

Western  Graduate&PostdoctoralStudies

Western University
Scholarship@Western

Electronic Thesis and Dissertation Repository

6-30-2014 12:00 AM

Transnational Conversations: The New Yorker and Canadian Short Story Writers

Nadine Fladd
The University of Western Ontario

Supervisor
Dr. Manina Jones
The University of Western Ontario

Graduate Program in English
A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree in Doctor of Philosophy
© Nadine Fladd 2014

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/etd>

 Part of the [American Literature Commons](#), [American Material Culture Commons](#), [Literature in English, North America Commons](#), and the [Visual Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Fladd, Nadine, "Transnational Conversations: The New Yorker and Canadian Short Story Writers" (2014). *Electronic Thesis and Dissertation Repository*. 2425.
<https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/etd/2425>

This Dissertation/Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Scholarship@Western. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Thesis and Dissertation Repository by an authorized administrator of Scholarship@Western. For more information, please contact wlsadmin@uwo.ca.

TRANSNATIONAL CONVERSATIONS: THE NEW YORKER AND CANADIAN
SHORT STORY WRITERS

(Thesis format: Monograph)

by

Nadine Louise Fladd

Graduate Program in English

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

The School of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies
The University of Western Ontario
London, Ontario, Canada

© Nadine Fladd 2014

Abstract

This dissertation explores *The New Yorker* magazine's role in shaping the Canadian short story, the contributions of Canadian authors to the magazine, and the aesthetic and ideological implications of transnational literary production. Using archival evidence, it explicates the publication histories of stories by Morley Callaghan, Mavis Gallant, and Alice Munro, as well as these authors' relationships with their editors at *The New Yorker*, in order to demonstrate some of the ways that Canadian literature emerged out of, as well as contributed to, North American transnational contexts. This project uses the work of textual studies scholars, and applies theories of literary collaboration to conceptualize the power dynamic between each author and his or her editors and its relationship to the material history of *The New Yorker* as a for profit endeavor. In the process, it attempts to negotiate the competing discourses of North American studies and Canadian literary nationalism, positing a correlation between the ways that these authors negotiate their relationships to place and nationalism in their work and the ways in which they react to the idea of giving up authorial control in their dealings with *The New Yorker*. Despite scholars' recognition that Canadian writing has long been in conversation with the literatures of other nations, until now no studies have attempted to delineate the nature and significance of transnational exchange in the development of the contemporary short story—a form often considered the premier genre of Canadian fiction. The study of these three authors together, whose publications represent discrete moments in the history of *The New Yorker*, offers a preliminary history of the impact of the intersection of transnationalism and collaboration on the Canadian short story, and the ways that these individual authors' conceptions of place and national identity inflect, or are reflected in, their approaches to collaborative writing practices.

Keywords

The New Yorker; New York; Canadian literature; American literature; transnationalism; nationalism; North American studies; cosmopolitanism; collaboration; multiple authorship; cultural production; editing; revision; Alice Munro; Morley Callaghan; Mavis Gallant; William Maxwell; Harold Ross; Charles McGrath; Katharine White; short story

Acknowledgments

Patricia Sullivan argues that "the intellectual qualities necessary for discovery, invention, and insight have long been perceived as properties of an individual knower rather than those of a collective subject" ("Revising the Myth of the Independent Scholar"12). In contrast, this dissertation, like the texts it studies, is covered in the fingerprints of the many hands that helped it to develop and evolve.

I would like to thank, first and foremost, my supervisor, Manina Jones, for her unwavering support and encouragement. This project is a more subtle, nuanced thing than it would have been without her attention to detail, her intellectual rigor, and her obsession with the "track changes" function. Whenever I handed her a draft that was rough and full of half-formed ideas, Manina always managed to pick a kernel of substantive scholarship out of the mess and set me on the right track again. Perhaps more importantly, she is a skilled practitioner of the psychology of positive reinforcement. Manina has a reassuring way of making finding a clearer focus and tackling yet another round of revisions sound like a task that is not just possible, but pleasurable. Her enthusiasm, and ability to see the "finish line" in the distance before I could, were invaluable.

My heartfelt thanks go also to David Bentley. It was Professor Bentley who first pointed out that both Alice Munro and Mavis Gallant had been publishing their stories in *The New Yorker* for some time, and that there might be something to a project that attempted to define what makes a *New Yorker* story. The important questions he posed in his responses to my drafts forced me to think through my assumptions in productive ways. I have also appreciated, and benefitted from, his keen editorial eye.

Thanks also to Allison Conway and Russell Poole for their individual contributions to earlier versions of my work on Alice Munro and Mavis Gallant, and to my examiners – Donna Pennee, Ian Rae, Kate Stanley, and Lorraine York – for helping me to think through what this project might look like in the future. Thank you to Mavis Gallant, Alice Munro, and Barry Callaghan for allowing me to quote from the archival material that is the foundation of this dissertation, and to Aquascutum for allowing me to reprint their advertisement.

This project could not have been completed without the institutional and financial support of The UWO Department of English, the UWO School of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies, the Faculty of Arts and Humanities, and the Ontario Graduate Scholarship program. I am grateful for the funding that made the trips to New York City, Calgary, Ottawa, and Toronto necessary for this project possible. I am especially thankful to Leanne Trask for shepherding me through many administrative hurdles, and cheerfully answering the million-and-one annoying questions I have asked her over the years.

I have been lucky to find a vibrant, supportive intellectual community among my colleagues at Western. Thanks to Tina Northrup, Mandy Penney, Kara Kennedy, David Hickey, Rebecca Campbell, Stephanie Oliver, Jenna Hunnef, Alicia Robinet and many others for your friendship and conversation from the very beginning. Thanks to Elan Paulson, Sarah Pesce, Erica Kelly and Brooke Pratt for being friends and mentors.

I also owe a debt of gratitude to Sarah Picton, Stephanie Cryer, Melissa Miller, and Heather Walton, my cheerleaders and second family.

Thanks to my brothers, Matthew and Adam, and my parents, Dawn and Ken, for helping me to move so many times over the years, visiting me, feeding me, housing me, and loving me. Thanks also to Aunt Liz and Uncle Rick for your generous hospitality in Calgary.

My final (but not insignificant) thanks go to James Dunne: for finding Morley Callaghan's *New Yorker Stories*, for keeping me accountable, for putting up with the dissertation-induced freak-outs, and for believing (perhaps more than I did) that I would, one day, finally, finish this thing.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	iii
Acknowledgments.....	iv
Table of Contents.....	vi
List of Figures.....	viii
Chapter 1.....	1
1 Introduction.....	1
1.1 A Brief History of <i>The New Yorker</i>	6
1.2 The Short Story in North America.....	9
1.3 An Intervention in North American Studies.....	16
1.4 Collaborative Writing and Shifting Conceptions of Authorship.....	27
1.5 Morley Callaghan, Mavis Gallant, and Alice Munro in <i>The New Yorker</i>	36
Chapter 2.....	51
2 Morley Callaghan as Literary "Heavyweight": Modernism and Contingencies of Cultural Value.....	51
2.1 Revis(it)ing Modernism: <i>The New Yorker Stories</i> as fluid texts.....	55
2.1.1 Revising Modernism: "An Escapade".....	58
2.2 <i>The New Yorker's</i> Early Years: Banking on Callaghan's Symbolic Capital.....	66
2.3 Nationalist Criticisms and Callaghan's Own Sense of Identity.....	70
2.4 Morley Callaghan of Toronto: <i>The New Yorker's</i> Sense of the Local.....	76
2.5 Archival Typescripts: "Tailored to the tastes and needs of New York editors" ...	83
2.5.1 Archival Typescripts: "The White Pony" and Callaghan's Decline in Symbolic Capital.....	90
2.5.2 Archival Typescripts: "Timothy Harshaw's Flute" as Case Study.....	94
Chapter 3.....	127

3	Mavis Gallant and Cross-Border Collaboration: <i>The New Yorker</i> as Authorial Contact Zone.....	127
3.1	Gallant's Career with <i>The New Yorker</i> : A Brief Overview.....	132
3.2	William Maxwell: The Editor as Collaborator, American, and Ally.....	135
3.3	From Literal to Imaginary Maps: <i>The New Yorker</i> as a Literary Contact Zone .	140
3.3.1	From Literal to Imaginary Maps: Gallant as Cultural Translator in "Immortal Gatito"	146
3.4	New Yorker Style: "Orphan's Progress" as a Case Study in Nationalist Tensions and Censorship.....	153
3.5	"Luc and His Father" in Collaboration with the Enemy: <i>The New Yorker</i> Advertising.....	168
3.5.1	"Luc and His Father" and the Selling Power of Irony: Aquascutum London's "Thorough-bred crowd"	177
	Chapter 4.....	195
4	Collaborative Contexts: Reciprocal Influence in Alice Munro's Relationship with <i>The New Yorker</i>	195
4.1	Munro and Her <i>New Yorker</i> Editors: Charles McGrath as "Ideal Editor"	198
4.2	The "Turkey Season" Composite: McGrath's Shaping of Munro's Relationship to Epistemology	200
4.3	"The Turkey Season" as Formative Exception: Epistemology in "Meneseteung"	215
4.4	The Editor as Co-Creator: Theorizing Dialogic Collaboration in "The Turkey Season"	219
4.5	Reciprocal Influence: The American South and Munro's Role in Shaping Editorial Practice.....	225
4.6	"World Famous in Canada": Munro's Regionalism as a Marketing Tool	233
4.7	Munro as Regionalist and Attempts to Avoid Canadian Literary Nationalism ..	237
	Chapter 5.....	251
5	Conclusion.....	251
	Curriculum Vitae	261

List of Figures

Figure 1. Advertisement for Aquascutum wools. *The New Yorker* 4 October 1982. 52-53. 180

Chapter 1

1 Introduction

On the morning of 10 October 2013, as news of the Swedish Academy's decision to award Alice Munro the 2013 Nobel Prize in Literature broke in North America, reporters clamored to speak to the author, who is usually reticent to give interviews. Munro's Nobel win was touted as a victory for Canada¹ and Canadian literature, for women,² and for the short story as a genre. Even Munro herself participated in this nationalist sentiment, stating in one of the few interviews she gave: "I think there will now be more thought about Canadian writers as a whole. I think this will help boost our idea of Canadian writing in the world" (qtd. in Leung). The Swedish Academy, and Munro herself, positioned the awarding of the prize as a step towards validating the genre of the short story. The Academy bestowed the honour upon Munro as "master of the contemporary short story" (Alice Munro – Facts), while Munro herself commented several times in interviews about the effect her win would have in bringing the short story "to the fore" in general.³ The response to the news that Canada now had a Nobel Laureate in literature demonstrates, on a small scale, many of the arguments about the production and circulation of literature in North America that this project makes: that representations

¹ Before Munro's win, the closest association Canada had to a Nobel prize in literature was that of the Canadian-born, but largely American-raised and educated Saul Bellow in 1976; Munro's upbringing, education, and writing were all thoroughly "Canadian." Prime Minister Stephen Harper congratulated Munro, stating that this "Nobel Prize further solidifies Canada's place among the ranks of countries with the best writers in the world" (qtd. in Leung), while in his opening "essay" for his CBC radio show "Q," Jian Ghomeshi mused, "It's hard not to feel a sense of national pride to see a fellow Canadian recognized in this way. Another Victory for Canada" (qtd. in "Q Essay:").

² The celebration of the Swedish Academy's decision to award a Nobel Prize in Literature to a woman for only the thirteenth time since 1901 was compounded in Canada by the recent uproar over novelist and University of Toronto lecturer David Gilmour's comments about his lack of interest in teaching the work of women writers (See Gilmour).

³ In a telephone interview with The Swedish Academy's Adam Smith, Munro's comments included: "This is quite a wonderful thing for me. It's a wonderful thing for the short story" and "Because I work generally in the short story form this is a special thing, I think, to get this recognition," and "I hope this would happen not just for me but for the short story in general ... I would like it to come to the fore."

of place and nationhood inform, and are informed by, the publication process; that editorial interventions often go unrecognized; and that socio-historical and economic factors play a significant role in the "branding" of readerships.

When Munro stopped taking calls from interviewers, individuals, groups and organizations associated with Munro and her work rushed to "claim" her publically. Deborah Treisman, fiction editor at *The New Yorker*, was one of the voices that helped to fill the void left by Munro's silence. Internationally, Munro is generally known as a *New Yorker* writer, and with good reason. She has published stories in the magazine since the late 1970s, and its fiction editors have played a significant role in furthering her career. Since Munro's win, Treisman has steadily promoted the magazine's association with her by participating in interviews, writing columns on the magazine's website about what it is like to be her editor, and reprinting what is perhaps Munro's best known short story,⁴ "The Bear Came Over the Mountain," in the 21 October 2013 issue of *The New Yorker* (see "Q: Essay" and Treisman, "Editing Alice Munro").

Before Munro, the Canadian authors Morley Callaghan and Mavis Gallant also enjoyed long-standing relationships with *The New Yorker*. Although literary markets and trade relations between the U.S. and Canada have changed considerably over the past one-hundred years, the trajectory of these writers' careers would appear, at first glance, to extend into the twentieth century Nick Mount's claim in *When Canadian Literature Moved to New York* that Canadian writing developed "not in the backwoods of Ontario . . . but in the cafés, publishing offices, and boarding houses of late-nineteenth-century New York" (19). As Robert Thacker writes:

like Morley Callaghan during the 1920s and 1930s, or like Mavis Gallant during the 1950s and 1960s, or like Alice Munro during the 1970s through the 1990s, Canadian writers have always sought, and often found, foreign markets for their stories – and during most of Canada's history that has meant publication in the United States. Munro's stories, now generally regarded as among the best in the

⁴ Thanks to Canadian director Sarah Polley's film adaptation of the story: *Away From Her*.

language, have since the late 1970s most often first appeared in the *New Yorker*, a magazine that was a significant outlet for Callaghan and remains Gallant's primary venue. ("Canadian Literature's 'America'" 134)

My project explores these Canadian short story writers' relationships with their editors at the celebrated *New Yorker* magazine. I focus on the rich and under-studied publication histories of stories by Morley Callaghan, Mavis Gallant and Alice Munro, including the cultural contexts within which various versions of their work have been produced, typescript drafts and emendations, editorial correspondence, paratextual materials such as advertising and cover design, and scholarly responses to these authors' positioning of their work in relation to issues of place and nationhood. By doing so, I address a question often overlooked by the emergent field of North American studies, which has concentrated primarily on literary and cultural exchange within the U.S. and between the U.S. and Mexico: how has Canadian literature emerged out of, and what has it contributed to, North American transnational cultural contexts? Through my analysis of the relationships between these authors and both their individual editors and the profit-driven publishing industry in general, I also explore what it has meant, and currently means, to be an author.

In order to answer these questions, this project both draws from and contributes to the development of American, North American, and border studies as disciplines and previous scholarship on transnational collaboration; histories of the short story genre and *The New Yorker* as an institution; the work of scholars of literary collaboration and other textual studies scholars who theorize the shifting nature of conceptions of authorship over the twentieth and early-twenty-first centuries; and most important, a wealth of primary documents drawn from the archives of Munro, Gallant, Callaghan, and the records of *The New Yorker* itself. Studying the three authors together through the lens of transnational and textual studies offers not only a literary history of Canadian authors' involvement in *The New Yorker* and American letters generally, but also new insights into our understanding of authorship, the creative process, and their relationship to place and history. As the attempt of both American editors and Canadian reporters and radio

personalities to claim Munro as "theirs" demonstrates, this approach complicates an understanding of a "national literature."

In "Towards a Model of an International History of American Literatures," Armin Paul Frank asserts that "All national literatures are international" (22). Canadian literature has long been in conversation with other national literatures and transnational audiences, providing, in the process, rich economic, cultural and national contexts within which the reciprocal influences of *The New Yorker* and Canadian short stories ought to be illuminated. Callaghan's, Gallant's, and Munro's careers reveal a correlation between each author's beliefs about Canadian identity and his or her approach to collaboration. Despite having been published in a magazine identified with the distinctive culture of an American metropolis, these three authors negotiate geographical and national contexts in very different ways. These negotiations are reflected in, or inflect, each author's approach to transnational author-editor relationships. A study of Callaghan's relationship with the magazine reveals that it was predicated on an exchange of symbolic and economic capital in which Callaghan was not particularly concerned with preserving his authorial sovereignty. Callaghan, because his intellectual allegiance was "intensely North American" and cosmopolitan (despite his physical comfort with Toronto as home), was perfectly willing to alter the settings of his stories (*That Summer in Paris* 22). Gallant's relationship with the magazine, on the other hand, functions as an example of the role that tension and conflict can play in collaboration, whether that collaboration is intentional or not. Gallant, who, unlike Callaghan, feared the potentially intrusive editorial intervention of *New Yorker* editors, was intent on retaining autonomy over the representation of national cultures, especially French culture, in her work. Paradoxically, she rejected definitions of her work as Canadian out of a fear of the dangers of nationalism, yet defined the work of other writers, specifically William Maxwell, in nationalist terms ("Preface" XIX).

While Gallant spent much of her life as an expatriate in Paris, often depicting the experiences of North Americans in Europe, Munro usually sets her fiction within Huron County, where she grew up. Munro's "The Turkey Season" offers the most obvious example of collaboration of all of the works studied in this project, an example that she

herself has identified as a collaboration even if the story is not explicitly co-signed ("Introduction" xvi). Not coincidentally, Munro appears to be the most comfortable of all three authors with her position as a Canadian writer, a position that she neither rejects, perceives as marginal, nor proselytizes for.

Exploring the three authors' relationships to editors, publishing institutions, and discourses of nationalism helps to reveal the implications of the changing relations of literary production, both economic and cultural, between Canada and the United States throughout the twentieth century, and how these transnational relations of literary production have informed the development and reception of Canadian writers' contributions to *The New Yorker*. In addition to accounting for the magazine's contribution to the development of Canadian fiction, this approach helps to trace the role Canadian authors have played in shaping what has become known as the "*New Yorker* Short Story," a phenomenon in short fiction that some critics (Miller, Burkhardt, Yagoda) assert constitutes a familiar, formulaic genre of its own.

Since my project takes place at the intersection of several literary/critical fields and approaches, this introduction provides the preliminary historical and theoretical background necessary for the other chapters of my dissertation, each of which focuses on a particular author from a different era of the history of *The New Yorker*. I begin with a history of both the magazine itself and the short story as a genre. This is followed by a comparative discussion of the histories of the development of Canadian literature as a legitimate field of study and the shifting of American studies from a nationalist pursuit to a transnational one. I then offer an overview of the current state of theories of collaborative authorship and conceptions of "authorship" in general. Finally, I situate the individual explorations I make into the *New Yorker* careers of Morley Callaghan, Mavis Gallant, and Morley Callaghan within the historical and theoretical context I have established in order to telegraph some of the major conclusions I come to in individual chapters about each author's relationship with the magazine in terms of place, authorial autonomy, and distribution and reception.

1.1 A Brief History of *The New Yorker*

The first issue of *The New Yorker*⁵ was published on 21 February 1925. The magazine was founded by Harold W. Ross, a high school drop out from Colorado who worked as an itinerant newspaper reporter until enlisting for duty during World War I and becoming editor of the military publication *Stars & Stripes* (Stingone i). Despite its current reputation for serious journalism and literary fiction, the magazine was originally intended as sophisticated humour magazine that would serve as a vehicle for selling advertising to local, New York merchants. As the historical overview in the New York Public Library's index to *The New Yorker* Records states:

He [Ross] believed there was a gap in the magazine industry, that there was room for a sophisticated, funny, urbane, upscale weekly. He found contemporary magazines (i.e. *Judge*, *Life*, *Saturday Evening Post*) either sophomoric, or middlebrow. Furthermore these national magazines were not suited to upscale advertising because they had to appeal to readers spread throughout the country and of all levels of sophistication and income. For Ross, the number of people reading his magazine would not be as important as who was reading it. Ross's audience would be educated, cosmopolitan New Yorkers, who spent money in fine restaurants and stores – the kind of audience advertisers would pay to target (Stingone i).

Before Katharine White (née Angell) began recruiting writers of serious fiction as contributors, the magazine established itself during a "rare moment in literary history when funny writers were respected – not only by the Algonquin set⁶ but in the culture at

⁵ Scholars are about equally divided in their use of "*The New Yorker*" or "the *New Yorker*" when writing about the magazine. Throughout this project, I have chosen to use "*The New Yorker*" because it is consistent with both the magazine's own treatment of its title and that of the New York Public Library in *The New Yorker* Records.

⁶ This group of writers and actors, who called themselves "The Vicious Circle," were referred to by the rest of society as "The Algonquin Round Table" for the table at which they met for lunch each day at the Algonquin Hotel during the 1920s. Its members included *New Yorker* founder Harold Ross and magazine contributors like Alexander Woollcott, Frank Sullivan, and Dorothy Parker.

large—as much as or more than any other kind" (Yagoda 33). Over time, the magazine drifted from this original focus, founding new genres, including the profile.⁷ The crossover between fiction and journalism that occurred in the magazine is clearest in the example of the landmark serial publication of Truman Capote's *In Cold Blood* in 1965, which was originally a journalistic assignment, but resulted in a literary and partially fictionalized account of the 1959 murders of a family in Kansas and the subsequent trial of their killers (Yagoda 347).

In addition to generating new journalistic or literary-journalistic genres, the magazine also firmly established itself as the publisher of a very specific kind of short story. As Ben Yagoda explains in his history of the magazine, the *New Yorker* short story "became [a] cultural categor[y], [its] very name . . . implying a specific kind of aesthetic lens on experience" (12). As the materials located in *The New Yorker* Records and the archives of Callaghan, Gallant, and Munro indicate, *New Yorker* contributors played a role in helping to shape the character of the "*New Yorker* short story" as a genre over the magazine's history, and *New Yorker* fiction editors also helped these authors' stories to adhere more closely to the conventions of the "*New Yorker* short story" that the magazine had already established. Rather than playing the role of the solitary genius, *New Yorker* short story writers were, and continue to be, subject to significant editorial intervention. As Yagoda explains:

Generally, the assumption among the editors was that substantial editing was almost always necessary – an unexalted view of authorial sovereignty that Ross carried over from his newspaper years. At the *New Yorker*, it was consistent with the bylines being at the end of pieces, the lack of a table of contents, and the anonymity of Notes and Comment and The Talk

⁷ As Yagoda writes of the Profile: "The term now appears in the dictionary with the definition 'concise biographical sketch' and is universally used in journalism to refer to any article about a person, so it is easy to overlook that the early *New Yorker* staffer James Kevin McGuinness coined it. Similarly, so inescapable are such articles today that it is likewise hard to believe that when the *New Yorker* started publishing these pieces, they were considered unusual" (133).

of the Town.⁸ The ethos was mostly unspoken, but was given voice in "Theory and Practice of Editing New Yorker Articles," a remarkable and only minimally facetious document [editor] Wolcott Gibbs prepared for Gus Loblano in 1937, when Loblano was about to join the staff as fiction editor. (200)

Similarly, George H. Douglas describes the writing published in *The New Yorker* of Callaghan's day as subject to "editorial uniformity and near-formulaic consistency": "A *New Yorker* writer had to fit himself into the prescribed mold" (191-92). This practice, if not the strict policy, continues to the present day; according to Treisman, *The New Yorker* still has a style guide in place for fiction and still "do[es] significant editing" on the stories it accepts (email). It is because of this hands-on role that *New Yorker* editors have historically played, and continue to play, that I theorize the relationships between Callaghan, Gallant, and Munro and their editors as collaborative, and resulting in work that is in effect multiply authored. Throughout this project, then, I read textual evidence of editorial or institutional interventions in the three Canadian authors' works through the lens of theories of collaboration and authorship. Using Jerome McGann and Jack Stillinger's conceptions of the social text and multiple authorship, I argue for the influence of each author's editor(s) on their work, especially as that influence relates to the representation of place and national identity in the work published by *The New Yorker*.

⁸ "As it was originally conceived, Notes and Comment was in the tradition of the collection of editorial paragraphs, a staple of American journalism dating . . . from 1883 . . . The *New Yorker's* version was anonymous but otherwise resembled its counterparts in offering up an assortment of usually unrelated bons mots, observations, ironies and bits of intelligence or whimsy" (Yagoda 85). As Yagoda points out, most of the magazine's early contributors did not want to be identified, since they worked for other, competing publications. The magazine developed a "custom of placing author credits at the end rather than the beginning of articles" (Yagoda 42). "In his years of writing Notes and Comment," writes Yagoda, E.B. White "chafed at the anonymity of the style . . . and suggested it be extracted from The Talk of the Town to stand alone as a signed column." Ross responded "I think . . . your page is stronger anonymous, as an expression of an institution, rather than an individual" (qtd. in Yagoda 43).

1.2 The Short Story in North America

It has become a truism that Canadian writers are particularly adept at the short story form. H. Pearson Gundy's historical research on the slow-to-develop Canadian publishing industry may help to account for the strength of Canadian writing in short formats. As Gundy writes, the publication of books within Canada in the nineteenth century was also costly, hazardous, and unprotected; "For publishers the problem was not merely promotion of their Canadian authors but the impossibility of obtaining effective copyright protection as the law then stood" (197) (see also *History of the Book in Canada* and George L. Parker's *The Beginnings of the Book Trade in Canada*, 1985). Gundy explains:

an American author, by establishing temporary residence in Canada and sending a few advance copies of his latest book to England for "first publication," could obtain full protection under the Imperial Act against the reprinting of his work in Canada. A Canadian author's copyright in Great Britain, however, was forfeited if the original form of publication in Canada was deemed to be inferior to British Standards. (197)

It is widely accepted that the Canadian short story emerged out of newspapers and magazines before the publication of books was feasible. V.S. Pritchett, for example, "defines the short story as a hybrid that 'owes much to the poet on the one hand and the newspaper reporter on the other'" (qtd. in Campbell 19). For the most part, publishing took place in "Newspaper offices, government printing departments, and bookstores" rather than publishing houses (Gundy 189). As a result, literary journals rather than books played a leading, if often unsuccessful, role in Canada's literary development (Gundy 195). For example, the *Literary Garland*, launched in 1838, was "the first successful Canadian literary journal, which lasted for thirteen years until 1851." One of the journal's founder's "innovations" writes Gundy, "was to pay his contributors," thus providing a heretofore absent "forum for writers both native and immigrant" (195). These material factors limiting possibilities for publication in Canada help to explain why Canadian writers often wrote in the short story format, why they often sought publication in the United States, and why early *New Yorker* contributors such as Callaghan and Stephen

Leacock were particularly adept at writing the kind of sketches and short fiction the magazine was looking for.

In *When Canadian Literature Moved to New York* Mount suggests that the decisions of individual Canadian writers in the late 1800s "to move to American cities wasn't about giving up one national literary culture for another; it was about moving from the margins to the centres of a continental literary culture" (13). The reason that U.S. cities became the centres of literary culture in North America had a lot to do with copyright regulations and the economics of publishing. Canada's cultural relationship with the United States is inextricably linked to its economic one, and as George Grant argues in his landmark text *Lament for a Nation*, capitalism is not usually conducive to nationalism. "Since 1960" he writes, "Canada has developed into a northern extension of the continental economy" (9). According to Mount, Canadian copyright law only protected authors' works within Canada; someone in England, for example, could reprint a Canadian author's work and sell it to Canadians without paying royalties (27-28).⁹

One example of the necessity for a transnational approach to the study of the development of the short story in North America is that of Thomas Chandler Haliburton's *Clockmaker* sketches. These sketches were originally published serially in the *Novascotian* magazine in the early nineteenth century and exerted considerable influence on American writers: "Despite his clear refusal to celebrate American values or the American way of life in anything resembling an indiscriminating fashion," Thomas Allen Smith writes, "Haliburton's work reflected so much that was characteristic of that way of life that American humorists could draw upon it in the creation of some of their society's most memorable popular art" (52-53). Haliburton drew inspiration for his *Clockmaker* sketches from John Howison's *Sketches of Upper Canada, Domestic, Local and Characteristic* (1821). In his 1920 Harvard dissertation, Ray Palmer Baker goes so far as to argue that the Canadian author of the Sam Slick sketches, who influenced Mark Twain, is the father of *American* humour. Smith reaches even further back into history by

⁹ There appears to be a discrepancy between Mount and Gundy on the details of copyright law.

pointing out the inspirational effect of the work of a Maine journalist on Thomas Chandler Haliburton, thus identifying a recurring pattern of reciprocal, transnational influence (52-53).

In both Canadian literary history, and in *The New Yorker* in the 1920s, the development of the short story is marked by a transition from journalism to sketches to literary fiction.¹⁰ Although in general terms the modern short story developed out of the fable and the myth, these are not the kinds of texts critics mean when they refer to a "*New Yorker* story." Edgar Allan Poe is often credited with first identifying and theorizing the American short story in the nineteenth century, and critics from Brander Matthews – Poe's "disciple" who wrote the first literary criticism of the short story in America after Poe, in 1901 (Patea 2) – to the present return to Poe's focus on the "unity of effect" of a story again and again (Poe 60). Since Poe, critics have made countless attempts to formally define the short story and its characteristics. Although this notion of a concrete set of structural characteristics that defines the short story is not always useful because there will always be examples that undermine or do not adhere to these definitions,¹¹ critics such as Viorica Patea (9), Charles E. May, and Gerald Lynch and Angela Arnold Robbeson have found Ludwig Wittgenstein's 1953 concept of family resemblance or overlapping similarities applicable to the concept of genre. In their introduction to *Dominant Impressions: Essays on the Canadian Short Story*, Lynch and Robbeson explain:

When the generic status of even the novel can be made to appear questionable, it is perhaps most sensible to adopt Alistair Fowler's conception of genre (derived from Wittgenstein by way of Dugald Stewart) as kinds of literary works that share a "family resemblance": "Literary genre seems just the sort of concept with

¹⁰ Before the magazine began publishing serious fiction, it published several of Canadian humourist Stephen Leacock's short sketches, beginning with "Save Me from my Friend the Guide" in the 9 July 1927 issue, and ending with "Life of J. Correspondence" in the 6 April 1929 issue.

¹¹ Munro's stories appear to have grown longer and longer as her career with the magazine progressed, and the stories *The New Yorker* published in general have grown longer over time.

blurred edges that is suited to such an approach. Representatives of a genre may then be regarded as making up a family whose septs and individual members are related in various ways, without necessarily having any single feature shared in common by all." (2)

Lynch and Robbeson list "brevity, concision, unity of impression and effect" as some of the "strongest family features of the genre," but admit that these features do not, and can not "tell the whole story of the Canadian short story" on their own (2). In her analysis of the history of theorizations of the short story, Patea highlights another important structural element of the genre, writing:

As the first short story theorist, [Poe] brought into discussion issues of form, style, length, design, authorial goals, and reader affect, developing the framework within which the short story is discussed even today . . . Poe was the first to consider endings as crucial elements in compositional strategies and defined the short story in terms of reading experience. (7-9)

This formalistic focus on the aesthetics and structuring of the short story has continued throughout the twentieth century and into the twenty-first, with critics from B.M. Éjxendbaum (1925, 81) to May referring to a story's ending or conclusion, especially if it is an epiphanic one¹² (Patea 15; Cox 5) as "one of the form's most important aspects" (May, "American Short Story" 300) in the twentieth century. As an examination of Munro's relationship with *The New Yorker* will reveal, *The New Yorker*, in addition to its contributors, has always been particularly interested in tweaking and perfecting the endings of the stories it publishes. When combined with international authors' own attempts to define what a short story does or achieves, and several other theorizations of the genre's relationship to national identity, this list of general aesthetic characteristics functions as part of a more holistic, well-rounded conception of the Canadian short story.

¹² A style of ending made popular by James Joyce.

Some of the most compelling definitions of the short story have been penned by practitioners of the art itself, from Nadine Gordimer, who asserts that "Short-story writers see by the light of the flash" (264), to Joyce Carol Oates, who suggests that the genre features "a concentration of imagination, and not an expansion" (qtd. in Cox 3). Here Gordimer refers to the flash of fireflies at night, but the reference dovetails nicely with the frequent comparative descriptions writer-critics like Julio Cortázar make of the relationship between the short story and the novel as analogous to that between the photograph and the feature-length film (Patea 11). Cortázar argues that "the film is, essentially, an 'open order' like the novel, while a successful photo presupposes a circumscribed limitation, imposed in part by the reduced field which the camera captures and also by the way in which the photographer uses that limitation esthetically" (246). This analogy complements Mary Louise Pratt's theorization of the ways in which authors of the short story, particularly those from colonies or former colonies, can turn the genre's marginal position in the canon to aesthetic and political advantage.

It would be an overstatement to suggest that the short story or short story cycle is a distinguishing Canadian genre, but there are reasons the form has been attractive to writers in Canada or countries in a similar position. First, there is the leisure theory of literature. From a practical standpoint, the story's popularity among nineteenth-century Canadian writers was due in part to the time it took to write one; it requires less sustained attention than a novel might, thus freeing the author to do the "real" work of settling the country (Lynch and Robbeson, "Introduction" 3). For writers in colonies that may not have local audiences that are substantial enough to compensate writers for the labour involved in writing a novel, the individual short story was also, and continues to be, a potentially more financially rewarding choice for authors, even if publishers have trouble selling collections of short stories. As Gordimer, who has earned more money from the publication of short stories than novels, explains, stories can be published, and therefore "sold," more than once.¹³

¹³ Nadine Gordimer writes: "quite a large number of my stories have been published in *The New Yorker*. My living as a short-story writer has been earned almost entirely in America" (267).

In addition to these practical, material concerns, some scholars suggest that Canada's historical struggle to define its own identity, and its resistance to definition in anything other than negative terms (i.e., as not-American),¹⁴ may have given Canadian writers an affinity for the short story form. As a result of continuously being required to recognize the position of the hegemonic other – of being a marginal nation-state in relation first to England, then to the U.S. – Canadian writers may be more comfortable with the provisionality of definitions, or even the complete lack of categories that May suggests characterizes the short story.¹⁵ Many theorists in May's anthology refer to Poe's emphasis on the "unity of effect" (60), but a seemingly equal number emphasize the opportunity for disunity that the contemporary short story form offers. In contrast to the novel and its supposed presentation of a unitary subject, the short story allows for the fragmentation of identity. Gordimer asserts that, in a short story "A discrete moment of truth is aimed at – not *the* moment of truth, because the short story doesn't deal in cumulatives" (265).¹⁶

Finally, by relating the historically asymmetrical relationship between the short story and the novel to transnational political power, Pratt offers a third option for

¹⁴ As Bean, Gonzalez and Kaufman write: "Canadians often define themselves as "un-American," a diverse people joined by their common opposition to American values" (900).

¹⁵ Gallant's work in particular is concerned with the provisionality of identities and categories that May and others argue characterize the short story form. This is the conventional reading of Gallant's work, and the one that Danielle Schaub takes up in her essays: that, as a result of her multinational upbringing, she "look[s] at once through two lenses (French and British), [and] she cannot have one, and only one, view of things" (14). While scholars have focused on the performative nature of identity in her work, Gallant's own comments suggest a more fixed sense of national essence. She writes of Canadian expatriates, for example: "[s]ometimes they try to pass for British, not too successfully, or for someone vaguely chic and transatlantic. I have wondered, but not wanted to ask, how they replace the national sense of self" (*Home Truths* xv).

¹⁶ Admittedly, because most attempts to define the short story as a genre rely upon distinguishing it from the novel, such definitions risk oversimplifying the novel and its wide range of formal and aesthetic characteristics.

conceptualizing the development of the short story in relation to national identity. She explains that the genres' "relation is not one of contrasting equivalents in a system (separate but equal), but a hierarchical one with the novel on top and the short story dependent" (96). She argues, as Lynch and Robbeson have ("Introduction" 3), that the short story's aesthetically marginal position makes it an appropriate form of literary expression for politically marginal (often colonized) societies. Pratt describes Bret Harte's "1899 retrospective on the origins of the American short story," writing that, "for Harte the American short story signaled the end of the dominance of English models in American literature . . . In other parts of the world we similarly find the short story being used to introduce new regions or groups into an established national literature, or into an emerging national literature in the process of decolonization" (104). Similarly, Lynch argues that the best short stories in the U.S. were written while it was still in the process of defining itself against Britain. Lynch's view was adumbrated in Éjxenbaum's 1925 observation that, throughout the 1830s and 1840s – as "magazines had begun to play a sizable role in both England and America" – English magazines tended to print serialized novels while "the main position in American magazines was held by short stories" (883). Similarly, Thacker asserts that "Any history of the [short-story] genre must begin with Canada's colonial position during the nineteenth century, one similar to that of the United States immediately after the American Revolution and, to some degree, into the nineteenth century as well" ("Canadian Literature's America" 131). In Canada, the first anthology of *Canadian Short Stories* wasn't compiled until 1928, almost thirty years after the genre was being theorized in the United States. Canada achieved political independence from Britain much later than the U.S. and the Canadian short story came to prominence at the same time that the *New Yorker* began to publish serious short fiction in its magazine.¹⁷ It is possible that Canada's colonial position – its formal, political one in relation to Britain, and its later de facto, cultural and economic one in relation to the

¹⁷ Pratt cites one example of American authors' move away from the short story just as *The New Yorker* demonstrated an interest in the form: "One of the strangest responses to this commercialization of the short story occurs in a book published in 1929 called *The Dance of the Machines*. In the face of a good deal of patriotic boasting about the short story as the American genre, the author, Edward J. O'Brien, condemns it as an instance of the 'mechanistic structures' increasingly taking over American life and the American psyche" (110).

United States – has positioned its authors to be particularly open to the short story form. What is easier to demonstrate is that limited opportunities to publish within Canada encouraged Canadian writers to publish the short stories they did write in American magazines.

Callaghan himself, who was writing and publishing at this time, "pointedly critiqued Canadian conditions" of publication, when he wrote that "the fact remains that there is no publication in the country interested in the publication of decent prose and poetry for its own sake, and until such a periodical appears, there will be no local expression in literature" (qtd. in Thacker, "Canadian Literature's America" 133). Callaghan, as an early *New Yorker* contributor at the very moment the "Canadian short story" was beginning to come of age (Knister xi),¹⁸ helped to create the mold into which later contributors, both American and Canadian, were expected to fit. The short story, then, paradoxically established itself as a canonical genre in Canadian literature by way of *The New Yorker*.

1.3 An Intervention in North American Studies

Given the transnational, but not simultaneous, nature of the development of the short story in the United States and Canada, my project is situated at the intersection of two dissonant critical discourses: the first is the trend of North American Studies, an approach that claims to explore the confluence and continuation of cultures across the continent without perceiving national boundaries and borders as conceptual limits. The second is a strain of nationalist Canadian literary criticism that, since the 1950s, has suggested that a degree of cultural protectionism is necessary for English Canadian literature to flourish. North American Studies focuses on transnational economic and cultural "flows" while nationalist literary criticism seeks to assert and safeguard national difference through a kind of critical protectionism. One product of this attitude is economic protectionism,

¹⁸ Certainly, other kinds of short stories, such as the animal stories of Charles G.D. Roberts and Ernest Thompson Seton, were already being written before the publication of Knister's *Canadian Short Stories*. Knister was a modernist, however, and was not interested in this kind of work.

which for several decades has sought to provide funding for developing and sustaining a distinct national literature within Canada. These competing discourses of Canadian nationalist criticism and North American Studies – which, in practice, tends to elide cultural and political differences between Canada and the U.S. in favour of tracing other forms of affiliation – suggest the need for a project like Mount's and my own that embraces the study of transnational exchange but is also cognizant of the asymmetrical cultural, political and economic power dynamic between Canada and the U.S.

Baker argues that the Loyalists who moved from the United States to Canada were anti-conflict rather than pro-British, that there was a close intellectual relationship between Nova Scotia and Massachusetts, and that "the elements which have determined the progress of Canadian literature have been distinctively American" (183). Although he suggests that early Canadian literature was not a nationalist endeavor, it certainly became one over time. In *Zones of Instability*, Imre Szeman suggests that in Canada, as well as other Commonwealth countries that are former colonies, "nation building involved a federal project." In Canada, "the state itself was actively involved in the production of the Canadian nation during the period from 1945 to 1970."¹⁹ As Szeman writes: "In the decades following World War II, the Canadian federal government began an ambitious series of programs whose intention was to identify, foster, protect, and develop Canadian culture in order to assert and maintain Canadian political sovereignty" (ch. 4). He claims that this government project was in part a result of "Anxiety over the tenuous existence of the Canadian nation." Following the Second World War, he writes, the nearby and "linguistically and culturally similar" United States became more powerful, causing fears

¹⁹ The impulse to institute economic and cultural protectionism that Szeman describes was not entirely new. John A. Macdonald's National Policy (1878), which "levied high tariffs on foreign imported goods," was designed to "shield Canadian manufacturers from American competition" (Brown, Robert Craig). Another father of Confederation, Thomas D'Arcy McGee, supported a protectionist tariff, helped to edit a nationalist newspaper, and called for the protection of Canadian literature (using the "infant industry" argument) in order to allow it to develop (Burns). The nationalist movement that began in the 1950s and continued through the centenary of Confederation was a repetition of what had first occurred in the late-nineteenth century.

within Canada of cultural annexation (Introduction).²⁰ Although Szeman's claims about Canadians' fear of political annexation are slightly hyperbolic, it is clear that their fears of cultural annexation were real.²¹ In 1951, the concerns raised by Vincent Massey's Report on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences led to the implementation of a nationalist program to support arts and culture (ch. 4).

In response to the Massey Report, the Canadian government founded the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (1952), the National Library (1953), adopted the maple leaf flag (1965), and, most important, founded the Canada Council for the Arts to fund culture in Canada. As Szeman writes:

The latter had an enormous and direct impact on literary production, both by providing funding to individual authors and by making funds available to book and magazine publishers in order to provide outlets for Canadian literary production. The most important literary initiatives to grow out of these programs were the establishment of the New Canadian Library Series (1957), which . . . made the widespread teaching of Canadian literature in universities and high schools a possibility, and the production of *The Literary History of Canada* (1965). (ch. 4)

Canadian literary production exploded in the 1960s and 1970s as a result of Canada Council funding. Szeman claims that the literature produced during this period in Canada, despite federal funding, was not inherently nationalist²² despite the fact that texts from

²⁰ Szeman writes: "In the period following World War II, a period which saw the United States definitively achieve its position as a cultural, economic, and political superpower, questions regarding the continued viability of the Canadian nation extended into virtually every form of governmental and intellectual discourse" (ch. 4).

²¹ Such fears of political annexation by the United States were warranted in the 1880s and 1890s.

