its professed role as a "Canadian critical magazine." Under the new editorship of Findley Weaver, it would continue to carry CAA news, and there was still a discernible "trade" slant, but the addition of Merrill Dennison, T. G. Marquis and J. E. Middleton as contributing editors helped to expand the journal's focus somewhat. It now became "A Monthly Devoted to Literature and the Creative Arts." Probably because of the influence of Dennison — an early contributor to the *Forum* — it began to feature articles on Canadian theatre and the Group of Seven. Canadian literature, however, remained its main preoccupation.

SO CONVENIENT HAVE commentators found the booster/knocker dichotomy in characterizing Canadian literary journalism between the Wars that they have overlooked the healthy interchange of ideas and contributors which went on among journals presumably poles apart in their editorial styles. Writing in the *Bookman* during the early 1930's, for example, Marcus Adeney felt that there were still a few Canadian periodicals "in which creative and critical fires still burn brightly — periodicals that live by the warm human interest of contributors and readers alike, and serve no sterilized organization" (February 1932). As one of the founding contributors to the brash, young *Canadian Mercury*, Adeney could hardly be accused of being a Maple Leaffer. That journal was dedicated to "the emancipation of Canadian literature from the state of amiable mediocrity and insipidity in which it now languishes," allying itself "with all those whose literary schooling has survived the Confederation" (December 1928). The *Canadian Bookman* numbered a few such survivors among its contributors.

Adeney, for one, was no easier on his native literature in the *Bookman* than

he was in the *Mercury*. He contributed to the former throughout the late 1920's, during the remarkable 1928-29 period when the *Mercury* was publishing, and well into the 1930's, and his articles were always provocative. In "The Future of Canadian Literature," for example, while allowing that the development of a national literature depends on economic and cultural factors as well as on a vigorous criticism, he was trenchant on the subject of "any sort of Canada First movement": "To buy a Canadian book because it is Canadian would be almost as serious an offence as refusing to buy it for the same reason" (November 1928). Adeney located the Canadian psyche in a kind of cultural no man's land, somewhere between the old world and the new. Lacking roots and a background, he said, Canadians were trying to create artificially a "cultural oversoul," trying to find a "spiritual unity" where none actually existed (March 1930). So much for the New Era? As Adeney observed in a highly favourable review of Frederick Philip Grove's *It Needs to be Said*, "You can't tell people what they want to hear, and at the same time save your own immortal soul" (February 1930). Yet he did not reject the idea of a national literature so much as he did the myopia of literary nationalism. In "The National Consciousness Idea," he criticized the notion that "consciousness" means "consensus," and argued for a national consciousness conceived of in terms which allowed for conflict (May 1929). The subsequent correspondence elicited by this article might be said to have confirmed Adeney in his thesis, for the letters were copious and represented every shade of opinion. Grove was one of those who agreed with Adeney, remarking that "it takes many strains of thought to make a nation" (July 1929).

Like others of Eliot's generation, Adeney spoke from a cosmopolitan and urban point of view. Although in his criticisms of Canadian culture he spoke of the wilderness "in our great cities no less than in the far north" (February 1930), he posited a largely urban-based culture. A vital Canadian literature would depend "upon the sort of critical atmosphere we are able to create in the larger cities," he claimed, not "upon indiscriminating local appreciation (November 1928). A corollary of this was the call for more realism in literature, as against the prevailing "romantic" school. In "The Coming Canadian Novel (July 1919), John Murray Gibbon complained of "an unreported city life" in Canadian fiction: "The Canadian novel has hitherto rarely strayed beyond the life of the pioneer, the farmer or the small town dweller. There has been no memorable picture in fiction of either Montreal or Toronto, for instance, although Montreal has a population almost as large as Boston, and Toronto is no mean city." If the Canadian novel was to reflect contemporary Canadian life truly, Gibbon argued, then it must deal with the industrial unrest" of the age, which was to be found in the city, not in the hinterlands. Similarly, Lionel Stevenson noted some recent atten-



tion to "city life" in Canadian poetry, but concluded that as yet such elements were secondary to "themes of nature and mysticism," betraying what he called "the new world perspective" (February 1928).