²² Szeman writes: "There is nowhere in Canadian fiction after World War II a national literature that aspires to write the nation into existence. English-Canadian literary texts of this period inevitably examine and articulate the differences (with varying degrees of success) that exist *within* the boundaries of the nation, paying especially careful attention to the internal colonization of Native peoples and the Québécois. While they do articulate worries about American cultural imperialism, even what are thought to be classics of English-Canadian nationalist literature, such as Atwood's *Surfacing* (1972) and Hugh MacLennan's *Two*

this time period are often read as allegories for the Canadian nation and Canadian identity. The literary criticism that laid the foundation for the study of Canadian literature as a discrete discipline, however, clearly was nationalist in its approach.²³

Szeman explores "the persistence of the theme of the nation in Canadian literary criticism" (Introduction), describing the preoccupations of the "thematic critics" of the 1970s, who attempted to "locate what was essentially or particularly Canadian about Canadian literature" (ch. 4), and who helped to shape the discipline of Canadian literary criticism while it was in its infancy. He writes:

For [Margaret] Atwood, this was the theme of "survival," for [John] Moss the "garrison mentality" first identified by [Northrop] Frye in his conclusion to the *Literary History of Canada*, and for [D.G.] Jones the perpetual search for "national identity" itself. The unspoken assumption of this kind of criticism was that the writing produced in the nation must of necessity thematize the conditions of possibility of the nation itself. (ch. 4)

Although the work of Canadian literary and cultural critics has moved beyond this nationalist and thematic impulse, in some circles the nationalist approach to literary criticism has persisted. In the most extreme expression of these anxieties about the representation of national identity in Canadian literature, critics such as Stephen Henighan have argued that, since the signing of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA, 1993), which dismantled some of the protectionist measures designed to promote the economic health of Canadian industries, Canadian authors have

Solitudes (1945) . . . cast a surprisingly critical eye on the prospects of a unified, national body, and pay as much attention to the coexistence of multiple Canadas as Leonard Cohen's *Beautiful Losers* (1965)" (ch. 4)

²³ Szeman writes: "It is in literary criticism rather than in literary production itself that it is possible to see the explicit creation of a national literature . . . writing considered valuable enough to be included in the canon has been limited to texts that are, in one way or another, explicitly nationalist. Lecker suggests that the reasons for the obsessive interest in nationalist-mimetic texts grows out of the anxiety about the identity of the Canadian nation" (Introduction).

been forced to "disca[r]d their Canadian subject matter" to appeal to an international market (37). Canadian nationalist responses to transnational shifts in the field of American studies or North American studies, however, suggest that not all nationalist criticism is as outdated or simplistic as Henighan's.

In his Introduction to *The Futures of American Studies*, Donald E. Pease outlines the history of the field and its movement from the "frontier" of scholarship, to the institutionalized, conservative Nationalist project against which new fields defined themselves, to its more recent revitalization (18). Pease argues that the 1960s and 1970s, with their fragmentation of American society over civil rights and the Vietnam war, marked the end of "the myth-symbol school of American studies" which depended upon a conception of America as homogeneous (16). Instead, scholars "demanded that American studies be construed as a critical and self-reflexive rather than as a normative category" (Pease 17) and founded several related fields, such as Queer, African American, and Women's studies, in response to American studies' unitary, nationalist framework. Recently, "American studies" has not only come to include the study of diverse or marginal populations within U.S. borders, but has also transformed into "North American Studies," which explores cultural phenomena across Mexico, the U.S., and Canada. Rachel Adams and Sarah Phillips Casteel describe this "'transnational turn' in American literary and cultural studies" (Adams, *Continental Divides*, 18):

In recent years, US Americanists, often in dialogue with their Latin Americanist colleagues, have begun to unsettle the traditional insularity of US American Studies by adopting a more comparative, transnational or post-national orientation. At the same time, the emergence of the field of New World Studies, inspired by the quincentenary of Columbus' 'discovery' of America, has fueled interest in a hemispheric approach to the literatures of the Americas.

("Introduction" 6)

Adams sees an intensification of this trend of acknowledging "neighbourly exchange, both hostile and amicable" (*Continental Divides* 247) since the signing of NAFTA and since the attacks on the World Trade Centre towers on 11 September 2001, at which point

"Canada and Mexico were blamed for allowing terrorists onto North American soil" (17). John Carlos Rowe justifies this shift, explaining that "If a single nationalist mythology of the United States no longer prevails, then our understanding of just what constitutes the cultural border of the United States is no longer clear" ("Postnationalism" 167). My project, like Rowe's, is concerned with exploring the "ways different cultures are transformed by their contact and interaction with each other" ("Postnationalism" 169). As Rowe points out, however, in practice the "comparative cultural study" that the new American Studies is concerned with can often "reinforce, rather than transform, national and cultural hierarchies it is intended to criticize and overcome" (*The New* xvi).²⁴

Like Claudia Sadowski-Smith in her indictment of border studies' almost exclusive focus on the U.S.-Mexico border, Rowe critiques institutionalized American Studies' neglect of Canada in its pedagogical practices ("Postnationalism" 169). Similarly, Bryce Traister argues that, although the motives behind the theoretical deconstruction of nationalism are progressive, "[w]ithout a retained notion of 'America' as normative" (200), an American Studies approach could lead to the "reincorporation of Canadian literary and cultural history" (201) by "unwittingly restor[ing] the U.S.'s centripetal power" (193).²⁵ As Traister argues, the theoretical dismantling of nationalism does not mean that nationalism ceases to "influence literary productivity" in practice (195). My project attempts to rectify these oversights and avoid these pitfalls by exploring transnational exchange between the U.S. and Canada through authors' and editors' correspondence about the role of nation and place within individual short stories.

Adams and Phillips Casteel also critique this tendency in North American studies to focus predominantly on cultural exchange between communities within the U.S. or

²⁴ In his article "Towards a Dialogics of International American Cultural Studies," Gunter H. Lenz takes a similar approach to Rowe's. In general, though, he assumes that non-U.S. American studies scholars are only interested in the various multi-cultures within the United States, as well as U.S. imperialism and sites of resistance to it in their own nation-states. His conception of the "dialogic" does not seem to include the possibility that these nation-states could also infiltrate and influence U.S. cultures (477-8).

²⁵ See also Claudia Sadowski-Smith's analysis of the asymmetry between the institutionalization of American Studies in Canada and Canadian Studies in the United States (17).

between the U.S. and Mexico.²⁶ Examples of this tunnel vision include critics' focusing exclusively on the exportation of American culture rather than the ways in which other cultures "write back" to the U.S., and ignoring the work of non-U.S. American studies scholars (Rowe "Postnationalism" 172). Their proposed solution to the neo-imperialist potential of North American studies is not to abandon this approach, but rather to encourage Canadian scholars, who "have largely absented themselves from critical conversations about a hemispheric American Studies" to participate in the discussion ("Introduction" 6). "Acutely conscious of how recently the battle was fought to establish Canadian Studies," they write, scholars of Canadian culture

are understandably protective of its integrity and desirous of maintaining its independence. From this perspective, the absorption of Canadian Studies into a hemispheric framework can potentially appear to be a neo-imperial conquest, one that reproduces the political, economic and cultural hegemony exerted by the USA over Canada. Some Canadianists have expressed the legitimate fear that a

²⁶ In their Introduction to a recent issue of *Comparative American Studies*, Adams and Phillips Casteel write: "Canada has long been overlooked in scholarship about the Americas as a hemisphere, which has more typically focused on relationships between the USA and Latin America. The five articles in this issue seek to redress that imbalance by locating Canada within the history and culture of the Americas and, in doing so, to provide a compelling rationale for the inclusion of Canada in current articulations of a hemispheric American studies" ("Introduction," 6). In *Continental Divides*, Adams writes:

Canadian, Mexican, and U.S. American studies each evolved into a field with its own discrete histories and intellectual traditions. And much like diplomatic relations among the three nations, comparative scholarship on North America has often proceeded in terms of bilateral conversations between the United States and its neighbors, rather than an equitable dialogue involving many different parties. U.S.-based Americanists have shown considerable interest in Mexico, but typically ignore Canada or treat it as an extension of the United States, while those scholars of Mexico and Canada who have written comparatively about the United States rarely take one another as objects of critical interest. Partitioning the cultures of North America in this way has limited our reading of individual works and genres, and obscured opportunities for innovative comparative analysis. My fundamental claim is that many of the things we think we know about "American" culture appear very different when examined through transnational frames that include portions of Canada, the United States, and Mexico. (6-7)

hemispheric American Studies will maintain the USA as its hegemonic center.
("Introduction" 6-7)

Nonetheless, they argue, "a strong Canadian presence in Inter-American Studies has the potential to *decenter* the USA and to voice a forceful critique of the tendencies outlined above" (7). It is within this context that I orient my own project, which is designed to participate in the evolution of Canadian literary studies beyond the nationalist approach without abandoning an awareness of the cultural, political, and economic effects that state borders can have on literary and cultural production. By exploring the contributions of Canadian short story writers to a celebrated American magazine, I hope to participate in the intellectual task of "better integrating Canada into the study of the Americas" (Adams, *Continental Divides* 27).

Sadowski-Smith's recently published study of border literature significantly broadens discussions of U.S.-Canada literary relations. Like Adams and Phillips Casteel, she espouses applying Gloria Anzaldúa's theorization of the borderlands not just to the U.S.-Mexico border, but to the U.S.-Canadian one as well.²⁷ Sadowski-Smith takes a pan-continental approach, attempting to rectify what she sees as an imbalance in which "the complexities surrounding the Canada-U.S. boundary . . . are rarely addressed in popular and academic discourses on U.S. borders" (6). Like Mount, Sadowski-Smith explores the historical pull of the American publishing industry for Canadian authors, as well as for Mexican and Latin American ones (142).²⁸ She cites the example of the nineteenth-century Chinese Canadian author Edith Eaton, often known as Sui Sin Far, who "modified her work to conform to U.S. expectations" and whose "Canadian settings fared

²⁷ Adams and Phillips Casteel write that "The US-Canadian border provides an opportunity to expand the borderlands paradigm from encounters between Mexican and Anglo cultures to a comparative view of contact zones across the Americas" (10).

²⁸ Sadowski-Smith writes: "Today, 75 percent of all books read by English-speaking Canadians are imported from the United States (Smorkaloff 92) . . . writers residing in Canada have tended to either publish their work in the United States or physically move there, which results in their literature becoming increasingly influenced by the expectations of the U.S. publishing industry and reading audience" (142).

badly when her work was translated to a U.S. publishing context" (142). The "Canadian border settings" of Eaton's "early work" "have fared poorly in U.S. academia as well," argues Sadowski-Smith (142), using this example to demonstrate the potential for "manifestations of U.S. empire" (139) within both the publishing industry and academic disciplines.

Sadowski-Smith suggests that "The ways in which publishing industries shape the hemispheric production of literature need to be examined further to avoid reinforcing the mechanisms of the literary marketplace in the academic realm" (143), pointing out the fact that "Even though the writing of Alice Munro . . . clearly shows the influence of her home—Huron Country, Ontario [sic]—with protagonists and towns reflecting that part of Canada, the specificity of this location is marginalized every time she is included in collections of the best U.S. American short stories" (142). The labeling of authors and their works as members of "easily identifiable categories" such as ethnic or national identity (140), as practiced by the "literary marketplace" – both publishers and "'big box' bookstores" – she fears, is reflected in the scholarship about these authors and texts within insular academic disciplines and creates (unnecessary) intellectual barriers that often prevent scholars from accurately representing the transnational, transcultural border fictions that she studies.

Several scholars and writers have noted the ways that the structures of the academy itself contribute to bias and oversight in transnational literary scholarship (Rowe, "Postnationalism" 174). In his reviews of the state of criticism of Munro's work, Thacker, for example, argues that Canada's government-subsidized publishing system discourages Canadian publishers from showing interest in the work of American scholars on Canadian topics, and that, traditionally, American academic presses have shown little interest in work on Canadian literature ("Go ask Alice" 167-8).²⁹ In addressing the

²⁹ Footnote 11 in Thacker's article notes: "there are fields – anthropology, history, political science – where American presses do publish on Canadian topics; that these presses are noticeably more receptive to manuscripts on Canadian literary topics seems a relatively new phenomenon. Scholarly presses in Canada normally do not publish without a subvention, so it is conceivable that manuscripts on Canadian topics by

development of the work of Canadian authors and its reception in a transnational, North American context, I hope to redress this gap in scholarship. The boundary between American and Canadian literature is often an artificial one that has a tendency to result in scholarship that "turns literary history into something other than it really is, something neater but less true" (Mount 142). Mount sees the "excising of American influence" from Canadian literary history as an inadvertent result of generic and disciplinary boundaries (149), claiming that "Canadian writers have been *practising* transnationalism since before there was a Canadian literature" (162).

Sarah Corse's study of the differences between Canadian and American literary canons makes an economically important distinction between "high" canonical literature and mass-market "popular" literature. She argues that canonical texts are chosen for their distinctiveness, and that the process of creating a national literature intensifies our perception of cultural differences between Canada and the U.S. in order to contribute to the creation of a Canadian national identity. At the same time, she argues, the "best-sellers" read by most Americans and Canadians are quite similar. In short, "high-culture literature" functions as "a constructor of the unique nation" while "popular-culture literature" serves as "an economic commodity" (6). As a "middlebrow" publication, though, one that pretends to be targeted at an elite audience while simultaneously depending upon a broad subscription base in order to remain financially sustainable, *The New Yorker* functions as a good example of what happens when the nation-building function of "high-culture literature" by Canadian authors meets the demands of an explicitly New-York-based institution concerned with appealing to as many readers as possible. As Mount points out, most "Canadian writers who moved to the States in [the late 1800s] wrote or worked for mass-market monthlies or weeklies" (14). This tradition carried on into the twentieth century, and some of the Canadian writers who are now

Americans (of whom, I should say, I am one) might be denied publication solely for the absence of such grant support" ("Go ask Alice," 167-8).

considered canonical and whose works are taught in university courses in Canadian literature were nurtured and shaped by American commercial interests. Callaghan appears to have conceded to *The New Yorker's* demands that his work appeal to a specific, local market, while Gallant's stories, as they appear in the magazine, are marked by the tension between her own ideologies and the commercial interests of the magazine's advertisers. Munro, on the other hand, benefitted from the "branding" process that her work underwent at the magazine. Mount's *When Canadian Literature Moved to New York* and Sadowski-Smith's *Border Fictions* function as examples of the new broadening of the study of transnational literary study to include Canada that Adams espouses.

Sadowski-Smith perceives the U.S. as a cultural force that is not only threatening, but also culturally productive for Canada, and credits the Canada-U.S. border for helping Canada to define its sense of national identity in the 1960s. "In the metaphorical approach common in Canada," she writes, "the border often symbolizes Canadian efforts to resist U.S. cultural, economic, and political intrusions. The border thus functions as a bulwark for definitions of Canadian particularities, which are almost always conceptualized as different from its southern neighbor" (12). Here Sadowski-Smith highlights the productive role of conflict, a theme that I will explore in detail in my analysis of Gallant's contributions to *The New Yorker* and her sometimes fraught relationships with both her individual editors and the magazine as a whole. An analysis of Canadian writers in *The New Yorker* provides an ideal site for expanding our understanding of transnational cultural influence. Like Adams, this project is committed to "looking across, if not necessarily eroding, national borders" (28), in order to "reorient[t] the field of American Studies so that the United States is not always the central player" (27). I attempt to balance the competing perspectives of scholars of North American Studies and Canadian literary nationalists, not only by exploring U.S. contributions to the development of the Canadian short story, but also by making clear the contributions that Canadian literary figures have made in establishing the "*New Yorker* story" as a genre. I posit the relationship between the American institution of *The New Yorker*, and these Canadian short story writers as a reciprocal, collaborative one.

1.4 Collaborative Writing and Shifting Conceptions of Authorship

Thus, in addition to transnationalism and North American studies as an academic discipline, this project is also informed by, and explicitly concerned with, questions about how twentieth- and twenty-first-century North America has defined "authorship" in general, and its definitions and theorizations of "collaborative" authorship in particular. The concept of authorship as it is currently understood is a relatively recent one.³⁰ Jeffrey Masten in *Textual Intercourse*, for example, highlights the "collaborative texts produced" for the stage during the Early Modern period, which have a different relationship to "mechanisms of textual property and control, different conceptions of imitation, originality . . . from collaborations produced within the regime of the author" because they were created "before the emergence of authorship" in its current form as a concept (21). Thomas M. Inge writes that "The idea of establishing ownership of a text through signing it . . . [is] fairly recent" (624), and as Andrea Lunsford and Lisa Ede explain:

Scholars now understand—in theory, at least—that the notion of author (like that of the founding or sovereign subject on which it depends) is a peculiarly modern construct, one that can be traced back through multiple and overdetermined pathways to the development of modern capitalism and of intellectual property, to Western rationalism, and to patriarchy. Foucault's assertion that "[t]he coming into being of the notion of 'author' constitutes the privileged moment of individualization in the history of ideas, knowledge, literature, philosophy, and the sciences" no longer surprises (141). ("Collaboration and Concepts" 354)

³⁰ In her introduction to a collection that discusses the intersection of literature and culture and the legal aspects of intellectual property, Martha Woodmansee asserts that "the presence of the author figure," is "the central organizing concept in personalist copyright discourse" (8). Summarizing Peter Jaszi's analysis of the effect of postmodern literary and cultural theory upon jurisprudence, Woodmansee writes that "the 'romantic author' . . . has been central to most of the critical literature on copyright of the last two decades" (17). New technologies, however, including the "free software (FS) and open source (OS) movements" (5), are challenging our individualist conception of authorship, since they have "profoundly changed the conditions of possibility for collaborative production of knowledge and culture" (8).

Today, theories of collaborative writing, and the act of collaboration itself, challenge our modern conception of authorship as an individual act.

Textual studies scholars and their analyses of the material conditions under which "the collaboration of the author with the institutions of publishing" takes place greatly inform my broad definition of collaboration, or multiple authorship, in this project (McGann 3-4). The editorial interventions I explore range from the coercive to the cooperative, and from the stylistic to the structural and thematic. In each case, *The New Yorker's* editors contributed substantively to the linguistic texts of Callaghan, Gallant, and Munro's stories in ways that challenge rigid distinctions between authors and editors. At the same time, *The New Yorker* as a corporate entity and institution produced these authors' bibliographic texts in ways that shaped their reception by readers.

Holly Laird, like other scholars of collaboration whose work informs my own, focuses specifically on co-signed literary work in her analysis, but also admits that "Undisguised, cosigned literary coauthorships are, moreover, so rare as to be nearly invisible in the heftier nonacademic literary marketplace" (346). Unlike Laird and Lorraine York, my project is concerned with un-signed "collaborations" – those that York labels "implicit" collaboration, and that McGann, in *The Textual Condition*, refers to as "social text[s]" (21): "creative interventions by editors, publishers, and the like" (157).

The reason that I am concerned with what I consider "collaborative," "multiply-authored" or "social texts" that are specifically attributed to a single author is that these texts, in their various incarnations, provide greater insight into the political, artistic, and economic implications of the processes of literary production, especially across national borders. These unsigned co-authorships also help to reveal the constructed, historically contingent nature of our current concept of authorship. While much of the scholarship on collaboration addresses the notion of intimate partnership as a potentially subversive erotic creative engagement,³¹ my project is less concerned with the subversive power of

³¹ One of the first scholarly attempts to theorize collaborative writing was Wayne Koestenbaum's *Double Talk: The Erotics of Male Literary Collaboration* (1989). Since then, many scholars have focused on

collaboration between friends and lovers than it is with documenting the institutional frameworks within which "professional" collaboration between colleagues who are not friends, and have often never met, takes place. By delineating the contributions of editors, publishers and literary colleagues in *Multiple Authorship and the Myth of Solitary Genius*, for example, Jack Stillinger highlights the "collaborative authorship of writings that we routinely consider the work of a single author" (22). This act "challenges the traditional suppression or subordination of other hands in authorship" (Laird 348) and undermines the "myth" of the author as "solitary genius" (Stillinger 17). As an initial example of multiple authorship, Stillinger follows the "transmission and publication of Keats's poems" (vi), and "Sonnet to Sleep" in particular, to demonstrate that "a work may be the collaborative product of the nominal author and a friend, a spouse, a ghost, an agent, an editor, a translator, a publisher, a censor, a transcriber, a printer, or—what is more often the case—several of these acting together or in succession" (v). He suggests that although "Keats is always *thought* to have been the sole author" of "Sonnet to Sleep," he "actually . . . wrote only most of the words—not all of them—and in the course of

collaboration as heterosexual, homosexual, or homoerotic coupling between lovers or friends. In describing their collaborative relationships, York argues, collaborative writers have struggled "over finding apt metaphors for collective creativity" (4). "Michael Field relied upon the metaphor of the mosaic to describe their partnership," she continues, and "More recently, women collaborators have mused over an array of other possible metaphors: sibling relationship, erotic bond, mixed salad, stew, operatic duets, and much else besides" (York 4-5). These attempts to find new metaphors for their work also reveal explicitly collaborative writers' and their theorists' sense of the work they are doing as somehow new and politically progressive. As Laird explains:

Until the late 1980s, the question about collaboration was a question about methodology: how did writers collaborate, and how could the investigator sort out their contributions (a query that turned the collaboration into a matter of two writers writing individually, one better than the other)? In the late 1980s, a few scholars (inspired by changes within pedagogy and by feminism) began to seek alternative theories of collaboration and to see it as an alternative sociocultural practice. (347)

In *Writing Double: Women's Literary Partnerships*, Bette London espouses an idealized conception of collaboration as a "full and equal coauthorship" (9). York argues that, as the collaborative method has been adopted by, and associated with, feminists, analyses of this approach to writing have shifted from "deploring collaboration as degeneratively subversive to heralding it as revolutionary in its subversiveness" (9).

revision, transcription, and publication, the sonnet underwent numerous changes" (17). Stillinger identifies some of these numerous changes and how they might affect a reader's interpretation of each version of "Sonnet to Sleep." He performs similar analyses of other instances of multiple authorship, such as Ezra Pound's editorial influence upon, and pruning of, T.S. Eliot's *The Waste Land*, in order to demonstrate just how "common" this phenomenon of multiple authorship is (22).

The seventh chapter of Stillinger's book, "American Novels: Authors, Agents, Editors, Publishers," and its focus on "literature as commercial enterprise" (139), provides a model for my own approach to Callaghan's, Gallant's, and Munro's work and relationships with their editors at *The New Yorker*. Stillinger argues that the collaborative production of literature, especially popular literature, became a more frequent practice as the twentieth century progressed (139-40). He also identifies the practice of "self-effacement" in which two of Callaghan's editors, Harold Ross and Maxwell Perkins, participated. In his analyses of Grace Metalious's *Peyton Place* and Jacqueline Susann's *Valley of the Dolls*, Stillinger explores authors' potentially disparate reactions to the loss of authority over their texts to commercially-driven editors, a phenomenon I explore in my own discussions of the publication histories of Callaghan's and Gallant's stories and what Stillinger would call the "divided and even conflicting intentions" of the "multiple authors" that helped to shape them (Stillinger vi).

Inge argues that "Anytime another hand enters into an effort, a kind of collaboration occurs" (629), and that, while "The publishing process is not the same as a collaboration between two or more authors in the writing of a book . . . it is a collaboration that involves many people with various degrees of influence on the finished text" (625). While my definition of collaboration in this project is similar to Inge's, I do not consider the products of these collaborations as "finished" texts. Rather, like McGann does in *The Textual Condition* and John Bryant does in *The Fluid Text*, I see the stories of Callaghan, Gallant, and Munro as they were published in *The New Yorker* as specific iterations, or versions, of their stories among many available versions, each with its own historical, material and cultural contexts.

McGann explores the dimensions of texts that are altered by their transmission and are thus no longer, strictly speaking, the work of a singular author. He explains that "every part of the productive process is meaning-constitutive—so that we are compelled, if we want to understand a literary work, to examine it in all its multiple aspects" (33). These productive processes, or moments of transmission, include the "material conditions" (7) and "material negotiations" (3) that occur when a text is published: when or where a text is published or accessed, and by whom; the images or other texts (such as advertisements, artwork, prefaces or back cover copy) that surround it; decisions about what spelling or language to use; as well as substantive changes to the text that an editor might make. For McGann, texts are social:

As the process of textual transmission expands, whether vertically (i.e., over time), or horizontally (in institutional space), the signifying processes of the work become increasingly collaborative and socialized. . . . The point is that authors (and authorial intentions) do not govern those textual dimensions of a work which become most clearly present to us in bibliographical terms. (58)

This process-driven understanding of transmission suggests that "a 'text' is not a 'material thing' but a material event or set of events" (McGann 21). Because texts, for McGann, are historically situated, he is interested in the "histories of textual change and variance" (9) that accompany literary works in their various iterations and editions. He distinguishes between the linguistic elements of a text – the words the author (usually) chooses – and bibliographic ones – the material aspects of the publication of the text such as "the physical form of books and manuscripts (paper, ink, typefaces, layouts) or their prices, advertising mechanisms and distribution venues" (12). It is because of McGann's claim that "both linguistic and bibliographical texts are symbolic and signifying mechanisms," and that "Each generates meaning" (67) that I turn my attention to these material, paratextual, or bibliographical elements of *The New Yorker's* production of individual stories, especially in my discussion of Gallant.

Like Stillinger's, McGann's claims are based in the concrete rather than the abstract; he studies the "production, transmission, and reception histories" (46) of texts by

Dante Gabriel Rossetti, Ezra Pound, William Blake, Lord Byron, William Butler Yeats, and others. He cites, like Stillinger, examples of what he calls "the presence of other textual authorities" – editors, copy-editors, friends, influences – within the "linguistic codes" of a few texts, but McGann is more concerned with the meaning-making process that authors, readers, editors and others are involved in together when they make decisions about the production of the material text. "The most important 'collaboration' process" he writes, "is that which finds ways of marrying a linguistic to a bibliographical text" (60-61). Since, according to McGann, "the chief (but not sole) authority over the bibliographical text normally falls to the publishing institution within which an author is working" (66-67), editors play "collaborative" roles in the "productive process" (58) of literary texts.

In her analyses of collaborative processes of production in *Rethinking Women's Collaborative Writing*, York is concerned not with ranking and classifying collaborations, but rather with "observ[ing] their variable power dynamics and ideological positionings" (5). I too am concerned with the disparate possibilities for the power dynamic between author, editor, and the institution of *The New Yorker* that an exploration of the publication histories of the work of Callaghan, Gallant, and Munro reveals. Throughout this project I perform critical readings of the various versions of these authors' stories within each story's historical context. I use archival evidence such as letters between authors and editors, as well as principles from the field of textual studies, to theorize the ways that these power dynamics between authors, editors, and the publishing institution affect the meaning, presentation, and reception of these works. I use Pierre Bourdieu's definitions of the autonomous and heteronomous poles of a field, and his theorization of the relationship between symbolic, cultural and economic capital in order to make sense of the shifting relationships between these Canadian authors and the conditions of literary production. Like Bourdieu, I posit the act of publishing a literary work as an exchange of kinds of capital or power. Each author I explore offers a case study in a different way of negotiating these exchanges. Callaghan, for example, who wrote for *The New Yorker* throughout the Great Depression, needed economic capital to support his family. In order for *The New Yorker* to accept his stories, and in order to get paid for them, Callaghan had to move from the autonomous to the heteronomous pole; he exchanged his authorial

autonomy, or control over his own work – by allowing the magazine to make significant changes to his stories – for money.

Throughout this project, I demonstrate the ways that Canadian short story writers and *The New Yorker* negotiated disparate goals, values, and shifting power dynamics. I theorize how both conflicting and convergent institutional and economic dynamics between the author and editor play out in both the structure and ideologies of *New Yorker* short stories, and in those stories' relationships to nation and place. York writes of Henry James's 1893 short story "Collaboration": "James plays on the other sense of 'collaboration,' of treasonable cooperation with an enemy, in order to examine and critique the boundaries constructed to keep artists and nationalities hermetically sealed and, consequently, mutually misunderstood and suspect" (9). It is in this "other sense of 'collaboration,'" one that is rooted in national identity and militarism, that my foci on transnationalism and conceptions of North American Studies, and collaboration and the power dynamics at play in definitions of authorship, intersect. Aside from York, few theorists of collaborative writing have paid attention to the role of conflict in the creative process; instead, most theorists and authors, including Munro, idealize the collaborative process.³² In Chapter Three, I theorize the productive capacity of conflict for

³² York argues that, as the collaborative method has been adopted by, and associated with, feminists, analyses of this approach to writing have shifted from "deploring collaboration as degeneratively subversive to heralding it as revolutionary in its subversiveness" (9). Although Lunsford and Ede, in their analyses of hierarchical and dialogic modes of collaboration, suggest that they do not intend to establish a binary in which one method is preferable or more ethical than the other, they nonetheless highlight the fact that dialogic collaboration "can in some circumstances be deeply subversive. And because neither we nor our respondents had ready language with which to describe such an enterprise, because most who tried to describe it were women, and because it seemed so clearly 'other,' we think of this mode as predominantly feminine" (133). York critiques this approach in *Rethinking Women's Collaborative Writing*, arguing that collaboration, even between women, is not an inherently utopic, feminist practice. Rather, she argues: "the act of collaborating on texts does not in itself determine a specific or consistent ideological stance, feminist or any other" (3). In fact, York argues, Lunsford and Ede's approach holds "essentializing and fetishizing dangers" (17-18). In referring to her work with McGrath as "seamless," Munro, like Lunsford and Ede, appears to reproduce the tendency of co-authors to avoid acknowledging any conflict in their writing relationships that York identifies. In identifying the power dynamic between Munro and McGrath as dialogic relative to the relationships between Callaghan and Gallant and their editors, it is important not to idealize this dynamic, or dialogic collaboration in general, as a superior creative or social model. Instead, reading "The Turkey Season" through the lens of collaboration allows me to come to a more nuanced understanding of the author-editor relationship, the material contexts in which literary texts are produced, and how those material contexts influence their meaning.

collaboration through a military model in which Gallant's editor, whose American citizenship she highlights as different from her own, becomes her "ally."

Rather than differentiating between an author's original intentions and editorial interventions into those intentions, I aim to explore the implications of the differences between various versions of particular stories, whether published or in typescript form. Since short stories can be published in multiple forms and contexts, John Bryant's concept of "the fluid text" and Barbara Herrnstein Smith's theorization of the shifting purposes that individual literary works fulfill over time in *Contingencies of Value* help me to conceive of "the work as a dynamic process" rather than a finished product (Eggert 312). Bryant argues that different versions of a work are created by "the processes of authorial, editorial, and cultural revision" (9), and that these varying versions of a work, produced over time, often have different audiences. He focuses on validating each of these various versions of a work as evidence of the production process, or the role that historical and social forces have played in shaping the text of the work itself. Similarly, Herrnstein Smith focuses on the ways that historical and social forces affect not the words on the page, but rather our interpretations of those words, and which works we value, or canonize, in a given historical period. For Herrnstein Smith, even when the words of a text remain the same, their meaning and cultural function are historically contingent, and change with their audience. My aim in this project, then, is not to privilege one version – the "original" typescript of a work that is often perceived as the least "corrupted" expression of authorial intention – of a work over its others, but, rather, to uncover the dynamics of particular author-editor relationships by examining the shifting meanings, purposes, and political, economic, or aesthetic implications of versions of a work that have been shaped by more than one "hand." Throughout this project, then, I examine drafts of stories to determine the changes *New Yorker* editors made – with or without consultation – to these authors' stories; correspondence between authors and editors discussing these changes and reactions to them; and comments from authors and

editors in interviews and prefaces as they look back at the editing process from a distance. As I have discovered, these changes are often based on individual editors' sense of either the local or the national. I also analyze some of the paratextual elements of publication in *The New Yorker*: the advertisements that surround the stories, the ideologies those advertisements represent, and their interaction with the stories themselves; as well as the development of the concept of particular authors as *New Yorker* writers, the branding of these authors as such, and its effect on their reception in both Canada and the United States. Because of my dual aims of exploring the role of collaboration in shaping these short stories, and of inserting a discussion of Canada-U.S. relations into the current scholarship on North American studies,³³ my approach is largely comparative. "Contemporary literature in an age of globalization is, in many ways, a comparative literature," writes Rebecca L. Walkowitz in "The Location of Literature: The Transnational Book and the Migrant Writer"; "works circulate in several literary systems at once, and . . . need . . . to be read within several national traditions" (529). In exploring how these stories are circulated and received, I attempt to delineate how different audiences that are separated by space, culture, or history might read the various versions of these authors' texts.

³³ In the introduction to her 1981 *ECW* Special Issue on literary relations between Canada and the U.S., Ildikó de Papp Carrington uses the example of Joyce Carol Oates's dismissal of Canadian authors as "minor" talents to ask: "What do American authors and critics think of Canadian literature?" (6). Barbara Burkhardt's biography of one of Gallant's *New Yorker* editors – *William Maxwell: A Literary Life*—seems to answer this question. She writes of Maxwell reading from his own work at the Folger Shakespeare Library upon his acceptance of the PEN/Malamud award for achievement in short fiction:

It seemed to me that the past and future of *The New Yorker*, perhaps that of American short fiction generally, had met on stage that night. The evening was filled with appreciation for two superb writers [fellow honoree Stuart Dybek and Maxwell himself] whose work, though poles apart on many fronts, preserves part of our shared American experience. (5)

Burkhardt's monograph explores Maxwell's editing relationship with several *New Yorker* writers from John Updike and J.D. Salinger to Vladimir Nabokov, but Gallant, one of the most prolific contributors to the magazine's fiction section in history, but a Canadian, is not mentioned at all. Burkhardt's book provides a tangible example of why continued study of the intersections between Canadian and American literature, and the reception of Canadian literature within the U.S., is so necessary; scholarship on *The New Yorker* continues to be limited by national boundaries.

1.5 Morley Callaghan, Mavis Gallant, and Alice Munro in *The New Yorker*

Callaghan, Gallant, and Munro are not the only Canadian short story writers to have published in *The New Yorker*. Other contributors include Stephen Leacock, Margaret Atwood and, more recently, David Bezmozgis. I have chosen to focus on these particular authors for several reasons, both practical and theoretical. These three authors have had long careers with *The New Yorker*, and published more work with the magazine than other Canadian authors. Barry Callaghan's collection *The New Yorker Stories* records twenty-one Callaghan stories that the magazine published, most of which appeared during the 1930s. *The New Yorker* published over 100 stories by Gallant between the 1950s and her death in 2014, and has published nearly 60 stories by Munro since the 1970s (Overbey; Beran 204-5). These decades-long relationships with *The New Yorker* have left a wealth of archival material, allowing me to track the development of these contributors as writers, and the changing nature of their relationships with *New Yorker* editors over time. I have made an effort throughout this project to ground my arguments in original research of the primary documents from these archives, including typescripts of stories as Callaghan, Gallant and Munro initially submitted them, galleys and authors' proofs containing editors' comments and changes, and correspondence between these authors and their editors, whenever possible. The Callaghan records are located in Ottawa at Library and Archives Canada. The Thomas Fisher Rare Book Library at the University of Toronto houses the Mavis Gallant archives, and the Alice Munro Papers are located within the Special Collections Division of the University of Calgary Library. In addition to visiting the archives of each individual author, I also used the New York Public Library's *The New Yorker* Records from the Manuscripts and Archives Division to access correspondence not included in individual author archives, and historical records about marketing and editorial policies and practices at *The New Yorker* itself. Although several scholars, including Carol L. Beran, Joanne McCaig and Thacker have already studied Munro's archives extensively and written about their contents, few scholars have commented about what the Callaghan and Gallant archives reveal about those authors' work. This project functions not only to make claims for each individual author's relationship to transnational politics and the power dynamics between author and editor,

but also contributes to future scholarship about these individual authors by bringing to light the more-or-less unexplored contents of the Callaghan and Gallant fonds.

In addition to this practical reason for choosing these particular authors to study, the careers of Callaghan, Gallant and Munro represent different moments in *The New Yorker's* long history, a variety of ways that Canadian authors might relate to concepts of place and nation, and a diverse range of relationships with the magazine and its editors. Collectively, the chapters of my dissertation offer a literary history of Canadian authors in *The New Yorker*. Chapter Two demonstrates the role Callaghan played in negotiating the tone of the *New Yorker* short story. Having published with *The New Yorker* in the late 1920s and throughout the 1930s, Callaghan's work is positioned at an ideal historical moment at which to begin an analysis of Canadian writers' contributions to the magazine: the point at which it first began to publish "serious" fiction and the "Canadian short story" was also moving away from the rural and towards depictions of urban life (Knister xi). Callaghan was, in fact, one of the first authors to publish short fiction in *The New Yorker*, and was specifically sought out by editor Katharine Angell, who was soliciting new work for the magazine (Yagoda 53). Gallant's literary career began with *The New Yorker* in the 1950s, when the magazine was at its zenith, and when, in a post-World-War-II world, the magazine's ideological perspective became more left-leaning, and the magazine's "imaginary map of Manhattan" that dictated possible settings for the stories it published began to be less strictly enforced (Yagoda 220). Munro, on the other hand, hit her stride with the magazine during the early 1980s, a period during which the magazine was undergoing a significant transition away from its reputation for the "puritan" censorship of "naughty words" – an editorial shift that I argue Munro's depictions of bodies and sexuality played a role in encouraging (Yagoda 100-01).

In addition to representing important moments in the history and development of the magazine, these particular authors also embody a variety of the ways in which conceptions of nation and national identity have informed Canadian writers' contributions to *The New Yorker*. Callaghan, in contrast to *The New Yorker* at this period, took a "cosmopolitan" approach to literature, and the settings for his stories, according to Thacker and several other scholars, were "vague, North American rather than explicitly

Canadian"("Canadian Literature's America" 132).³⁴ Lynch credits him with "mov[ing] the modern Canadian short story into an urban setting" ("Introduction" 5). Significantly influenced by Ernest Hemingway, Callaghan, with his "spare" style (Lynch "Introduction" 2), unsurprisingly identified more closely with cosmopolitanism and the U.S. than he did with his literary predecessors concerned with small town life and rural settings such as Horatio Gilbert Parker, Duncan Campbell Scott, Stephen Leacock, and Charles G.D. Roberts. As Gary Boire explains:

On the one hand Callaghan was resolutely international, hostile to what he saw as misguided definitions based solely on nationality. He stated bluntly in *That Summer in Paris*, "[Toronto] was a very British city. I was intensely North American. . . . Physically . . . I was wonderfully at home in my native city, and yet intellectually, spiritually, the part that had to do with my wanting to be a writer was utterly, but splendidly and happily, alien." (1-2)

Unlike Munro or Gallant, Callaghan willingly assimilated himself into American literary culture, calling himself an "American" writer and emphasizing the cultural similarities between Canada and the U.S. (Boire 8).

Gallant, a Canadian expatriate who lived in Paris from the 1950s on but retained her Canadian citizenship, resisted labeling of her work as Canadian, and actively critiqued nationalism in all its forms, whether Canadian or American ("The Writer in the State"). Many of her stories are set in either Montreal or Europe, and concern the fates of refugees, exiles and the displaced after the Second World War. Finally, Munro's stories set in rural Ontario shed light on *The New Yorker's* shifting approach to regionalist fiction. *The New Yorker* has had a complex relationship with "regional" fiction. The

³⁴ Controversial critic and writer Stephen Henighan, for example, in his lamentation of globalization's effect on the quality of Canadian literature that gets published, has written that "Prominent among the lessons Canadian writers can learn from Latin American fiction is that if the place you know best is not somewhere famous your writing is most likely to flourish when you immerse yourself in the particular details of your own time and space, rather than pretending, like Morley Callaghan, that your characters live in 'the city'" (Henighan 79).

magazine once known for only publishing fiction set in locations to which a "New Yorker" might travel rejected "regional" fiction altogether until after the end of the Second World War, but later sought it out specifically, and framed it in ways that emphasize its rural setting by, for example, consistently requesting that Munro "peg" her stories, or "specify the . . . setting . . . for an audience likely to assume a setting south of the border unless otherwise informed" (Beran 205). In comparison with Callaghan and Gallant, Munro more explicitly identifies her work as Canadian and shaped by her rural Canadian upbringing; however, she has deliberately avoided participating in, or becoming indirectly complicit in, nationalist campaigns that promote Canadian literature for its own sake. In so doing, Munro actively refuses readings that suggest that her position as a Canadian within the U.S. literary establishment is a marginal one.

Finally, the archival evidence for each of these three authors reveals a different social and artistic relationship with *The New Yorker*, and each author therefore participates in a different model of editorial influence, multiple authorship, or collaboration. Callaghan's relationship with his editors appears to have been a mercenary one, in which he and *The New Yorker* exchanged symbolic capital for economic capital. As an established modernist, Callaghan first extended his own symbolic capital to *The New Yorker* through his association with it, and, in exchange, the magazine granted him a degree of artistic autonomy. As the Great Depression continued, *The New Yorker* established a reputation for itself as a publisher of fiction, and Callaghan experienced a period of artistic drought. He became more and more willing to alter stories in the ways that his editors demanded – even if he disagreed with the changes – in order to sell a story to support his family, and to rebuild his own reputation as a writer through association with *The New Yorker*.

Gallant was much more protective of her artistic autonomy than Callaghan was and feared *The New Yorker's* editorial influence even before she began publishing with the magazine. She often argued with her editors over the changes to her work that they suggested. The nationalist tensions evident in Gallant's relationships with *New Yorker* editors were based on misconceptions about cultural differences between Canada, the

U.S., and France, and have shaped the reception of her work through their influence on the form and content of the stories themselves, and through the conscious pairing of her stories, which invoke an anti-bourgeois, anti-imperial ethos, with advertisements for products and services devoted to "upscale urbanity" (Yagoda 13). York identifies "a strong tendency to celebrate women's collaborations unproblematically and idealistically" (6). I use the example of Gallant in order to theorize a model of collaboration that takes into account conflict, difference, and disagreement. Like York, I believe that "difference and disagreement [can] strengthen rather than disable collaboration" (5). Unlike York, however, who studies co-signed, explicitly collaborative works, my study of Gallant must also take the institutional authority of *The New Yorker*, and its power to coerce rather than merely influence contributors, into account.

Finally, I read Munro's relationship with one *New Yorker* editor in particular, Charles McGrath, as a genuinely dialogic collaboration. Although this reading risks idealizing collaboration, the dynamic between McGrath and Munro, and his influence on the structure and style of her work, appears to exceed the boundaries of a traditional author-editor relationship. Instead, I posit the stories produced by this relationship as the products of artistic negotiation and exchange rather than coercion, conflict, or economic incentive.

...

An analysis of Canadian writers in the *New Yorker* provides an ideal site for expanding our understanding of transnational relations of literary production and transnational cultural influence in general, as well as the creative process and the contemporary, shifting understanding of the concept of authorship. Until now, no studies have attempted to delineate the nature and significance of transnational exchange in the development of the Canadian contemporary short story. By conducting archival research into typescripts and correspondence between Gallant, Munro and Callaghan and their editors, my project not only traces the contributions of three major Canadian authors to the *New Yorker*, but also extends scholars' understanding of the ways in which the development of Canadian literature as a whole has exceeded traditions of rigid nationalism. Exploring Munro's

relationship with *The New Yorker* alongside the work of Callaghan and Gallant offers a perspective that the individual essays of other critics, such as Thacker and Beran – who have already written about Munro's relationship with *The New Yorker* – cannot.

Positioning Munro's work within the broader context of the history of *The New Yorker* in general, the work of other Canadian short story writers who wrote for the magazine, and theories of collaboration and transnationalism offers an example of a more nuanced approach to North American studies that moves the study of Canadian literature beyond the *merely* nationalist, without abandoning a sense of the national altogether.

Works Cited

- Adams, Rachel. *Continental Divides: Remapping the Cultures of North America*. Chicago: U Chicago P, 2009. Web. 26 Feb. 2014.
- Adams, Rachel, and Sarah Phillips Casteel. "Introduction: Canada and the Americas." *Comparative American Studies* 3.1 (2005): 5-13. Print.
- Alice Munro – Facts. *Nobelprize.org*. Nobel Media AB 2013. Web. 26 Feb. 2014.
- The Alice Munro Papers. Special Collections Division, U of Calgary Library.
- Baker, Ray Palmer. *A History of English-Canadian Literature to the Confederation: Its Relation to the Literature of Great Britain and the United States*. 1920. New York: Russell & Russell, 1968. Print.
- Bean, Lydia, Marco Gonzalez, and Jason Kaufman. "Why Doesn't Canada Have an American-Style Christian Right? A Comparative Framework for Analyzing the Political Effects of Evangelical Subcultural Identity." *Canadian Journal of Sociology* 33.4 (2008): 899-943. Web.
- Beran, Carol L. "The Luxury of Excellence: Alice Munro in the *New Yorker*." *The Rest of the Story: Critical Essays on Alice Munro*. Ed. Robert Thacker. Toronto: ECW, 1999. 204-232. Print.
- Boire, Gary. *Morley Callaghan and his Works*. Toronto: ECW, 1991. Print.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. *The Field of Cultural Production: Essays on Art and Literature*. Ed. Randal Johnson. New York: Columbia UP, 1993. Print.
- Brown, Robert Craig. "National Policy." *The Canadian Encyclopedia*. Historica Canada, 2014. Web. 11 July 2014.
- Brown, E.K. "Canadian Poetry." *Contexts of Canadian Criticism: A Collection of Critical Essays*. Ed. Eli Mandel. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1971. 29-47. Print.

- Bryant, John L. *The Fluid Text: A Theory of Revision and Editing for Book and Screen*. Ann Arbor: U Michigan P, 2002. Print.
- Burkhardt, Barbara. *William Maxwell: A Literary Life*. Chicago: U of Illinois P, 2005. Print.
- Burns, Robin. "Thomas D'Arcy McGee." *The Canadian Encyclopedia*. Historica Canada, 2013. Web. 11 July 2014.
- Callaghan, Barry. "Preface." *The New Yorker Stories*. Holstein, ON: Exile Editions, 2008. ix-xii. Print.
- Callaghan, Morley. *The New Yorker Stories*. Toronto: Exile Editions, 2001. Print.
- . *That Summer in Paris: Memories of Tangled Friendships with Hemingway, Fitzgerald and Some Others*. New York: Coward-McCann, 1963. Print.
- Campbell, Wanda. "Of Kings and Cabbages: Short Stories by Early Canadian Women." *Dominant Impressions: Essays on the Canadian Short Story*. Ed. Gerald Lynch and Angela Arnold Robbeson. Ottawa: U of Ottawa P, 1999. 17-26. Print.
- Carrington, Ildikó de Papp. "Introduction." *Canadian-American Literary Relations*. Special issue of *Essays on Canadian Writing*. Eds. Ildikó de Papp Carrington and Jack David. 22 (1981): 1-168. Print.
- Corse, Sarah M. *Nationalism and Literature: The Politics of Culture in Canada and the United States*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1997. Print.
- Cortázar, Julio. "Some Aspects of the Short Story." *The New Short Story Theories*. Ed. Charles E. May. Athens: Ohio UP, 1994. 245-255. Print.
- Cox, Ailsa, ed. "Introduction." *Teaching the Short Story*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011. 1-12. Print.
- Douglas, George H. *The Smart Magazines: 50 Years of Literary Revelry and High Jinks at Vanity Fair, The New Yorker, Life, Esquire and The Smart Set*. Hamden:

Archon Books, 1991. Print.

Ede, Lisa and Andrea Lunsford. "Collaboration and Concepts of Authorship." *PMLA* 116.3 (May 2001): 354-369. Print.

---. *Singular Texts/Plural Authors: Perspectives on Collaborative Writing*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1990. Print.

Eggert, Paul. "Making Sense of Multiple Authorship." *Text: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Textual Studies* 8 (1995): 305-323. Print.

Éjxenbaum, B.M. "O. Henry and the Theory of the Short Story." *The New Short Story Theories*. Ed. Charles E. May. Athens: Ohio UP, 1994. 81-88. Print.

Fein, Seth. "Everyday Forms of Transnational Collaboration: U. S. Film Propaganda in Cold War Mexico." *Close Encounters of Empire: Writing the Cultural History of U.S.-Latin American Relations*. Eds. Joseph M. Gilbert *et al.* Durham, NC: Duke UP, 1998. 400-450. Print.

---. "Transnationalism and Cultural Collaboration: Mexican Film Propaganda During World War II." *Studies in Latin American Popular Culture*. 17 (1998): 105-128. Web.

Fogel, Stanley. *A Tale of Two Countries: Contemporary Fiction in English Canada and the United States*. Toronto: ECW, 1984. Print.

Frank, Armin Paul. "Introduction: Towards a Model of an International History of American Literatures." *Do the Americas Have a Common Literary History?* Ed. Barbara Buchenau and Annette Paatz. New York: Peter Lang, 2002. 13-22. Print.

Gallant, Mavis. *Home Truths: Selected Canadian Stories*. Toronto: MacMillan, 1981. Print.

---. "Preface." *The Selected Stories of Mavis Gallant*. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart,

1996. IX-XIX. Print.

---. "The Writer in the State." *Queen's Quarterly*. 99.1 (Spring 1992): 91-104. Print.

Gilmour, David. "David Gilmour: 'There isn't a racist or sexist bone in my body.'"

Interview by Mark Medley. *National Post*. 25 September, 2013. Web. 26 Feb.

2014.

---. "The Gilmour Transcript." Interview by Emily M. Keeler. *Random House of Canada*.

25 September, 2013. Web. 26 Feb. 2014.

Gordimer, Nadine. "The Flash of Fireflies." *The New Short Story Theories*. Ed. Charles

E. May. Athens: Ohio UP, 1994. 263-267. Print.

Grant, Grant, George. *Lament for a Nation: The Defeat of Canadian Nationalism*. 40th

Anniversary Edition. McGill-Queen's UP, 2005. Print.

Gundy, H. Pearson. "Literary Publishing." *The Literary History of Canada*. Ed. Carl F.

Klinck. Vol. 1, 1976-1990. 188-202. Print.

Henighan, Stephen. *When Words Deny the World: The Reshaping of Canadian Writing*.

Erin: The Porcupine's Quill, 2002. Print.

Herrnstein Smith, Barbara. *Contingencies of Value: Alternative Perspectives for Critical*

Theory. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard UP, 1988. Print.

History of the Book in Canada. Ed. Patricia Lockhart Fleming and Yvan Lamonde.

Toronto: U of Toronto P, 2004-2007. Print.

Inge, M. Thomas. "Collaboration and Concepts of Authorship." *PMLA* 116.3 (May

2001): 623-30. Web.

Jackel, David. "Short Fiction." *The Literary History of Canada*. Carl F. Klinck, ed. Vol.

4, 1976-1990. 46-72. Print.

Jaszi, Peter. "Is there Such a Thing as Postmodern Copyright?" *Making and Unmaking*

Intellectual Property: Creative Production in Legal and Cultural Perspective. Ed.

Mario Biagioli, Peter Jaszi, and Martha Woodmansee. Chicago: U Chicago P, 2011. 413-428. Print.

Koestenbaum, Wayne. *Double Talk: The Erotics of Male Literary Collaboration*. New York: Routledge, 1989. Print.

Knister, Raymond. *Canadian Short Stories*. Toronto: Macmillan, 1928. Print.

Laird, Holly. "'A Hand Spills from the Book's Threshold': Coauthorship's Readers." *PMLA* 116.2 (2001): 344-353. Web.

Lenz, Gunter H. "Towards a Dialogics of International American Culture Studies: Transnationality, Border Discourses, and Public Culture(s)." *The Futures of American Studies*. Ed. Donald E. Pease and Robyn Wiegman. Durham: Duke UP, 2002. 461-485. Print.

Leung, Marlene. "Alice Munro wins Nobel Prize in literature: 'A master of the short story'". *CTVNews.ca*. 10 October, 2013. Web. 26 February, 2014.

London, Bette. *Writing Double: Women's Literary Partnerships*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1999. Print.

Lynch, Gerald, and Angela Arnold Robbeson. "Introduction" *Dominant Impressions: essays on the Canadian Short Story*. Ed. Gerald Lynch and Angela Arnold Robbeson. Ottawa: U of Ottawa P, 1999. 1-8. Print.

MacLeod, Alistair. "The Windsor Printmaker's Forum National Touring Exhibition: *Sense of Place*." Western University, London, ON. 30 Jan. 2011. Reading.

Masten, Jeffrey. *Textual Intercourse: Collaboration, Authorship, and Sexualities in Renaissance Drama*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1997. Print.

Mavis Gallant Fonds. MS Coll 189 Thomas Fisher Rare Book Library, U of Toronto.

May, Charles E. "The American Short Story in the Twenty-First Century." *Short Story Theories: A Twenty-First Century Perspective*. Ed. Viorica Patea. New York:

- Rodopi, 2012. 299-324. Print.
- . "Introduction." *The New Short Story Theories*. Ed. Charles May. Athens: Ohio UP, 1994. xv-xxvi. Print.
- . "The Nature of Knowledge in Short Fiction." *The New Short Story Theories*. Ed. Charles May. Athens: Ohio UP, 1994. 131-143.
- McCaig, Joann. "Alice Munro's Agency: The Virginia Barber Correspondence, 1976-1983." *The Rest of the Story: Critical Essays on Alice Munro*. Ed. Robert Thacker. Toronto: ECW, 1999. 81-102. Print.
- . *Reading In: Alice Munro's Archives*. Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier UP, 2002. Print.
- McGann, Jerome J. *The Textual Condition*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton UP, 1991.
- Meindl, Dieter. "Modernism and the English Canadian Short Story Cycle." *Recherches anglaises et nord-américaines: RANAM*. 20(1987): 17-22.
- Metcalf, John. "Canada's Successful Writers Must Rely on Blessings from the US. First." *National Post* 17 June, 2000: E4-5. Web. 19 Aug. 2010.
- Miller, Laura. "The Last Word; Long Story Short." *The New York Times*. Nov. 2, 2003. Web. 17 Sept. 2007.
- Morley Callaghan Fonds, MG 30 D365, Library and Archives Canada, Ottawa.
- Mount, Nick. *When Canadian Literature Moved to New York*. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 2005. Print.
- Munro, Alice. "The Bear Came Over the Mountain." *The New Yorker*. 21 October, 2013. Web. 27 February, 2014.
- . "Introduction." *Selected Stories*. Toronto: Penguin, 1998. ix-xvii. Print.
- . "Telephone Interview with Alice Munro." By Adam Smith. *Nobelprize.org*. 10 October, 2013. Web. 26 February, 2014.

- The New Yorker* Records, Humanities and Social Sciences Library, Manuscripts and Archives Division, New York Public Library.
- Overbey, Erin: Deputy Head of Library *The New Yorker* Magazine. "re: doctoral research on Canadian writers in the New Yorker." Email to Nadine Fladd 19 Sept. 2007.
- Parker, George L. *The Beginnings of the Book Trade in Canada*. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1985. Print.
- Patea, Viorica. "The Short Story: An Overview of the History and Evolution of the Genre." *Short Story Theories: A Twenty-First Century Perspective*. Ed. Viorica Patea. New York: Rodopi, 2012. 1-24.
- Pease, Donald E. and Robyn Wiegman, eds. "Futures." *The Futures of American Studies*. Durham: Duke UP, 2002. Print.
- Poe, Edgar Allan. Review of *Twice-Told Tales*. *Short Story Theories*. Ed. Charles E. May. Athens: Ohio UP, 1976. 45-51. Print.
- Pratt, Mary Louise. "The Short Story: The Long and the Short of It." *The New Short Story Theories*. Ed. Charles E. May. Athens: Ohio UP, 1994. 91-113. Print.
- "Q Essay: Alice Munro, Nobel Laureate." *CBC Radio*. 10 October, 2013. Web. 26 February, 2014.
- Rowe, John Carlos. *The New American Studies*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota Press, 2002. Print.
- . "Postnationalism, Globalism, and the New American Studies." *The Futures of American Studies*. Ed. Donald E. Pease and Robyn Wiegman. Durham: Duke UP, 2002. 167-182. Print.
- Sadowski-Smith, Claudia. *Border Fictions: Globalization, Empire, and Writing at the Boundaries of the United States*. Charlottesville: U of Virginia P, 2008. Print.

- Schaub, Danielle. "Mavis Gallant's Irony and its Destabilizing Double Edge: Translating the Exile's Experience." *Varieties of Exile: New Essays on Mavis Gallant*. Eds. Nicole and Peter Sabor. New York: Peter Lang, 2002. 13-36. Print.
- Siemerling, Winfried. *The New North American Studies: Culture, Writing and the Politics of Re/cognition*. New York: Routledge, 2005. Print.
- Smith, Allan. "The Continental Dimension in the Evolution of the English-Canadian Mind." *Canada: An American Nation?* Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's UP, 1994. 40-64. Print.
- Stillinger, Jack. *Multiple Authorship and the Myth of Solitary Genius*. New York: Oxford UP, 1991. Print.
- Stingone, William. Finding Aid. The New Yorker Records. The New York Public Library, Humanities and Social Sciences Library, Manuscript and Archives Division. 1996. Web.
- Szeman, Imre. *Zones of Instability: Literature, Postcolonialism, and the Nation*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2003. Kindle file.
- Thacker, Robert. "Alice Munro and the Anxiety of American Influence." *Context North America: Canadian / U.S. Literary Relations*. Ed. Camille La Bossière. Ottawa: U of Ottawa P, 1994. 133-144. Print.
- . *Alice Munro: Writing Her Lives: A Biography*. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 2005. Print.
- . "Alice Munro's Willa Cather." *Canadian Literature*. 134 (1992): 42-47. Web. 13 May 2013.
- . "Canadian Literature's 'America.'" *Essays on Canadian Writing* 71 (2000): 128-39. Print.
- . "Gazing Through the One-Way Mirror: English-Canadian Literature and the American Presence." *Colby Quarterly* 29.2 (1993): 74-87. Print.

- . "Go Ask Alice: The Progress of Munro Criticism." *Journal of Canadian Studies/Revue d'Etudes Canadiennes* 26.2(1991): 156-70. Print.
- Traister, Bryce. "Risking Nationalism: NAFTA and the Limits of the New American Studies." *Canadian Review of American Studies/Revue canadienne d'etudes américaines* 27.3 (1997): 191-204. Print.
- Treisman, Deborah. "Editing Alice Munro." *The New Yorker*. 10 October, 2013. Web. 26 Feb. 2014.
- . "re: doctoral research on Canadian writers in the New Yorker." Email to Nadine Fladd 20 Sept. 2007.
- Walkowitz, Rebecca L. "The Location of Literature: The Transnational Book and the Migrant Writer." *Contemporary Literature* 47.4 (2006): 527-545.
- Whitaker, Reg. "Revolutionaries out of Ontario: The Mike Harris Government and Canada." *A Passion for Identity: Canadian Studies for the 21st Century*. Ed. David Taras and Beverly Rasporich. Scarborough: Nelson Thomson Learning, 2001. 355-373. Print.
- Woodmansee, Martha. "Introduction. *Making and Unmaking Intellectual Property: Creative Production in Legal and Cultural Perspective*. Ed. Mario Biagioli, Peter Jaszi, and Martha Woodmansee. Chicago: U Chicago P, 2011. 1-24. Print.
- Yagoda, Ben. *About Town: The New Yorker and the World It Made*. New York: Scribner, 2000. Print.
- York, Lorraine. *Rethinking Women's Collaborative Writing: Power, Difference, Property*. Toronto: U Toronto P, 2002. Print.

Chapter 2

2 Morley Callaghan as Literary "Heavyweight": Modernism and Contingencies of Cultural Value

In *On Being a Maritime Writer*, Hugh MacLennan, a modernist, Canadian contemporary of Morley Callaghan, looks back on the effect that writing about Canadian subject matter had on the commercial success of his novel *Barometer Rising* about the 1917 explosion of the French cargo ship the SS Mont-Blanc in the Halifax harbor: "...I was not as successful as I might have been. American reviews were good, but didn't sell many copies. In England, it became a Book Society choice . . . but in wartime the shortage of paper limited the sale to 15,000 copies and wartime taxes were confiscatory."

MacLennan met a Hollywood agent for lunch at the Ritz in New York to discuss the possibility of adapting *Barometer Rising* for film.³⁵ Unfortunately, the agent told him that although the novel had merit, Paramount would not be turning it into a movie. "You see," the agent explained, "That Halifax thing kills it. We tried to work a switcheroo onto the Johnstown Flood, but that happened long ago and who'd care?" MacLennan responded by suggesting that where a story is set should not make a difference if the story itself is good, to which the agent replied, "It shouldn't make any difference. Only it does. Let's put it this way. Boy meets girl in Paris, France—that's great. Boy meets girl in New York – not so good but good enough. But boy meets girl in Winnipeg and who cares?" (MacLennan 22-3).

This anecdote highlights several of the issues that this chapter will address through an analysis of Morley Callaghan's career, his oeuvre, his relationship with *The New Yorker*, and his current place in the Canadian literary canon. The story highlights the fact that literature, like film, is an industry in which what Pierre Bourdieu calls the

³⁵ The first U.K. edition of *Barometer Rising* was published in 1942; presumably, the meeting MacLennan describes took place within the first few years after the novel's publication.

cultural agent –whether producer or publisher—is forced to judge not just the aesthetic merit of a (potential) film or literary work, but also its economic potential. He or she must determine whether or not the work is marketable to a large enough audience in order to justify the publisher or film studio's investment of time, effort, and money. In the case of Callaghan, as in the case of MacLennan, the question of marketability was often couched in geographic terms that were marked by a tension between the cosmopolitan and the local (or in some cases, the parochial). Just as MacLennan's agent suggests the change in location of the Halifax explosion since Canadian locations such as Halifax and Winnipeg would not appeal to a U.S. audience, Callaghan's editors at *The New Yorker* frequently asked him to change his short stories, often set in Toronto or a North-American "every city," to reflect a specifically New York locale, effectively constraining Callaghan's commitment to modernism and its sense of the cosmopolitan North American metropolitan centre.

MacLennan's reference to the shortage of paper during the Second World War and its effect on sales of *Barometer Rising* demonstrates the economic realities of the book industry that, in its attempts to sell cultural products for profit, is affected by historical events and shifts in economic markets. The Great Depression, another significant historical, social and financial event, coincided with Callaghan's most productive time at *The New Yorker*. The *New Yorker* years – 1928-1938 – mark what many critics consider the zenith of Callaghan's literary career, but it was a "peak" that was followed by a sharp decline (Sutherland 10). As Brandon Conron explains: "[f]rom the late 'thirties until the late 'forties Callaghan's creative energy flagged under the depressing influence of the Spanish Civil War, Italy's annexation of Ethiopia, and the outbreak of World War II" (8).

Callaghan (1903-1990) was born and grew up in Toronto, where he first met Ernest Hemingway while they were both working at the *Toronto Star* in the 1920s. The New York publisher Scribner's published his first novel, *Strange Fugitive*, in 1928, the same year that he graduated from Osgoode Hall law school and published his first *New Yorker* story, "An Escapade." In 1929, he married Loretto Dee, with whom he had two sons, Michael (b. 1931) and Barry (b. 1937), and published his second book, the

collection of stories *Strange Fugitive*. Morley and Loretto also travelled to Paris in 1929, where they lived for less than a year. Unlike Mavis Gallant's stories, which were nearly always accepted by *The New Yorker*, Callaghan's stories were rejected as often as they were accepted. Callaghan published stories in *The New Yorker* consistently from 1928 to 1938, but beginning in 1935 and 1936, the magazine began to reject more stories than it accepted. Callaghan published his last *New Yorker* story, "The White Pony," in 1938, but he consistently submitted work to the magazine – which it rejected – from 1939 to 1945, submitting his last story as late as 1959.³⁶ *The New Yorker* helped Callaghan to make ends meet and support his family financially throughout the Great Depression, but the relationship between Callaghan, *The New Yorker*, and the Depression can be triangulated in ideological and artistic as well as economic terms. As the publication history of the short story "Timothy Harshaw's Flute" (1934) will demonstrate, Callaghan and his editors at a magazine known for "upscale urbanity" (Yagoda 13) and often accused of ignoring the Depression as it was happening, were forced to negotiate differing conceptions about how this historical event ought to be represented within the pages of the magazine.

Finally, when the agent MacLennan met told him "We tried to work a switcheroo onto the Johnstown Flood, but that happened long ago and who'd care?" he demonstrated that the passage of time changes an audience's perception of and relationship to historical events. By reading Callaghan's stories as they were published in the 1920s and 30s alongside the 2001 Exile Editions collection of *The New Yorker Stories*, it becomes evident that, as Barbara Herrnstein Smith argues, a work's "meaning" is "constantly variable and eternally indeterminate;" in short, even when the words of a text remain the same, their meaning is historically contingent, and changes with its audience (*Contingencies* 9). In the case of *Barometer Rising*, the Hollywood agent considered rectifying an imagined audience's lack of connection to the novel's geographical context by "re-writing" history, by applying the story to a different historical event to which

³⁶ See C.M. Newman's July 15, 1959 letter to Don Congdon rejecting Callaghan's story "Come Home, Stan, Come Home."

audiences would have a stronger geographical connection. He concludes, however, that this approach will not work because the historical event he suggests substituting for the Halifax Explosion happened so long ago that the imagined audience would not have a sufficient historical connection to it. Morley Callaghan and his son, Barry, publisher of the Exile Editions collection *The New Yorker Stories*, also attempted to rewrite history in order to negotiate a 2001 audience's current conception of modernism and its different relationship to Callaghan's 1930s stories. In this case, however, unlike in Herrnstein Smith's examples of varying, historically contingent interpretations of Shakespeare's sonnets, both the meaning *and* the text of the stories change.

Throughout this chapter, Herrnstein Smith's conception of "contingencies," combined with John Bryant's notion of the fluid text will inform my readings of the various historically-situated "versions" of a handful of Callaghan's short stories. Rather than evaluating Callaghan's stories as singular, unified products of a "solitary genius," like Jack Stillinger does in *Multiple Authorship and the Myth of Solitary Genius*, I will demonstrate the ways in which Callaghan's published works are the product of willing collaboration with multiple "authors": his editors at *The New Yorker* and his son, Barry. Readings of Callaghan's work, and the versions of that work to which current readers have access, are not merely historically contingent; this chapter will demonstrate that the versions of stories that were published are also the result of geographic and economic contingencies, most of which were produced by Callaghan's collaboration with *The New Yorker*. Through a close reading of the production history of the stories "Timothy Harshaw's Flute" (1934), "An Escapade" (1928), "Silk Stockings" (1932) and "The White Pony" (1938), I will demonstrate how Callaghan and his editors negotiated these historical, economic, and geographic contingencies, and the shifting power dynamics between author and editors through the exchanging back and forth of what Bourdieu describes in *The Field of Cultural Production* as symbolic capital and economic capital.

2.1 Revis(it)ing Modernism: *The New Yorker Stories* as fluid texts

Using the theories of Stillinger, Bryant and Jerome McGann of the social text, collaboration and the fluid text, I will begin my analysis of the role that historical contingencies play in the reading of Callaghan's work by arguing that he has had a shifting relationship to both the modernist aesthetic and the history of modernism, and his work still does in the twenty-first century. The finding aid for *The New Yorker Records* at the New York Public library states of the editorial process that contributors to the magazine went through – "After the writer wrote the first draft he or she collaborated with an editor (by letter or more often in person) in line-by-line revision" (vi) – and claims that, "because many of these writers' stories and articles first appeared in the *New Yorker*, the magazine's editorial process greatly informed the final versions of their work" (ix). In the case of Callaghan, however, the versions published in *The New Yorker* were not always final versions. Callaghan's oeuvre, and the mythology around Callaghan as a writer, have been revised over time, even posthumously. These revisions have resulted in a series of fluid texts – various versions of Callaghan's stories, and various interpretations of his persona as a writer and his role in the American modernist movement in Paris.

The 1963 memoir *That Summer in Paris* offers Callaghan's own, public version of the events in Paris in the 1920s. It reveals Callaghan's desire to revise, or offer an alternative (and from his perspective more accurate) account of his mythologized relationship with Hemingway and their infamous boxing match in which F. Scott Fitzgerald allowed the round to continue for too long, a fact that Hemingway argued was the only reason Callaghan managed to win the boxing match. In his analysis of Callaghan's memoir and John Glassco's response to it, *Memoirs of Montparnasse*, Russell Brown claims that "[e]ach author modifies the American-in-Paris myth by offering an alternative Canadian-in-Paris narrative that inserts his presence into a history in which Canadians had previously been invisible" (86) and that the memoir's form "links it to the sixties (and early seventies) Canadian project of reclaiming a national literature . . . [d]eriving much of its interest from its promise to replace a false story with an authentic

one" (91). *That Summer in Paris* not only attempted to revise readers' understanding of the nature of his relationship with Hemingway and the details of the infamous boxing match in which he punched Hemingway out; according to Brown it also served as a nationalist intervention that inserted Canadian voices into the mythology surrounding a historical moment that was perceived as exclusively American. Until the publication of *That Summer in Paris* and *Memoirs of Montparnasse*, he argues, Paris, home of the "lost generation," was seen as "an extension of America." Callaghan and Glassco, however, "challenged this American view" of the myth of Paris in the 1920s as "An American decade somehow passed in France" (83). In this sense, *That Summer In Paris* serves a similar purpose to the one that this chapter as a whole is intended to serve; by inserting a Canadian voice into histories – in this case, the history of "the *New Yorker* short story" – that have, until now, only included American authors and American perspectives, it offers greater insight into the transnational nature of modernist publication *within* North America.

Barry Callaghan's *The New Yorker Stories*, published in 2001, functions as another, more tangible example of the rewriting or revising of literary history. The contents of *The New Yorker Stories* are not in fact *New Yorker* stories, however; they differ from the versions of the stories that *The New Yorker* published in the 1920s and 30s. As Bryant argues in *The Fluid Text*, different versions of a work often have different audiences: "[t]hat is, one version distinguishes itself from another by its attempt to manipulate a readership differently, or by its embracing of new readerships. Moreover, specific historical readerships may be attached to specific historical versions" (90). It is with this claim in mind that I will argue for a reading of the differences between Callaghan's stories as published in *The New Yorker* in the 1920s and 30s and those published in Barry Callaghan's *The New Yorker Stories* in 2001 as reflections of two varying approaches to modernism. The first are historical documents of the modernist period that capture Callaghan's capabilities as a writer during the early part of his career, as well as the social mores of the period in which they were published. The second reflect an attempt to recreate or revise the modernist moment by intensifying the elements of the stories that critics, in hindsight, associate with a modernist aesthetic.

According to Barry Callaghan, the differences between the stories as published in *The New Yorker* and those published in the collection *The New Yorker Stories* do not represent, as is often the case with *New Yorker* authors, a reversion to an earlier version of the text or an "original" incarnation of the work that more accurately reflected authorial intention before *The New Yorker's* editorial process altered or suggested alterations to a story. Rather, they reflect changes that were made to the stories long after they had been published by *The New Yorker*. When asked about the differences between these versions of the stories, Barry Callaghan wrote: "The changes are as a result of conversations with Morley, while he was alive, as we went through the texts, or with respect to those published In The Lost And Found Stories, the changes ,ight [sic] have been made back then by MORley [sic]" (Email to Nadine Fladd, 9 August 2011). In short, the stories contained within *The New Yorker Stories* are new versions of Callaghan's work that have been edited by Barry Callaghan based on the wishes of Morley Callaghan as he expressed them to his son. Just as the finding aid to *The New Yorker* Records suggests the stories published in the magazine were collaborative efforts between Callaghan and Katharine White, Harold Ross, Gus Lobrano *et al.*, those in *The New Yorker Stories* are the product of a collaborative effort between Morley and Barry Callaghan.

The drafts, typescripts, and published versions of these stories are all incarnations of fluid texts: "material manifestations" of a "literary work" (Bryant 1-2). Since, Bryant explains, "the processes of authorial, editorial, and cultural revision that create these versions are inescapable elements of the literary phenomenon" (1-2), he argues for treating fluid texts as "the material evidence of *shifting* intentions" (9). Rather than perceiving varying versions of a work, such as the versions of Callaghan's stories published in *The New Yorker* and *The New Yorker Stories*, as "anomalous corruptions" (5), he "take[s] [Jack] Stillinger's notion of [textual] pluralism to mean that no one version of a work (earliest or final) has priority over another" (76) and encourages critics to ask what "the meaning of th[e] difference" between "the variant meanings of the variant texts" might be able to tell us (5). Rather than perceiving Barry Callaghan's versions of his father's stories as corruptions of an "original" text Callaghan agreed to publish in *The New Yorker*, the variations between these two versions of Callaghan's

"work" are meaningful. Together, the Callaghans revised Morley's stories so that they adhere to what are now perceived to be some of the formal and thematic characteristics of international modernist literature even more closely than his stories, as they were published during the modernist period, originally did.³⁷ They did so, I will argue, in order to try to secure a place for Callaghan's work at the centre of North American modernist literary history. In the collection's version of "An Escapade," for example, Callaghan's already "sparse" style (Lynch 2) becomes even more so; the story's sentences are even shorter and more clipped and Hemingwayesque than they were in *The New Yorker's* version.

2.1.1 Revising Modernism: "An Escapade"

"An Escapade," which appeared in the 24 November 1928 issue of *The New Yorker*, is one of the first stories Callaghan published in the magazine. In late 1928, Callaghan wrote to Max Perkins, his editor at Scribner's, asking for advice: "Do you think *The New Yorker* would be a good magazine for my stories?" he asked. "They have never printed fiction before," he continued, "but are going to start with the story of mine called 'The Escapade'" (qtd. in B. Callaghan ix). The editor Katharine Angell³⁸ had written to Callaghan on 23 October 1928 asking him to submit to the magazine:

We have read with much interest and pleasure your stories in Scribner's, and we wonder if by any chance you have on hand any short sketches (from 1000 to 1500 words) which you would care to let us see.

We do not necessarily, you know, publish only "funny" stuff, but we do like a great deal such vivid character sketches as you do, although they must of

³⁷ These characteristics and thematic concerns include: ambiguity; alienation and the failure of communication; deliberate inaccessibility in order to divide "high" culture from "low" culture; epiphanic endings; and formal experimentation.

³⁸ Angell would later become Katharine White when she married E.B. White in 1929. Throughout this chapter, I refer to her as Katharine Angell when referring to letters she wrote before her marriage, and Katharine White when referring to letters she wrote after her marriage.

course be pretty short , compared with the usual length of stories in the monthlies. What is too short for most magazines is often just the right length for us.

With hopes then that you may have something for us,

Sincerely yours,

THE NEW YORKER

"An Escapade" is a story about a woman who goes to a theatre to hear the Reverend John Simpson speak after leading her husband to believe she is on her way to their usual cathedral to hear Father Conley speak. Inside the theatre, she has an uncomfortable encounter with a crying man. The story appears in a very different version in Barry Callaghan's collection than it did in the magazine in 1928. Most of the changes the Callaghans made to the story were cuts, especially to sections that clarified its events or gave the reader insight into the protagonist Rose Carey's motives and character.

In the version published in *The New Yorker*, Mrs. Carey stands outside of the theatre, gathering the courage to enter:

She walked with dignity, bothered by her own shyness, and thinking of her husband asking if Father Conley was speaking tonight in the Cathedral. She didn't want to think of Father Conley, or at least she didn't want to compare him with Mr. Simpson, who was simply interesting because all her bridge friends were talking about him. It was altogether different about Father Conley.

She was under the theatre lights, turning in, and someone said to her:

"This way, lady, step this way, right along now." (22)

In the version that Barry Callaghan published, this scene is considerably shorter:

"Bothered by her own shyness, she remembered that her husband had asked if Father Conley was speaking tonight in the Cathedral. Under the theatre lights someone said to her: 'This way, lady. Step this way, right along now'" (35). In this shortened version, the Callaghans have removed the explanation for Mrs. Carey's motive for sneaking out to hear Reverend Simpson as well as the more detailed description of her movements. The

reader is left to speculate about the reason for her interest in Reverend Simpson, and expected to make the reasonable inference that, since she is under the theatre lights, she is about to enter the theatre. This shortened version is not only more succinct and terse, it is also slightly more enigmatic; it offers the reader a story whose meaning is more indeterminate and ambiguous because it does not spell out the protagonists' motivation for going to hear the Reverend speak, and allows more room for readers to make meaning out of the text for themselves by leaving small gaps between descriptions of Mrs. Carey's actions which the reader must fill.

In her surveys of modernism and the Canadian short story, Reingard M. Nischik identifies "ambiguity, allusion, ellipsis" as well as "narrative economy, [and] stylistic succinctness" as "modernist strategies" ("The Canadian Short Story" 7 and "The Modernist English-Canadian Short Story" 195). In its increased economy, Barry Callaghan's version of "An Escapade" more closely conforms to literary critics' conceptions of the modernist aesthetic than the version of the story that *The New Yorker* published during the modernist period does. These differences demonstrate both Barry Callaghan's desire to associate his father's work with that of other canonical modernists, as well *The New Yorker's* hostility to modernism through its parochial editorial policies and practices concerning both setting and subject matter and the aesthetic or stylistic elements of the work it published.

Where the *New Yorker* version clarifies Mrs. Carey's thoughts and motives, Barry Callaghan's version makes Mrs. Carey's character more opaque, thus making the connections between the events in the story less obvious, and forcing readers to perform more of the interpretive work themselves. As Gary Boire's obituary for Callaghan makes clear, this shifting of the work of meaning making onto the shoulders of the reader was deliberate and characteristic of Callaghan's style. Boire claims that, in addition to "a pared down style," Callaghan's work was also marked by "the meticulous rhetorical construction of an elusive ambiguity of plot, language, and structure which forces individual readers to 'see the world through their own eyes' . . . his writing always strove deliberately for a "haiku effect," because 'it's always completed by the reader inside their own mind'" (Boire, "Morley Callaghan 1903-1990" 209).

Faye Hammill and Karen Leick argue that, unlike its competitor *Vanity Fair*, "*The New Yorker* did not cultivate relationships with modernist writers" because it did not "wis[h] to be considered difficult, academic, or inaccessible" (185). While "the *New Yorker* was knowledgeable about [the most experimental] modernist writers, so familiar with these writers that it could laugh at them and even with them, it was never a home to them" (190). In contrast to the modernist espousal of newness and difficulty for its own sake, *The New Yorker*, and Harold Ross in particular, were well known for an obsession with clarity. In 1949, White wrote to the poet Elizabeth Bishop, explaining a query: "You know one of Mr. Ross's fetishes is that he understand every poem we publish. Sometimes we've published ones he doesn't understand but we try to make clarity an aim even so which is why I'm bothering you" (qtd. in Bielle 39-40). As Hammill and Leick point out, citing Thomas Kunkel's work in support of their argument about the magazine's resistance to experimental modernism, Gertrude Stein received a letter from White – addressed to Alice B. Toklas – indicating the same policy; Stein's submission was rejected because White "was not allowed to buy anything her boss didn't understand" (187). Barry Callaghan's *The New Yorker Stories* reflect the competing desires to canonize Morley Callaghan as a modernist and to profit off of the association with the anti-modernist *New Yorker*.

In the *New Yorker Stories* version of "An Escapade," the Callaghans remove some of the qualifiers and clarifiers that are so characteristic of *New Yorker* fiction. For example, the man whom Mrs. Carey meets outside the theatre, and who takes off his hat to greet her, must first be described as wearing a hat in order to have one to remove. In the version that the Callaghans published, the fact that "the man had on a derby" (*New Yorker* 22) is not included, and readers must take it on faith that, when they are told that the man removed his hat, he must have been wearing one to begin with. Inside the theatre, the man Mrs. Carey met outside sits down beside her. *The New Yorker* version of the story tells us "She was annoyed *because* she knew she was too definitely aware of him sitting beside her" (22, my emphasis). The version published in the collected *New Yorker Stories* is not only more succinct, but also, through the omission of the word "because," does not spell out the reason for Mrs. Carey's annoyance quite so obviously: "She was annoyed, she knew she was too aware of his closeness" (35). The use of a

comma instead of the conjunction "because" opens up ambiguity; it is possible that Mrs. Carey is annoyed either by the fact that the man has sat down beside her, or by her own awareness of his closeness.

Barry and Morley Callaghan's cutting of descriptions, transitions, and conjunctions in "The Escapade" and other stories included in *The New Yorker Stories* has the effect of making Callaghan's early work appear to adhere even more closely to critics' descriptions of Callaghan's laconic,³⁹ simplistic style, and the modernist aesthetic. In *That Summer In Paris*, Callaghan himself relates what, in hindsight, he conceived of as his goal in writing: to "strip the language, and make the style, the method, all the psychological ramifications, the ambience of the relationships, all one thing, so the reader couldn't make separations" (148). The revisions present a version of Callaghan's modernism as current critics describe Callaghan and modernism. They function to reinforce Callaghan's ties to modernism as a recognizable (if retroactively imposed) stylistic phenomenon, and the symbolic value inherent in the work of canonical authors associated with the cosmopolitan modernist movement (Joyce, Hemingway, Fitzgerald, Stein, and Pound). Callaghan attempts to derive recognition for his father's work by connecting it to the prestige a non-specialist readership associates with modernism in general rather than with a specific movement or strain of modernism.

While the revised version of "An Escapade" simplifies Callaghan's syntax, it does not simplify the motives of the protagonist. Rather, the changes the Callaghans made have the effect of increasing the ambiguity surrounding Mrs. Carey's actions and their motives. Adrian Hunter describes "plotless," modernist short stories such as Katherine Mansfield's "The Daughters of the Late Colonel" as "willfully enigmatic" (44), and examples of "modernism's valorization of *difficulty*" (48). Hunter continues:

³⁹ Writes Nischik: "Further trademarks of his narrative style are the ironic narrative voice, the ambiguity of plot and language, and, above all, the laconic diction, which has time and again spurred associations with Ernest Hemingway. Particularly in his early work, Callaghan's vocabulary and syntax create a deceptively simple and direct, deliberately repetitive, unadorned style" ("The Canadian Short Story" 9).

Although we may be more accustomed to thinking of difficulty, in the modernist text at least, as the product of multiplicity, superabundance and allusive excess, it was also recognized that obscurity could be generated through radically curtailed or laconic modes of expression where these broke down the logical connections in narrative and semantic sequence. (48)

In the revised version of "An Escapade," the Callaghans increase obscurity or opacity in the story by curtailing readers' access to the protagonist's thoughts. In *The New Yorker's* version of the story, a third-person, omniscient narrator describes Mrs. Carey's thoughts once she notices the man beside her is crying: "She tried to adjust her thoughts so the man's misery would belong to a pattern of Sunday service in a theatre, and did not glance at him again till she realized that his elbow was on the arm of her seat, supporting his chin, while he blinked his eyes and slowly moved his head" (23). In the story as published by Barry Callaghan, we are granted more limited access to the protagonists' thoughts; they are the kinds of thoughts an observant third-person narrator could infer based on Mrs. Carey's *actions*, movements, and facial expressions rather than a description of attempts to control her thinking that only Mrs. Carey or an omniscient narrator could know about: "She did not glance at him again till she realized that his elbow was on the arm of her seat, supporting his chin, while he blinked and moved his head" (33). Throughout the later version, the reader is required to make connections, inferences and assumptions that are not required of readers of the *New Yorker* version of the story.

These changes function as part of Barry Callaghan's larger attempt to tap into the cultural capital of both the modernist canon and *The New Yorker* in order to increase Callaghan's cultural capital through association. In *Contingencies of Value*, Herrnstein Smith theorizes the evaluation of "great literature" and the shifting purposes it fulfills over time. She writes:

The recommendation of value represented by the repeated inclusion of a particular work in anthologies of "great poetry" not only promotes but goes some distance toward *creating* the value of that work, as does its repeated appearance on

reading lists or its frequent citation or quotation by professors, scholars, critics, poets, and other elders of the tribe; (10)

Callaghan's work has fallen out of favour in university classrooms, and is not often included on the syllabi of courses in modernism, which tend to focus on American or British and Irish writers, nor is he often included in survey courses on Canadian literature.⁴⁰ Barry Callaghan's Preface to *The New Yorker Stories* attempts to create a place for Callaghan at the centre of the modernist canon, particularly among the primarily American writers who expatriated to Paris in the 1920s and 1930s, through association with canonical modernists, and allusions to Callaghan's superiority to these writers. The Preface begins:

It was 1928. Morley Callaghan had published a story in Ezra Pound's little magazine, *The Exile*, and he had appeared in *transition* with James Joyce and Gertrude Stein. He'd had a story in the Paris magazine, *This Quarter*, and so had Hemingway, and Hemingway had written to the editor, saying, "Of the two I would much rather have written the story by Morley Callaghan . . . Oh Christ, I want to write so well [. . .] Callaghan's story is as good as Dubliners." (ix)

The Preface continues this canonical name-dropping: "Morley went to Paris, settled in near the city prison, had supper with Joyce, drove to Chartres with Hemingway and watched F. Scott Fitzgerald stand on his head" (x), and "William Carlos Williams had him to his house for supper and told him that he had found the effect of *Strange Fugitive* so stark it had kept him awake all night" (ix). The Preface implies that since Callaghan's work has been consecrated by the consecrated authors of American modernism, it too deserves canonical status. As Herrnstein Smith argues,

⁴⁰ Norman Snider's 25 October 2008 Globe and Mail article indicates that "Callaghan's reputation is in the midst of a revival." This statement suggests that Callaghan's literary star had shone less brightly before the 2008 publication of *The New Yorker Stories* and *A Literary Life: Reflections and Reminiscences*. As Snider states, Morley Callaghan "knows how reputations are made, how they fade . . . He himself is fortunate to have had Barry Callaghan, his son, a writer, publisher and talented editor, to keep his books before the public."

What is commonly referred to as "the test of time" . . . is not, as the figure implies, an impersonal and impartial mechanism; for the cultural institutions through which it operates . . . are, of course, all managed by *persons* [and] . . . the texts that are selected and preserved by "time" will always tend to be those which "fit" (and, indeed, have often been *designed* to fit) *their* characteristics, needs, interests, resources, and purposes. (51)

In this case, Barry Callaghan uses his access to the cultural institution of publishing house *Exile Editions* in order to meet his own need: reestablishing his father's work's place in the modernist canon.

Barry Callaghan's collection clearly also attempts to acquire symbolic capital for his father's work by appealing to its association with *The New Yorker*. Although this was not the case when Harold Ross first began publishing *The New Yorker*, the magazine has at times been considered by readers, and by contributors such as Mavis Gallant, to be "the best magazine in the world" (Gallant 32). In drawing readers' attention to Callaghan's association with the magazine by entitling this collection *The New Yorker Stories*, Barry Callaghan participates in what Ben Yagoda describes as a tradition of appealing to the notion of "upscale urbanity" that the magazine, and association with it, connotes, in order to sell products (13).⁴¹ Nowhere in the Preface or Editor's Note does Barry Callaghan draw attention to the changes made to these *New Yorker* stories; instead he leads readers to believe that what they hold in their hands is a reproduction of stories as they appeared in the magazine. These are not historical texts, but rather updated versions of the stories revised in collaboration between Barry and Morley Callaghan at the end of Morley's career. These versions are designed to appeal to a contemporary readership and meet their expectations of modernist style. As I argue in my discussion of the changes made to the story "Timothy Harshaw's Flute," they are also designed to sanitize some of the racial prejudices of the modernist period that are likely to make a contemporary readership

⁴¹ Other examples Yagoda cites include using the recognizable typeface Rea Irvin designed for the *New Yorker's* headlines and mastheads in everything from advertisements for cars to the covers of books such as the cover of Alice Munro's collection of stories, *The Moons of Jupiter* (13).

uncomfortable. Drawing readers' attention to these changes, however, would risk weakening the collection's association with the elegance, sophistication, and tradition of the magazine that the title *The New Yorker Stories* evokes.