There were lapses, of course, and in the *Bookman* files one will run across instances like "A Peter Pan of Literature" by N. de Bertrand Lugrin. This writer decried current English fiction's "monotonous partiality for heroines of the demi-monde" and called for "a Peter Pan, a Peter Pan of Literature who will restore to us our lost faith" (April 1926). "Bolshevism in Modern Poetry" (April 1925) by Crawford Irving was a reactionary piece equating *vers libre* with political subversion, while Mrs. Glynn Ward's "A Plea for Purity" (March 1924) exposed the "foetid breath of decadence" in the writings of Sherwood Anderson and D. H. Lawrence. Nevertheless, such instances were offset in the *Bookman* by balanced, critical discussion. As a matter of fact, "A Plea for Purity" was answered by Francis Dickie's "A Plea for Tolerance" (May 1924), while in the July 1920 number W. H. Clawson had defended the realists from "current charges of sordid realism." If A. J. M. Smith stated in the *Forum* that "Sensibility is no longer enough, intelligence is also required. Even in Canada" (April 1928), *Bookman* contributors like Thomas O'Hagan were equally aware of this fact, observing: "While there is an ardency in the air we are wanting in a literary standard, as we are wanting in canons of taste" (June 1927). If Douglas Bush asked "Do Canadian authors ever read anything?" and criticized the "lack of intellectual grip" displayed by these authors (*Forum*, December 1926), Raymond Knister, in the *Bookman*, urged Canadian short-story writers to learn their art "by reading . . . the masters of the form" (August 1923).

It is doubtful whether "standards of criticism" by themselves have ever produced a literature, but clearly such standards would play their part and the *Bookman* was as persistent in its call for them as either the *Forum* or the *Mercury*. "If we do not achieve in the next forty or fifty years all that we should achieve in letters it will not be for lack of creative ability," stated John Elson, "but because we do not set up high enough standards . . . Wholesome criticism will save us" (January 1929). The *Bookman's* tolerant spirit, its emphasis on "wholesome" or constructive criticism, need not suggest an uncritical attitude. As Merrill Dennison observed in a lead article in the January 1923 number, the "complacent finality" displayed by those who damned Canadian literature utterly was as destructive of critical standards as undue complacency in the opposite direction. The *Bookman's* contribution to Canadian criticism lay finally in its appreciation of what one of its writers aptly termed "the value of sheer fecundity": "To reach your harvest you must first have the shoots of spring. From the quality of the shoots you can judge already your prospects for the grain. When they are vigorous and abundant, you can be reasonably sure of what you will finally reap" (January 1924).

THE *Bookman* HAD NEVER been an especially profitable concern; in the main, it had survived on reader subscriptions rather than on advertising revenue. Whereas it had begun as a large quarto numbering an average of eighty to ninety pages per issue, it had eventually shrunk to a meagre octavo with some issues numbering less than ten pages. By the mid 1930's a typical number might consist of little more than a lead article followed by sundry short book notices and perhaps some ads ("Send your MSS. to the Mother Country"). In 1937, frequency became irregular and several numbers simply failed to appear. Clearly the *Bookman* was in trouble. Then, in the spring of 1938, a renovated *Canadian Bookman* appeared under a new management, directed "exclusively to the book reader" (April/May 1938).

In many way the new *Bookman* was now closer to its original founding premise than at any time since the CAA episode, pursuing entirely "bookish" interests. "All contents will be related to books," it announced, "particularly through book reviews — of books to every taste, for every age; books reviewed by people who enjoy reading; books available in Canada, interpreted by Canadian experience" (April/May 1938). Books available in Canada, but not necessarily by Canadian authors: the *Bookman* now disclaimed any "mission to form the reader's taste" and it professed a much tempered nationalism. Nevertheless, it still viewed its role as supplemental to Canadian letters:

This magazine, *The Canadian Bookman*, believes itself a valuable supporter of Canadian literature by the encouragement, through practical service, that it aims to give reading in Canada. The *Bookman* is published in Canada, without inconsistency although it is somewhat similar to the London and New York Times *Literary Supplements*, the *Saturday Review of Literature*, and other publications available here, because we believe the reader in Canada will enjoy having the book world brought closer home to him through news stories of books and interpretations by Canadians.

"The failure of subscriptions to arrive," it noted however, "may prove wrong even this modest conception of a Canadian literary magazine" (June/July 1938).