2.2 *The New Yorker's* Early Years: Banking on Callaghan's Symbolic Capital

In his Introduction to the collection of essays by Bourdieu, *The Field of Cultural Production: Essays on Art and Literature*, Randal Johnson effectively summarizes the main tenets of Bourdieu's theories about the ways that the exchange of economic and symbolic capital, artists' reputations, and distinctions between "art" and "popular culture" function in the cultural sphere. He writes:

The field of cultural production is structured, in the broadest sense, by an opposition between two sub-fields: the field of restricted production and the field of large-scale production. The field of restricted production concerns what we normally think of as 'high' art . . . the stakes of competition between agents are largely symbolic, involving prestige, consecration and artistic celebrity. This, as Bourdieu often writes, is production for producers. Economic profit is normally disavowed (at least by the artists themselves), and the hierarchy of authority is based on different forms of symbolic profit. (15)

According to Bourdieu, symbolic goods such as short stories "are a two-faced reality" in that they possess both a "cultural value" and a "commercial value" (113). For the most part, Bourdieu sees the relationship between a work's cultural value and its economic value as an inverse one. High art is considered non-commercial, and often produced on a small scale, whereas art produced on a larger-scale (mass produced) for the purpose of profit is no longer considered "art," but rather "popular culture." Bourdieu's theories about the exchange of symbolic capital and economic capital in the field of cultural production provide a useful framework for helping us to understand the relationship between Callaghan and *The New Yorker*.

In the example of Barry Callaghan's *The New Yorker Stories*, we can see his attempt to profit economically (i.e., to sell books) by association with a magazine with symbolic capital – a reputation for intellectualism – as well as to acquire "consecration" for his father's work through association with canonical modernist authors whose symbolic capital has lasted into the twenty-first century. The power dynamic between Callaghan as seeker of "consecration" and his "cultural bankers" at *The New Yorker* as wealthy in symbolic capital represents an inversion of the beginning of this relationship, however. In its early days, it was *The New Yorker* that benefitted from Callaghan's "consecrated" status as a producer of "high art." Over the 1930s and 1940s, as the magazine's reputation grew stronger and Callaghan's own career as a short story writer declined, the shift in this relationship resulted in a shift in Callaghan's work. As his symbolic capital declined and the magazine's increased, Callaghan became more and more likely to alter his work to meet *The New Yorker's* editorial requests. The requests themselves demonstrate the tension in this relationship between Callaghan's sense of the cosmopolitan and *The New Yorker's* sense of the local, or more accurately, the parochial.

In her historical survey of the Canadian short story, Nischik points out that "Almost as a matter of course by now, several Canadian writers frequently first publish their short stories in *The New Yorker*, the foremost international forum for the genre" ("The Canadian Short Story" 1). *The New Yorker* was not always so closely associated with the short story genre, however. Journalist Harold Ross, who founded the magazine in 1925 primarily as a home for sophisticated humour and local advertisers, had little interest in fiction. As Thomas Kunkel explains in his biography of Ross, the magazine was specifically designed with selling advertising space to high-end New York retailers in mind:

With commercial radio in its infancy . . . magazines represented . . . the only efficient way for major advertisers to reach audiences from coast to coast. For magazine publishers, this combination caused an explosion of prosperity. But to Ross, it presented an obvious opportunity. Why would an upscale New York department store or other retailer want to reach readers in Duluth and Denver? . . . This was what happened when they advertised in national magazines . . .

The magazine he had in mind – glossy, intelligent, and cheeky – could deliver quality New York merchandise to a quality New York audience. (Kunkel 88)

Fiction was not a priority for Ross, and was the slowest element of the magazine to develop (Kunkel 305). Callaghan's contributions helped this "formula" to fall into place. It was one of Ross's editors, Angell, who persuaded him to make room for fiction in the magazine, and who solicited writers like Callaghan for "serious" fiction for the first time (Yagoda 53). As Kunkel argues, "it was only in the late Thirties that what would become known as 'the *New Yorker* short story' was actually starting to turn up in the magazine with any regularity" (Kunkel 308). Although the form of Callaghan's stories did not necessarily inform the form of the "*New Yorker* short story" as it has come to be recognized, what he did contribute to the magazine was symbolic capital as a producer of small-scale high art.

Although the magazine as a whole had quickly established a distinguished reputation for itself, *The New Yorker's* fiction roster was weak in the late 1920s. Callaghan, who had published primarily in the little magazines in Europe such as *This Quarter* and *transition*, and whose work had only just appeared in North America in a "periodical of general circulation" for the first time in *Scribners* (Conron, 63-64), considered himself a "serious" rather than a "commercial" writer. In his Foreword to *The Lost and Found Stories of Morley Callaghan*, Barry Callaghan quotes his father, who told him of the beginning of his career during the Great Depression: "I was the only guy I knew of in America somehow selling my non-commercial stories in the great commercial market and staying alive" (3). Bourdieu likens this ubiquitous "opposition between the 'commercial' and the 'non-commercial'" in cultural spheres to distinctions made "between 'bourgeois' art and 'intellectual' art, between 'traditional' and 'avant-garde' art, or, in Parisian terms, between the 'right bank' and the 'left bank'" (82). Because of his association with the American modernists living on the left bank of Paris, he considered himself a non-commercial, intellectual, or "real" artist, as did *The New Yorker*.

Following Bourdieu's model, *The New Yorker* would need to "borro[w] from high art," in this case the work of Callaghan, in order to develop its own reputation as a

publisher of literary fiction (Bourdieu 129). Callaghan benefitted economically from this exchange, and received the kinds of payments associated with commercial magazines that allowed him to support his family with his writing throughout the Great Depression. He also benefitted symbolically from this relationship, however. Aside from fiction, *The New Yorker* had already developed a distinguished reputation, and Callaghan's Scribner's editor, Maxwell Perkins, responded to the author's request for advice about whether or not to publish "An Escapade" with *The New Yorker* by suggesting that he submit work to the magazine over the higher-paying *Cosmopolitan*.⁴² At this point in his career, as the holder of symbolic capital, Callaghan could afford to appear more disinterested in the economics of publication than he could in later years. He chose to publish with the lower-paying *New Yorker* in exchange for association with its more discerning audience. In a letter responding to the cheque he received for "An Escapade," Callaghan emphasized to Angell that association with the magazine was more important to him than the rate at which he was paid for his work:

Thank you for your letter, and I am very glad that you liked "An Escapade". The check seemed to me to be a reasonable payment; reasonable in that the amount was within twenty five or fifty dollars of what I thought I ought to get from you. I know that you can not pay as much as say "Cosmopolitan", but I am quite satisfied because I believe that your magazine reaches a good audience for me. That is important to me right now. (20 Nov. 1928)

In a 7 November 1928 letter Angell, for her part, emphasized the artistic merit of "An Escapade":

We were more delighted than we can say to receive your story "AN ESCAPADE" which we think is a very distinguished piece of writing and [we] are honored to publish it. A short story of this sort is new sort of material for us and we have

⁴² Perkins writes: "As for 'The New Yorker' I think it has a very excellent type of circulation from your standpoint and ours, and that you are perfectly right in your opinion. The only value in writing for the Cosmo would be the pecuniary one, and [only] you know how much importance to attach to that" (16 November 1928).

always, more or less, been in a quandary as to whether or not to publish straight fictional material but when anything as good as "Escapade" comes along we are glad to take the plunge into a new field . . . What we hope is that you will want to send us other material even shorter if possible. Do you ever write stories with a New York background? They are even better for us because we are, after all, a local magazine but as you see the Toronto setting did not influence us in this case.

The very first Callaghan story that the magazine accepted was set in Toronto. In later submissions, Angell et al. would become less willing to overlook the Toronto setting of Callaghan's stories, and insist upon changes. As Bourdieu explains, "In the field of cultural production economic profits increase as one moves from the 'autonomous' pole to the 'heteronomous' pole" and "the most heteronomous cultural producers (i.e., those with least symbolic capital) can offer the least resistance [sic] to external demands, of whatever sort" (45 and 41). At this point in Callaghan's career, it was he who bestowed his symbolic capital upon *The New Yorker*, and the magazine was not in a position to negotiate with Callaghan in ways that would threaten his literary autonomy. Callaghan's autonomy was preserved because both he and Angell as the pursuer of "serious" fiction were invested in the notion that they were publishing "high art." As the relationship between Callaghan and his editors evolved over time, however, he would not always be able to present himself as so economically disinterested.

2.3 Nationalist Criticisms and Callaghan's Own Sense of Identity

That Summer In Paris describes Callaghan's perception of his 1920s self as "intellectually alien" to the work of Canadian poets and artists of the period. He contrasts British Toronto with his own "North American" identity, writing:

In my city were many poets, a group of painters called the Group of Seven, and no doubt many great readers and scholars. But in those days it was a very British city. I was intensely North American. It never occurred to me that the local poets had anything to do with me. Physically, and with some other part of me, the ball-

playing, political, debating, lovemaking, family part of me, I was wonderfully at home in my native city, and yet intellectually, spiritually, the part that had to do with wanting to be a writer was utterly, but splendidly and happily, alien. (22)

This statement perhaps best represents Callaghan's complicated and ambivalent relationship to Toronto, a city to which he was fondly attached, but one that he saw as a cultural wasteland that failed to differentiate itself from English colonial cultural traditions. This colonial mentality is reflected in the criticism of two important pre-World War Two Canadian literary critics, A.J.M. Smith and E.K. Brown, who discuss Callaghan's work, holding it up respectively as an example of the best and worst of what Canadian literature had to offer. The differences in Smith's and Brown's approaches to Callaghan demonstrate that the reception of his work is often contingent upon historical factors such as the critical climate and the work being done by other writers of the period, trends in literary criticism, and approaches to nationhood and nationalism.

As W. J. Keith argued in 1985, "Until the 1930s Canada saw little of the artistic challenge and achievement of the modernist movement that had transformed literary attitudes in other parts of the English-speaking world" and Callaghan, who was developing an "engaging directness" (58), was out of step with the work of other Canadian writers of the 1920s. In his 1928 article in *Canadian Forum*, "Wanted Canadian Criticism," A.J.M. Smith, who supported "the 'cosmopolitan' over the 'native' . . . the maple-and-beaver references of a self-conscious pseudo-nationalism" (Keith 60), praised Callaghan's unconventional approach. Condemning Canadian critics, writers, and readers for their "materialistic patriotism" and for confusing "commerce and art" by praising "poor canadian, rather than good foreign books" simply because they included references to "the far north and . . . the canada goose," Smith claims that, unlike other Canadian writers willing to pander to the demand for "He-man canadiana [sic]," "[y]oung writers like Morley Callaghan have contributed realistic stories of canadiana [sic] life to foreign radical journals." Smith's and Callaghan's sense of the cosmopolitan as consisting of a tension between non-jingoistic nationhood and universal citizenship (a Kantian "universal civic society" (Berman 34) that Amanda Anderson describes as a "cultivated detachment from restrictive forms of identity" [qtd. in Lutz 56]), is best expressed by the masthead of

Cosmopolitan magazine in the late nineteenth century: "The world is my country and all mankind are my countrymen!" (Berman 34; 28).

In the 1940s, Brown argued that, contrary to Smith's claim that the Canadian literary economy (misguidedly) panders to the native at the expense of literary merit, "an alien audience has shaped the treatment of Canadian life" (12). Brown lamented Canadians' colonial attitude towards, and cultural dependence upon, both Britain and the United States (18-19). "No writer can live by the Canadian sales of his books," Brown argues, because the country's small population, overwhelming geography, and proximity to another English-speaking country make publishing in Canada a risky venture (6). In addition to the economically "unsound" nature of Canada's literary industry, Brown claims that there are psychological factors that have slowed the development of a national literature and a national literary criticism, including "the colonial spirit" (6; 13). Although he admits, *pace* Smith's argument, that literary and cultural autonomy can breed unwarranted flag-waving and the praising of second-rate art, Brown insists that a national Canadian literature is necessary, and that "A great art is fostered by artists and audience possessing in common a passionate and peculiar interest in the kind of life that exists in the country where they live" (17). According to Brown, Callaghan's work fails to meet this standard because he "uses his Canadian setting for its interest for a larger North American audience" rather than out of interest in Canada and Canadians in particular (12). Brown claims:

Most of Mr. Callaghan's novels and shorter tales are about the city in which he lives, Toronto; but it seems to me . . . that Mr. Callaghan's Toronto is not an individualized city but simply a representative one . . . Toronto is being used not to bring out what will have the most original flavor, but what will remind people who live in Cleveland, or Detroit, or Buffalo, or any other city on the Great Lakes, of the general quality of their own milieu. (11)

While Smith sees Callaghan's refusal to pander to the market for nationalist Canadiana in positive terms, Brown is sure that his "methods . . . have interfered with their presentation of Canadian life in the terms most stimulating and informing to Canadian readers" (12).

Smith's and Brown's claims exemplify the unnecessary intellectual dichotomy between the cosmopolitan and the native, local, or parochial that began in the late nineteenth century and has characterized Callaghan criticism throughout the twentieth and twenty-first centuries.

Callaghan may have felt physically at home in Canada, but he was not a sentimental nationalist; his devotion to literary and economic success superseded his devotion to supporting the development of a Canadian cultural infrastructure. When interviewed by Robert Weaver of CBC's *Anthology* in 1958, Callaghan criticized Canadian cultural nationalism, stating:

I was an American writer, and I am an American writer now. I think there's a lot that's very silly going on in this country. The effort to direct our culture away from the sources of light is all very well for speeches by ministers of education or presidents of cultural councils, and that sort of person, but it has nothing to do with the real problem. The writer's problem is somehow or other to catch the tempo, the stream, the way people live, think, and feel in their time, quite aside from any intellectual attitude to the matter. Canada is part of the North American cultural pattern. ("A Talk With Morley Callaghan" 5)

As a transnational figure – a Canadian who published primarily in the United States, but lived in Toronto (and for a short time, Paris) – Callaghan, and his relationship to Canada and the U.S., have been the source of much discussion and disagreement among critics. Some, including fellow *New Yorker* contributor William Saroyan, have interpreted Callaghan and his choice to work in the short story genre as uncomplicatedly American (qtd. in Mailer 124). Others, "resenting the effrontery of [American critics'] American imperialism" (Frank Watt qtd. in Conron 11), have questioned to what political, geographical or cultural entity Callaghan refers when he uses the term "America," or

have criticized his work for reinforcing a colonial mentality by simply shifting his cultural allegiance from England to the United States.⁴³

Boire's more balanced analyses from the 1990s come closest to describing the actual nature of Callaghan's relationship to both his physical home (Canada) and his cultural one (the United States), by describing him as "a paradoxical activist who agitated on behalf of Canadian writers while simultaneously decrying sentimental nationalism" ("1903-1990" 208). Thanks to his various media careers, from memoirist to columnist to radio host, a rich record of Callaghan's own conception of his literary and political identities exists. Callaghan identified himself as an American writer from early on. His cosmopolitan, urban focus resulted in his "chief influences" being U.S.-American ones such as Hemingway and Sherwood Anderson (Mathews 80) rather than his Canadian literary predecessors, such as Leacock, Roberts, and Seton, who were primarily concerned with small town life or wildlife (Morley 7). Callaghan's description of his artistic development in *That Summer in Paris* suggests that, although he may have wanted Canada to take part in a North American cultural pattern, by his estimation his native city of Toronto failed to do so in the 1920s.

In practice, Callaghan's cosmopolitan sense of urban "North America" as a cultural identity that transcended national borders, and one in which readers from both Canada and the U.S. ought to be interested and ought to feel at home, often conflicted with his *New Yorker* editors' sense of the distinct, local characteristics of cities like New York. Callaghan, in contrast to the "academic men highly trained in English literature" at the University of Toronto, wanted to write in a "North American language" (Callaghan,

⁴³ Robin Mathews' concerns about the paucity of references to Canadian settings in Callaghan's work are representative of the nationalist tendencies in Canadian literary criticism in the 1970s in general. He writes:

Callaghan's sense that "America" means North America comes down to the unproclaimed consciousness that North America means the U.S.A. It comes down to a state of colonial impotence in reaction to Canadian place. Callaghan cannot believe, it would seem, that a character would go – except perhaps in *Summer to Barrie* – to a Canadian place. The colonial who becomes hypnotized by the imperial culture rejects, almost biologically, the legitimacy of his own identity and place. (86)

"An Ocean Away" 242). His reference here to a single, unified North American language suggests the lack of sensitivity to regional differences in language, and dialogue in general, that both Callaghan's critics and his *New Yorker* editors would later point out.⁴⁴

Readers' and critics' reception of Callaghan's work has been fiercely divided along national lines. David Staines refers to the "topsy-turvy fate of Callaghan's writings at the hands of national and international critics," and quotes Milton Wilson: "'When the internationals liked him, the locals didn't'" (Staines "Introduction" 1). The international review that had the biggest impact on Callaghan's career, the American critic Edmund Wilson's "Morley Callaghan of Toronto," was published in the pages of *The New Yorker* in 1960. Wilson referred to Callaghan as "perhaps the most unjustly neglected novelist in the English-speaking world," and appears to accuse Canadians of "indifference" to Callaghan's work as a result of Canada's cultural position: its isolation "from the rest of the cultural world" and "peculiar relation" "to England and the United States" (224). Wilson speculated that "The Canadian background of Morley Callaghan's stories seems alien to both these other countries [England and the United States] and at the same time not strange enough to exercise the spell of the truly exotic" (224). As Staines and others have pointed out, Wilson's praise of Callaghan hurt Callaghan's reception in Canada: "Recent reviewers have tended to find increasingly more faults in his novels and short stories, and their studies often begin with rebuttals of Wilson's outlook . . . more frequently the criticism is an answer to Wilson rather than an exploration of Callaghan" (Staines 2). In his interview with Weaver, Callaghan himself hinted at the disparities in the reception of his work on either side of the U.S. Canada-Border. When Weaver asked Callaghan to clarify how many of his stories have appeared in Edward O'Brien's yearly anthology of *Best American Short Stories*, Callaghan responded, "Thirteen," but then

⁴⁴ Compare Callaghan's relative lack of sensitivity to the differences between Canadian and American idiom, and the idiom of different decades, to Dennis Lee's careful attention to capturing the "cadence" of (164) of Canadian speech in poetry in "Cadence, Country, Silence: Writing in Colonial Space." "To speak unreflectingly in a colony, then," Lee writes, "is to use words that speak only alien space" (163). Callaghan's approach to place and idiom appears to mirror the one that Lee rejects, writing that "to write a jolly ode to harvests in Saskatchewan, or set an American murder mystery in Newfoundland, is no answer at all" (163).

slightly shifted the focus of the discussion: "As a matter of fact, Bob, you're a little off the beam. I could go into my library and get about eight American textbooks that have those stories in them. That is a rather ridiculous thing. I think there are about two Canadian textbooks with them in" (16). This disparity in the frequency of publication of Callaghan's work between U.S. and Canadian textbooks demonstrates the national and historical contingency of the critical reception and distribution of Callaghan's work; moreover, it supports Smith's claims about the nationalist nature of Canadian readers. Perhaps because he had been celebrated as an "American" writer by O'Brien, Callaghan and his work fell out of favour among Canadian readers in general. Although there are also shifts in taste and matters of "quality" in play, the fact that his work has fallen out of fashion with Canadian educators and designers of textbooks in particular, whose role in part is to inculcate in Canadian students a sense of national culture and citizenship, makes clear that Callaghan's work has been judged as insufficiently "Canadian" to fulfill this task. As the following section will demonstrate, this perception is in part a result of Callaghan and *The New Yorker's* conflicting sense of place; this phenomenon demonstrates the importance of reading Callaghan's works and their reception within both their transnational contexts and the material contexts of their production.

2.4 Morley Callaghan of Toronto: *The New Yorker's* Sense of the Local

The New Yorker is often referred to as a cosmopolitan magazine today, but in Callaghan's era, this cosmopolitanism was more akin to the "upscale urbanity" that Yagoda describes in his history of the magazine than an openness to worldly perspectives or citizenship beyond the national that critics associate with international modernism (13). As Jessica Schiff Berman points out in *Modernist Fiction, Cosmopolitanism and the Politics of Community*, the magazine *Cosmopolitan* was associated with modernity, with "[t]he implication, of course . . . that what is new is cosmopolitan" (39). In *Cosmopolitan Vistas: American Regionalism and Literary Value*, Tom Lutz also addresses the "the colloquial meaning of 'cosmopolitan' as up-to-date connoisseurship, of not so much knowing everything the world has to offer as knowing the best the world has to offer"

(47). He cites Nietzsche's claim that "'cosmopolitanism in foods, literatures, newspapers, forms, tastes, even landscapes'" reflects "not an ethical ideal or a philosophical idea but the description of a cultural attitude" (55). *The New Yorker* of the 1920s and 1930s was not interested in representing or being at home among various cultures; rather, it was founded primarily in order to sell advertising space to local merchants. As *The New Yorker's* reputation for both journalism and fiction solidified it became popular nationally and internationally, and this shift in subscribers' demographics resulted in changes to the magazine's editorial content, but until the Second World War, Harold Ross and his editors were very conscious of the necessity to appeal to their (sophisticated, East Coast American) audience. As the writer and fiction editor for the magazine William Maxwell explained, "Ross had a map in his mind of the thing *The New Yorker* should be covering . . . Florida, the West Indies, California and Europe were on it" since these were parts of the world which either interested New Yorkers or which they might visit on vacation, "but Illinois and Canada were not" (qtd. in Kunkel 107). These geographical restrictions applied not only to the magazine's journalism, but also to the fiction it published. For Callaghan, of whom the magazine took notice just as its unofficial editorial policies were beginning to take shape, not being a New Yorker was occasionally a literary disadvantage.

Critics from Raymond Knister (1928) to Stephen Henighan (2002) have claimed that Canadian fiction writers, including Callaghan, "have been obliged to adjust their contributions to foreign markets" (Knister xvii). In 2007 Paul Goetsch observed:

Callaghan's success in the United States was no coincidence. Although many of his works are set in Canada, particularly in rural Ontario or, more often, in the urban centers of Toronto and Montreal, Callaghan usually does not emphasize the Canadian setting. Nor does he regularly "Canadianize" his works by addressing specifically Canadian issues in the manner of his contemporary, Hugh MacLennan. (96)

Although there seems to be a consensus among scholars that Callaghan's decisions about where to publish have affected his work in measurable ways, less attention has been paid

to the fact that Callaghan's decisions about where to live have also affected his work. Scholars such as George Woodcock have written about the Torontonians' depictions of Toronto and Montreal, but friends, family, and Callaghan himself have focused more on how his decision *not* to live in New York has affected his work and his career.⁴⁵

Callaghan must have been aware, at least to a certain degree, that his lack of familiarity with New York was negatively affecting his career with the magazine. White had put it plainly to him, when she wrote rejecting his story "The Homing Pigeon" on 10 October 1934: "Has anything come of your plans for moving to New York? We all wish you would seriously consider it and feel that it would greatly increase the quantity of stuff you could write for us." White was convinced that Callaghan would have not only found more financial success had he moved to New York, but also improved as a writer. She, Ross, and Sinclair Lewis were asked to write letters in support of Callaghan's application for a Guggenheim Fellowship. Her 1935 assessment of his work states that "He is an uneven writer but many of his stories have been distinguished work. In writing of New York and American life in general we have often felt that his work has suffered because of his enforced residence in Toronto" (Angell, K.S. Letter 1935). This letter demonstrates the conflicting sense of place between Callaghan and *The New Yorker* that is evident in the patterns of acceptance, rejection, and revision of his work. White believed that New Yorkers had specific ways of speaking and behaving, whereas Callaghan believed in readers' ability to identify with one North American urban centre just as easily as another. In some cases, Callaghan's unwillingness or inability to write about New York life resulted in either rejections from *The New Yorker* – or exactly the kinds of adjustments to an American market that Raymond Knister referred to in his Introduction to *Canadian Short Stories* (xvii).

⁴⁵ In a letter to Peg Carroll, the wife of Callaghan's longtime friend and sports reporter Austin (Dink) Carroll, Loretta Callaghan remarks that "Morley has started a new book, and of course it is to be his biggest and best. The Canadian editors cannot persuade him to lie down and quit. I guess we should have gone to live in the States and then he would have been appreciated in his own country" (n.d.). Here she makes an argument that is similar to the one that critic Edmund Wilson made in 1960, and that John Metcalf would later make of another *New Yorker* writer, Alice Munro: that Canadians ignore their own writers out of a colonial mentality; in order to be appreciated by Canadian readers, a writer must either come from the U.S. or have been validated by American critics and readers first.

When the magazine first began publishing fiction and required the help of an author respected by other authors such as Fitzgerald and Hemingway in order to establish its own symbolic capital, it accepted "An Escapade" despite its Toronto setting. In other cases, though, the setting, or specific details in the story that would prevent readers from imagining the setting as New York, influenced whether or not the magazine accepted Callaghan's work. On 19 December 1928 Angell wrote to Callaghan rejecting four stories, explaining:

This matter of fiction for The New Yorker is difficult and since we do not regularly run stories they must either be just so perfect that we cannot see our way clear not to use them or so appropriate and so much a part of New York experience that they belong in this very specialized magazine because of the theme.

These four stories were either too "far afield" for the magazine or not "up [its] street." On 28 January 1930, White rejected "A Guilty Woman," explaining that the protagonist, Mrs. Hilts, "could not possibly be imagined as living in New York" and that "a New York audience would not take [the story] seriously." Later that year White rejected another story because its premise "just d[idn't] seem possible – to people living in New York at least –" (Letter to Morley Callaghan, 12 September 1930). In 1931 Wolcott Gibbs rejected another "because of our old complaint that the setting seems pretty remote" (Letter to Morley Callaghan, 6 March 1931). On 28 March 1932, White wrote to Callaghan, rejecting "A Sick Call," despite the fact that she considered it "a distinguished piece of work," because "in subject matter and situation" it was "a little out of The New Yorker field." On 28 July 1933 he received a similar letter from Gibbs, rejecting once again what he considered to be a fine story because of the geographical limitations of the magazine:

I'm afraid we owe you an apology for the length of time this has been held, but it has been very difficult for us to make up our minds about it. Everyone feels that it is a very expert and moving story, but there is one objection that we have finally had to decide couldn't be overcome. It is the question of locale which I'm afraid

has operated more against your stories with us than anything else. The story as you've written it is not a New York piece. There are so many details that would be unlikely here, that it would be hard work to list them all, but such things as the turtleneck sweater which Ross and I can't remember having seen or heard of for twenty years, the description of the place she lives in which we can't identify satisfactorily at all, and to some extent the dialect seem to place it definitely outside New York, presumably in Canada. I have no idea how the piece could be fixed without spoiling it since the provincial atmosphere is implicit in almost every sentence.

We return the piece very reluctantly, as we rarely get a story as sincere and effective, but we have simply got to confine ourselves to a New York background or at least to one that would be intelligible to New Yorkers. Im [sic] sorry.

Here we see *The New Yorker* clearly refuting the cosmopolitan idea that its readers would be able to relate to, or even be interested in, a story set any place other than the "native" or immediately local. In fact, the magazine was convinced that its readers would assume any story was set in New York unless they were explicitly told otherwise. Gibbs's implication here that places other than New York must be provincial is, itself, not merely nativist or localist, but parochial. He assumes that the magazine's readers will share this parochial approach to literature, which was an assumption that Callaghan's fellow Canadian, Robert McAlmon, in his letter to Callaghan describing the "insularity" of people who live in supposedly "cosmopolitan centers," indicates might have been well-founded.⁴⁶ In its early years, *The New Yorker's* fiction section, with its insistence upon

⁴⁶ On 8 January 1926, McAlmon wrote to Callaghan about Callaghan's potential move to New York:

It might be a helpful experience for you to be in N.Y. for a while, meeting people. You needn't expect much. They're just people, and they stunt, and have the insularity of people in 'cosmopolitan' centers, where few realize that things do go on outside their city. Paris and London are that way too. Cliques and circles; ... No one is worldly or sophisticated, so why not use the more restive and flagrant types as material, occasionally.

A year later, on 6 February, McAlmon reiterated this claim about the insularity of New York:

stories set in New York, ran counter to Callaghan's, and international modernism's, espousal of the cosmopolitan.

A few weeks later Gibbs sent a rejection letter to Ann Watkins, Callaghan's agent in New York, making a similar observation to her about Callaghan's work: "There is the same vague suggestion, we notice, in a great deal of Mr. Callaghan's work that the setting is some other place than New York. It's hard to put your finger on precisely, but neither the place nor the people are identifiable to me, or to Mr. Ross" (16 Aug. 1933). Gibbs's comments presage scholars' later claims about Callaghan's work. Woodcock, for example, argues that "Ultimately the test of characters lies in what they say and how they speak. Callaghan's early characters are often laconic in their peculiar Callaghanese way of speaking; but they are usually idiosyncratic enough to be acceptable" ("Lost Eurydice" 34). Woodcock criticizes Callaghan's characters' dialogue as "undifferentiated substandard North American" (34) while Barbara Godard, in contrast, suggests that "Callaghan is *deliberately* non-regionalist in his dialogue, using North American speech in its most general, if extremely simple, form" (56 my emphasis). Her phrasing suggests that this is an aesthetic choice on Callaghan's part rather than a failure. His dialogue is the facet of Callaghan's work that is the most commonly criticized by scholars, editors and publishers alike. *New Yorker* editors did not believe that his dialogue accurately reflected New Yorkers' way of speaking, while some of the more incendiary Canadian critics such as Henighan and Metcalf have ridiculed Callaghan's "North American" writing style as "vague, generalized . . . unfocused," and imprecise (Metcalf 134).

Don't think I tell you to expect grand things of New York, or the mob here. They are, as great city people generally are, unaware that things exist outside. Any alert small town person is apt to be more "cosmopolitan" minded.

Although Callaghan does not appear to have had a strong ear for dialogue or regional differences in speech, a letter he wrote to Gibbs in response to his criticisms of a story demonstrates a fundamental conflict between Callaghan's approach to fiction and the magazine's. While *The New Yorker* in its early years remained devoted to the local, Callaghan was devoted to the cosmopolitan, and did not seem to believe that regional differences exist between the North American cities in which he often set his stories.

After Gibbs wrote to Callaghan on July 31, 1931, rejecting another story on the basis of setting, Callaghan responded to say that he was "taking another shot" at the story, and attempted to challenge this ruling:

About the pieces being definitely set in New York: I've always felt that actual names, street, names, store names and so on, don't need to be used. A piece in its fabric is either a city piece or it isn't, and a surface reality of names won't help it, although I can see where things about one place may be put it in [sic] that definitely make the story not of another city. But in my story, "The Young Priest," which you published, which wasn't about New York any more than Boston, or Montreal, many people in New York told me that they liked the story about the New York priest. An editor wrote me that he liked the story about the young priest at St. Patricks, and it took me a moment to think of Fifth Avenue. And in my own city here the brother of a priest who used to be at the local cathedral stopped me on the street and gave me a setting out for writing about his brother and a prominent parishioner, which pleased me immensely, though I had never thought of his brother or his parishioner. (3 August 1931)

This letter reveals the strength of Callaghan's belief in cosmopolitanism. At this point in his career, rather than consciously "adjusting" his work to appeal to New Yorker editors, or any other literary market, he saw North American cities as sharing a culture and perceived ways of being and speaking in Anglophone Montreal and Boston as interchangeable. For Callaghan, cultural divisions existed between the urban and the rural, not between Canada and the United States, and this approach to place was might account for the vague descriptions of setting in some of the stories he submitted to *The*

New Yorker. As the 1930s progressed, however, Callaghan found himself "adjusting" his work, or allowing his editors to adjust it for him, in order to make it clear that his stories were set in New York.

2.5 Archival Typescripts: "Tailored to the tastes and needs of New York editors"

The New Yorker is a middle brow magazine in Bourdieu's terms; its editorial content purports to be selected with the intellectual elite in mind, but its advertising content betrays its target market as the economic elite. The magazine is mass produced, yet in its contact with fiction contributors it disavows its economic motivation and attempts to comport itself as a literary magazine produced, in Bourdieu's terms, for other producers.⁴⁷ As a result of this equivocation, Callaghan "misrecognized" his relationship with his *New Yorker* editors as having been more artistically than economically motivated – and therefore more artistically autonomous – than the typescripts in the National Archives of Canada's Morley Callaghan fonds suggest that it actually was in practice.⁴⁸

In the editorial "Around the Parish Pump," Callaghan criticizes Canadian academic literary criticism's preoccupation with nationalism, and its "excommunication" of him from Canadian literature because he "wrote for Americans." He writes:

I remember crossing the road from a hotel to a television studio with the writer Dave Godfrey. Just before entering the studio he said he had always taken it for granted that the stories I wrote for the *New Yorker* had been tailored to the tastes

⁴⁷ That *The New Yorker* continues to cultivate this reputation is evident in its fiction podcast, a feature in which current *New Yorker* fiction contributors read aloud their favourite short stories written by other *New Yorker* contributors.

⁴⁸ Bourdieu describes the relationship between artistic producers and the agents who help to consecrate and distribute their work as one of misrecognition. He writes that publishers, for example, "are equivocal figures" who must "possess, simultaneously, economic dispositions which, in some sectors . . . are totally alien to the producers and also properties close to those of the producers whose work they valorize and exploit" (39). The result is the creation of a "relationship of trust and belief [between producer and publisher] which is the basis of an exploitation presupposing a high degree of misrecognition on each side" (40).

and needs of New York editors. Startled, I explained that no editors had ever altered my stories or tried to make them seem like anything else but what they were . . . What was the use in explaining that I hadn't headed for the *New Yorker*? When I was twenty-five, the *New Yorker* had come to me, asking if I had stories they might want to print. (142-3)

Callaghan himself, and supporters such as Margaret Avison claimed that he is "an artist . . . who makes no such concessions to the market's demands" (Avison 74). This narrative of artistic autonomy is echoed in Barry Callaghan's comments on his father's work. He, like Morley Callaghan himself, claims that *The New Yorker* did not "tinker" with these stories, but rather accepted Callaghan's stories as-is or rejected them outright: "Morley did not go in much for editors tinkering... [. . .]. As for the *New Yorker*, he dealt with Mrs. White, and had very amiable relations with her... they seem either to have taken his stories as they came in, or not (he never once spoke of any line editing) and given the number of stories they took... well, he was happy" (Email to Nadine Fladd, 2 December 2010).⁴⁹ These descriptions of Callaghan's editors differ greatly from the traditional perception of editorial practices at *The New Yorker*. As Yagoda explains, *The New Yorker* had (and still has) a reputation for editing contributors' work quite heavily: "Generally, the assumption among the editors was that substantial editing was almost always necessary – an unexalted view of authorial sovereignty that [founder Harold] Ross carried over from his newspaper years" (200).

Even the finding aid for *The New Yorker* Records at the New York Public library states that "After the writer wrote the first draft he or she collaborated with an editor (by letter or more often in person) in line-by-line revision" (vi). In the case of Morley Callaghan's work, both the Callaghans' own claims and the claims of those who would

⁴⁹ In general, Barry Callaghan appears to be right in characterizing Morley's relationships with his editors as "amiable." In his 1958 interview with Robert Weaver, host of CBC Radio's short story program "Anthology," Morley indicates the high esteem in which he held Harold Ross by describing him as "a remarkable editor." In the same interview, he described "Mrs. White" as possessing "a very remarkable talent" and "a better gift for fiction" than his editor at Scribners, Maxwell Perkins (26-27).

insist that *The New Yorker* edited so heavily that they made all writers and their works adopt a typical "New Yorker" voice and style, are overstatements. In some cases, Callaghan's stories were accepted with virtually no editing, while in others, editors re-worked Callaghan's submissions to the point of interfering with Callaghan's authorial intentions.

Callaghan's editors at *The New Yorker*, White and Gibbs in particular, "greatly informed the final versions" of Callaghan's stories, in some cases even those stories that did not appear in the magazine (Stingone ix). The editorial processes surrounding the stories Callaghan submitted to *The New Yorker* can be broken down into several categories: stories that required little or no editing; stories that were edited to make them more consistent with anticipated readers' assumptions that they were set in New York; stories that required significant structural or line by line editing; stories that were rejected, but with commentary that encouraged Callaghan to make revisions; and stories that were edited for length or financially-motivated reasons. I will offer a brief overview of these categories and explore the evolution of two stories, "Timothy Harshaw's Flute" (1934) and "The White Pony" (1938), in more detail. "Timothy Harshaw's Flute" functions as a representative example of collaboration between editor and author, that is, of the ways in which Callaghan's relationships with his *New Yorker* editors informed the evolution and published versions of his work. "The White Pony," on the other hand, functions as an extreme example of editorial interference, but one which lays bare the economic rather than artistic foundation of Callaghan's editorial relationships.

In some cases what both Callaghans claimed about the lack of line-by-line editing of Morley's stories is true. Letters regarding the story "The Son," which was published as "All The Years of Her Life," indicate that it was accepted virtually as-is, and required "hardly any editing" (Letter from K.S. White to Ann Watkins, 22 May 1935).⁵⁰ "The

⁵⁰ "The Son" is likely the story that was published as "All the Years of Her Life," a story about a son who is caught stealing from a druggist, and the mother who rescues him from his predicament. "All The Years of Her Life" appeared in *The New Yorker* on June 8, 1935, a few weeks after White wrote the letter to Callaghan's agent. Curiously, however, the typescript of "All the Years of Her Life" in Callaghan's archives is titled as such, suggesting that this typescript is not the untitled version that Callaghan submitted

"Rejected One" is another story that required only minor editing. An original typescript of this story is available in Library and Archives Canada's Callaghan fonds, making it possible to track the differences between the version of the story Callaghan submitted and that published by *The New Yorker*, but as the letters between Callaghan and White indicate, except for one substantive exception, the changes were minimal and, more important, Callaghan did not believe they compromised his vision of the work. On November 13, 1933, White wrote to Callaghan:

We are delighted with THE REJECTED ONE which we think is a very fine story indeed . . . A few points came up in editing which we hope you will agree on, mostly minor changes for clarity. The chief one, however, was not for this, but was to change the part where you said the boy had met his girl at a dance hall. In New York most of the dance halls where you can meet girls are the five and ten cent ones where the girls are a pretty bad lot, so we made a change to have him meet her at Coney Island with a fellow from the office. This adds a local note also.

Although Callaghan never signed off on a final proof of this story,⁵¹ he was perfectly happy with the way that it appeared, and told White as much: "The Rejected One looked all right to me in print, I don't notice any changes that altered my conception in any way, and it read beautifully" (9 December 1933). This example demonstrates what often took place during the editing process between Callaghan and *The New Yorker*. Cognizant

to White. Although there is no date or address on the typescript to help date it, its contents, save for minor punctuation, are nearly identical to those published on 8 June 1935.

⁵¹ White explained the situation that prevented a proof from getting to Callaghan in a letter: "[i]n your last story which we are using in the issue that goes to press this week, an unfortunate thing happened which I want to square with you if I can. You're [sic] author's proof went out without the proper proof queries on it, since it was read by a new proof reader. Seven or eight minor changes came up since and as the piece was going to press we had to make them without consulting you, but they were mostly commas or questions that involved very minor changes. I do hope you won't think we have made any unjust changes" (2 December 1933).

of the need to appeal to its target market, the magazine insisted on the addition of details that denote a New York setting. Callaghan, as a believer in the cosmopolitan who was, in practice, often out of touch with the idiom and class issues outside of his native Toronto, saw his stories as taking place in one North American city as nearly as easily as any other, and did not resist the addition of direct references to New York. Sometimes the ways in which Callaghan's focus on settings other than New York caused *The New Yorker* to reject some of his stories outright. In several other cases, however, the magazine's editors saw potential in a story and attempted to increase the likelihood that its readers would be able to identify with it by either adding New York-specific details or by removing details that indicated a Canadian context or which might confuse American readers.

In the case of "Silk Stockings," White wrote to Callaghan on February 1, 1932:

We like SILK STOCKINGS and think it is one of the best stories you have sent us for some time. Our only objection to it is that it seems to be placed in some small city or town which as a background is not recognizable to New York readers. It occurred to us that this story could be placed in Brooklyn, for in Brooklyn there are boarding houses and it would bring it more home if you could faintly suggest a Brooklyn background.

As the story is published in the 16 April 1932 issue of the magazine, when the protagonist David Monroe leaves a department store after purchasing a pair of stockings for his landlady's daughter, with whom he is enamored, it is clear that he is not in a small town. In fact, the narrator makes it obvious that the streetscape described is Manhattan, where David is shopping before returning home to Brooklyn: "David began to hurry, for he had to cross over to Brooklyn and he wanted to get home to the boarding house before Anne did" (16). White et al. asked for similar changes to "The Voyage Out." The letter she wrote to Callaghan regarding the story serves as an example to support her belief that Callaghan, try as he might, was parochial in his own way and was not as familiar with

New York as he needed to be. From White's perspective, his fiction suffered as a result.⁵² In all three of these examples, Callaghan may not have tailored his work "to the tastes and needs of New York editors" himself (142), but he did allow his editors to tailor his work to the tastes and needs of New York readers.

Another story with a long trail of letters indicating revision based on making the story sound more like it is set in New York is "One Spring Night." When Callaghan first submitted the story, which is about a young man and woman who stay out walking together so late that they fear it will cause suspicion about how they might have been spending their time together, White rejected it, describing some of the problems that she and the other fiction editors perceived with the story. Once again, Callaghan's sensitivity to the idioms and class-structures of New York was insufficient for the magazine's purposes:

many people are bothered by some of your wording throughout the piece, particularly in the dialogue. For example, "I don't like to go home at this hour, Bob. I dare not," doesn't sound to us real. One man here said about it that "never in all his walkings with women has one said 'I dare not!'" Another point that

⁵² White wrote to Callaghan:

We think yes, in principle, on this story and like it very much, but there are certain things we hope you can do to it. For one thing, we think you ought to give a different explanation of how Jeff met Jessie. It doesn't seem to us a reasonable explanation, from the point of view of living in New York, to have a man look into a millinery store on 42nd Street and pick up an acquaintance that way. Incidentally, we doubt if there are any millinery stores on 42nd Street, though we don't say there may not be. The big street for millinery stores is farther down, however, and the millinery district in general is in the thirties. But that is unsound on the neighborhood business. Boy picks up girl at millinery store in 42nd Street. (Is there such, for God's sake?) They walk to her home. He apparently lives right around the neighborhood, too. This is too much, I think, and I would overcome the preposterous coincidence by having him meet her at some kind of a social, or pick her up in front of his house . . . In other words, in New York most people, particularly people who are like this boy, don't live anywhere near their work, and they are more apt than not to live at the opposite end of the city from their lady loves. Perhaps your young man could pick the girl up at the movies. I think that is one way it is done, or on a bus, or something. (4 February 1936)

White enumerated a few other issues, and sent the story back to Callaghan "chiefly to have [him] fix up the matter of how the boy and girl meet." In the version of the story published in the June 17, 1936 issue of *The New Yorker*, Jessie works in a millinery store, but meets Jeff at the movies.

bothers us that we don't recognize these people, at least not in New York.

Nowhere in New York do families of this sort still live in private houses. (Letter to Morley Callaghan, 15 February 1934)

Callaghan replied to White a few days later, promising to "move the family into an apartment" and reassuring her that "There should be no difficulty about that because it is a mere detail in the story." He also promised to "go over the dialogue with a fine eye" (18 February 1934). He resubmitted the revised story on 20 February, which White accepted on 10 March. She was still not satisfied with the dialogue, however, and continued to focus on making the characters sound as if they came from 1930s New York. She described the additional changes the magazine had made to the story, in order to "simplify or explain the spots that were not quite clear" and "to make the dialogue sound [more] like [the talk of] boy[s] and girl[s] . . . We didn't think it quite sounded like them" she continued, "or at least not like New York boys and girls" (Letter to Morley Callaghan, 10 March 1934). In the version *The New Yorker* published on 14 April 1934 Sheila asks: "What will they say when I go home at this hour, Bob?" instead of stating that she dare not go home (21). Callaghan does indeed make it clear that Sheila's family lives in an apartment rather than a single-family home, and makes reference to Sheila's father talking "in his good-humored way about the old days in New York and the old eating places" (22) to reassure readers that the setting is in fact New York. Other than the reference to Sheila and Bob looking "along the wide avenue and up the towering, slanting faces of the buildings to the patches of night sky" (21), there is very little descriptive evidence of the New York setting. Sheila and Bob walk for hours, but it is unclear which part of the city they are wandering in, and there is not a single reference to a specific street, neighbourhood, landmark or local business. While this story reinforces White's claim that Callaghan had a weak grasp of New York culture and geography, the most interesting thing that the letters between White and Callaghan reveal is the inaccuracy of Callaghan's claim that "the stories I wrote for the *New Yorker* had [not] been tailored to the tastes and needs of New York editors [and] . . . that no editors had ever altered my stories or tried to make them seem like anything else but what they were" (Weaver, "A Talk" 142). In this instance *The New Yorker* took a story whose unspecified urban North American setting reflects the author's strong belief in the value of cosmopolitanism, and

transformed it into a story that clumsily reflects the native or local. That Callaghan agreed so often to these kinds of changes demonstrates the economic nature of his relationship with the magazine. As time passed, he came to value the economic capital he earned through publication more than he valued authorial autonomy.

2.5.1 Archival Typescripts: "The White Pony" and Callaghan's Decline in Symbolic Capital

Unlike his relationship with his son Barry, Callaghan's relationship with *The New Yorker* was rarely one in which equal partners collaborated. At the beginning of his career, it was he who possessed symbolic capital as a result of his publication in little magazines in Europe and association with Hemingway, and it was *The New Yorker* that solicited his work and gladly accepted his submissions, even those set in Toronto such as "An Escapade." The above examples in which Callaghan's editors negotiated for changes to his work based on setting, changes which Callaghan approved (and did not seem to mind as a result of his differing view of place), represent a middle period in his relationship with the magazine during the early 1930s in which *The New Yorker* had developed a reputation for itself as a publisher of fiction, and no longer needed to rely on Callaghan's literary reputation for artistic legitimacy. The magazine became a culturally legitimizing entity (in addition to an economic entity) in itself. This shift helps to explain Callaghan's willingness to alter his stories for the magazine; he was willing to meet their demands in order to have his work printed in the magazine and have its symbolic capital extended to him. Callaghan's willingness to submit to the demands of a specific (New York) market was also economically motivated. In his theorization of the hierarchical power dynamics of cultural production, Bourdieu argues that "the less well endowed they are with specific capital," the more likely intellectual or cultural producers are to be seduced by "the powers that be" (41). As the Second World War drew closer, Callaghan experienced a decline in symbolic capital; his writing and his reputation stagnated. In order to support his family financially through The Great Depression, he exchanged authorial autonomy for monetary compensation, marking a reversal in his relationship with *The New Yorker*.

In the case of "The White Pony" (1938), Callaghan was clearly disappointed with the changes made to his story. The publication history of this story illustrates some of the more quotidian and competing motivations behind the artistic decisions he and his editors made. His editors were concerned about length, while Callaghan was concerned about money. In her monograph on Callaghan, Patricia Morley suggests that his decision to publish in the U.S. was motivated by the fact that he "had a living to make, a literary reputation to establish" (8). Once he had established that reputation, however, in the late 1930s and 1940s he went through "a period of spiritual dryness" in which he could not produce publishable stories:

The rise of Hitler and the Spanish war had made me profoundly cynical about the Great War that was approaching. For years I had been writing stories for *The New Yorker*. Suddenly I couldn't write such stories. Any story I attempted was done half-heartedly. Soon no one wanted my work. I had either lost my talent or no longer had anything to say. But I had a wife and two children. I tried to borrow money, using my car as security. No one even wanted my car . . . After all the quick early success, was I all washed up? (Callaghan, "The Pleasures of Failure" 13)

The New Yorker rejected nearly every story Callaghan submitted during his period of "drought." On 26 February 1937, White wrote to Callaghan's agent, Harold Matson, rejecting yet another story and offering some advice:

I have a feeling that he is trying to write too many stories too fast. There really seems to be too many points against this story to go into them, except that [it contains too many] ~~the~~ coincidences, ~~the~~ [and] fortuitous circumstances, etc. that aid his plot, and a great deal of pretty bad writing I am afraid . . . perhaps you can warn him against trying to do too much too fast.

Another letter to Matson dated June 30th of that year includes the lines: "Of course, we hope that there will be more stories from Morley Callaghan and hope that the [New Yorker's] jinx can be broken somehow on him" (White, K.S. Letter to Harold Matson, 30 June 1937). In archival material from 1939, *The New Yorker's* frustration with the work

Callaghan was producing is even clearer. Matson submitted Callaghan's "Gus's Disordered Life" to Gus Lobrano for consideration, which Lobrano passed on to another fiction editor, Maxwell. Maxwell offered his thoughts on the story in handwriting directly upon Matson's letter with the words, "Just ridiculous, isn't it?" Lobrano concurred, and responded with: "You're absolutely right, brother" (Matson, Harold. Letter to Gus Lobrano, 1 February 1939). Callaghan continued to submit stories into the 1940s, but *The New Yorker* did not publish any of his work past 1938. Nonetheless, the magazine did what it could to help him financially. *The New Yorker* allowed its contributors to set up a drawing account against future pieces purchased by the magazine and, in part because his wife Loretto had required an operation, Callaghan was in the position of owing money to the magazine. Beginning in 1937, letters from Ik Shuman to Callaghan's agent appear in the correspondence archives, asking for updated information about the author's recent sales to other magazines, and contributions against the balance of the \$900 that the magazine had advanced him.

It is within this context that *The New Yorker* purchased "The White Pony" from Callaghan in 1938. In its typical desire for brevity, the magazine made several cuts to the story. For the first time, however, the cuts appeared to affect the price the magazine was willing to pay. On 23 March 1938, White wrote to Matson:

The negotiations concerning Morley Callaghan's story, "The White Pony," were begun while I was away and I believe that the arrangement with you was that we would send a copy of the story, cut as we should like to see it go, for Mr. Callaghan's approval. I enclose such a copy and hope that he will approve of it. Since we think we can only use the story in this considerably abbreviated form, we don't feel that we can pay Mr. Callaghan's \$300 flat rate for the story. What we can offer is \$210 which is at the same word rate (based on the average of his usual length for fiction) that the \$300 pieces work out to average per word. In other words, he is getting our top rate of pay and the price is less now only because the story is so short in its present form.

We'll understand if you and Mr. Callaghan don't wish to sell the story in this way, but we hope that you will want to, because we are anxious to have a story of his to use after all these months, and because we like the white pony and the small boy.

As Shuman disclosed to White in a handwritten note at the end of her copy of the letter to Matson that included Callaghan's cheque, however, the cut in Callaghan's rate had more to do with the quality of the story than its length.

Fiction contributions were appraised based on the "grade" that their editors assigned to them. Gallant's editor, Maxwell, for example, usually gave all of his writers' work an A+ rating so that they would receive the highest pay rate possible. Shuman explained to White that "The White Pony" had been "bought at B rating . . . because it was inferior piece, required lot of work etc." (Shuman, Ik. Letter to Harold Matson, 31 March 1938). When the financially-strapped Callaghan found out about this lowered rate he was upset, but acquiesced to the cuts to both his story and his rate of pay. Harold Matson wrote to White on March 30th:

I have now heard from Morley Callaghan. I quote from his letter:

"I was a bit astonished by The New Yorker business. This is the first time in eight years of association with them that anything like this ever happened.

"Some of my stories, I know, have been only five pages long: if this one now is only four, ninety dollars seems to be a hell of a large cut for a page.

"I haven't a possible explanation, because once Mrs. White told me the shorter the stories were the better for them, and it didn't touch the rate."

. . . Despite all these questions and despite the fact that he, the author, naturally likes his own version of the story, he wants you to have it, and I return to you herewith your version.

An incomplete typescript of "The White Pony" is available in Library and Archives Canada's Callaghan fonds, but since it is untitled, relatively rough and does not contain

Callaghan's name and address, it is likely an early version of the story rather than the typescript that Callaghan submitted to White (Callaghan, "Fragments of 'The White Pony'"). It is therefore not possible to discern which cuts and changes to the story as it appears in the magazine were Callaghan's, and which were made by his editors. This partial typescript contains seven pages, though, and appears to be missing at least one page. The version published in the 27 August 1938 issue of *The New Yorker*, as Callaghan pointed out, was four pages long; in short, *The New Yorker* may have cut as much as 50% of the story.

When Callaghan's editors accepted "The White Pony," they appear to have purchased what they considered an inferior story for the sake of helping a longtime contributor. Although this gesture appears altruistic on the surface, the editorial process "The White Pony" went through makes clear the power dynamics of this financial transaction. Bourdieu argues that, despite their claims that they produce art for art's sake, "writers are deeply self-interested," and "the least well-off writers resign themselves more readily to 'industrial literature,' in which writing becomes a job like any other" (79 and 68). Lacking in both symbolic and economic capital, Callaghan ceded to *The New Yorker* the only commodity he still had to offer in an exchange: authorial sovereignty over "The White Pony." Callaghan's objections to the significant editing the magazine undertook seem financially rather than aesthetically motivated; despite Matson's claim that Callaghan preferred his own, longer version of the story, Callaghan published "The White Pony" in the 1959 Collection *Morley Callaghan's Stories* in its abbreviated form, exactly as it appeared in *The New Yorker*. The example of "The White Pony" marks the completion of the reversal in Callaghan's relationship with *The New Yorker*.

2.5.2 Archival Typescripts: "Timothy Harshaw's Flute" as Case Study

On 26 February, 1932, White wrote to Callaghan rejecting a story about a poor man, his wife, their dream to move to Paris and the baby that interfered with these plans, pointing out that "there is certainly something in the theme of the kind, impractical optimist, the kind of man the husband is in your story, but we don't think you have quite worked out

the details as you should. And the wife doesn't seem to us a very clear characterization. Perhaps you will want to think along the theme again and make another start at it."

"Timothy Harshaw's Flute" (1934) functions as a representative example of collaboration between editor and author: of the ways in which Callaghan's relationships with his *New Yorker* editors informed the evolution of and published versions of his work. The magazine's original rejection of the story (K.S. White, Letter to Callaghan, 26 Feb. 1932) encouraged Callaghan to revise it (Callaghan, Letter to K.S. White, 6 March 1932; Callaghan, Letter to K.S. White 2 May [1932]). Unlike some of the other stories that Callaghan revised at *The New Yorker's* suggestion,⁵³ it exists in both typescript *and* published form (in this case, published first by *The New Yorker*); there is enough archival evidence to trace the revision and publication process of the story. "Timothy Harshaw's Flute" functions as a representative of the many stories that *The New Yorker* rejected, the revisions that such rejections encouraged, and the kind of rigorous editing *New Yorker* editors subjected a story to once they had accepted it. They often turned short sentences into complex, subordinated sentences, cut the word "so" out of several of Callaghan's sentences, and shortened long descriptions. The story also demonstrates Callaghan's usual response to the editing. The editing process that this relatively complete set of archival material reveals gives us an insider's view into how *The New Yorker* worked with its authors during the 1920s and 30s: when possible, in an amiably quasi-

⁵³ Callaghan re-wrote the stories "Madison Square" and "Two Sisters" and resubmitted them to *The New Yorker* after they had been rejected. White rejected "Madison Square" on September 17, 1936 (Letter to Morley Callaghan). Callaghan revised and resubmitted the story (Letter to K.S. White, 1936), which White rejected again on October 13, 1936 (Letter to Morley Callaghan). Callaghan's archives contain a typescript of "Madison Square" with handwritten revisions on it (Callaghan, "Madison Square"). "Madison Square" is not included in Callaghan's *Complete Stories*, however, which suggests that it was never published. A similar fate befell "Two Sisters" or "The Italian Grove Street story" as White often referred to it. On White's advice – "I do wish you would let the piece lay around for a while and try again because it does seem to me it might be fixed up" (17 June 1930) – Callaghan re-wrote the story several times in an attempt to get *The New Yorker* to accept it. The Callaghan fonds at Library and Archives Canada contains at least four versions of the story, one in which a landlord tells his tenant the story of courting and marrying a woman he didn't love (his now wife) but also making love to her sister (who now lives with them), and others in which this story is told directly in the third person without the tenant's own story to frame it (Callaghan, "Two Sisters," and "Draft of Two Sisters,"). White rejected the story for good on July 29, 1930 (Letter to Callaghan). Again, however, since no published version of the story exists, it is difficult to argue that the changes we can track through the different versions of the story informed the *final* version of the story.

collaborative fashion, creating the kinds of "collaborative texts that Stillinger and McGann theorize. Occasionally, however, these collaborative, social texts were formed not through collaboration between equal partners, but rather by enforcing substantive changes designed to better appeal to the magazine's target market. In the case of "Timothy Harshaw's Flute," these changes include (once again) emphasizing the story's New York setting and subtle de-emphasis of the pathos of Callaghan's first typescript by removing descriptions of the Harshaws' struggles and references to the historical fact of the Great Depression. These changes demonstrate the way that Callaghan and the magazine negotiated two sets of tensions: conflicting senses of place, and conflicting ideological approaches to the representation of suffering and poverty. The changes also demonstrate the significant influence the magazine's editors had on Callaghan's work on both a structural level, and on the level of "line-by-line editing."

On 2 May 1932 Callaghan sent White a new version of the story, writing, "As you suggested, I put this story, Timothy Harshaw's Flute Music, away for some time, and then the other day I rewrote it without looking at all at the old story, to try and see it freshly and get the details sharper. I think it worth reading in any event." The Callaghan fonds contain a complete typescript of the story, a partial typescript containing the first two pages of a different version of the story, and two copies of the first page of a third typescript, one a clean copy and one containing handwritten revisions (Callaghan, Drafts of "Timothy Harshaw's Flute Music"). Although these typescripts are undated, they do include Callaghan's name and address in the top right corner. Since the address listed at the top of the complete typescript and the one-page typescripts – 191 Roxton Road – corresponds to the address to which White sent her rejection letter, it is likely that these documents represent earlier versions of the story, and that the complete typescript is the one that Callaghan submitted to *The New Yorker*. I will refer to this complete typescript as the first version of the story. The address listed on what I will refer to as the second version of the story – 46 Avenue Road – matches the address Callaghan included in his letter to White when he resubmitted the story. This fact suggests that the partial, two-page typescript represents a revised version of the story informed by White's criticisms.

The major changes between the first two pages of these versions deal with the amount of detail in which Louise Harshaw, Timothy Harshaw's wife, is described, the setting, the emphasis on secondary characters, and the framing of the story's core action. The first version of the story begins:

In the early winter morning Timothy Harshaw and his wife went looking for a room and finally took one with a worn red carpet ~~fr~~ in a house owned by a round cheeked and pretty Italian woman. Mrs. Harshaw was a shy, shapely girl with a lovely head of prematurely white thick hair whom Timothy called Du Barry because he thought she looked so much like pictures he had seen of the illustrious Frenchwoman. Timothy, a fine featured blue eye fellow, had been a Rhodes scholar at Oxford. In England where he had been very happy those two years, he had acquired a slight accent and had learned to play most agreeable tunes on a silver flute. Timothy and his wife had decided at last to live cheaply, save their money and go to Europe where they thought they could be happy for the rest of their lives.

Throughout the first version of the story Timothy's wife is referred to as either Du Barry or Mrs. Harshaw. In the second version, in accordance with White's concern that Mrs. Harshaw's characterization is vague, she is given a name: Louise. More significant, however, is the fact that, in this first version of the story Callaghan makes clear that the decision to go to Paris – the dream that animates these characters throughout the entire story – has already been made before the story has begun. In the second version of the story, Callaghan eliminates the Italian landlady and the detailed description of Timothy Harshaw's boss,⁵⁴ but introduces a new character: the Harshaws' neighbour Mr. Weeks.

⁵⁴ In the first version of the story, Timothy has two confrontations with his boss, who, in an amusing coincidence, is a man named Bill Clinton who smokes a cigar. He is first introduced on the second page of the typescript:

Timothy was the first one to get a job. He became a reporter on the News. His journalistic style was really too leisurely for such a paper but for a time he adapted himself very well. Most of the fellows in the city room thought he was too scholarly and too eager to be polite to ever achieve anything but they were willing to help him for they felt he was apt to lose his job at any moment. The routine of the paper seemed to mean nothing at all to him. He was apt to start an

The addition of a neighbour character gives the Harshaws someone to speak to and explain their plans to—making what were expository sections of the story dovetail more gracefully into the action and character development. This allows Callaghan's narrator to vividly describe events as they take place rather than simply tell the reader that they *did* take place. For example, in the first version of the story Callaghan makes a passing reference to the Harshaws' neighbours in a way that emphasizes Timothy's love for playing the flute: "Timothy sat cross legged on the end of the bed playing his silver flute and making fine wistful music till the boys in the next room pounded on the ~~door~~ wall and the Italian woman came and rapped lightly on the door and asked Timothy if he

amiable conversation with Bill Clinton, the city editor, just when the paper was going to press and Bill was chewing a cigar and handling copy very rapidly. At the time of the communistic disturbances when the police charged the crowd, Bill Clinton was oozing good humor because the staff photographer had got enough pictures to fill a front page. Timothy, who was standing beside Clinton said suddenly, "You now Bill, all this confusion is a bit silly. Those fellows aren't half as radical as they think they are."

Clinton didn't like being called Bill by a fellow he hardly knew. Besides, Timothy's little accent and his coats that never matched his pants didn't appeal to him, so he just twisted his cigar. Timothy went on, "A few years ago I was interested in a movement that was twice as radical as this social movement."

"What was that?" Clinton said. He thought Timothy must have been an anarchist. "What movement," he said.

"Theosophy," Timothy said.

"Theosophy, OH go way," Clinton said. "Don't bother me." (2-3)

While in the second version it is this confrontation that gets Timothy fired, in the first version, Bill Clinton and Timothy butt heads over a matter of conscience:

They had a temporary setback when Timothy lost his job at the News. There had been a fire in the summer hotel by a lake and many were burned to death. News men who had been rushed up to the hotel in a motor car came back to the office to write their stories. All night relatives of those who had been staying at the hotel kept on phoning to the newspaper offices asking for information about the fire. Timothy was answering the phone when and [sic] elderly woman in a tearful voice asked if her daughter, Miss Brown, had been saved. Timothy called to Bill Clinton who had been up all night, "Any word about a Miss Brown, Bill." Running his finger down the list of the dead. Clinton called, "She was burned to death in her room. Who's on the phone?" "Her mother," Timothy said. "Swell, tell her the daughter's OK. Then she'll feel good and tell her you'd like a picture," Clinton said.

Looking very worried Timothy said, "Really old man, I couldn't do that. it might kill the poor woman later on when she found out."

"You couldn't, he. Well, you cab [sic] get the hell out. I'm tired of you anyway."

would mind going to sleep." In the second version, the flute-playing allows Callaghan to introduce his expository device, the neighbour Mr. Weeks: "In the evenenings [sic], Mr.s Weeks, the bondsalesman, who lived in the room behind the Harshaws, used to hear Timothy playing on his silver flute[.] One night, when Mr.s Weeks could stand the flute playing no longer he went and rapped on the Harshaw's door and pretended he was making a social call." Louise Harshaw opens the door for Mr. Weeks, giving Callaghan the opportunity to describe her in detail, and giving Timothy Harshaw a chance to explain to his neighbour (but for the benefit of the reader) that he learned to play the flute while on scholarship at the Sorbonne. Rather than telling the reader that the Harshaws have already decided to move to France, in this version Callaghan allows this decision-making to become part of the story.

The addition of the bond salesman also allows for more detail at other points in the story. To celebrate getting a job, for example, Timothy goes out to buy fine cheeses. In the second version of the story, Timothy borrows five dollars from the bondsalesman in order to make the purchase, since presumably he and Louise have no money. In addition, Timothy's enthusiasm and optimism, which is, in essence the point of the story since it ends with a description of him playing the flute despite the challenges facing him, is much clearer in the second version. In the first version of the story Callaghan emphasizes the difficulty they face in finding work – "But it was hard getting any kind of work in the winter and they both got sore feet from tramping around the streets. Once Timothy got his feet wet and caught a cold and after that he wore a heavy woolen scarf tied high around his neck." In the second version, Callaghan cuts the description of the difficulties of searching for work in the winter and simply states that Timothy and Louise "both seemed to have some of the shining enthusiasm that makes every obstacle a stimulation." This description makes it clear that the Harshaws' enthusiasm comes not from the specific project at hand, but is rather a part of their temperament, and might easily be applied to any situation.

Here the two pages of the partial, second typescript end, and it is necessary to compare Callaghan's original submission to the version of the story that *The New Yorker* published to get a sense of the rest of the changes that were made. Some of these

changes may have been made by Callaghan in response to White's criticism, but others were made by White herself. As she wrote to Callaghan on 9 June 1932: "Now on TIMOTHY HARSHAW'S FLUTE we have taken tremendous liberties, which we should not have done if you had been nearer," and outlines some of the more significant revisions:

Some of these changes, as I said, were for brevity only, others were to make it sound like New York. For example, there are no bond salesmen visible in New York any more so we changed Mr. Weeks to a bank teller. We also placed the house they were living in to identify it as people of this sort don't live in rooming houses in New York. also, there is no such thing as a publicity agent for burlesque companies here, that we know of at least; and we changed snow to rain because we haven't had any snow in years.

After detailing a few other changes and clarifications she has made, White concludes: "I should be awfully glad if you thought we had improved rather than hurt the story. A good many of the cuts were made to shorten the piece as it really ran far too long for our purposes." There are two significant general differences between the first typescript that Callaghan submitted and the version of the story *The New Yorker* published on 10 February 1934 under the title "Timothy Harshaw's Flute." One difference White alluded to: the second version more clearly emphasizes the story's New York setting. The other difference is subtler; it deemphasizes the pathos of the first typescript.

By removing descriptions of the Harshaws' struggles and references to Communism and the Great Depression, the published version of the story presents Timothy Harshaw as an unrealistic fool whose delusions are amusing rather than a model of positive thinking during difficult times that readers might emulate. The first typescript of the story, for example, includes a reference to "the time of the communistic disturbances when the police charged the crowd" that does not appear in the version of the story published in *The New Yorker*. This version encourages the reader to see Timothy and Louise Harshaw as part of their historical context; they are clearly dreamers, but their financial challenges are at least in part a result of the Great Depression. When

Timothy is fired from the publishing house at which he works in the version *The New Yorker* published, it is not because he is faced with the crisis of conscience he faces at the newspaper in the first version. The *New Yorker* version explains that "he had got into an argument with his boss about theosophy and had suggested that modern Americans might be the ancient Egyptians reincarnated, and the boss, slamming his fist on the desk, had begun to tell Timothy everything that was wrong with him." In the first version of the story, Bill Clinton, Timothy's boss, comes across as the villain, while Timothy is a principled, if eccentric, man who risks his job despite the Depression in order to do the right thing. In the *New Yorker* version, it is the combination of Timothy's eccentricity and inability to hold his tongue, and his boss's impatience, that result in his losing his job. The difference in the actions Timothy takes after being fired also highlights the way that his character evolves to become more foolish and amusing than pathetic and edifying. In the *New Yorker* version, readers are invited to laugh at Timothy's enthusiastic embrace of a (feminine) domestic role and the image of him wearing a woman's apron: "Louise worked hard, rebuffed her sly, sentimental employer sweetly, and hurried home every night to Timothy, who cooked the dinner for her. He used to stand at the window waiting for her, with one of her aprons around his waist. He had taken a special fancy to cooking" (18). In the first version of the story, the division between wage earner and domestic worker is less clear:

Timothy . . . always had a meal prepared. The Italian woman had cleaned up the room for him and left him free to do his cooking, a very special cooking by this time, for there seemed to be no end to his inventiveness. And in the mornings, by working consistently, he wrote twelve detective stories which he sent to the pulpwood magazines, and sold one.

In this version of the story, Timothy attempts to contribute to his and Louise's financial well being by writing stories. The description of his cooking as "inventive" suggests a creativity that is borne out of the necessity of eating economically, as opposed to the self-indulgent creativity that the words "special" and "fancy" imply. In the first version, Timothy and Louise work as a team, and do whatever is necessary to achieve their goals during challenging times. In the *New Yorker* version, the focus is on the (implied) role

reversal of Timothy as homemaker: a reversal that the narrator's tone and diction condemn.

When Louise reveals that she is pregnant, Timothy, contrary to Louise's fears, and despite the economic challenges that having a child will pose, does not despair. In the first version of the story, although Timothy is happy that he will be a father, the revelation that he will soon be responsible for a child forces him to put his own life and the decisions he has made into perspective, thus inducing a sense of humility: "he held her hands while he explained quietly that that he was aware that he had failed to make certain adjustments with life and had disappointed his won [sic] people, but he was confident that in an environment more suitable to his temperament, he would be more successful." In the *New Yorker* version, Timothy's reaction to the news is less complicated, and more self-absorbed: "At last he took a deep breath and said, "Good, good. That gives a man a sense of completion. Let's hope it's a boy, Louise." The addition of the suggestion that "It never occurred to Timothy that he would have to pay" the obstetrical specialist that he hires for Louise (19) once again encourages the reader to see him as foolishly deluded rather than someone who chooses to make the best of the hand he has been dealt, and changes the implications of the final scene in which, after having helped to deliver the baby, the obstetrician listens to Timothy's incessant flute-playing from the street. Depending on the way Timothy's character has been presented in each version of the story, this scene encourages varying responses from the reader, ranging from admiration for Timothy's perseverance to derision and scorn for his refusal to deal with reality.

This shift in the tone of the story is not altogether unexpected. Callaghan, although not overtly Marxist or ideological about it, was class-conscious (if unfamiliar with the American class context) and interested in the financial and psychological hardships facing North Americans during the 1930s.⁵⁵ *The New Yorker*, in contrast, was

⁵⁵ Callaghan himself wrote in the prologue to *Morley Callaghan's Stories*: "Looking back on them I can see that I have been concerned with the problems of many kinds of people but I have neglected those of

not, and is often accused of having been out of touch with the concerns of the average American during the Great Depression. As Kunkel explains, the advertisements in the magazine remained "relentlessly upscale" throughout the Depression (183):

Ross was slow to notice that for almost everyone else the party was over. For millions of Americans, the Depression meant anything from discomfiture to destitution, but he was not among them . . . Had they been more profoundly touched, doubtless *The New Yorker* would have been quicker to recognize the hard times . . . Especially through the early Thirties, it tended to treat hard times as more a nuisance—an inconvenience, really, on a par with balky automobiles or feckless valets—than the catastrophe it was. (181)

Perhaps, amidst the gloom of the Depression, the humour magazine's goal – "to give people a laugh and a lift" – seemed like a noble one to Ross (Kunkel 183). The magazine may also have profited from the Depression-era trend of escapism (seen in other media, particularly in musicals) into wish-fulfillment fantasies that focused on the lavish lifestyles of the rich and offered audiences a psychological reprieve. This escape motif is repeated in the theatrical theme and aspirations to high culture reflected in Timothy Harshaw's lectures about fine cheeses and wine.

the very, very rich. I have a story that begins, 'Once upon a time there were two millionaires', but I haven't finished it yet" (in Conron "Short Story Writer" 71-72).

As Woodcock argues, Callaghan

shows a deep consciousness of existing social ills; it is depression conditions that originally drive Ronnie to prostitution in *Such is My Beloved* and scar Michael Aikenhead's young manhood with unemployment in *They Shall Inherit the Earth*. At the same time there is no suggestion – at least in Callaghan's own attitude – of the political messianism that spoilt so many novels in the thirties; . . . he passes no Marxist judgment and the effects of a depression environment on his characters are observed objectively. (28-29)

Throughout the 1920s and 1930s, the magazine printed several Callaghan stories featuring protagonists whose struggles include, but are not limited to, financial ones. As the differences between the typescript Callaghan originally submitted and the version *The New Yorker* ultimately published reveal, though, Callaghan's literary world view and his interest in bearing witness to the lives of the working class in his "serious fiction" conflicted with the magazine's tacit policy to favour the light-hearted over the sober. The magazine preferred Callaghan's explorations of serious topics such as unemployment and poverty when his earnestness was seasoned with a little schadenfreude; *New Yorker* stories at this point were supposed to make readers chuckle rather than empathize. This change in tone dampens Callaghan's celebration of his characters' cosmopolitan sensibility – Timothy and Louise Harshaw are willing to leave America for France because "There's nothing here" in the US for them, and as a translator, Timothy Harshaw would feel perfectly at home living in another culture. *The New Yorker*, in contrast, encourages readers to see this decision to move to Europe as a foolish dream.

The other major difference between the first typescript of "Timothy Harshaw's Flute" and the version published by *The New Yorker*, and one for which White took responsibility in her letter to Callaghan, revolved around making it clear that the story was set in New York. What is not clear in the first version, though, is where in North America Timothy and Louise Harshaw currently live. The narrator explains that Du Barry "had never been out of the country but she expected to love France." The story sends mixed messages about which country Du Barry has never left, however. No streets are named to help the reader identify the city as Toronto; the newspaper for which Timothy works is simply called "The News," and the restaurant at which Timothy and Louise Harshaw meet each day, Child's, had franchises in both Canada and the United States.⁵⁶ The changes made by both Callaghan and White throughout the editorial process

⁵⁶ The first page of a typescript with handwritten revisions that appears to be an even earlier version than the one Callaghan presumably sent to *The New Yorker*, however, makes it clear that the story is set in the United States and not Canada. This incomplete typescript contains the same address – 191 Roxton Road – as the "first version" Callaghan sent to *The New Yorker*, as well as hand-written notes indicating changes and additions that would bring this presumably early draft closer to the version in the first full typescript. It begins: "At last Mr. and Mrs. Timothy Harshaw decided they could not make an adjustment with America

serve to make the setting clearer to readers, and earlier. The reference to Barrow Street in the very first sentence pegs the setting as New York. This change demonstrates, once again, a shift from the cosmopolitan – Callaghan's unnamed North American city – to the local. The ambiguous reference to "the old country" is gone, and Callaghan's own revision, focusing exclusively on France rather than France and England, would be easier for an American audience to relate to given Paris's place in the 1930s as one of the capitals of modernity (see Harvey) and the trope of the American in Paris.

Callaghan, for his part, was pleased by the work of his editors. In response to White's letter about the "liberties" the magazine had taken in editing "Timothy Harshaw's Flute" Callaghan wrote reassuringly:

I thought it best simply to read "Timothy Harshaw's Flute" without any reference to the original manuscript[,] the exact text of which I have forgotten. And when I had finished reading this new version I found it so satisfactory that I decided not to look at the old one, and still have not done so and probably never will for it would only raise questions in my head which were more properly resolved as soon as I read the story as it is now and decided that it was first rate. So all I can say is that the cutting has been done with great skill so the conception and the two principal characters are never disturbed, and I congratulate you.

As for such changes as making my bon[d] salesman a bank teller, changing snow to rain, making a burlesque co. manager into a small producer and so on, that is a

and there was nothing to do but take a cheap room and save their money and then take a boat to Europe where they would be happy for the rest of their lives." While the version published in *The New Yorker* was clearly set in New York, the magazine probably did not change the setting of Callaghan's story; it was always set in a large city in the United States rather than in Canada.

matter of detail which doesn't disturb the story at all, and such minor changes in my stories never bother me.⁵⁷ (14 June 1932)

Callaghan was pleased enough with this version of the story to include it in the 1936 collection *Now That April's Here* without making any changes or undoing the editorial liberties taken by White or other editors. This letter demonstrates Callaghan's openness to editorial intervention. For the most part, he was accepting of the *New Yorker* model of editorial intervention, and was not particularly concerned with protecting, or even making himself aware of infringements upon, his authorial sovereignty, even when changes to his work were motivated by economic factors such as the amount of space available within the pages of a magazine.

Thus far this chapter has explored the ways that various versions of "Timothy Harshaw's Flute" reflect Callaghan's short story oeuvre as fluid – which is to say, contingent upon the site of their publication, and that publication's ideology, implicit editorial policies, and business model. Versions of "Timothy Harshaw's Flute" have been, in various instances, autonomously, heteronomously, or quite often, collaboratively produced. The most recent version of "Timothy Harshaw's Flute," published in Barry Callaghan's *The New Yorker Stories*, contributes a final example of the ways in which versions of Callaghan's stories are both historically contingent and collaborative. In her discussion of "The cultural-historical dynamics of endurance of an object/artifact" – how and why some works of art are adopted as canonical while others are forgotten or ignored as time passes – Herrnstein Smith argues that, as time passes and social conditions change, the function a particular work fulfills, or the functions that we need works to fulfill, may also change (48-49). She offers an overview of readings of Shakespeare's sonnets from different literary and historical periods (by Johnson, Coleridge, and others),

⁵⁷ Although Callaghan did not object to, but rather authorized, the changes the magazine made to the story, he is careful to add a postscript, lest he sound unconcerned about what happens to his own work:

As I read this note it seems that I have given the impression that I don't worry much about changes to my stories; nothing could be further ~~than~~ [from] the truth, but I appreciate the great care you used in making the cuts and can't help but express satisfaction.

wonders "whether any of the[se critics] read the same poems" (4), and argues that "Evaluation is always compromised because value is always in motion: a never-fixed mark" (9). Since, as she argues, literary tastes are not "formed, sustained, or exercised independently" of a critic's social and historical milieu (9), literary works must be "evaluated, continuously, repeatedly" (5). The versions of Callaghan's work collected in his archives and published in *The New Yorker* function as relics and are of "'historical' interest" for the purposes of this study, but the declining use of Callaghan's work in high school and university classrooms suggests that his stories no longer serve a useful function for readers. When a canonical work continues to perform its function or performs a new function for a new group of readers, when its value "is seen as unquestionable," readers and critics are willing to overlook aspects of the text that "conflict intolerably with the interests and ideologies" of twenty-first-century society because of its importance as great art:

for example, incidents or sentiments of brutality, bigotry, and racial, sexual, or national chauvinism—will be repressed or rationalized, and there will be a tendency among humanistic scholars and academics critics to "save the text" by transferring the locus of its interest to more formal or structural features . . .

Thus we make texts timeless by suppressing their temporality. (Herrnstein Smith 49-50)

The "sanitization" of Barry Callaghan's version of "Timothy Harshaw's Flute" in order to remove some of the story's anti-Semitic overtones that 1934 readers may not have found problematic serves as one example of the historically contingent ways readers and critics approach texts.

Barry Callaghan's version of "Timothy Harshaw's Flute" highlights its own historical contingency, not through misdirection away from "alienating" aspects of the text to more formal ones, but rather through an attempt to create a "timeless" text by removing historically contingent elements that a twenty-first-century audience is likely to find problematic. In the version of the story that was published in *The New Yorker*, Louise Harshaw gets a job doing publicity for a small theatrical producer, thanks to her

friend Selma Simpson: "she went around to see the producer with Selma. He was a short Jew who listened respectfully while Selma swore there wasn't a girl like Louise in the whole country" (18). In the version that Barry Callaghan published, the reference to Selma's boss's religion has been eliminated (69). This excision of the fact that Louise's new boss is Jewish compellingly supports Bryant's claims that culture itself is a fluid text (174), and that "texts are mutable and the measure of their mutation is a record of the interpenetrations of artist and culture" (73). Although Callaghan's readers in 1934 may not have paid much attention to this detail, a contemporary audience is much more likely to notice Callaghan's drawing attention to the producer's religious and cultural background. A reader encountering "Timothy Harshaw's Flute" after the Holocaust is much more likely to be sensitive to stereotypes about Jewish people –including the notion of the Jew as manipulative and willing to cheat to gain an economic advantage – than a reader encountering the story well before the Second World War. Had Barry Callaghan included the descriptions of Louise's employer as both "a short Jew" and "sly," a contemporary reader would be inclined to read Callaghan's depiction of the producer as anti-Semitic.

It is tempting to speculate that Barry and/or Morley Callaghan removed this reference from the story before including it in *The New Yorker Stories* in order to avoid accusations of prejudice. By allowing readers to assume that the stories included within the collection are documents of Callaghan's literary achievement in the 1920s and 30s, without drawing attention to the changes that have been made to them, *The New Yorker Stories* succeeds in revising the past. The excision of the reference to Louise's boss's religion, however, betrays the fact that *The New Yorker Stories* is a historical document itself. The attempt to create a "timeless" text by removing historically contingent elements that a contemporary audience is likely to find problematic only highlights the collection's historical nature; it is a text that reflects twenty-first-century social mores and twenty-first-century notions about the characteristics of modernism.

...

Reading the stories Callaghan published in *The New Yorker* alongside archival materials and Barry Callaghan's *The New Yorker Stories* contributes to a deeper understanding of the contingencies of authorship: the material circumstances that make up the social text. For Callaghan, these material circumstances include the shifting nature of his relationship with the magazine, as well as the contingencies of cultural value – the processes of canonization, de-canonization, and the attempted re-canonization of a historical literary figure.

The works that emerged from Callaghan's literary relationships are not only multiply authored; they and their meanings are also historically contingent and continually evolving. The case study of "Timothy Harshaw's Flute" demonstrates the fluidity of Callaghan's oeuvre; its various versions include, but are not limited to, archival typescripts, the story as published within *The New Yorker*, and as published within Barry Callaghan's *The New Yorker Stories*. Two of these versions demonstrate the social nature of Callaghan's oeuvre; both the *New Yorker* version and Barry Callaghan's version evolved through Callaghan's willing cooperation with an editor figure. The differences between *The New Yorker's* versions and the archival materials about "Timothy Harshaw's Flute," "An Escapade" and "The White Pony" give us insight into the power dynamics and the various priorities at play within these projects; while Callaghan espoused a cosmopolitan perspective, and that perspective coloured his treatment of place in his stories, it often conflicted with *The New Yorker's* parochial insistence on the local. The ways in which this conflict between the cosmopolitan and the local were resolved changed throughout Callaghan's career as the power dynamic between the author and the magazine shifted as a result of Callaghan's decline in, and *The New Yorker's* increase in, symbolic capital. At the beginning of their relationship, *The New Yorker* respected Callaghan's authorial autonomy and sense of place in "An Escapade," but by the end of their partnership, it exerted its power to force changes to "The White Pony" that reveal the economic more than artistic foundations of their relationship. "The White Pony" also demonstrates the material realities of Callaghan's attempt to support his family solely by writing; sometimes he could not afford to insist on authorial autonomy.

Barry Callaghan's attempt to exploit the *New Yorker* brand in the title of his collection marks the completion of the reversal of the dynamic between Callaghan and *The New Yorker*; in the twenty-first century, it is "Callaghan" who needs to borrow symbolic capital from the magazine in order to establish his own place in the modernist canon rather than the other way around. This chapter's analysis of the reception of Callaghan's work across the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, his branding as a literary figure, and his relationship to place demonstrates not only the importance of Canadian authors to the history of *The New Yorker*, but also the importance of reading Canadian literature, and the short story in particular, in a transnational context. The next chapter theorizes another aspect of Canadian short story writers' relationship to art and commerce; I will explore the ways in which specific advertisements within the pages of the magazine, rather than *The New Yorker* as an abstract brand, inform readers' experiences of Mavis Gallant's work.

Works Cited

Note: Katharine White (née Angell) married E.B. White in 1929 and changed her last name partway through her career at *The New Yorker*. In this Works Cited list, I have grouped all letters attributed to K.S. White or K.S. Angell under "White, K.S."

Aaron, Daniel. "Morley Callaghan and the Great Depression." *The Callaghan Symposium*. Ed. David Staines. Ottawa: U of Ottawa P, 1981. 23-35. Print.

Angell, Roger. "Storyville." *The New Yorker* 27 June, 1994: 104-117. Print.

Arnason, David. "The Historical Development of the Canadian Short Story." *Recherches Anglaises et Nord Américaines* 16 (1983): 159-164. Print.

Avison, Margaret. "Callaghan Revisited." *Morley Callaghan*. Ed. Brandon Conron. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson, 1975. 74-77. Print.

Barrett, J.J. Letter to Morley Callaghan. 11 May 1932. TS. Morley Callaghan Fonds, MG 30 D365, Library and Archives Canada, Ottawa. Vol. 5, File 21.

---. Letter to Morley Callaghan. 29 June 1933. TS. Morley Callaghan Fonds, MG 30 D365, Library and Archives Canada, Ottawa. Vol. 5, File 22.

Berman, Jessica Schiff. *Modernist Fiction, Cosmopolitanism, and the Politics of Community*. New York: Cambridge UP, 2001. Web.

Bielle, Joelle, ed. *Elizabeth Bishop and The New Yorker: The Complete Correspondence*. New York, NY: Farrar, Strauss & Giroux, 2011. Print.

Boire, Gary. "Morley Callaghan 1930-1990." *Canadian Literature* 133 (1992 Summer): 208-291. Print.

---. *Morley Callaghan and his Works*. Toronto: ECW, 1991. Print.

---. *Morley Callaghan: Literary Anarchist*. Toronto: ECW, 1994. Print.