Modest the conception may have been, but the new *Bookman* boasted some impressive editorial personnel and contributors. Lorne Pierce was president of the company which had been formed to take over the running of the journal, while Howe Martyn, a frequent contributor to *Canadian Forum*, became its editor. The Advisory Board included Sir Charles G. D. Roberts, Mazo de la Roche, and Duncan Campbell Scott among others. Reviews and articles appeared by Kathleen Coburn, Northrop Frye, and Carl Klinck, as well as by E. J. Pratt, Leo Kennedy (late of the *Canadian Mercury*), and Dorothy Livesay. The *Bookman* had always featured poetry, much of it of poor quality, although some early verse

by Pratt, "Sea Variations," had appeared in it as early as 1922. It continued to publish poetry, now by Kennedy, Livesay, and others, but for the first time it now featured short stories as well, including one by Frederick Philip Grove, "The Platinum Watch," and stories by Katherine Hale and Dorothy Livesay. Ink-drawings by the *Forum's* Thoreau MacDonald also appeared in its pages. The format was simple and uncluttered, with attractive *sans serif* headings, and it ran to an average of sixty pages per issue. Consisting mainly of reviews, with verse and short fiction interspersed throughout, it eschewed the hard-sell, whether of the commercial kind or the nationalistic. Altogether, the new *Bookman* offered what it had said it would, "efficient, practical, unpretentious service to the Canadian book reader" (April/May 1938).

This surprising efflorescence notwithstanding, the *Bookman's* run was soon to come to an end. An open letter to subscribers in the final number (October/November 1939) announced that the *Bookman* was closing the books and locking the door. In their bid to raise circulation, the new managers had sent copies of the journal to selected lists. Out of a thousand mailed to authors and learned societies, they received ten subscriptions. Out of three thousand sent to book clubs, no more than a dozen subscriptions resulted. And so on. "We have learned a lot," stated the editors. "We know now that there are not enough people genuinely interested in literature and the creative arts in Canada to support a magazine, even so inexpensive as *The Canadian Bookman*" (October/November 1939). It was a bitter and untypically gloomy valedictory for the *Bookman*. Perhaps a farewell notice which appeared the following year in *Queen's Quarterly* more aptly summed up the character and achievements of this journal: "For twenty-two years its issues have offered a library of native literary criticism, a running record of artistic and literary events in Canada of major importance, a portrait gallery of artists and men of letters found nowhere else in our Dominion, an expanding anthology of poetry and *belles lettres*" (Spring 1940). A Canadian Bookman.

#### NOTES

<sup>1</sup> "The Writer and his Public (1920-1960)," *Literary History of Canada*, ed. Carl Klinck, 2nd ed. (Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1976), II, 5; "Literary Magazines," *The Oxford Companion to Canadian Literature*, ed. William Toye (Toronto: Oxford Univ. Press, 1983), p. 458. For good accounts of literary periodicals in this period, besides those given above, see: F. W. Watt, "Climate of Unrest: Periodicals in the Twenties and Thirties," *Canadian Literature*, No. 12 (Spring 1962), 15-27; Sandra Djwa, "The *Canadian Forum*: Literary Catalyst," *Studies in Canadian Literature*, 1 (Winter 1976), 7-25; Kathryn Chittick, "Making Literature Hum": Canadian Literary Journalism in the Twenties," *Studies in Canadian Literature*, 6 (1981), 274-85.

<sup>2</sup> "The Writer and his Public," II, 5.

<sup>3</sup> "Here is Us: The Topocentrism of Canadian Literary Criticism," *Canadian Poetry*, No. 10 (Spring/Summer 1982), 44-57.

- <sup>4</sup> Possibly because of its nationalistic preoccupations, the *Bookman* seems to have avoided identifying itself too explicitly with its two counterparts (although the July 1926 number carries an ad offering subscriptions to both the American and Canadian Bookmen for the price of one). Nevertheless, a comparison of the features regularly carried in its pages to those carried in the English and American Bookmen reveals an unmistakable family likeness.
- <sup>5</sup> The scant attention the *Bookman* has received from commentators largely focuses on this two year affiliation: for example, Chittick's account, cited above, and John Lennox's in "New Era: B. K. Sandwell and the Canadian Authors Association," *English Studies in Canada*, 7 (Spring 1981), 93-103.

## CHANGING PLACE

*Elizabeth Allen*

more and more  
i want to re-design the prairie  
put in the ocean  
just over the rise

take the white frost jungles  
obscuring window panes  
in winter turn them  
into green ferns

paint people  
in the doorways of all  
the empty homesteads

the prairie is too often silent  
and i am alone  
a rabbit crouching  
in an open field

keeping still  
knowing the smallest movement  
the twitch of an ear  
kills