- Bourdieu, Pierre. *The Field of Cultural Production: Essays on Art and Literature*. Ed. Randal Johnson. New York: Columbia UP, 1993. Print.
- Brown, E.K. *On Canadian Poetry*. Toronto, Hunter-Rose, 1944. Print.
- Brown, Russell. "Callaghan, Glassco, and the Canadian Lost Generation." *Essays on Canadian Writing* 51-52 (1993 Winter-1994 Spring): 83-112. Print.
- Bryant, John L. *The Fluid Text: A Theory of Revision and Editing for Book and Screen*. Ann Arbor: U Michigan P, 2002. Print.
- Callaghan, Barry. "Preface." *The New Yorker Stories*. Holstein, ON: Exile Editions, 2008. ix-xii. Print.
- . "Re: Research on Morley Callaghan and The New Yorker." Email to Nadine Fladd 2 December 2010.
- . "Re: Research on Morley Callaghan and The New Yorker." Email to Nadine Fladd 9 August 2011.
- . Foreword. *The Lost and Found Stories of Morley Callaghan*. Toronto: Exile Editions, 1985. 1-4. Print.
- Callaghan, Loretto. Letter to Peg Carroll. N.d. MS. Carroll, Austin (Dink) Papers. MG 4151 c4 1351B, McGill University Archives, Montreal. File 6.
- Callaghan, Morley. "All The Years of Her Life." *The New Yorker*. 8 June 1935. 17-19. Web.
- . "All the Years of Her Life." TS. Morley Callaghan Fonds, MG 30 D365, Library and Archives Canada, Ottawa. Vol. 46, File 26.
- . "An Escapade." *The New Yorker*. November 24, 1928. 22-25. Web.
- . "Around the Parish Pump." *Morley Callaghan A Literary Life: Reflections and Reminiscences 1928-1990*. Holstein, ON: Exile Editions, 2008. 142-149. Print.

- . *A Fine and Private Place*. Toronto: Macmillan, 1975. Print.
- . "For the Sake of Argument: Morley Callaghan Asks: Why shouldn't we be like the Americans?" *Maclean's Magazine* 23 June 1956: 6+. Print.
- . Letter to K.S. Angell. 20 Nov. 1928. TS. *The New Yorker* Records. New York Public Library Humanities and Social Sciences Library, Manuscript and Archives Division. Box 136, File 8.
- . Letter to Wolcott Gibbs. 3 Aug. 1931. TS. *The New Yorker* Records. New York Public Library Humanities and Social Sciences Library, Manuscript and Archives Division. Box 155, File 8.
- . Letter to K.S. White. 11 Sept. 1931. TS. *The New Yorker* Records. New York Public Library Humanities and Social Sciences Library, Manuscript and Archives Division. Box 155, File 8.
- . Letter to K.S. White. 5 Oct. 1931. TS. *The New Yorker* Records. New York Public Library Humanities and Social Sciences Library, Manuscript and Archives Division. Box 155, File 8.
- . Letter to K.S. White: 6 March 1932. TS. *The New Yorker* Records. New York Public Library Humanities and Social Sciences Library, Manuscript and Archives Division. Box 166, File 16.
- . Letter to K.S. White: 2 May 1932. TS. *The New Yorker* Records. New York Public Library Humanities and Social Sciences Library, Manuscript and Archives Division. Box 166, File 16.
- . Letter to K.S. White: 14 June 1932. TS. *The New Yorker* Records. New York Public Library Humanities and Social Sciences Library, Manuscript and Archives Division. Box 166, File 16.

- . Letter to K.S. White. 2 Oct. 1933. TS. *The New Yorker* Records. New York Public Library Humanities and Social Sciences Library, Manuscript and Archives Division. Box 180, File 4.
- . Letter to K.S. White. 9 Dec. 1933. TS. *The New Yorker* Records. New York Public Library Humanities and Social Sciences Library, Manuscript and Archives Division. Box 180, File 4.
- . Letter to K.S. White. 18 Feb. 1934. TS. *The New Yorker* Records. New York Public Library Humanities and Social Sciences Library, Manuscript and Archives Division. Box 197, File 8.
- . Letter to K.S. White. 20 Feb. 1934. TS. *The New Yorker* Records. New York Public Library Humanities and Social Sciences Library, Manuscript and Archives Division. Box 197, File 8.
- . Letter to K.S. White. 1936 (N.d). TS. *The New Yorker* Records. New York Public Library Humanities and Social Sciences Library, Manuscript and Archives Division. Box 247, File 14.
- . Letter to Wolcott Gibbs. 31 July 1934. TS. *The New Yorker* Records. New York Public Library Humanities and Social Sciences Library, Manuscript and Archives Division. Box 197, File 8.
- . Letter to K.S. White. 8 Nov. 1934. TS. *The New Yorker* Records. New York Public Library Humanities and Social Sciences Library, Manuscript and Archives Division. Box 197, File 8.
- . Letter to Dink (Austin) Carroll. 2 Dec. 1935. TS. Carroll, Austin (Dink) Papers. MG 4151 c4 1351B, McGill University Archives, Montreal. File 7.
- . "Madison Square." TS. Morley Callaghan Fonds, MG 30 D365, Library and Archives Canada, Ottawa. Vol. 31, File 9.

- . *The New Yorker Stories*. Ed. Barry Callaghan. Holstein, ON: Exile Editions, 2008. Print.
- . *Now That April's Here And Other Stories*. New York: Random House, 1936. Print.
- . "An Ocean Away." *Morley Callaghan A Literary Life: Reflections and Reminiscences 1928-1990*. Holstein, ON: Exile Editions, 2008. 242-249. Print.
- . "One Spring Night." *The New Yorker* 14 April 1934. 21-24. Web.
- . "The Pleasures of Failure." *Morley Callaghan A Literary Life: Reflections and Reminiscences 1928-1990*. Holstein, ON: Exile Editions, 2008. 270-279. Print.
- . "The Plight of Canadian Fiction." *University of Toronto Quarterly* 7 (1938): 152-161. Print.
- . "Silk Stockings." *The New Yorker* 16 April 1932. 16-19. Web
- . *Such is my Beloved*. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1967. Print.
- . *That Summer in Paris: Memories of Tangled Friendships with Hemingway, Fitzgerald and Some Others*. New York: Coward-McCann, 1963. Print.
- . "Timothy Harshaw's Flute." *The New Yorker* 10 Feb. 1934. 17-19. Web.
- . Drafts of "Timothy Harshaw's Flute Music." TS. Morley Callaghan Fonds, MG 30 D365, Library and Archives Canada, Ottawa. Vol. 31, File 27.
- . "Two Sisters." TS. Morley Callaghan Fonds, MG 30 D365, Library and Archives Canada, Ottawa. Vol. 48, File 4.
- . Draft of "Two Sisters." TS. Morley Callaghan Fonds, MG 30 D365, Library and Archives Canada, Ottawa. Vol. 31, Untitled File begins "the two elderly grey haired sisters intended to go sometime and live in the south of France."

- . Draft of "Two Sisters." TS. Morley Callaghan Fonds, MG 30 D365, Library and Archives Canada, Ottawa. Vol. 31, Untitled File begins "For two months I lived in a house on Grove Street".
- . Draft of "Two Sisters." TS. Morley Callaghan Fonds, MG 30 D365, Library and Archives Canada, Ottawa. Vol. 31, Untitled File begins "There was so much angry whispering going on in the other room".
- . *The Varsity Story*. Toronto: Macmillan, 1948. Print.
- . "The Voyage Out." *The New Yorker* 27 June 1936. 15-17. Web.
- . "The White Pony." *Morley Callaghan's Stories*. Toronto: Macmillan, 1959. 49-53. Print.
- . "The White Pony." *The New Yorker* 27 Aug. 1938. 20-21. Web.
- . Fragments of "The White Pony." TS. Morley Callaghan Fonds, MG 30 D365/R2358. Library and Archives Canada, Ottawa. Vol. 56, File 20.
- Conron, Brandon. "Morley Callaghan as a Short Story Writer." *Journal of Commonwealth Literature* 3(1967): 56-75. Print.
- Edel, Leon. "Literature and Journalism: The Visible Boundaries." *The Callaghan Symposium*. Ed. David Staines. Ottawa: U of Ottawa P, 1981. 7-22. Print.
- Eggert, Paul. "Making Sense of Multiple Authorship." *Text: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Textual Studies* 8 (1995): 305-323. Print.
- Gallant, Mavis. Interview with Geoffrey Hancock. "An Interview with Mavis Gallant." *Canadian Fiction Magazine*. 28 (1978): 18-67. Print.
- Gibbs, Wolcott. Letter to Morley Callaghan. 6 March 1931. TS. *The New Yorker* Records. New York Public Library Humanities and Social Sciences Library, Manuscript and Archives Division. Box 155, File 8.

---. Letter to Morley Callaghan. 31 July 1931. TS. *The New Yorker* Records. New York Public Library Humanities and Social Sciences Library, Manuscript and Archives Division Box 155, File 8.

---. Letter to Morley Callaghan. 28 July 1933. TS. *The New Yorker* Records. New York Public Library Humanities and Social Sciences Library, Manuscript and Archives Division July 28, 1933. Box 180, File 4.

---. Letter to Ann Watkins. 16 Aug. 1933. TS. *The New Yorker* Records. New York Public Library Humanities and Social Sciences Library, Manuscript and Archives Division. Box 191, File 9.

---. Letter to Morley Callaghan. 12 July 1934. TS. *The New Yorker* Records. New York Public Library Humanities and Social Sciences Library, Manuscript and Archives Division. Box 197, File 8.

Godard, Barbara. "Across Frontiers: Callaghan in French." *The Callaghan Symposium*. Ed. David Staines. Ottawa: U of Ottawa P, 1981. 47-58. Print.

Goetsch, Paul. "Psychological Realism, Immigration, and City Fiction: Morley Callaghan, 'Last Spring They Came Over' (1927)". *The Canadian Short Story: Interpretations*. Ed. Reingard M. Nischik. Rochester, NY: Camden House, 2007. 95-103. Print.

Hammill, Faye and Karen Leick. "Modernism and the Quality Magazines: *Vanity Fair* (1914–36); *American Mercury* (1924–81); *New Yorker* (1925–); *Esquire* (1933–)." *The Oxford Critical and Cultural History of Modernist Magazines: Volume II, North America 1894-1960*. Ed. Peter Brooker and Andrew Thacker. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2012. 176-196. PDF.

Harvey, David. *Paris, Capital of Modernity*. New York: Routledge, 2003. Print.

Henighan, Stephen. *When Words Deny the World: The Reshaping of Canadian Writing*. Erin: The Porcupine's Quill, 2002. Print.

- Herrnstein Smith, Barbara. *Contingencies of Value: Alternative Perspectives for Critical Theory*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard UP, 1988. Print.
- Hunter, Adrian. "Part II: The modernist short story." *The Cambridge Introduction to the Short Story in English*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2007. 43-93. Print.
- Keith, W.J. *Canadian Literature in English*. New York: Longman, 1985. Print.
- Knister, Raymond, ed. *Canadian Short Stories*. Toronto: Macmillan, 1928. Print.
- Kunkel, Thomas. *Genius in Disguise: Harold Ross of The New Yorker*. New York: Random House, 1995. Print.
- Lee, Dennis. "Cadence, Country, Silence: Writing in Colonial Space." *Boundary 2* 3.1 (1974) 151-168. Print.
- Lutz, Tom. *Cosmopolitan Vistas: American Regionalism and Literary Value*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell UP, 2004. Print.
- Lynch, Gerald. "Introduction." *Dominant Impressions: Essays on the Canadian Short Story*. Ed. Gerald Lynch and Angela Arnold Robbeson. Ottawa: U of Ottawa P, 1999. 1-16. Print.
- MacLennan, Hugh. *On Being a Maritime Writer*. Sackville, NB: Centre for Canadian Studies, Mount Allison U, 1984. Print.
- Mailer, Norman. "Punching Papa: A Review of *That Summer in Paris*." *Morley Callaghan*. Ed. Brandon Conron. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson, 1975. 120-123. Print.
- Marshall, Tom. "Tragic Ambivalence: The Novels of Morley Callaghan." *University of Windsor Review* 12.1 (1976): 33-48.
- Mathews, Robin. "Morley Callaghan and the New Colonialism: The Supreme Individual in Traditionless Society." *Studies in Canadian Literature* 3 (1978): 78-92. Print.

- Matson, Harold. Letter to K.S. White. 30 March 1938. TS. *The New Yorker* Records. New York Public Library Humanities and Social Sciences Library, Manuscript and Archives Division. Box 300, File 16.
- . Letter to Gus Lobrano. 1 Feb. 1939. TS. *The New Yorker* Records. New York Public Library Humanities and Social Sciences Library, Manuscript and Archives Division. Box 321, File 5.
- Maxwell, William. Letter to Mavis Gallant. 6 Feb 1962. TS. *The New Yorker* Records. New York Public Library Humanities and Social Sciences Library, Manuscript and Archives Division. Box 792, File 19.
- McAlmon, Robert. *Being Geniuses Together, 1920-1930*. San Francisco: North Point Press, 1984. Print.
- . Letter to Morley Callaghan. 8 Jan. 1926. TS. Morley Callaghan Fonds, MG 30 D365, Library and Archives Canada, Ottawa. Vol. 4, File 4.
- McGann, Jerome J. *A Critique of Modern Textual Criticism*. London: UP Virginia, 1992. Print.
- McPherson, Hugo. "The Two Worlds of Morley Callaghan." *Queen's Quarterly* 64 (1957): 350-365. Print.
- Metcalf, John. "Winner Take All." *Essays on Canadian Writing* 51-52 (1993): 113-145. Web.
- Morley, Patricia. *Morley Callaghan*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1978. Print.
- Newman, C.M. Letter to Congdon. 15 July 1959. TS. *The New Yorker* Records. New York Public Library Humanities and Social Sciences Library, Manuscript and Archives Division. Box 767, File 3.
- Nischik, Reingard M. "The Canadian Short Story: Status, Criticism, Historical

- Survey." *The Canadian Short Story: Interpretations*. Ed. Reingard M. Nischik. Rochester, NY: Camden House, 2007. 1-39. Print.
- . "The Modernist English-Canadian Short Story." *History of Literature in Canada: English-Canadian and French-Canadian*. Rochester, NY: Camden House, 2008. 194-206. Print.
- Perkins, Maxwell. Letter to Morley Callaghan. 16 Nov. 1928. TS. Morley Callaghan Fonds, MG 30 D365, Library and Archives Canada, Ottawa. Vol. 4, File 21.
- Rahv, Philip. "The Cult of Experience in American Writing." *Critical Essays on American Modernism*. Michael J. Hoffman and Patrick D. Murphy, eds. New York: G. K. Hall, 1992. 66-69. Print.
- Saroyan, William. "The Adventures of American Writers in Paris 1929." *Morley Callaghan*. Ed. Brandon Conron. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson, 1975. 124-128. Print.
- Shuman, Ik. Letter to Harold Matson. 18 June 1937. TS. *The New Yorker* Records. New York Public Library Humanities and Social Sciences Library, Manuscript and Archives Division. Box 280, File 12.
- . Letter to Harold Matson. 15 Nov. 1937. TS. *The New Yorker* Records. New York Public Library Humanities and Social Sciences Library, Manuscript and Archives Division. Box 280, File 12.
- . Letter to Harold Matson. 31 March 1938. TS. *The New Yorker* Records. New York Public Library Humanities and Social Sciences Library, Manuscript and Archives Division. Box 300, File 16.
- . Letter to Harold Matson. 6 Oct. 1938. TS. *The New Yorker* Records. New York Public Library Humanities and Social Sciences Library, Manuscript and Archives Division. Box 300, File 16.

- . Letter to Harold Matson. 21 July 1939. TS. *The New Yorker* Records. New York Public Library Humanities and Social Sciences Library, Manuscript and Archives Division. Box 312, File 6.
- . Letter to Harold Matson. 14 June 1940. TS. *The New Yorker* Records. New York Public Library Humanities and Social Sciences Library, Manuscript and Archives Division. Box 341, File 11.
- . Letter to Harold Matson. 20 Aug. 1941. TS. *The New Yorker* Records. New York Public Library Humanities and Social Sciences Library, Manuscript and Archives Division. Box 361, File 17.
- . Letter to Harold Matson. 5 March 1941. TS. *The New Yorker* Records. New York Public Library Humanities and Social Sciences Library, Manuscript and Archives Division. Box 361, File 17.
- Smith, A.J.M. "Wanted – Canadian Criticism." *Canadian Poetry*. Ed. D.M.R. Bentley. Web. 13 July 2014.
- Smith, Barbara Herrnstein. *Contingencies of Value: Alternative Perspectives for Critical Theory*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1988. Print.
- Snider, Norman. "Why Morley Callaghan Still Matters." *The Globe and Mail*. 25 Oct. 2008. Web. 24 July 2012.
- Staines, David, ed. "Introduction." *The Callaghan Symposium*. Ottawa: U of Ottawa P 1981. 2-5. Print.
- Stillinger, Jack. *Multiple Authorship and the Myth of Solitary Genius*. New York: Oxford UP, 1991. Print.
- Stingone, William. Finding Aid. *The New Yorker* Records. The New York Public Library, Humanities and Social Sciences Library, Manuscript and Archives Division. 1996. Web.

- Smith, A.J.M. "Wanted – Canadian Criticism." *Canadian Poetry*. Ed. D.M.R. Bentley. Web. 22 July 2012.
- Sutherland, Fraser. "Hemingway and Callaghan: Friends and Writers." *Canadian Literature* 53 (1972): 8-17. Print.
- . *The Style of Innocence: A Study of Hemingway and Callaghan*. Toronto: Clarke, Irwin, 1972. Print.
- Walkowitz, Rebecca L. *Cosmopolitan Style: Modernism Beyond the Nation*. New York: Columbia UP, 2006. Print.
- Walsh, William. "Streets of Life: Novels of Morley Callaghan." *ARIEL* 1.1 (1970): 31-42. Print.
- Ward, Anthony. "A Way of Feeling." *Morley Callaghan*. Ed. Brandon Conron. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson, 1975. 104-105. Print.
- Weaver, Robert. Introduction to The New Edition. *Strange Fugitive*. By Morley Callaghan. Rutland, Vermont: Charles E. Tuttle, 1970. Vii-xii. Print.
- . "A Talk with Morley Callaghan." *Tamarack Review* 7 (Spring 1958): 3-29. Print.
- Angell, K.S. Letter to Morley Callaghan. 23 Oct. 1928. TS. *The New Yorker* Records. New York Public Library Humanities and Social Sciences Library, Manuscript and Archives Division. Box 136, File 8.
- Angell, K.S. Letter to Morley Callaghan. 7 Nov. 1928. TS. *The New Yorker* Records. New York Public Library Humanities and Social Sciences Library, Manuscript and Archives Division. Box 136, File 8.
- Angell, K.S. Letter to Morley Callaghan. 19 Dec. 1928. TS. *The New Yorker* Records. New York Public Library Humanities and Social Sciences Library, Manuscript and Archives Division. Box 136, File 8.

- White, K.S. Letter to Morley Callaghan. 28 Jan. 1930. TS. *The New Yorker* Records.
New York Public Library Humanities and Social Sciences Library, Manuscript
and Archives Division. Box 149, File 19.
- White, K.S. Letter to Morley Callaghan. 17 June 1930. TS. *The New Yorker* Records.
New York Public Library Humanities and Social Sciences Library, Manuscript
and Archives Division. Box 149, File 19.
- White, K.S. Letter to Morley Callaghan. 29 July 1930. TS. *The New Yorker* Records.
New York Public Library Humanities and Social Sciences Library, Manuscript
and Archives Division. Box 149, File 19.
- White, K.S. Letter to Morley Callaghan. 12 Sept. 1930. TS. *The New Yorker* Records.
New York Public Library Humanities and Social Sciences Library, Manuscript
and Archives Division. Box 149, File 19.
- White, K.S. Letter to Morley Callaghan. 4 Sept. 1931. TS. *The New Yorker* Records.
New York Public Library Humanities and Social Sciences Library, Manuscript
and Archives Division. Box 155, File 8.
- White, K.S. Letter to Morley Callaghan. 26 Sept. 1931. TS. *The New Yorker* Records.
New York Public Library Humanities and Social Sciences Library, Manuscript
and Archives Division. Box 155, File 8.
- White, K.S. Letter to Morley Callaghan. 26 Feb. 1932. TS. *The New Yorker* Records.
New York Public Library Humanities and Social Sciences Library, Manuscript
and Archives Division. Box 166, File 15.
- White, K.S. Letter to Morley Callaghan. 28 March 1932. TS. *The New Yorker* Records.
New York Public Library Humanities and Social Sciences Library, Manuscript
and Archives Division. Box 166, File 15.
- White, K.S. Letter to Morley Callaghan. 9 June 1932. TS. *The New Yorker* Records.
New York Public Library Humanities and Social Sciences Library, Manuscript
and Archives Division. Box 166, File 15.

- White, K.S. Letter to Morley Callaghan. 1 Feb. 1933. TS. *The New Yorker* Records.
New York Public Library Humanities and Social Sciences Library, Manuscript
and Archives Division. Box 166, File 15.
- White, K.S. Letter to Morley Callaghan. 13 Nov. 1933. TS. *The New Yorker* Records.
New York Public Library Humanities and Social Sciences Library, Manuscript
and Archives Division. Box 180, File 4.
- White, K.S. Letter to Morley Callaghan. 2 Dec. 1933. TS. *The New Yorker* Records.
New York Public Library Humanities and Social Sciences Library, Manuscript
and Archives Division. Box 180, File 4.
- White, K.S. Letter to Morley Callaghan. 15 Feb. 1934. TS. *The New Yorker* Records.
New York Public Library Humanities and Social Sciences Library, Manuscript
and Archives Division. Box 197, File 8.
- White, K.S. Letter to Morley Callaghan. 10 March 1934. TS. *The New Yorker* Records.
New York Public Library Humanities and Social Sciences Library, Manuscript
and Archives Division. Box 197, File 8.
- White, K.S. Letter to Ann Watkins. 15 March 1934. TS. *The New Yorker* Records.
New York Public Library Humanities and Social Sciences Library, Manuscript
and Archives Division. Box 218, File 2.
- White, K.S. Letter to Morley Callaghan 10 Oct. 1934. TS. *The New Yorker* Records.
New York Public Library Humanities and Social Sciences Library, Manuscript
and Archives Division. Box 197, File 8.
- White, K.S. Letter to Ann Watkins. 22 May 1935. TS. *The New Yorker* Records.
New York Public Library Humanities and Social Sciences Library, Manuscript
and Archives Division. Box 242, File 15.
- White, K.S. to Callaghan. 10 Oct. 1935. TS. *The New Yorker* Records.
New York Public Library Humanities and Social Sciences Library, Manuscript
and Archives Division. Box 197, File 8.

- Angell, K.S. Letter to John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation. 1935. TS. *The New Yorker* Records. New York Public Library Humanities and Social Sciences Library, Manuscript and Archives Division. Box 223, File 17.
- White, K.S. Letter to Morley Callaghan. 4 Feb. 1936. *The New Yorker* Records. New York Public Library Humanities and Social Sciences Library, Manuscript and Archives Division. Box 247, File 14.
- White, K.S. Letter to Morley Callaghan. 17 Sept. 1936. TS. *The New Yorker* Records. New York Public Library Humanities and Social Sciences Library, Manuscript and Archives Division. Box 247, File 14.
- White, K.S. Letter to Morley Callaghan. 13 Oct. 1936. TS. *The New Yorker* Records. New York Public Library Humanities and Social Sciences Library, Manuscript and Archives Division. Box 247, File 14.
- White, K.S. Letter to Ik Shuman. 22 Feb. 1937. TS. *The New Yorker* Records. New York Public Library Humanities and Social Sciences Library, Manuscript and Archives Division. Box 271, File 9.
- White, K.S. Letter to Harold Matson. 26 Feb. 1937. TS. *The New Yorker* Records. New York Public Library Humanities and Social Sciences Library, Manuscript and Archives Division. Box 280, File 12.
- White, K.S. Letter to Harold Matson. 30 June. 1937. TS. *The New Yorker* Records. New York Public Library Humanities and Social Sciences Library, Manuscript and Archives Division. Box 280, File 12.
- White, K.S. Letter to Harold Matson. 22 March 1938. TS. *The New Yorker* Records. New York Public Library Humanities and Social Sciences Library, Manuscript and Archives Division. Box 300, File 16.

- White, K.S. Letter to Harold Matson. 29 April 1938. TS. *The New Yorker* Records. New York Public Library Humanities and Social Sciences Library, Manuscript and Archives Division. Box 300, File 16.
- Wilson, Edmund. "Morley Callaghan of Toronto." *Morley Callaghan*. Ed. Brandon Conron. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson, 1975. 106-119. Print.
- Woodcock, George. "Callaghan's Toronto: The Persona of a City." *Journal of Canadian Studies* 7.2 (1972): 21-24. Print.
- . "Lost Eurydice: The Novels of Callaghan." *Canadian Literature* 21 (1964): 21-35. Print.
- Yagoda, Ben. *About Town: The New Yorker and the World It Made*. New York: Scribner, 2000. Print.

Chapter 3

3 Mavis Gallant and Cross-Border Collaboration: *The New Yorker* as Authorial Contact Zone

[Harold] Ross has deemed editing as "quarreling with writers—same thing exactly"

—*Time Magazine*, 1950 ("Lovable Old Volcano")

In the previous chapter, I argued for the usefulness of reading Morley Callaghan's career and work through the framework of exchanges of cultural, economic and social capital as theorized by Pierre Bourdieu. I characterized this kind of exchange as generally mutually beneficial or symbiotic, if at times somewhat exploitative. In this chapter, I will explore three examples from Gallant's body of work that were published in *The New Yorker* – the short stories "Luc and His Father" (1982) and "Orphan's Progress" (1965), and the literary journalistic work "Immortal Gatito" (1971) – as case studies that demonstrate the collaborative conditions of her relationship with the magazine. I am using the example of Mavis Gallant and her relationship with *The New Yorker* to articulate a conflict-based model of transnational collaboration. Based on Jack Stillinger's and Jerome McGann's conceptions of the social text, it is possible to conceive of the stories that Gallant published in *The New Yorker* as multiply-authored, if not always explicitly collaborative; they are products of her relationship with her editors at the magazine, despite the fact that she is still identified as retaining authority over the texts as their sole author. The magazine's founding editor, Harold Ross, encouraged this kind of thinking, suggesting that in their relationships with authors, he and other editors should regard themselves "pretty much in the role of collaborators, suggest[ing] something might be better if done another way" (The New Yorker Records, 14.15, Ts). When read as social texts, Gallant's stories as published in *The New Yorker* highlight the magazine's role as a site of communication or exchange: between Gallant and her editors, between Gallant and other *New Yorker* authors, between Gallant and the institutional machinery of *The New Yorker*, and between Gallant and the cultural contexts of Paris, New York, and Canada.

Although, in general, readers and scholars continue to be attached to the idea of individual authorship, against which editorial intervention is often conceived as an imposition, or as trespassing on an author's property, the juxtaposition of editorial (and paratextual) interventions in Gallant's work and Gallant's own characterization of her relationship with editors such as William Maxwell reveals that tension and conflict can be a vital part of a shared process of composition. The OED offers two definitions of collaboration. The first is "United labour, co-operation; *esp.* in literary, artistic, or scientific work." The second, more nefarious entry is "traitorous cooperation with the enemy." This chapter explores the sites (geographical, psychological, cultural and institutional) at which these two definitions intersect: the fine line between difference that is creatively productive and editorial intervention or influence that is an imposition or censorship. The publication history of "Orphan's Progress" is an example of this second kind of difference, in which Gallant's editors, in a zealous attempt to protect the conservative reputation of *The New Yorker*, deployed their ideas about national difference to censor Gallant's work or impose their own social mores upon it. In contrast, I will argue that in the case of the story "Luc and His Father" – through the juxtaposition of the story and the advertisements that surround it in the magazine – Gallant, as a contributor to the editorial side of the magazine, participates in a collaboration with the enemy of editorial members, the business side of *The New Yorker*; furthermore, I will argue that this collaboration was a productive one for both parties.

Gallant's career with *The New Yorker* is full of subtle contradictions between the ideas that she claims to espouse about identity and nationalism, imperialism, gender, sexuality, and class, and the ways that identities and discussions of them are actually represented in her fiction as it was published in the magazine. Conflicts between her conception of identity as a Canadian expatriate living in France and those of editors, other authors, and *The New Yorker* as an institution have left their trace on her work. These literary relationships produced texts that are mediated by their paratexts⁵⁸ and

⁵⁸ The term "paratext" was coined by Gérard Genette, the French textual scholar, founder of the practice of Genetic criticism, and author of *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*. He writes:

publication histories, and function as collaborations marked by tension, disagreement, difference, and misunderstandings that have shaped the form, content, and the reception of her work. It is within this context that I propose reading *The New Yorker* as an institution as an authorial "contact zone."⁵⁹ Based on Mary Louise Pratt's conception of "Arts of the Contact Zone" as those produced when disparate national "cultures meet, clash, and grapple with each other" (34), I apply the term "authorial contact zone" to *The New Yorker* as a site at which *literary* figures, cultures and traditions meet and negotiate conflicts and differences.

Using the example of "The Immortal Gatito" to demonstrate Gallant's attempt, as a Canadian living in France who publishes in an American magazine, to act as a cultural

A literary work consists, entirely or essentially, of a text, defined (very minimally) as a more or less long sequence of verbal statements that are more or less endowed with significance. But this text is rarely presented in an unadorned state, unreinforced and unaccompanied by a certain number of verbal or other productions, such as an author's name, a title, a preface, illustrations. And although we do not always know whether these productions are to be regarded as belonging to the text, in any case they surround it and extend it . . . These accompanying productions, which vary in extent and appearance, constitute what I have called elsewhere the work's *paratext* . . . More than a boundary or a sealed border, the paratext is, rather, a *threshold* . . . It is an "undefined zone" between the inside and the outside, a zone without any hard and fast boundary . . . "a fringe of the printed text which in reality controls one's whole reading of the text" (1-2).

⁵⁹ Despite this chapter's application of terminology derived from post-colonial theory and projects invested in processes of decolonization, it is important to note the significant differences between Pratt's work – the political and historical specificity of the situations she describes – and the ways in which I am employing the term "authorial contact zone" in relation to Gallant and *The New Yorker*. I borrow Pratt's focus on the relationship between "collaboration" (*Imperial Eyes* 9) and transcultural interaction, as well as her methodology based in observing reciprocal cultural exchange, but without the colonial or post-colonial context Pratt describes. She explores "relations of domination and subordination" (4) that are "radically asymmetrical" (9) since they are marked by "colonialism, slavery, or their aftermaths" (4). The asymmetry in relations of power between Canada and the United States, although it exists, is not equivalent to what Pratt describes; Canada's economy may be influenced by, and be less powerful than, that of the United States, but it has never been a U.S. colony. Similarly, although at times this chapter refers to the asymmetrical power relations between Gallant as author and the role of *New Yorker* editor, it is important to keep in mind the distinction between Gallant's career and the conditions experienced in relationships between (former) colonies and their colonizers. Unlike these communities, who did not choose to be colonized or enslaved, Mavis Gallant willingly entered into a relationship with *The New Yorker* and its editors.

translator for *New Yorker* readers, I argue for reading *The New Yorker* as a cultural and psychological, rather than geographical "authorial contact zone" where authors, editors and publishers meet and influence one another. An analysis of "Orphan's Progress," a story whose censorship is couched in terms that hint at nationalist tensions between Gallant as a Canadian author and her editors as Americans, reveals the significant influence *New Yorker* editors and *New Yorker* style can have on the structure, and therefore the reader's experience of a story. Finally, as a case study, the story "Luc and His Father" reveals the ways that Gallant, in publishing in *The New Yorker*, collaborated not only with her editors, but also with the magazine as an institution. The pairing of her stories, which invoke an anti-bourgeois, anti-imperial ethos, with advertisements for products and services that invoke these concepts to demonstrate their sophistication (Yagoda 13) exemplifies the relationship between the two "camps" at *The New Yorker*: the business and the editorial sides of the magazine. The result of the juxtaposition of Gallant's story with these advertisements, I argue, posits Gallant in a transnational, conflict-based, collaborative relationship with "the enemy" of the editorial side of the magazine: its business side.

In his study of another instance of transnational collaboration, war-time film collaborations across the U.S.-Mexico border, Seth Fein likens transnational collaborations to Pratt's "contact zones" ("Everyday Forms" 403). His analysis recognizes the presence of often asymmetrical power relations, but highlights the importance of encouraging an analysis of these kinds of projects "that considers the representation and dissemination of images and ideas not as simple imperialist impositions but as collaborative processes involving complicated, often contradictory, transnational exchanges" ("Everyday Forms" 403). Fein argues that, over the long term, the Mexican cinema industry "prospered" and developed "owing to collaboration with Hollywood and the U.S. government" during the Second World War and the Cold War ("Transnationalism and Cultural Collaboration"). Despite asymmetrical power relations, the collaboration managed to "meld the reciprocal ideological needs of U.S. foreign policy and that of allied Latin American governments," and allowed the U.S. and Mexico to "pursu[e] convergent (but separate) goals that benefitted from cooperative production and distribution of a wide range of films" ("Transnational and Cultural Collaboration").

Through this collaboration, "former aggressors [became] trusted allies" ("Transnational and Cultural Collaboration"). I apply an analogous approach to my study of the relationship between Gallant and *The New Yorker* by considering the ways that cultural transmission travels in both directions despite potentially asymmetrical power relations between the roles of author and editor or author and the publishing institution.⁶⁰

In addition to Pratt's concept of the contact zone and Fein's focus on reciprocal influence and benefit, I also employ the work of the textual studies scholar John Bryant to frame my approach to Gallant's work. His claim in *The Fluid Text* that "packaging affects meaning" (82) serves as a foundation for my treatment of the multiple "versions" of Gallant's works that exist in their various forms (typescript, galley, various published forms, etc.) and, in particular, my reading of "Luc and His Father" as it was published in *The New Yorker* as a unique version with specific meanings. Bryant insists on the use of the word "editor" rather than "collaborator" in his exploration of "the complex of interacting intentions between writer and editor in the flow of their sometimes synergistic sometimes oppositional creativities" (8-9). Although Gallant describes most of her encounters with Maxwell as pleasant, Bryant suggests that, in relationships with editors or second readers, "most collaboration derives from conflict" (7). I argue that in "Luc and His Father" the conflict between the ethos of the advertisements and Gallant's skewering of these ideologies is productive and "meaning constitutive" (McGann 33). Gallant's story, despite its investment in a critique of imperialism, nationalism, and class distinctions, increases the effectiveness of the advertisements for products invested in these very ideologies that surround the story, putting her work in "traitorous cooperation" with the advertising side of *The New Yorker* ("Collaboration" OED). It is this conflict-based model, and the meaning created out of conflict at individual, institutional and national levels, that this chapter explores.

⁶⁰ Again, it is important to distinguish here between Fein's approach, which I borrow in order to address what Gallant, in the asymmetrical relationship between author and publishing institution, is able to contribute to the development of *The New Yorker*, and the historical and political context that Fein describes. The specific history of the power dynamics at play in Mexico's relationship with the United States is long, fraught, and not analogous to the power dynamics between author and editor, into which Gallant willingly enters, that I attempt to describe here.

3.1 Gallant's Career with *The New Yorker*: A Brief Overview

"In 1950, at the age of twenty-eight," reads *The New Yorker's* introduction to Gallant's final publication before her death, "Mavis Gallant left a job as a journalist in Montreal and moved to Paris. She published her first short story in [the magazine] in 1951" ("The Hunger Diaries" 48). Upon leaving Montreal, Gallant gave herself two years to establish a career as a writer. She spent the rest of her career, which spanned more than sixty years, publishing her short works – stories, literary journalism and memoirs – almost exclusively with *The New Yorker*. Gallant's career with *The New Yorker* began when the magazine was at its height. This post-war period, and the stories Gallant published during it, served as a transition between the modernism of Morley Callaghan and the postmodernist⁶¹ era in which Alice Munro began publishing in the magazine, as well as the beginnings of significant change in *The New Yorker's* audience, the political and ideological concerns of the kinds of work it published, and its approach to vulgarity and sexuality.⁶² Remarks Gallant has made about her editors and the magazine suggest that she perceived them and it as both allies in an artistic struggle and official literary gatekeepers. Unlike Callaghan, she approached publication with the magazine cautiously, and was concerned about the potential need to defend her work from heavy-handed

⁶¹ In the previous chapter, I characterized ambiguity and deliberately elliptical syntax and structures as characteristics of the modernist short story. I define post-modernism primarily as an extension and intensification of these characteristics. Gallant's stories, in their early, helical forms before *New Yorker* editors smoothed them into more linear ones (see the discussion of "Orphan's Progress") were deliberately elliptical and ambiguous. The difference between modernism and post-modernism (as I have categorized them) in *New Yorker* fiction lies in authors' (and the magazine's) assumptions about narration and epistemology. Gallant's most post-modernist works are polyphonic and present multiple voices and multiple perspectives as if they are equally valid. Earlier modernist stories such as Callaghan's favour a singular narrative perspective and presuppose that fixed knowledge or a singular Truth exists and can be accessed by the author or the reader.

⁶² Whereas Callaghan's relationship with *The New Yorker* just before he stopped publishing with the magazine could be characterized as one between employee and employer in which Callaghan tailored his work to the demands of his editors, even if he did not recognize that fact, Alice Munro successfully pushed the boundaries of the magazine's infamous prudishness and worked with her editor collaboratively as an equal. Mavis Gallant's relationship with *The New Yorker* was not marked by the same parochialism as Callaghan's; the magazine was beginning to accept stories set in locations other than those to which New Yorkers might conceivably travel. Unlike Munro, however, her stories, especially their depictions of sexuality, were still subject to censorship. Instead of location, the magazine's locus of control in this era concerned issues of language, narrative structure and depictions of sex.

editing in order to retain a sense of artistic control. Gallant's descriptions of her relationship with *The New Yorker* as an institution, and with her individual editors, Maxwell, Robert Henderson, and Daniel Menaker, are full of contradictions. She considered it the best magazine in the world in the 1950s⁶³ and was anxious to be published in it, but over her decades-long career, its editorial processes also frustrated her. She has both defended and criticized the magazine in ways that demonstrate that she was much more conscious of retaining authorial autonomy over her work than was Callaghan.

In a 1977 interview with Geoffrey Hancock, Gallant reveals that she initially worried that *The New Yorker* might "be too strong for me—that it would put a kind of hand on me," that "there would be so much editing that my work would cease to be mine" (58-59). In that interview, and for most of her career, she vehemently denied that the magazine put any constraints on her work, claiming that "It was my work, always . . . it was a kind of editing that consisted of queries" (Hancock 33), or even that such a thing as a typical "*New Yorker* short story" exists.⁶⁴ In *Reading Mavis Gallant*, Janice Kulyk Keefer writes that Gallant "has vigorously and persistently denied contentions that she is a '*New Yorker* writer'" (34). A discussion of her story "Virus X" (1965) during a 2009 interview with her fellow *New Yorker* contributor Jhumpa Lahiri serves as an example of Gallant's persistent defense of the magazine's editorial practices. Gallant suggests that, rather than prescribing a specific fictional form or aesthetic, *The New Yorker* was actually more open to experimental or unusual work than other magazines were at that time, claiming, "They would take a chance on things that others wouldn't" (114).

Despite Gallant's defense of the editorial practices at *The New Yorker* and the originality and variety of the fiction published within its pages, there are other examples

⁶³ See the discussion in Hancock, 32.

⁶⁴ Gallant insists that: "This thing about *The New Yorker* publishing writers who write alike is so absurd that I'm surprised it still has currency. Take any four consecutive issues and try to find the link. Usually those things are said by people who never read it, or haven't since their last Christmas gift subscription ran out in 1964" (58-9). This interview predates the publication of "Orphan's Progress."

of comments in which she implicitly appears to accept that there is a typical "*New Yorker* story" form, or suggests that the magazine's editorial practices were more intrusive than her discussion with Hancock initially suggested. She tells Christine Evain and Christine Bertail about the magazine's decision to publish a series of stories featuring a fictional French writer, Henri Grippes, as their protagonist: "I was rather surprised that *The New Yorker* took them, because they're not it's [sic] usual (style) at all" (81). In her archives, Gallant often includes short typed or hand-written notes as prefaces to typescripts of her stories. Included in the folder with the typescript of her story "Vacances Pax" (1966) is a note that reads:

"Vacances Pax" was the subject of a long and furious correspondence between The New Yorker and myself. I refused to answer a number of questions that I considered idiotic. The original ms became so cross-hatched with scribbles and comments that someone at The New Yorker typed it over. One of The New Yorker's great specialties is to take something one has right, such as a French expression, and put it wrong.

This is a far cry from Gallant's claim in 1977 that her editors did an exemplary job of leaving her work alone, except for ensuring the accuracy of the facts.⁶⁵ While she has made clear her appreciation for the opportunities that *The New Yorker* has given her, and its solicitous, query-based editorial system, these contradictions indicate that a more thorough investigation of the editorial process Gallant's stories underwent will yield a better understanding of her fiction and her changing relationship with the magazine and its editorial practices. These changing institutional editorial practices were implemented by several individual editors: namely, the fiction editors Maxwell (whose first piece appeared in 1936 and who retired from *The New Yorker* in 1975), Henderson (whose first piece appeared in 1939) and Menaker (whose own work first appeared in *The New Yorker*

⁶⁵ Other "complaints" embedded within notes about her typescripts include the fact that it once "took a flight to New York and a personal visit" to break up what Gallant refers to as "the log jam": the fact that she "sometimes used to wait three years" for the magazine to publish stories it had accepted, and once had "twelve unpublished stories in the New Yorker's files" awaiting publication (note: re "The Good Deed," (1969) "The Sunday After Christmas" (1967) and "The Captive Niece" (1969)).

in 1974), and the General Editor William Shawn (whose tenure lasted from 1952 to 1987).

3.2 William Maxwell: The Editor as Collaborator, American, and Ally

In his analysis of the story "Orphan's Progress," Michel Fabre claims that the "tone" of Gallant's narration "indicates a refusal of a single totalitarian point of view [which] sometimes leads to the creation of a polyphonic voice, a collective voice born from the overlapping points of view" (156). *The New Yorker* editors of Gallant's work represent one of the voices in this polyphony. Maxwell was Gallant's first editor at *The New Yorker*, and one whom she respected immensely. McGann argues that since "every part of the productive process" of literature is "meaning constitutive" (33), editors play "collaborative" roles (58). According to Yagoda, several of Maxwell's authors did think of his role this way: "Maxwell would develop intimate relationships with a number of contributors—Sylvia Townsend Warner, Frank O'Connor, Eudora Welty, John Cheever, Mavis Gallant, John Updike, Larry Woiwode—and they would come to think of him as a true collaborator" (161).

Gallant reflects on her own relationship with her former editor in the preface to her *Selected Stories*, writing: "Good luck and bad luck comes in waves. It was a wave of the best that brought me to William Maxwell, who read my first story and every other for the next twenty-five years. He has turned away the IOUs I have tried to hand him, which announce just simply that I owe him everything." She continues, describing Maxwell's support of her decision to move to Europe and attempt a writing career:

I felt suddenly like a stranded army with an unexpected ally . . . He seems to me the most American of writers and the most American of all the Americans I have known; but even as I say this, I know it almost makes no sense and that it is undefinable and that I am unable to explain what I mean. I can get myself out of it only by saying it is a compliment. (XIX)

This Preface, in which Gallant describes her relationship with Maxwell as a military operation in which both parties share a similar goal, not only indicates the close literary bonds between them, but also frames Gallant's praise through the language of nation and an identification of her editor with a national aesthetic or sensibility.

Although Gallant claims here that she is unable to define what she means by "American," her ability to recognize "Americanness" in Maxwell's writing and personality suggests that she has a clear sense of their difference from her own as Canadian or "non-American" and the difference between these two aesthetics and that of France. In interviews and stories she has made explicit claims about the differences between Canada and the U.S., contrasting English-Canadians' British-influenced restraint to Americans' boisterousness, willingness to laugh, and express emotion openly, and insisting that the U.S. is "where all the exciting things are being done" (5).⁶⁶ In practice, however, as the discussion of the story "Orphan's Progress" will demonstrate, *The New Yorker's* infamous prudishness contradicted Gallant's perception of the differences between American and Canadian sensibilities. Nonetheless, Gallant's description of her relationship with Maxwell frames this relationship both in terms of national differences between literary aesthetics and, through the use of the word "ally," in terms of partnership and cooperation against a mutual enemy. While in this case the "enemy" Gallant refers to are the people who doubted her decision to move to France, Fein's triangulation of transnational collaboration between the U.S. and Mexico during the Cold War, which I will apply to an analysis of Gallant's story "Luc and His Father," uses similar militaristic language.

Citing John Updike as an example of one of many American authors who respected Maxwell's editorial process, Barbara Burkhardt suggests that these

⁶⁶ In her interview with Hancock, Gallant expresses her "marked bias against British and towards American social and cultural forms" (Keefer *Reading Mavis Gallant 2*) in the form of an analogy: "I have this image of the monarchy holding Canada back. It's like a political cartoon. The mother, marked 'Queen', is dragging a child named Canada away from the other children in the playground marked USA. Canada points back to where all the other kids are playing and says, 'Mother, that's where all the exciting things are being done'" (5).

relationships allowed him to "guid[e writers] toward what he called their essential quality" (3). It is this respect for the "essential quality" of an author's work that characterizes most of Maxwell's editing: an inherited tradition throughout the tenure of several generations of *New Yorker* editors. Although it was Walcott Gibbs, author of the infamous editor's guide "Theory and Practice of Editing New Yorker Articles," who initiated Maxwell into the world of fiction editing, Maxwell did not inherit the kind of invasive editorial practice that Gibbs prescribed.⁶⁷ As Burkhardt explains:

After Maxwell was with the magazine about three months, having spent many hours sitting staring at a self-portrait of James Thurber on the wall above his desk, Gibbs handed him a manuscript and suggested he edit it. "He didn't explain what editing was, so I treated it as I would a manuscript of my own in an unfinished state—that is I cut and rearranged and put in or took out punctuation, and to my surprise he sent it off to the printer. The next time I overshot the mark, and in the end it required a good deal of teaching and observing of his and Katharine White's editing before I began to get the hang of it." (64-5)

Maxwell appears to have learned how to edit from his own fiction editor at *The New Yorker*: Roger Angell, the son of Katharine White, the magazine's original fiction editor. Burkhardt's characterization of Maxwell's editorial approach is similar to the advice Angell claims to have received from Shawn in his capacity as General Editor: "'It's very easy to make somebody's manuscript into the best story ever written,' he said. 'The trick is to help the writer make it into the best story he can write on that particular day'" (Angell 106). Yagoda claims that Shawn was able to edit manuscripts without their authors even noticing; he was so in-tune with and able to adapt to an individual author's tone and style that "it was almost a trick" (248). This same respect for the author's work as his or her own (in contrast to Ross and Gibbs) is reflected in Maxwell's philosophy

⁶⁷ "The ethos was mostly unspoken, but was given voice in 'Theory and Practice of Editing New Yorker Articles,' a remarkable and only minimally facetious document Wolcott Gibbs prepared for Gus Loblano in 1937, when Loblano was about to join the staff as fiction editor" (Yagoda 200).

that, in order for a story "to capture the breath of life," its editor's job was merely to ensure "that the writer 'said what he meant and meant what he said'" (Burkhardt 146). In her reminiscence of her apprenticeship towards becoming a *New Yorker* fiction editor, Frances Kiernan (whose first *New Yorker* piece appeared in 1993) writes, "from William Maxwell I learned that the best editors know when to put their pencils down." Shawn began a relatively "hands off" editorial tradition that Angell, and eventually Maxwell, carried on after him. Maxwell's description of his initial instinct when faced with his first editorial task – to claim ownership of another author's story and "trea[t] it as I would a manuscript of my own in an unfinished state" – justifies editors', contributors', and *New Yorker* scholars' characterization of the author-editor relationship as collaborative. Maxwell describes "finishing" a manuscript that another author, his collaborator on a story, had begun rather than helping a contributor to polish or "improve" a finished manuscript of his or her own. *The New Yorker*, as an institutional or authorial contact zone, provided the site for this collaborative work.

New Yorker editors and contributors consistently characterized these editorial relationships as collaborative despite the magazine's well-documented, aggressive editorial practices.⁶⁸ In describing the difficult transition to working with Menaker when Maxwell retired, Gallant uses a simile commonly applied to collaboration: describing the bond between author and editor as similar to that between spouses. She writes: "Every writer/editor relationship is a kind of shotgun wedding; it works or it doesn't. There is no median way or jogging along" ("Preface" XIX).⁶⁹ In addition to the legitimization of a mutual offspring – in this case, Gallant's work – that the metaphor of a "shotgun wedding" implies, both this image and Gallant's description of her relationship with Maxwell as one between allies, have an element of conflict in common. The difference

⁶⁸ George H. Douglas describes the writing published in the *New Yorker* of Callaghan's day as subject to "editorial uniformity and near-formulaic consistency" (191-2), while according to current fiction editor Deborah Treisman, *The New Yorker* has a style guide in place for fiction and still "do[es] significant editing" on the stories it accepts.

⁶⁹ For scholarly analyses of the intersection between collaborative writing and romantic partnerships, see Hutcheon and Hutcheon, Chadwick and de Courtivron, and Stone and Thompson.

between Gallant's relationship with Maxwell, which she describes as pleasant, and with Menaker, which she describes as unpleasant, was not the presence or absence of conflict, but, rather, a willingness on the part of both author and editor to engage in and negotiate that conflict, to find a "median way" rather than abandoning or rejecting a project altogether.

Maxwell's impulse to claim ownership or take control of a story, however, also demonstrates how easily the dynamic between author and editor can shift from one of partnership between equals to a hierarchical one in which the editor, as institutional representative for *The New Yorker*, retains authority over how the story will appear in print. *New Yorker* editors sometimes compromised Gallant and other authors' autonomy or "authority" over a story by crossing the line between a lively debate about what changes to make to a story and coercion; writers were sometimes "forced" to change to a story or risk losing the opportunity to publish in *The New Yorker*.⁷⁰ A seemingly collaborative relationship can sometimes fall apart under the weight of asymmetrical relations of power between author and editor.

⁷⁰ Ross outlines this risk of losing a sale in a 30 November 1945 letter to Mrs. Norton Baskin (who wrote under the pen name Marjorie Kinnan Rawlings):

You are a little wrong in your idea of how we work here. I never actually decide on the details of a piece, or when I do it is extra routine business. I do what I call "query" things in a story, pass the queries on to Mr. Lobrano, and then he and the author decide on the details. And actually what I and the rest of us do is query, too, for in the long run the story is the author's and is run over the author's signature, and if the author wants to retain some bad grammar or some ambiguity, or even print two or three words upside down, we let them do it if the story is good enough to get by with the defects, or what we consider the defects. We've got to accept or reject what the author wants in the long run, in toto. We do put up a hell of an argument about details sometimes, though, and occasionally we have to hand back a story we think we have bought because the author won't yield on points we consider important . . . The only great argument I have against writers, generally speaking, is that many of them deny the function of an editor, and I claim editors are important. For one thing, an editor is a good trial horse; the writer can use him to see if a story and its various elements register as he or she thinks they register. An author is very likely to suffer a loss of viewpoint (due to nearness to the subject) before he gets through with a story and finish up with something more or less out of focus. (qtd. in Kunkel, 281-282)

3.3 From Literal to Imaginary Maps: *The New Yorker* as a Literary Contact Zone

In addition to a collaborative relationship with Maxwell, Gallant's early career also reflects *The New Yorker's* shift away from the geographical concerns that characterized Callaghan's career with the magazine. During the 1920s and 1930s, Katharine White required that Callaghan set his stories in New York City. Yagoda refers to Maxwell's "imaginary map of Manhattan," which determined the settings that made for desirable *New Yorker* stories in the 1930s and 1940s. Maxwell defined "Manhattan" as "wherever New Yorkers go," and included "all of Connecticut and Long Island, Florida, New Jersey, [and] Hollywood" (220).⁷¹ Although Maxwell's "imaginary map" was thrown out some time after the end of the Second World War and *The New Yorker* eventually came to welcome fiction set all over the globe, Gallant was not unaffected by this geographical constraint. The very first story she submitted to the magazine, "The Flowers of Spring," was rejected as "too specifically Canadian" (Hancock 32). When asked if she had written anything else, she sent *The New Yorker* another story called "Madeline's Birthday," which was set in Manhattan and Connecticut, and which the magazine accepted and published in its 1 September 1951 issue (Hancock 32; Keefer *Reading Mavis Gallant* 74). Eventually, however, the magazine also accepted Gallant's stories set in Canada and Europe.

After the Second World War, when the magazine's geographical scope expanded and its map of New York became "imaginary" rather than literal, the magazine came to represent, not a delineated geographical space, but, rather, an intellectual one: with psychological and cultural borders that served as a venue for transcultural literary influence between editors, authors and readers. The magazine's own advertising copy suggests that marketers in the 1940s would have encouraged non-New Yorkers to perceive the publication this way. In response to the growing number of out-of-town

⁷¹ Saul Steinberg's famous 1976 *New Yorker* cover, "View of the World from 9th Avenue," provides a visual representation of the magazine's geographical priorities (see http://www.condenaststore.com/-sp/The-New-Yorker-Cover-View-of-the-World-from-9th-Avenue-March-29-1976-Prints_i8553097_.htm).

subscribers in the 1940s and in an effort to attract more, *The New Yorker* argued that New York, the city it claimed to represent, could not be geographically defined. The advertisement reads:

You cannot keep *The New Yorker* out of the hands of New York-minded people, wherever they are. For, unlike the myriad points in which New York-minded people live, New York is not a tack on a map, not a city, not an island or an evening at '21,' *The New Yorker* is a mood, a point of view. It is found wherever people are electrically sensitive to new ideas, eager for new things to do (qtd in Yagoda 59)

This advertising campaign highlights the beginning of the shift away from geographical definitions of place and identity at *The New Yorker* after the Second World War. The magazine that was originally founded in order to sell local advertisements from New York City businesses aimed at New York City residents was moving towards a cultural and economic definition of what constituted a "New Yorker."

During this period, the magazine's definitions of "New York" identity were becoming increasingly tied up in consumerism and its readers' ability to purchase luxury goods rather than geographical location. An earlier advertising campaign, which literally defined the "borders" of New York City – the original locus of the magazine's subscriber base – still emphasized the magazine's association with a culture rather than a topography. "We thrill that Manhattan is more than a place," the advertisement exclaimed: "It is a point of view" (*Encyclopedia of Marketing Campaigns* 1242). Although in this earlier campaign this "civilized center of the world"⁷² was a real geographical place (*Encyclopedia* 1241), New York as envisioned by *The New Yorker* was always also a "geography of the mind" (Corey xiv). For readers, writers, and aspiring writers, then, the magazine had and was a unique, mutually-reinforcing culture, even if

⁷² "Calling New York a 'gold coast' to which no other city was equal, the ad invoked ancient Greece and Renaissance Italy. By implication, patrons of *The New Yorker* were equated with patrons of Horace and Michelangelo, thus establishing solidarity with all that was refined" (*Encyclopedia* 1241).

contributors to it never met except for within the pages of the magazine. With its focus on class, patronage, civilization, and the shared values of a New York "point of view," the advertisements posit readers of *The New Yorker* as members of a kind of "imagined community" similar to the kind Benedict Anderson theorizes in his analysis of nationalism and national identity. The identity of members of the *New Yorker* community, however, was conditioned by an association with *the* American post-War metropolis and a shared consumer culture rather than shared geographical or political borders.

In addition to functioning as a site of identification for readers who, despite being geographically disparate, shared "sophisticated" tastes and consumerist values, during and after the Second World War *The New Yorker* also served as a transnational community for authors who might not otherwise have encountered a particular author or that author's work. The magazine exposed Gallant to a little Canadian literature at a time when reading Canadian literature was not yet considered fashionable: it is where she encountered "some stories by Callaghan" (qtd. in Schaub 94), but Callaghan is not the only modernist contributor to *The New Yorker* whose work Gallant read.⁷³ Several *New Yorker* fiction writers contributed to and influenced the development of Gallant's fiction within the confines of the culture of the 'New Yorker short story.' Katherine Mansfield (1888-1923) who was born in colonial New Zealand and moved to Great Britain as a young woman, published poetry in *The New Yorker* and had two stories published posthumously in the magazine in 1939, and it is likely that *The New Yorker* was the site of Gallant's contact with her work. Mansfield is mentioned in at least three of the works that Gallant published in the magazine: "Virus X" (1965), "The Moslem Wife" (1976), and "A Paris Notebook" (1968). In "La Dame Seule Meets the Angel of History: Katherine Mansfield and Mavis Gallant," Keefer explores the implications of Gallant's reference to Mansfield in "Virus X," the story of a Canadian scholarship student abroad. Lottie, the scholarship student, and Vera, Lottie's former classmate who has been exiled

⁷³ Schaub refers to the work Gallant publishes in *The New Yorker*, and the author herself, as "a 'modernist anachronism'" (6).

to Europe, visit Mansfield's grave while in France. Keefer's essay explores the parallels between the lives of Mansfield and Gallant: specifically, the effects that the First (for Mansfield) and Second (for Gallant) World Wars had on their fiction and the fact that they both lived as "colonial expatriate[s] in Europe" (90). She also observes some of the parallels between their work. As Keefer argues:

Much of Gallant's early fiction and some of her finest, mature work not only make direct reference to Katharine Mansfield, but also explore and extend some of Mansfield's most characteristic motifs – the displaced "dame seule," for example. And though the two writers' oeuvres are quite different, Gallant's aesthetic shares crucial elements with Mansfield's. In their extraordinary mastery of the "divine detail," and their concern with deracination and isolation, particularly as they affect women of different cultures and social classes, the works of these two writers compose a continuum in which the possibilities of short fiction as a genre have richly flowered. (91)

Keefer is careful not to overstate the "influence" of Mansfield on Gallant's work; she is one of several writers the well-read Gallant claims have influenced her work, but the concept of a "continuum" between their work – a continuum that *The New Yorker* played a role in making possible – is compelling. For Gallant as a *New Yorker* writer, and for the magazine's readers, references to Mansfield, a *New Yorker* contributor, add another layer of meaning to Gallant's work. The ideological position associated with, and the implications, of Gallant's use of these references, though, are only available to the "in" crowd: those who read fiction by the likes of Mansfield and are, therefore, part of *New Yorker* culture and members of this intellectual community.

In addition to Mansfield, Gallant also refers to fellow *New Yorker* writer Sylvia Townsend Warner in her work. In "An 'I' for an Evanescent Eye: The Personal and the Private—Autobiography, Essay and Story," Peter Stevens points out a reference in the Linnet Muir cycle to Linnet reading a novel by Warner "on her way back to Montreal" (86). Stevens notes that the narrator of "In Youth is Pleasure" mentions Warner, whose "parents were asked to withdraw her from kindergarten for disrupting the class," just after

she describes her own unwillingness to salute the American flag or recite the pledge of allegiance. Stevens explores the various parallels between Warner's and Gallant's personal lives and the thematic concerns of their work, although he admits that they have little in common stylistically (87-90). With all this in mind, he speculates:

There is perhaps a mystery about this name appearing in this story, "In Youth Is Pleasure," dated 1975 in *Collected Stories*. Did a young Mavis Gallant actually read Warner or did she choose this name because she had learned of this writer from her editor at the *New Yorker* later on, William Maxwell, who had been Warner's editor at the magazine from 1936. The exchange of letters between Maxwell and Warner was published, and then Maxwell edited Warner's general correspondence. He seems to have had a close literary relationship with Warner – perhaps similar to the one he had with Gallant. (87)

Stevens is on to something here; Gallant may or may not have been familiar with Warner's work before beginning to work with Maxwell, but he very likely introduced the two writers to one another. Gallant's archives at the University of Toronto include a file that consists entirely of personal correspondence from Warner. Since Warner and Gallant would have both been working under Maxwell's editorship for at least a brief period of time, Maxwell himself is likely the intermediary who put the two authors in touch with one another. Gallant's incorporation of references to the work of Mansfield and Warner in her own *New Yorker* fiction highlights the role that the magazine as an institution played as a site of intellectual community for readers and writers. In introducing Gallant to Warner, Maxwell serves as an example of the important cultural and community-building role of the editor; he or she not only builds relationships with individual authors, but also fosters the development of influential artistic relationships between them.

Just as earlier *New Yorker* contributors influenced Gallant's work, she has in turn influenced the work of the magazine's younger writers. In *The New Yorker's* monthly fiction podcast, current contributors choose a short story from the magazine's archives to read aloud and discuss with fiction editor Deborah Treisman. Antonya Nelson, who has been publishing in the magazine since the early 1990s, chose Gallant's "When We Were

Nearly Young" to share with the audience for the 5 November 2007 episode. During her discussion with Treisman, Nelson reveals that she first came across Gallant's fiction in the 1970s in *The New Yorker*, then rediscovered her upon the publication of *Paris Stories*, at which point she felt compelled to read all of Gallant's work. Treisman tells a similar story about having discovered Gallant's work in college and subsequently scouring used bookstores in an attempt to track down all of her out-of-print collections. That the magazine's fiction department is run by such a hearty Gallant fan and publishes fiction by other admirers of her work suggests that the magazine attracts artists and editors who participate in a shared aesthetic vision. Nelson, for example, argues that short stories "feel inconclusive," and that "the thing that short stories do best, in my estimation, is make you inhabit a moment with a character, and see the power of a small decision in many instances or just a very brief period of time and present it in jewel-like fashion rather than stringing it together in a larger project like the novel." This perspective echoes Gallant's own focus on depicting only the "turning-points" of characters' lives, and nothing in between (Gallant, "What is Style" 6; Dvořák). Yet in suggesting that short stories "don't wrap up," Nelson describes not all stories, but the modern story tradition that Gallant inherited from Hemingway and Chekhov, which is characteristic of work published in *The New Yorker*. The very premise of the podcast – *New Yorker* contributors gushing over the work of previous *New Yorker* contributors – suggests that the magazine encourages the development of a literary culture that constantly reinforces itself. On 9 July 2012 the magazine published Gallant's "The Hunger Diaries," a short excerpt from Gallant's 1952 diary entries in which she discusses waiting for payment from her literary agent, Jacques Chambrun (who had kept the money for himself) for the publication of some of her first *New Yorker* stories. Several writers, including Treisman, published blog entries on the magazine's website about this piece. Treisman's entry includes a link back to her 2007 podcast with Nelson about the story that fictionalizes the very period Gallant describes in her published diary entries. This series of linked posts or "intertexts" as Jonathan Gray describes them, further reinscribes Gallant as a *New Yorker* writer who is part of an insular, self-reinforcing literary culture.

3.3.1 From Literal to Imaginary Maps: Gallant as Cultural Translator in "Immortal Gatito"

In addition to fiction, Gallant has occasionally published what Keefer calls "social narrative" in the pages of *The New Yorker* (*Reading Mavis Gallant* 197). One of these "social narratives," a kind of literary journalism crossed with social commentary, is "Immortal Gatito" (1971), a piece that explores the conviction and suicide of Gabrielle Russier – a *lycée* teacher who had an affair with a male student – and relates this event to the larger gender and class structures of France.⁷⁴ This text functions as a specific example of an attempt at cross-cultural communication in which, once again, *The New Yorker* serves as the site of cross-cultural contact. Gallant's introductory essay to the English translation of Russier's letters, *The Affair of Gabrielle Russier*, appeared under the "Annals of Justice" rubric in the 26 June 1971 issue of the magazine. Although the text presents itself as non-fiction, it is full of speculative, literary moments, such as debates over what colour Russier's eyes were – "some people remember her eyes as green, others say no, dark brown" – and speculation about what her lover might, or might not, have said had he testified at her trial (65). Rather than revealing all of the facts of the story in the order in which they took place, Gallant seemingly deliberately withholds a few details in order to defy readers' expectations, plotting the events of the Russier case into a narrative structure. She also often refers to Russier as "Gabrielle" – as if she were a character – rather than as "Russier" as one might expect a journalist to do. It is because of this close relationship between the fiction and the journalism that Gallant published in *The New Yorker* that an examination of "Immortal Gatito," which offers one of the most complete archives amongst Gallant's *New Yorker*-related material, is productive for an understanding of Gallant's literary relationship with *The New Yorker*. The piece and its accompanying archival material also offer the most direct look at a theme that recurs throughout Gallant's *New Yorker* career, including in "Orphan's Progress" and "Luc and

⁷⁴ *The New Yorker* has been open to generic ambiguity since its first issue, and has helped to pioneer new literary and journalistic genres through the development of the "Profile" and the "true crime" genre with the publication of Truman Capote's *In Cold Blood*. The fluidity in Gallant's work between fiction and journalism may be one of the reasons she has been so successful with the magazine; Gallant's story, "When We Were Nearly Young," (1960) for example, has often been taken for an essay (Besner, "A Broken Dialogue" 89; *The Light of Imagination* 21).

His Father": cultural translation in general, and cultural translation between French-speaking and English-speaking cultures in particular.

As an attempt at translation—of cultural context rather than language—"Immortal Gatito" and the editorial process behind it reveal a specific instance of *The New Yorker's* role as an authorial contact zone. The text is full of explanations of French cultural practices for an American audience, as well as comparisons between French and U.S. society, legal practices, and parenting styles.⁷⁵ Gallant, as Keefer points out, admits that since "this is not an American tragedy" it "needs its own context" – namely, the "improvisat[ion of] a new society" – that she then attempts to sketch for her readers (Gallant, "Immortal Gatito" 47). The conflicts and misunderstandings that result from her attempt at cross-cultural communication are visible in the archives surrounding the essay's publication.

Although Gallant readily admits within the essay itself that linguistic and cultural translation are impossible tasks,⁷⁶ her several thousand word attempt reveals an authorial contact zone in which Gallant, as a Canadian and translator of French culture into "American idiom," comes into contact with and often adopts the cultural idioms of her American editor and her audience, which she assumes is also American (Keefer, *Reading Mavis Gallant* 216).

⁷⁵ Keefer suggests that "Gallant's communicative strategy at the beginning of her narrative is to translate certain public forms of the French mindset into North American terms" (*Reading Mavis Gallant* 216-218).

⁷⁶ Near the end of her essay, Gallant makes much of the fact that, in response to a question regarding his feelings about the outcome of the Russier case, President Pompidou recited poetry – a verse by Paul Eluard – and the cultural difference that this represents between France and the United States. She chooses not to translate the poem into English, however, explaining, "When poetry is translated, the result is either not faithful, not poetry, or not English" (74). This approach bears out the claims Gallant would later make regarding her doubts about the viability of translation during an address to Glendon College graduates, and her own fears when it comes to having her work translated into French. In the draft of her convocation speech accepting an honorary doctorate of letters in 1984, Gallant argues that:

there are a hundred and one shadings of tone, of nuance that make even a conversation in English or French so very unlike. One never talks in quite the same way, or about the same things. And these differences must be allowed to exist, too, because the belief that everything can be exactly rendered is death to one of the two—the one betrayed by the translation.

Gallant's position as an expatriate Canadian living in France allows her allegiance and her cultural or national identification to shift throughout the essay. At times she aligns herself with the U.S., the home of an intellectual tradition with which she deeply sympathizes,⁷⁷ while at others she implies that she is a member of the French society within which she has spent the majority of her life. Throughout much of "Immortal Gatito," Gallant positions herself as an intermediary capable of explaining French cultural practices and values to an American reader. For example, she suggests that to an American audience, the reaction of the parents of Christian, the student who had a relationship with Russier, "may seem extreme, but it is not inexplicable. In a situation where an American might expect a boy of sixteen or seventeen to rebel, a French father is taken aback. France is anything but a matriarchal society: public opinion holds a father responsible for his children and the way they behave even after they grow up" (58). She continues this ironic, anthropological analysis by suggesting that paternal influence is linked to geography and climate.⁷⁸ At other moments in the essay though, Gallant positions herself as part of American society rather than as a disinterested observer. In describing parenting conventions in France in even further detail she claims that Russier, a divorced mother of nine-year-old twins, "was an attentive, a scrupulous, but also—to foreign eyes—a severe and unbending mother" (48). Here Gallant's tone implies that she considers herself part of that group that possesses "foreign eyes" in relation to the object of study – French culture. The critiques throughout Gallant's body of work of the ways in which children are controlled or mistreated support this reading. "To some of us," she writes, Russier's daughter "nine-year-old Valérie might sound like a prig and a busybody, but in France such stories are quite often repeated with the intention of gaining the listener's approval" (48). Through the pronoun "us," Gallant explicitly identifies herself as part of a foreign community rather than as a member of French society. In a similar

⁷⁷ Although she suggests in "Varieties of Exile" (1976) that "Canadian patriotism is always anti-American in part" (33), Gallant's sense of Canadian identity is not dependent upon anti-American sentiment; her interview with Hancock suggests that she is quite fond of the United States and Americans.

⁷⁸ "France is cut into two distinct climatic zones by the Loire River," Gallant writes, in yet another example of the ways in which claims about her beliefs about the anti-essentialist nature of identity are contradicted by her work as it is published in *The New Yorker*: "South of the Loire, there are fewer divorces, fewer suicides, and—where the father's authority is stronger—four times *fewer* parricides" (59).

example, Gallant writes that "Gabrielle Russier suffered what we loosely call a nervous breakdown"; once again, she does not clarify who is included in the group identified by the pronoun "we" (51). Given her earlier invocation of an American audience, it is likely she is identifying with her American readers at this point in the text.

Gallant does not always identify with her American audience, however. She sometimes speaks "through" others' comments rather than choosing a position from which to identify herself, as she does when she suggests that "someone close to her," or a particular professor under whose supervision Russier studied, believes that the fact that Russier was half-American accounts for her behavior (48). At other points, she appears to want to distance herself from her American readership, presumably in order to condemn, and avoid appearing complicit in, the United States' history of racist treatment of African Americans. After explaining how the fact that Russier was a female teacher who had an affair with a male student affected her legal position in ways that would not have affected a male teacher who had had an affair with a female student, Gallant writes: "None of this is to say that if the legal status of women in France were different Gabrielle Russier would have found tolerant magistrates, for Americans do not need to be told at this stage of their social history that you cannot legislate attitudes" (52). This seems to be a veiled critique of the gap between civil rights legislation and public attitudes that complicated the process of desegregation in the late 1960s and early 1970s. Gallant's use of "their history" here rather than "our," in contrast with the inclusive "we" and "us" that she uses in other parts of the essay indicates that, as far as this issue is concerned, Gallant does not wish to align herself with American society.

The editing process, and the written conversations that took place between Gallant and her editors during it, reveal not only the expected differences in how Gallant and her editors position themselves, but also some interesting differences in the characteristics they assume define the magazine's readers. The archives available for this essay include type-written responses to several queries her editor(s) likely made on an unavailable, early set of galleys, and a copy of a different set of galleys (the page proofs to which Gallant refers) which include changes, clarifications and additions based upon Gallant's responses to these (missing) queries and hand-written notes pointing them out. There is

also correspondence between Gallant and a law firm over the legal implications of her essay, which the firm considered libelous. The available galleys for the essay explain the ways in which Russier was at a legal disadvantage at her trial: "One other count against her was the fact that she was divorced. It sounds improbable in a country like France, where divorce is accepted, relatively easy to obtain." There is a box drawn around the words "like France" in pencil, and a hand-written note nearby that reads: "my insert, for clarity, so that the reader won't think, as I did, that you are talking about the U.S." (galley 440). Before the editor's addition of the clarifier "like France," Gallant's statement would indeed have been ambiguous. It could imply that although divorce is readily accepted in France, the fact that Russier was divorced still counted against her in her trial, or it could imply that, to readers from the U.S., where divorce is readily accepted, Gallant expects it to seem improbable that Russier's divorce counted against her. The fact that Gallant, living in France, assumes that readers will assume the former, while her editor, living in New York, assumes – probably correctly – that readers will assume the latter, serves as just one example of the ways that within the authorial contact zone of *The New Yorker*, conflicting conceptions of and assumptions about cultural differences have affected the writing, reading, and editing of Gallant's work.

The addition of "like France" highlights the transition that was taking place in *The New Yorker's* editorial position on world events. The inclusion of such a long article about a legal trial in France in the pages of the magazine at all is indicative of its increasingly cosmopolitan nature at this period, but *The New Yorker* clearly still posited its ideal or average reader as American, if not specifically in New York city. The limitations on the setting and subject matter of journalism and fiction were not nearly as parochial in 1971 as they were during Callaghan's career with the magazine, but a certain degree of America-centrism still lingered in the magazine's orientation toward world events that has all but disappeared in the magazine's current issues, with their mix of fiction by authors from, and set in a wide range of countries.⁷⁹

⁷⁹ Exceptions are the short, front of book pieces such as "Comment" and "Talk of the Town" which are usually New York- or U.S.-centric.

Gallant may not have been subject to Maxwell's "imaginary map" of Manhattan in obvious ways throughout most of her career, but its lingering presence did influence her editors' approach to her work through an assumption that readers come to the magazine with a New York perspective. When it comes to her identification with American readers throughout "Immortal Gatito," Gallant is far less regionally specific than are her editors. This is evident through a series of exchanges about whether to use New York or Arkansas as an example of inhumane prison conditions and the practice of preventive detention. After a tirade about the conditions faced by Algerians in France, who are often not charged with crimes, but are instead the victims of preventive detention, the essay continues: "Now, these conditions are no worse than in some other places and countries, including the state of Arkansas or New York City. But unless a middle-class public can see its own image reflected in someone like Gabrielle Russier, nobody—nobody in the middle class, that is—cares" (galley 431). Once again, it was Gallant's editor who added a geographical qualifier, "or New York City."⁸⁰ On the available, second set of page proofs, the editor highlights "or New York City" in pencil, and includes the following hand-written note:

It isn't that we are ignorant about what goes on in Arkansas. I guess I didn't make myself clear about this point, or you wouldn't have written (note 13, galley 34 [sic]) "I am staggered by the question 'Why Arkansas'"

If, as is actually the case, the situation in prisons is exactly as bad in New York City in every respect that you have mentioned as it is in Arkansas, then the reader is bound to ask "why pick on Arkansas, when New York City is just as bad?" What we are trying to avoid by the insert is a tone of wholly unjustified self-righteousness. Okay? (galley 431)

Although the practice of only accepting fiction set in New York or places that New Yorkers were likely to travel to went out of fashion after the Second World War, this note

⁸⁰ Based on her response to query 13 from her editor on galley 30 of the (missing) original set of galleys – "I am staggered by the question 'Why Arkansas?'" (leaf 8) – we can deduce that Gallant's original version of the essay did not mention New York City.

suggests that, as late as 1971, the editorial staff of the magazine still considered New Yorkers their standard audience, rather than Americans or English-speakers around the world. It would be impossible to interpret failing to mention New York City in the context of inhumane prisons as "unjustified self-righteousness" without the underlying assumption that the magazine's readers are either New Yorkers themselves, or see New York as the source of the magazine's content. When Gallant implicitly identifies herself as American through her use of "we" and "us" throughout the essay, it is in a general sense that encompasses all of the United States without prejudice for one region over another. For her editors, on the other hand, "we" still meant residents of New York City at this point.

Throughout Gallant's career, *The New Yorker*, with its famous fact-checking department known "for its Canadian Mounty-like determination to hunt down any fact, no matter how obscure" (Yagoda 203), was concerned with avoiding libel. The editing of "Immortal Gatito" reveals this fear of legal action and its occasional basis in conflicting political ideals and misunderstandings about national cultures between Gallant and the magazine. In some cases, the editor's fear of litigation and Gallant's nonchalance about it are obviously based in the differences between the cultural conventions of the U.S. and France. The "Immortal Gatito" files include a four-page, typed letter from the legal office of Weil, Gotshal & Manges, which had been hired by the publisher Knopf to scrutinize Gallant's introduction to a book about the Russier affair, and found it highly libelous. One of the aspects of the essay with which Weil, Gotshal & Manges took issue was "[t]he repeated allegations that Christian's parents are Communists and that Christian is a Maoist," which they argued were "libelous and should be deleted unless they may be proven to be true" (1-2). *The New Yorker* was also concerned about the legal implications of such an allegation. Gallant's lengthy response to her editor's query about this aspect of the essay reveals a moment in which the "translation" of the details of the Russier affair into American terms breaks down; both Gallant's legal advisors and her editor at *The New Yorker* seem not to realize Christian Rossi and his father may not actually be offended by being called Communists – that these labels were not nearly as offensive or scandalous in France as they were in the U.S., which was in the midst of a decades-long Cold War. Gallant responded to her editor:

Professor Rossi would be more likely to have The New Yorker seized if you said he was a supporter of de Gaulle. The Rossis were spoken of as Communists since the beginning of the affaire. The climate of France is not the climate of America. It is not pejorative to be called a communist in France. It was as a communist that he was criticized by leftists, ie he had not behaved as a communist by dealing with the bourgeois police. (leaf 2)

The explanation continues beyond this excerpt for another two-thirds of a page. That the editors and legal department at *The New Yorker* could not conceive of a culture in which the term "Communist" is not a libelous epithet once again reveals the magazine's rootedness in American culture despite its attempts to become more cosmopolitan. Moments of cultural "clash" such as these reinforce a reading of "Immortal Gatito" as a work in which Gallant, her editors and publishers negotiate cross-cultural or transnational relations. The publication history of this essay supports Gallant's suspicions about the inadequate nature of both linguistic and cultural translation and reveals the multiply-authored nature of not only her fiction, but also her journalism, both of which were shaped by their publication within the literary contact zone of *The New Yorker*. Here, the perceptions of and expectations about national characteristics – Gallant's, her editors', and *The New Yorker's* lawyers' – meet and influence one another in ways that subtly alter "Immortal Gatito's" presentation in the magazine, as well as the essay's geographical and national alignment. The archives reveal the role of editorial conflict in shaping Gallant's work. Similar misunderstandings about national characteristics also occurred while Gallant and her editors were preparing to publish "Orphan's Progress."

3.4 New Yorker Style: "Orphan's Progress" as a Case Study in Nationalist Tensions and Censorship

During the preparation of "Orphan's Progress" (1965) for publication, the contrast in values and perceptions of national character between Gallant and her editors was resolved in a way that exceeds the bounds of collaboration and enters the territory of "imposition" or "censorship." The story functions as an excellent case study of the coercive influence of "*New Yorker* style" on Gallant's work, and the archival materials available allow us to trace the changes that were made to Gallant's typescript of "Orphan's Progress" in order

to, as I will argue, make it more closely adhere to the stylistic traits that characterized *New Yorker* fiction.

Scholars of Gallant's work often discuss the ways that her fiction reveals the constructed and transient nature of identity. For Gallant, "Canadianness" was less a question of essence than performance, and her inability or unwillingness to fix a singular definition of what is "Canadian" is reflected in both the form and structure of her fiction in ways that are described as cubist or polyphonic. In an exploration of Gallant's use of irony, Danielle Schaub calls her an "expert in the art of polyphony" and attributes this skill to Gallant's bicultural upbringing and her choice to live as an expatriate surrounded by a language other than English: "Looking at once through two lenses (French and British)," she writes, "she cannot have one, and only one, view of things" ("Gallant's Irony and its Double Edge" 33, 14). Gallant told Hancock that she has "never noticed any single Canadian theme" (25) in her work, and she expands upon this rejection of a singular sense of what is "Canadian" in her introduction to the 1981 collection *Home Truths: Selected Canadian Stories*, in *Selected Stories of Mavis Gallant* (1996), and in her interview with fellow *New Yorker* writer Jhumpa Lahiri (2009). Archival research into the publication history of the story "Orphan's Progress," though, brings to light the tensions and contradictions between what Gallant often claimed to believe about identity, or the beliefs about identity scholars often attribute to Gallant, and the discussions about national identity in which Gallant often participated with her editors.

Gallant still considered herself a Canadian after having spent the majority of her life in Europe,⁸¹ but she was adamant that her identity as a Canadian and her identity as a writer be kept separate. She was reluctant to publish the collection of stories *Home Truths: Selected Canadian Stories* (1981) – a treatise on her conception of Canadian identity – because she did not want to be labeled as a specifically Canadian writer, or, as

⁸¹ Gallant has always insisted that she is very sure about her own national identity. In a January 24, 1984 CBC television broadcast of Gallant reading from *Home Truths*, she describes her sense of identity by saying: "I am a writer and I am Canadian," and calls the claim that Canada lacks a clear national identity "hogwash." "When the famous identity problem began," she offers, "I wasn't here," claiming that she "never had any doubts" about her identity.

Gallant herself put it, she wanted to avoid "[t]he ghetto!" (Bertail and Evain 41). This word choice indicates just how strongly she believed that any tie between the writer and the state, in this case in the form of cultural nationalism, has the potential to not only narrow a writer's appeal, but also be dangerous or oppressive. As several critics have noted, her introduction to this collection begins with an epigraph: Boris Pasternak's "credo," "Only personal independence matters" (Keefer, "Gallant's World of Women" 26; Smythe 113). For Gallant, personal independence included avoiding dependence upon the state or even the informal association of her work with a nation. She established herself as a writer without the help of Canada Council grants, partly because they did not yet exist when she began her career,⁸² but also because, as she argues in "The Writer in the State" (1992), she believed that "A funeral is the only harmless fusion of writer and state" (103). This stance refers not only to art commissioned by the state or produced in fascist or totalitarian societies,⁸³ but also to the seemingly less nefarious phenomenon of being received as a writer who represents, or whose work is representative of a nation. "I have come to the conclusion that it is wise not to become a sort of *pet writer*," she writes, "liked or even admired for perhaps the wrong reasons. It is sensible, where the state is concerned, to keep a buffer in one's mind, something that says: 'Yes, I am a writer, but I am not necessarily *your* writer. I just – exist'" (92). In my own correspondence with her, Gallant has insisted that she was not "published in *The New Yorker* as a Canadian, but as a writer."⁸⁴ Gallant distrusts relationships between artists and the state because she fears that they lead to nationalism, imperialism, fascism, and even Nazism. Nevertheless, in

⁸² "The Canada Council was created by an Act of Parliament in 1957 [six years after Gallant began publishing in *The New Yorker*] (Canada Council for the Arts Act) to foster and promote the study, enjoyment and production of works in the arts, and operate at 'arm's length.'" See the Canada Council for the Arts' website for more history and background information on the Council and its grants to writers and other artists.

⁸³ Gallant writes: "The Canadian passport has always been unlimited. This was not always the case for the citizens of other countries who also prided themselves on *their* freedom and their way of life" (91), and "We have seen in this century that when the state is the publisher, producer, and distributor, art falls into the hands of people who, if they are not cultural ninnyes to begin with, soon become so . . . One cannot help feeling a certain uneasiness about writers who become too closely identified with the state – any state" (98).

⁸⁴ See also the portion of Hancock's interview in which he and Gallant discuss the fact that that she, like Mansfield, is "a writer in the English language" (60-61).

referring to her "ally" Maxwell as "the most American of writers and the most American of all the Americans I have known," she positions the work of one of her editors as part of a nationally-identified literary aesthetic ("Preface" XIX). Her editors, in turn, position the elements of her work that they find unpalatable, or inconsistent with their prudish editorial policies, as explicitly Canadian.

Gallant is lucky to have found such a supportive community at *The New Yorker* because she did not receive much encouragement from the Canadian literary community during the first few decades of her career. Gallant, whom Keefer described as simultaneously "accomplished" and "among the . . . least accommodating of contemporary writers" ("Strange Fashions of Forsaking" 721), did not produce work that easily leant itself to the nationalist project taking place in Canadian literary communities during the 1960s and 1970s.⁸⁵ Gallant's work deals with urban, and often American or European settings, and is decidedly not nationalist in intention, and, therefore, does not fit Weiss' description of the kind of fiction that was marketable in Canada at the beginning of Gallant's career. Keefer, Smythe, Blodgett, Barbara Godard, and Silvia Mergenthal have thoroughly addressed, in their various analyses the sparse recognition that Gallant's work received in Canada until the publication of *Home Truths*. Without recourse to a non-Canadian magazine devoted to "urbanity," Gallant's work might have failed to find an audience.

⁸⁵ As Weiss writes in order to refute the claims that twentieth-century Canadian fiction has been diluted by vague, unspecified settings:

The popular short story in Canada reached its height during the period from about 1920 to the mid-1950s, quite naturally following the changing fortunes of the magazines themselves. What is truly remarkable about this period is the extent to which editors had a nationalist purpose or consciousness . . . The settings, as critics of the period's fiction have noted, are not reflective of the times. Canada was becoming a primarily urban society—indeed, sixty percent of the population lived in cities by 1951—but the fiction almost invariably concerns characters in small towns, on farms, or in fishing villages. As one might expect, stories published in Canadian magazines are more likely to be set in clearly identified Canadian places. (88-90)

The New Yorker played an important role in supporting Gallant's development as a writer by offering her a venue for publication. In exchange, however, Gallant was forced to abide by the magazine's constraining policies about what it did and did not consider appropriate for publication. *The New Yorker* had a shifting approach to, and a complicated set of rules about, the depiction of what it considered to be offensive. Sexual explicitness, profanity, and provocative material were prohibited. During the 1950s to the 1980s when Gallant was a frequent contributor, this policy had less to do with founding editor Ross's original conception of the cosmopolitan *New Yorker* reader than it did with the personal idiosyncrasies of Shawn, his successor. In addition to "discouraging references to sex and bodily functions" like his predecessor,⁸⁶ Shawn also "had an odd list of words that made him so uncomfortable he would not allow them in the magazine: *balding*, for example, and *pimples*" (Yagoda 296). In practice, *The New Yorker's* prudishness, combined with its conception of the writer/editor relationship as a collaborative one occasionally compromised Gallant's autonomy or "authority" over a story.

"Orphan's Progress" tells the story of two Montreal sisters who are taken away from their mother's care and sent to live with their grandmother in Ontario until their grandmother's death, at which point the sisters are separated. A note in Gallant's archives introducing the typescript for the story is particularly interesting to a study of the ways that competing conceptions of national identities have been negotiated through the editorial process. Gallant writes:

"Orphan's Progress" represents something of an editing curiosity. The penciled numbers stand for editorial queries – 33 in all, for an eight-page story. The first paragraph was considered too sexual for *The New Yorker's* readers and, after a long and bickering correspondence, I agreed to change it. It is the only major change I have ever made because of an objection of that kind, and I have always

⁸⁶ See Yagoda (100-101) for a discussion of the influence of Puritanism on Ross's editorial policies, and the distinctions he made between his personal habits of newsroom profanity and what was appropriate in a magazine he considered "for circulation in mixed company."

regretted having done so. The story has been anthologized more than once, but not as it was written. One of the many letters I had on the subject contained the imperishable sentence, "Perhaps these things go on in Canada, but no American reader would understand it." In fact, the incident mentioned did take place, in Connecticut, in 1938.

This example of (self-) censorship within *The New Yorker* starkly contrasts with the way that Gallant *perceived* the difference between Americans and Canadians in her Montreal stories. In the story "In Youth is Pleasure," which is part of the coming-of-age Linnet Muir cycle, Linnet is mesmerized by Americans' willingness to laugh openly and express emotions in a theatre, and its difference from her own Montreal upbringing in which she was constantly reminded to keep her boisterous urges under control through the repeated phrase: *pas si fort*" (*Selected Stories* 716-717).

The scene to which Maxwell and Shawn presumably took offense in "Orphan's Progress" occurs early in the story, and alludes to allowing the two young girls to watch goats mate. The version Gallant submitted to *The New Yorker* reads: "Their grandmother was scrupulous about food, particularly for these underfed children, and made them drink goat's milk. Two goats bought specially to supply the orphans were taken by station wagon to a buck fifty miles away, the girls accompanying them for reasons of enlightenment" (leaf 1). The edited passage was published in the magazine as: "The children's grandmother was scrupulous about food, and made them drink goat's milk. Two goats were brought by station wagon from fifty miles away. The girls went with the driver to get them" (49). This incident has clearly stuck with Gallant, for she repeated her dissatisfaction with it in her 2009 interview with Lahiri. Her comments to Lahiri about Maxwell do an excellent job of balancing both the admiration she obviously felt for her primary editor's characteristically restrained, personal editorial style and the frustration she sometimes experienced when faced with some of the magazine's conservative official editorial policies. She says of Maxwell:

There's never been as good an editor. He was prudish, and I had trouble with his prudishness, not to speak of William Shawn's. They would say to me, 'Maybe

those things go on in Canada, but they don't go on here.' The slightest hint of anything. I don't like pornography. But I'm very conscious of sexual tension. I think that's the most interesting thing to write about, the tension. (129-30)

Together, the editorial staff's personal idiosyncrasies and the desire to maintain a sense of decorum and urbanity for readers interfered in Gallant's autonomy as a writer through the excision of this detail from the published version of the story, and the justification of this excision through nationalist rhetoric. Gallant had no desire to represent Canadian literature or have her work be associated with Canada. Nonetheless, her American editors perceive the elements of her work that fall outside the purview of what Shawn would consider an acceptable code of behavior as foreign to America and American values. Against her will, Gallant's work is interpellated as representing Canadian values by her American editors in a way that reveals a moment of incompatibility between her literary vision and that of her "ally" Maxwell. In this instance, Yagoda's description of the magazine's "unexalted view of authorial sovereignty" seems particularly apt (200).

Although this particular incident can be attributed to the personal preferences of individual editors, Maxwell and Shawn, it is also representative of an attempt throughout the history of *The New Yorker* to cater to a "delicate" audience. In the 19 October 2009 issue of the magazine, Tad Friend writes a short article on writer-director Kevin Smith's debut at Carnegie Hall in which Smith's expletive-laden speech is deemed unfit to be printed in the pages of *The New Yorker*. Friend substitutes the names of Canadian hockey legends for the expletives, explaining that Smith offered

candid, digressive responses to his fans' questions—so candid that, in these pages, it's necessary to relay them in code. We're going to substitute 'Wayne Gretzky,' the hockey great whom Smith reveres, for the intimate body parts that he frequently mentions. When he discusses those body parts' being involved in certain private activities—when he uses them as a verb—the proxy phrase will be 'Walter Gretzky,' Wayne's father, and, according to Kevin Smith, one of the great human beings. (30)

While clearly Friend is being (somewhat) facetious in his decorousness, in this case, as in Gallant's, distasteful references to sexuality are referred to as associated with Canada, in

ways that indicate a long-term, institutional assumption about crudeness as "foreign." The version of "Orphan's Progress" that was published in *The New Yorker* was multiply-authored, but, given Ross's indication that *The New Yorker* might rescind its offer to purchase a story if an author did not submit to changes the magazine's editors deemed essential, the power dynamics driving this particular change suggest that it was a result of coercion rather than cooperation.

The New Yorker's censorship of Gallant's reference to sexual education in "Orphan's Progress," combined with encouraging the significant alteration of the first paragraph through queries has the effect of altering the structure, and therefore the reader's experience of, the story as a whole. Yagoda writes of the kinds of fiction published in *The New Yorker* in general: "The aesthetic that eventually came to inform the *New Yorker* had its shortcomings. It was rarely receptive to elliptical, experimental, gritty, or subversive artists, or to work that came from the margins of society" (21). This story functions as an example of the typical style of *New Yorker* fiction under Maxwell's editorship; the archival materials reveal the changes that Maxwell et al. made in order to help Gallant's writing to conform to that style. In discussing Gallant's story "The Doctor," Evain and Bertail comment upon what both Gallant and Maxwell have identified as Gallant's tendency to structure her work in a way that is helical or non-linear. Gallant responds to the interviewers' observation with the comment: "This bothered very much my editor: what he called not being linear. But he passed these stories and he ran them in *The New Yorker*, but he had his doubts whether people were going to understand them" (105). It is this insistence upon linearity that is evident in editorial queries and the changes between Gallant's typescript for "Orphan's Progress" and the version of the story ultimately published in *The New Yorker*.

Tied to the magazine's focus on linearity and realism is its penchant for clarity and accuracy, even in fiction. In his article about what does (or does not) constitute *New Yorker* fiction, Roger Angell reveals that the list of questions a fiction editor must ask about a submission is the same one used for any other piece of writing: the most important question being "is it clear?" (105). Gallant's comments about the novella *The Pegnitz Junction*, which Maxwell rejected, substantiate Yagoda's claims about what *The*

New Yorker and its editors valued in fiction. As Gallant explains in her interview with Evain and Bertail:

I sent it off to *The New Yorker* . . . And to my surprise, it was rejected by William Maxwell: . . . And twenty years later – he was in his nineties and had long retired – he sent me a long letter about the story and he said, "I don't know what went wrong with me. My mind must have been out to lunch," which was a wonderful way of putting it. And he said, the problem was, my prejudice against Germany – his own – and because of the linear literature that *The New Yorker* favoured. (77)⁸⁷

Despite her claim in her interview with Lahiri that the magazine accepted more experimental work than other magazines did, her comments here suggest that Maxwell was hanging on to *The New Yorker's* conventional, linear model for the short story that Gallant was writing against.

Gallant's editorial relationship with Maxwell resulted in the publication of at least two versions of "Orphan's Progress," the more linear version that appeared in *The New Yorker* in 1965 and a second version, published in 1981 in *Home Truths*, that resembles Gallant's "original" typescript. Each version of the story was published with a different audience in mind: a *New Yorker* readership, and a Canadian one. Each audience's presumed familiarity or unfamiliarity with Canadian geography results in place, specifically Waterloo, Ontario, functioning differently in each version of the story. *The New Yorker* editors represent one of the voices in this story's polyphonic "collective voice born from the overlapping points of view" (156) that Fabre identifies in his analysis of the story.

The differences between Gallant's typescript of "Orphan's Progress" and the

⁸⁷ What is interesting here is the concept of nation that informs the rejection. Maxwell rejects the story because of a post-World-War-II anti-German prejudice. Gallant, however, is proud of the story precisely because she believes it so successfully captures post-World-War-II Germany. As she tells Evain and Bertail: "'The Pognitz Junction' is the story I was most satisfied with. *Je l'ai fait. Pour moi, c'est l'Allemagne*" (79).

version of the story that *The New Yorker* published help to demonstrate the significant role that Maxwell and Shawn played in shaping Gallant's fiction, despite Gallant's claim that "It was my work, always" (qtd. in Hancock 33). *The New Yorker's* desire for clarity is evident in its untangling of the helical way in which the narrator of "Orphan's Progress" reveals information in the typescript that Gallant submitted to her editors. In the version of "Orphan's Progress" that Gallant originally submitted, information is revealed to the reader sporadically throughout the story, leaving the reader grasping for the cause of the actions that various adults take. The first paragraph of Gallant's original typescript of the story reads:

When the Collier girls were six and ten they were taken away from their mother, whom they loved without knowing what the word implied, or even that it existed, and sent to their father's mother. Their grandmother was scrupulous about food, particularly for these underfed children, and made them drink goat's milk. Two goats bought specially to supply the orphans were taken by station wagon to a buck fifty miles away, the girls accompanying them for reasons of enlightenment. A man in a filling station was frightened by the goats, because of their oblong eyes. The girls were not reflected in the goats' eyes, as they were in each other's. What they remembered afterwards of their grandmother was goat's milk, goat eyes, and the frightened man. (leaf 1)

The order in which events are described in Gallant's typescript is unexpected and confusing. Although she does not explain why the children are "underfed," or "afte[r]" what event or period the girls remember their grandmother, the reader has enough information to begin to do some interpretative work. In the version of the story published in *The New Yorker*, the first paragraphs offer much of the information that Gallant slowly "leaks" throughout the text of her original story, thus offering the reader all of the information necessary to understand the girls' situation from the beginning. In the following excerpt from the beginning of the story as it was published in the magazine, the additions and changes to the typescript that Gallant initially submitted have been italicized:

When the Collier *children* were six and ten, *a social worker came to the place where they were living in Montreal, and shortly after that they were taken away from their mother, whom they loved without knowing what the word implied, or even that it existed, and sent to their father's mother in Ontario. Their father was dead. Their mother was no longer capable of looking after them properly. When women turn strange, it happens very rapidly. The first sign is lack of care about clothes and hair, and all at once they are sluts. Drinking slides in. They attract frightening men—at first men without wits, money, affection, or a job, compared with whom the woman seems a monument of character and strength. At the end, the men around them are almost respectable (by contrast) but very unkind. I have more than once seen women get into this state, and the common factors were drink, and dirt, and weeping, and rages, and being preyed upon, and finally seeming so sexually innocent that one is frightened. One says she is alcoholic, she is manic-depressive, the children should be taken away. Yes, they are seeing things they shouldn't and not getting proper food, and in moral and perhaps physical danger (someday she will set the place on fire); but if the mother still has her qualities—those that attracted, say, her friends or her husband in the first place: warmth, generosity—do you take them away for their own good? One day someone tells—a janitor's wife, an anonymous friend of the husband—and the life that seems safe from inside (to the children) but perilous from without is destroyed. Whether it is the right thing or the wrong thing as far as the children are concerned, it is the end of love.*

The children's grandmother was scrupulous about food, and made them drink goat's milk. Two goats were brought by station wagon from fifty miles away. The girls went with the driver to get them. A man in a filling station was frightened by the goats, because of their oblong eyes. The girls were not reflected in the goats' eyes, as they were in each other's. What they remembered afterward of this period when they were living with their grandmother was goat's milk, goat eyes, and the frightened man. (49)

The slip that *New Yorker* editors usually pasted to the back of the first page of each typescript indicating what time of year, or what issue the story might be appropriate for, and its editor, is missing, but in her interview with Lahiri Gallant identifies Maxwell and Shawn as the editors of this story. The typescript version of the story contains numbers indicating where each of the thirty-three queries to which Gallant refers applies, but the queries themselves are missing. The numerous additions to the first few paragraphs that appear in the version of the story published in the magazine appear to be taken primarily from later parts of the typescript. It is unclear whether Gallant herself transferred the information she discloses throughout the story into the first few paragraphs in response to Maxwell's queries, or whether Maxwell physically made the changes himself. In either case, the volume of italicized writing here indicates what a significant role Maxwell et al. played in altering, or encouraging Gallant to alter, the first few paragraphs of the story by untangling its disorienting, helical structure and smoothing it out into a clearer, more linear one.

The frontloading of information in the *New Yorker* version that Gallant discloses gradually throughout her typescript⁸⁸ helps to demystify the events of the story for the reader from its very beginning. In the revised version of the story, Gallant and her editors are able to strike "particularly for these underfed children" from the reference to the grandmother's scrupulousness about food, because the introductory paragraphs have already made it clear that these children are underfed and ill-cared-for. Making it difficult for the reader to make sense of the story, though, is precisely the effect that Gallant's gradual "leaking" of information in the typescript of the story is designed to achieve.

In response to the queries placed throughout Gallant's original submission, *The New Yorker's* version of "Orphan's Progress" does its very best to ensure that even a moderately engaged reader can easily follow the events of the story. Because of these clarifications, though, the reader no longer experiences the same "dislocation" and

⁸⁸ For example, in the published *New Yorker* version, the musing on the various linguistic differences between Ontarian and Montreal English is saved for well after it is disclosed to the reader, and to the children, that "their mother was French-Canadian but had spoken French and English to them" (49) and how disturbing their upbringing with their mother had been.

confusion that is experienced by the girls in the story (Keefer, *Reading Mavis Gallant* 15). Here I am indebted to Fabre's discussion of the differences between what he considers the "original" *New Yorker* version of the story and the "later" version printed in *Home Truths* (1981), and their effect upon the reader's sense of displacement. Fabre, in an article Gallant herself included in her archives, suggests that dislocation is something that the reader must experience and work through along with the protagonists:

This ending reveals by its cold factuality the dehumanizing horror of the orphan's progress into alienation. But the horror is not named, it must be supplied by the reader from what is left unsaid by the narrator, who carefully refrains from taking sides or passing judgement. It is in this sense that the author's narrative strategy takes it [sic] originality from the use of voice rather than from the rejection of the conventions of the short story form (151).

Just as the little girls are forced to make sense of their constantly changing environments without having access to all of the necessary information, the reader is required to make sense of a story in which the narrator refuses to offer the necessary "facts" in an intelligible order. The result of the magazine's attempts to make "Orphan's Progress" more closely adhere to its policy of linearity is this loss of the (intentional) sense of dislocation for the reader.

The editors' desire for clarity is evident in both the untangling of the structure of "Orphan's Progress" and the smoothing out of Gallant's syntax. In describing Mildred's life in the dormitory of the convent, Gallant writes: "Like the other little girls, she dressed, in the morning, sitting on the floor, so that they would not see one another" (leaf 6). In the published version, the order of the sentence is altered in a way that allows readers to easily place the action ("In the morning") before reading about the action (dressing) being described (50). This change, combined with the addition of the explanation that girls cannot "see one another" because they are "hidden by the beds," requires the reader to do as little interpretive work as possible. While the revision of Gallant's recursive syntax to create more direct, linear sentences may be relatively innocuous, and even beneficial to the reader in this example, in other cases this desire for

clarity can become pedantic or punctilious.⁸⁹ Yagoda suggests that the magazine was misguided in prizing clarity and accuracy above other stylistic traits in its fiction: "writers internalized the magazine's approach and saw their prose lose liveliness, individuality, and grace as a result" (330). Any (even minor) attempt at subtlety or obliquity in this story appears to be thwarted by the editing process. Gallant has vehemently denied in interviews that such a thing as a *New Yorker* short story exists, but the changes that "Orphan's Progress" underwent suggest that her editors did attempt to force the story to conform to a particular structure and style.

Bryant argues that different versions of a work often have different audiences, and that these versions "distinguish" themselves from one another by their "attempt[s] to manipulate a readership differently" (90). While the differences between the versions of Callaghan's stories that were published in *The New Yorker* and those published in Barry Callaghan's collection *The New Yorker Stories* offer clues to some of the historical contingencies at stake in readers' conceptions of modernism, the differences in the versions of "Orphan's Progress" highlight some of the cultural and geographical contingencies at play. Fabre points out that the 1971 anthology *Commonwealth Short Stories* prints the story as it appeared in *The New Yorker*. In 1981, however, after Gallant wrote that the story had never been published in its original form, she published *Home Truths: Selected Canadian Stories*, a collection that markets itself to readers who are encouraged by the book's title to latch on to the "Canadian" aspects of Gallant's writing, and that includes a version of "Orphan's Progress." In contrast to Fabre's claim that the version of the story published in *Home Truths* is a new one, I argue that this version is actually very similar to Gallant's "original" typescript. The structural differences between these versions of the story, in combination with their sites of publication, result in two different relationships to place. In one version, a Canadian city (Waterloo) is made exotic for a non-Canadian audience, who read the story in *The New Yorker* or *Commonwealth*

⁸⁹ In reference to Mildred's encounter with a nun from Belgium who entreats her to call her "Maman" even though it is forbidden, Gallant writes: "Who was there to hear what was said in the broom-cupboard? What basket-carrier repeated that?" (Leaf 7). The magazine's version, on the off-chance that a reader may not have picked up on the implication that Mildred's conversation with the nun indeed was reported, answers the narrator's rhetorical question with: "Somebody" (51).

Short Stories; in the other, published in *Home Truths*, place functions as a marker of the girls' psychological state rather than the reader's lack of familiarity with Canadian geography.

Gallant's *New Yorker* editors' minimization of the reader's sense of dislocation in "Orphan's Progress" affects how place functions in the story. In Gallant's typescript of the story, the version published in *The New Yorker*, and the version published in *Home Truths*, the narrator explains that the grandmother's maid "was from a place called Waterloo, where, to hear her tell it, no one behaved strangely and all the rooms were warm." Here, in qualifying "Waterloo" with "a place called," Gallant writes in a style that reflects the lack of information – in this case about Ontario geography – to which the children are subject. This child's perspective is reinforced by a second reference to not just the maid, but "the maid from Waterloo" two lines later. Referring to Waterloo in this way suggests that the city is unfamiliar, which, to the young girls, it is. In preparing the story for publication, the editor of Gallant's typescript did not query this choice; presumably he believed that "a place called Waterloo" was a necessary introduction to a location that would be unfamiliar to *New Yorker* readers. Given the changes that had been made to the structure of the story in order to make it easier for readers to understand, however, this "introduction" to Waterloo ought to have been unnecessary. It makes sense to refer to the mysterious "place called Waterloo" in the original typescript, which, in its reticence in revealing the details necessary to follow the events of the story, mimics the displacement that the girls experience. In the much more linear, straightforward version that goes out of its way to clarify rather than to withhold details, the references to "a place called Waterloo" and "the maid from Waterloo" function differently. Rather than mirroring the confusion and perspective of the children, it suggests that *The New Yorker's* educated (American) readers cannot be expected to know (or discern) that Waterloo is a city located in Ontario. It suggests that such explanations of "foreign" locations are necessary to understand the story. The various versions of "Orphan's Progress" indicate that, in 1965, *New Yorker* readers in general, and Maxwell in particular, were not yet ready for Gallant's experimentally-structured, sexually frank

stories, and still perceived settings in Canada, such as Waterloo, to be "other" and unfamiliar to readers.⁹⁰

3.5 "Luc and His Father" in Collaboration with the Enemy: *The New Yorker* Advertising

"Orphan's Progress" and "Immortal Gatito" offer examples of the authorized, substantive changes to Gallant's stories that have resulted from the literary relationships into which Gallant deliberately entered with her *New Yorker* editors. The juxtaposition between Gallant's 1982 story "Luc and His Father" and advertisements within the magazine positions Gallant in a collaborative relationship of an unauthorized, kind. The story depicts the great lengths to which Roger and Simone Clairevoie go in order to help their unfocused son, Luc, gain entrance into a prestigious university and set him up for a successful life. It mocks xenophobic French aristocrats and their lack of self-awareness, but is surrounded by advertisements that appeal to readers with similar sensibilities to those of the fictional Clairevoie family. The tension created by the pairing of the story, which invokes an anti-bourgeois, anti-patriarchal, anti-imperial ethos, with advertisements for exclusive, high-end products and services alters readers' receptions of both the advertisements and Gallant's story. In publishing this and other stories within the

⁹⁰ Maxwell and Shawn believed that no American reader would understand Gallant's "foreign" openness to depictions of sex. Given the fact that Menaker, one of Gallant's *New Yorker* editors after Maxwell retired in 1975 also rejected a story on the premise that its "Canadianness" made it impossible to understand, it is not surprising that Gallant felt most comfortable debuting the non-linear, un-censored version of "Orphan's Progress" in a collection aimed at a specifically Canadian, rather than American, audience. In an interview Gallant discussed Menaker's rejections of the story "The Fenton Child":

he didn't like that story, and Bill Maxwell was no longer there. He didn't like it. He said he didn't understand it, and readers wouldn't understand it. He thought the end was "ambiguous." To me, it was very clear . . . I said, "Have you shown it to the editor?" (Tina Brown was then editor of the magazine: she would have taken it.) And he said, "Well, I can't show it to her, it's a mess." So, I really didn't want to make changes. I think it's a tight story –it doesn't wander all over the lot. He said he didn't understand it, he didn't understand Montreal, he'd never been there. (Evain and Bertail 105-106)

magazine, Gallant entered into a collaborative relationship, in the militaristic sense, with *The New Yorker* as an institution.

Fein's analysis of similar transcultural collaboration within the film industry provides a useful framework for theorizing Gallant's indirect collaboration with the advertising department of *The New Yorker*, as does Lorraine York's "conviction that difference and disagreement strengthen rather than disable collaboration" (5). In *About Town: The New Yorker and the World it Made*, Yagoda refers to "civil war within the magazine" at least twice (164-166), writing:

In truth, the magazine anticipated a commonplace in modern literary theory: the notion that texts conduct civil wars with themselves. Matters are further complicated in the *New Yorker* by the advertisements, which are indisputably a part of the "text" yet embody assumptions, values, and implications that were frequently and increasingly at odds with the articles and stories. (110)

"Luc and His Father" functions as an example of the ways in which this kind of conflict, or the tension between competing conceptions, values, and assumptions, has the potential to be productive. The publication of "Luc and His Father" occurs at the intersection of the two definitions of collaboration. The tension between competing conceptions of national identity created through the juxtaposition of the story and the advertisements that invoke cultural nationalism and genealogical purity resulted in a mutually reinforcing, or even a symbiotic relationship; the conflict between the advertisements and the text increases the effectiveness of the "offending" advertisements and produces new readings of Gallant's story. Yagoda has argued that *New Yorker* cartoons often "*fortified* the magazine's bourgeois readers in their very bourgeoisness" (121). When advertisements targeted toward a bourgeois readership surround a text that is explicitly concerned with class, hierarchy, and who constitutes a legitimate French citizen, the tension that results produces an additional level of irony and polyphony that actually intensifies the persuasiveness of the magazine's advertisements. The paratextual elements that surround Gallant's work put her in a conflicting, yet collaborative relationship with the magazine

as an institution that produces a new version of "Luc and His Father" that is even more ironic, and whose irony helps to sell consumer goods.

The "enemy" in this collaboration is the advertising or "business" side of *The New Yorker*, which did not have a cordial relationship with the "editorial" side of the magazine. Mary F. Corey and many other former staff members at the magazine and scholars have written about the conflict between, and complete separation of, "Church" – the editorial side of *The New Yorker* – and "State" – the business side. This separation has its roots in the animosity between Ross and Raoul Fleischmann, the magazine's publisher, who invested the money Ross needed to found *The New Yorker* and managed its business operations, and allegorizes the long-standing conflict between art and commerce that is evident even within the articles and essays the magazine published (Corey 240; Gill 182-183; Kunkel 212-214). Former staffer Brendan Gill refers to Fleischmann as "Ross's enemy" (31) noting both the separation of the advertising and editorial departments onto different floors of the building the magazine occupied at 25 West Forty-Third Street (110), and advertising and editorial employees' reticence to even say "hello" to one another in the elevator when travelling between floors (182-183). Corey discusses some of the ways in which this animosity revealed itself within the pages of the magazine, writing: "Ross was determined to establish the autonomy of the editorial side. As early as 1934, for example, he published a spoof of a Camel cigarette campaign featuring testimonials from attractive housewives, which was inadvertently run right next to one of the Camel ads" (194). Gallant's story, like the Camel spoof, sends up the advertisements that surround it, but with the unexpected result of helping to sell the advertised products.

Gallant would not likely have known exactly which advertisements would appear alongside "Luc and his Father" and how they would affect readers' reception of her work, but after thirty years of publishing stories in the magazine, and even longer reading it, she would have been well aware of the kinds of products the business side of the magazine accepted advertisements for and the typical manner in which those products were advertised. As Bryant suggests in *The Fluid Text*, however, Gallant need not have deliberately entered into a collaborative relationship with the advertising side of the magazine in order for one to have resulted from the publication of her work. Bryant

argues that individual versions of works "whether authorized in some way or not authorized, are equally valid" (89). In suggesting that the interpretations of "Luc and His Father" that emerge from its paratextual framing within the pages of *The New Yorker* constitute a unique version of the story, I rely on Bryant's interpretation of Peter Shillingsburg's "four analytical 'unities'" (81), which he uses to distinguish "the critical mass of difference" necessary to differentiate editions of works from "actually different versions" (66). The fact that "Luc and His Father" appears "in different material formats (manuscript, magazine, book)" is enough to argue that the story as published in *The New Yorker* constitutes a "version" of the text (Bryant 81). *The New Yorker's* version of "Luc and His Father" also achieves "the most crucial" of the elements that help to constitute a "version": "it functions differently either aesthetically, rhetorically, or socially" from other versions of the story (81). Through its implicit – even complicit – collaboration with the magazine as an institution, this version of "Luc and His Father" serves the unique function of reinforcing the classist, imperialist ethos of the advertisements that surround it: the very ideologies the story itself derides and attempts to undermine.

"Luc and His Father" appeared in the 4 October 1982 issue of *The New Yorker* and was edited by Menaker. The story appeared in Gallant's collection *Overhead in a Balloon* (1985), but would easily be at home within the pages of *The Pegnitz Junction* (1973), the collection that Gallant claims explores "where Fascism came from . . . its small possibilities in people" (Hancock 41). As Keefer explains: "In 'Luc and His Father' the satiric mode establishes a deliberate distance not only between narrator and characters, but between reader and story. The centre of our attention is not really Luc, but rather Gallant's skewering of the snobberies and stupidities of the Clairevoies" (*Reading Mavis Gallant* 110-111). Simone is wealthy, and Roger, a retired civil servant, comes from noble stock, and holds "a dubious nineteenth-century title Simone scarcely dared use because of the Communists" (42). Their French nationalism is imperialist, and Roger's sense of power and national identity rest precariously on patriarchal structures and a narrow conception of masculinity. Because of the weakening of this particular hierarchical structure in French society, Roger seems especially to value the power engendered to him through his education, imparting to Luc the importance of being able to address his fellow graduates in "the second persona singular, even by Christian name,"

while other, presumably envious, colleagues are required to approach them more formally (40). It is clear, argues Woolford, that "Roger's attempts to get Luc started on a degree in engineering are an attempt to induct him into this patriarchal tradition" (31).

The Clairevoie family is nostalgic for and wants to cling to a culturally and racially homogenous, imperialist, and hierarchical vision of France: "an older, truer Europe . . . a Europe caught in amber, unchanging" (47). Roger's and Simone's feelings about Charles de Gaulle and Algeria offer some of the story's first clues about these characters' political values. Gallant writes of Luc's disastrous failure at his examinations:

Luc's was a prime case of universal education gone crazy. He was a victim of the current belief that, any student, by dint of application, could answer what he was asked.

Luc's father blamed the late President de Gaulle. If de Gaulle had not opened the schools and universities to hordes of qualified but otherwise uninteresting young people, teachers would have had more time to spare for Luc. De Gaulle had been dead for years, but Roger Clairevoie still suspected him of cosmic mischief and double-dealing. (Like his wife, Roger had never got over the loss of Algeria. When the price of fresh fruit went high, as it did every winter, the Clairevoies told each other it was because of the loss of all those Algerian orchards). (40)

As President, de Gaulle opened up the education system, reformed the electoral process to ensure that the President was directly elected by the people of France, and granted independence to Algeria. He also, unlike the Vichy regime, resisted Nazi Germany, forming the Free French Forces in England during the Second World War. Roger and his father, in contrast, championed Charles Maurras, a monarchist and nationalist who supported the incarceration of Captain Alfred Dreyfus⁹¹ – whose framing is often attributed to anti-Semitism – for the good of the national interest and the reputation of the

⁹¹ Gallant had been working on a history of the Dreyfus affair for some time before her death.

French military. "Universal education" can be read in two ways in this passage. Roger laments the kind of "universal education" – a democratizing of the French educational system that allows intellectually qualified, but "uninteresting" students (those who lack the appropriate pedigree) access to higher education – that prevents teachers from focusing their attention on Luc's progress. The irony is that from another perspective, Luc is a victim of the kind of "universal education" that insists that students with the "right" background ought to pursue higher education regardless of scholastic aptitude or interest. Given Gallant's tendency towards narratorial neutrality and understatement that allows the gap between the narrator's reporting of "facts" and events and the absurdity of characters' thoughts and actions to produce meaning, the direct statement of a position: "Luc's was a prime case of universal education gone crazy" functions as free indirect speech. That Roger does not recognize the irony in such a statement – that the opening up of the schools to the "uninteresting" but also to dim-witted students like Luc is responsible for Luc's spectacular failure – is precisely the point.

Roger fears that Luc's girlfriend is not French (47), and laments the electoral defeat of his own monarchist father by "an impertinent youngster with an alien name full of z's and k's" (41). Simone, meanwhile, fears that Luc's future military service will likely take place beside "the sons of peasants and Algerian delinquents" (41). Gallant uses satire to critique these values and to mock the Clairevoie family's snobbery. Roger appears not to recognize that his distaste for "foreigners" and privileging access to inexpensive fruit over another country's independence stem from the same fears, hatred, and self-interest that allowed the Holocaust to happen, even if he does remove a photograph of Hitler from Luc's room because he does not want his son to become "quite that manly" (43). He does not see the relationship between the photograph of Hitler and his own behaviour: the "small possibilities" for fascism in everyday life with which Gallant is concerned. The ironically-named Clairevoies fail to see clearly the potential consequences of their ideological positions.

This reading of the story is encouraged by the relationship between Gallant's comments about the history of the story and the paratextual elements surrounding its publication in the magazine. In a note attached to the galleys of the story in her archives,

Gallant explains one of the significant differences between the galleys and the version of the story that was published in *The New Yorker*: the fact that the Clairevoie family was originally named "Perrot." Gallant writes: "the name 'Perrot' had to be changed, for fear of possible libel. There were five 'R. Perrots' in the Paris phone book, two of them 'Roger.'" In a 2009 interview she reveals that *The New Yorker's* fear of libel was well founded since the Clairevoies were modeled on a specific French family. In discussing characters based on real people, Gallant describes the family upon which "Luc and His Father" is based: "Well you know, I sent them the book. They didn't recognize themselves. She said to me, 'Thanks for the book, it was really interesting. We know so many families like that!'" (Evain and Bertail 88-89). Just as the Clairevoies are so indoctrinated into their privileged class, racial, and gender positions within French society that they are blind to the potential consequences of the ideologies that uphold these positions, the real-life Perrot family failed to recognize their own behaviour in print. In publishing "Luc and His Father," the challenge the editorial side of *The New Yorker*, with its post-war, left-leaning politics, puts to its readers is to recognize their own privilege. The advertisements that surround the story are central to this challenge.

Images play a significant role within "Luc and His Father," as they do in much of Gallant's fiction. The posters that decorate Luc's bedroom function as a kind of shorthand for political movements and ideologies. As Woolford observes, when Simone purchases a poster of Che Guevara in order to help her give her son more virile surroundings, she believes the salesman who tells her that the image of the communist figure no longer has any meaningful political significance, but for "Gallant herself . . . the poster *does* have a political significance. [Guevara] functions metonymically as a symbol of revolution; his poster is eventually replaced by one of the Foreign Legion, a metonym for imperialism and the nationalist, patriarchal tradition" (79). Gallant's story, concerned as it is with the oversight or blindness of the Clairevoies, is enveloped by advertisements that appeal to readers with similar sensibilities and beliefs.

The tension that is created by this juxtaposition is particularly strong when the consumer goods mentioned within the story coincide with the products being advertised alongside it. The Clairevoies spend a significant amount of money trying to cajole Luc

into succeeding at his exams by sending him to a "costly examination factory" and bribing him with vehicles. First, they buy him "a Honda 125 to make up for his recent loss of self-esteem," and, later, they dangle "[t]he promise of a BMW R/80 . . . as reward or consolation, depending on next year's results" (40). Although these are motorcycles rather than cars, the fact that a two-page spread advertising BMW luxury cars appears between the pages of the story can hardly be a coincidence.⁹² The language of the ad is designed to appeal to the reader's sense of financial well-being, good taste, and masculine sexual prowess. It boasts of "Performance through refinement. Not rediscovery" and urges readers to "Rediscover the thrill of solvency" since a BMW is "an investment that holds its value" (70-71). The juxtaposition of Gallant's story with this advertisement demonstrates the advertising department's constitutively conflicted relationship to the stated politics of the magazine at this period. After the Second World War, the editorial content began to reflect "a genuine concern with egalitarian democratic principles" (Corey 206) and a commitment to liberalism, publishing articles concerned with poverty, environmental degradation, and racial prejudice. The magazine's advertisements, meanwhile, continued to encourage aspirational consumption.

Just as Keefer argues that "the satiric mode [of "Luc and His Father"] establishes a deliberate distance . . . between reader and story" (*Reading Mavis Gallant* 110-111), the juxtaposition of advertisements like the one for BMW and the story encourages a critical awareness that helps to establish an even greater distance between the narrator, characters, reader and story. Corey has written at length about the recurring conflict between the shift toward democratization and social responsibility in the editorial content of the magazine and the business side's sustained practice of selling advertisements for

⁹² In the same issue, one writer's reflection on the decades-long process of obtaining and renewing his recreational pilot's license is buttressed by several advertisements for Boeing, as well as for a figurine of an eagle-in-flight. There has always been a clear distinction between the editorial and advertising sides of the magazine, but it would appear that the advertising side has taken care, at least in some cases, to assess where the placement of their advertisers' messages might be most successful. The placement of the advertisements here appears to be deliberate.

exclusive luxury goods during the years following the Second World War.⁹³ In *The World Through a Monocle: The New Yorker at Midcentury*, she writes that, because of this institutional division, the magazine successfully negotiated the conflicts of postwar liberalism and managed to "satisfy" two conflicting "sets of readers' desires: the desire for comfort and the consciousness of national and global ills" (xii). The juxtaposition of advertisements for luxury products with Gallant's "Luc and His Father" encourages readers to recognize this conflict between the two sets of messages espoused by *The New Yorker*. The tension that is produced – between this blatant call to wealth, consumerism, luxury, and classism and Gallant's critique of these values – however, does not undermine Gallant's story. Rather, the feeling of superiority an intelligent reader experiences upon recognizing this irony seems likely to encourage the reader to identify with, and purchase products from, the very company whose ideological stance he or she has just identified as in conflict with Gallant's story.

Although not placed directly within the pages of the story, other ads in the same issue of the magazine reveal the advertising department's ideal reader or target market even more clearly than the BMW advertisement: someone who is not only wealthy, but also concerned with imitating the "refinement" and sophistication of England and France. An advertisement for L'Aiglon Cufflinks, for example, claims to offer "European elegance for the world's most discriminating men" (CV3), and an advertisement for Cardelhac Sterling, makers of silverware, sets up France as the epitome of aristocracy, taste, and fine dining with its tagline: "Even in France only a few own Cardelhac Sterling" (4). In her analysis of the literary history of the concept of sophistication, Faye Hammill argues that, in the twentieth century "[t]he commodification of taste and sophistication [became] an important aspect of middlebrow culture" (119). Given the "exceptional increase in the number of educated, middle-class liberals in the postwar

⁹³ As Corey explains, "William Shawn's decision to commit an entire issue to 'Hiroshima' represented the culmination of *The New Yorker's* developing sense of social responsibility," but "Some critics on the left were particularly vexed by the fact that the magazine had run 'Hiroshima' amidst the usual ads for imported spirits and Caribbean vacations" (37).

years . . . newly empowered by unprecedented affluence" (Corey 2), *The New Yorker's* advertisements functioned as an aspirational guide to sophisticated living for new members of "urban society" concerned with "What to wear, what to see, and what to read in order to become members in good standing of an aristocracy of mind and manners" (Corey 7). In the advertisements for cufflinks and silverware exclusivity is a selling point, but the "discriminati[on]" they espouse is exactly the kind of snobbery that Gallant questions the ethics of in her story. It is doubtful that the producers of the advertisement for L'Aiglon Cufflinks intended their use of "discriminating" in the sense of "having good taste" to clash so uncomfortably with Gallant's depiction of a Europe in which respect for cultural traditions and the institutions of the past smacks of fascism.⁹⁴

3.5.1 "Luc and His Father" and the Selling Power of Irony: Aquascutum London's "Thorough-bred crowd"

In some of the more cleverly designed advertisements – those that are aware of their target demographic – this kind of uncomfortable clash with Gallant's story works to engage the reader more effectively. The copy in a two-page ad for Aquascutum London, makers of British clothing designed for equestrian competitions and hunting, uses the

⁹⁴ It is more difficult to dismiss the political sentiments of an advertisement from the Cayman Islands Department of Tourism. The advertisement features a brightly coloured, stylized depiction of a street scene full of people. It is the lengthy "pitch," however, that is particularly revealing. It reads, in part:

The past is ever present in the Caymans.

Not surprising that artists find inspiration in village scenes little changed in a century. Or that the design of many of the new holiday apartment complexes recaptures the charm of early Cayman architecture . . .

Or that the Caymans are the only major British Crown Colony remaining in the Caribbean, with all the English traditions of civility and gracious hospitality.

One gets the sense that the Clairevoies would highly approve of the Cayman Islands, a getaway destination in which its distinction as one of the few remaining Caribbean colonies not to have achieved independence, clinging to an idyllic past, and the maintenance of the trappings of the British class system and the definitions of civility it imposes on local inhabitants are presented as selling features. Once again, the challenge to a *New Yorker* reader is to recognize the folly of the Clairevoies' behaviour without, hypocritically, being taken in by the ads offering up the idyllic "charm" of colonialism to the distinct consumer.

language of refinement and imperialism in a way that is especially disconcerting given Gallant's critique of fascism and colonial oppression in the story. As Corey points out, this seeming contradiction was not an anomaly. "In this peaceable *New Yorker* kingdom," Corey writes:

the lion of elite consumption could lie down beside the lamb of geopolitical awareness . . . Advertisements for cigarettes or whiskey or luxury liners were not seen as inimical to serious articles concerning African-American heroin addicts, unwed mothers, or the bombing of the Bikini Atoll. This curious juxtaposition helps to place the magazine in the broader context of postwar liberalism, which, in this period, consisted of two principal strains: an absolute faith in the necessity of continued economic growth and, as Walter Lipmann put it in *The National Purpose*, an ongoing obligation to use this growth "wisely and prudently for public and immaterial ends." (Corey xi-xii)

In the case of "Luc and His Father," the conflict between "the lion of elite consumption" and "the lamb of geopolitical awareness" (xi) was a productive one; the tension it produces heightens Gallant's critique and readers' interest in the advertisements that surround it, and helps *The New Yorker* to fulfill what Hammill refers to as smart magazines' unique, "middlebrow" function (16): to "teach" sophistication to an aspirational readership. Although Hamill's analysis focuses mostly on *Vanity Fair*,⁹⁵ *The New Yorker* also served (and perhaps continues to serve) this function. Barbara B. Stern's research on print advertising that is directed at aspirational markets suggests that *The New Yorker's* subscription demographics make its advertisers' use of irony particularly appropriate. Stern's work is useful in helping to tease out this relationship between ideological conflict, irony and increased sales. Despite, or because of, its disconcerting association with genealogical purity, the advertisement for Aquascutum wools provides

⁹⁵ "Although *Vanity Fair* pretends to be exclusively addressing an already sophisticated metropolitan elite, it actually offers an education in sophistication designed for those who aspired towards membership of that elite" (Hammill 155).

an ideal example of the deployment of irony for the purposes of advertisement. It features a horse and rider, and dogs and spectators grouped together (see Figure 1). It reads:

The Character of Aquascutum. As British as Eventing.

Dressage, cross country, show jumping. The Three Day Event is the most challenging test for the Olympic Champion and calls for the best in everyone. Horse, rider—and spectators.

Here, surrounding world-champions—Bruce Davidson astride Might Tango—is a thorough-bred crowd. Characteristically, they show up to enjoy eventing training—as they do other civilized events—in great country wools by Aquascutum of London.

Today, as for more than a century, there is no civilized event, or place on earth, where the very British character of Aquascutum is not the proper attitude in attire for men and women.

Aquascutum of London makes an exceptional contribution to the quality of life. Eventing and eventful. (52-53)

The Character of Aquascutum.



As British as Eventing.



Aquascutum
OF LONDON

Dressage, cross country show jumping. The Three Day Event is the most challenging test for the Olympic Champion and calls for the best in everyone. Horse, rider—and spectators.

Here, surrounding world-champions—Bruce Davidson outside Night Tingle—is a thoroughbred crowd. Characteristically, they show up to enjoy Eventing training—as they do other civilized events—in great country wools by Aquascutum of London.

Today as for more than a century, there is no civilized event, or place on earth, where the very British character of Aquascutum is not the proper attitude in attire for men and women.

Aquascutum of London makes an exceptional contribution to the quality of life. Eventing and equestrian.

For the fine store near you, write:
Aquascutum of London, Suite 300,
120 Avenue of the Americas, New York, NY 10104.

Figure 1. Advertisement for Aquascutum wools. *The New Yorker* 4 October 1982. 52-53.

Since they arrive at events wearing Aquascutum wools, the "thorough-bred crowd" refers to the people in the image rather than the dogs. The phrase "thorough-bred crowd" has a double meaning; it can be read as a reference to the spectators' interest in the pedigree of horses as well as their own genealogical purity. The advertisement's suggestion that imitating the "civilized" fashions and customs of the English upper class is an admirable pursuit is directly at odds with Gallant's indictment of snobbery and xenophobia in her story. It exposes what Gallant has often referred to as fascism's "small possibilities in people" in Britain (Hancock 41), just as Gallant's story reveals their possibilities in France.

Stern's research supports a reading of the juxtaposition of Gallant's story with the advertisement for Aquascutum wools as strengthening the "message effect" of the advertisement. In "Pleasure and Persuasion in Advertising: Rhetorical Irony as a Humor Technique," Stern applies the methods of literary criticism to the fields of "marketing, advertising, and consumer research" (25). She suggests that, since "Irony is characterized by a blend of pleasure and persuasion in messages that 'teach by delight,'" it functions well as the "basis of advertisements using humor to convey social and intellectual rewards" (25). Stern is concerned primarily with rhetorical irony in her study, and the intellectual "pleasure of understanding [that] is boosted by a feeling of intellectual accomplishment" (30) when a reader is clever enough to possess "sophisticated language skills to disentangle saying/meaning discrepancies" within the wording of a printed advertisement (28). Humour and word play are present in the Aquascutum advertisement in the double meaning of the term "thorough-bred" (or triple meaning, if one includes the darker meaning produced by its interaction with Gallant's story). The visual elements of the advertisement also offer an intellectual reward to careful *New Yorker* readers. Despite the copy's focus on eventing and dressage, there are dogs present in the photograph along with the competitors, spectators and horse. Presumably, these dogs are also "thorough-breds" used for the "other civilized events" to which the advertisement refers, such as fox hunting. Although dogs and horses often work together while hunting in the field, and hunting and eventing often attract a similar, upper-class demographic, hounds have no place at the eventing competition that the advertising copy describes.⁹⁶ In *Defining New Yorker Humor*, Judith Yaross Lee claims that the parodies of modernist writers the magazine often published "flattered the cultured, up-to-date readers who got the joke" (294). The photograph of the dogs, horse, riders, and spectators functions in a similar fashion; it flatters and offers intellectual pleasure to the reader who is sufficiently well-versed in the customs of eventing and hunting to recognize that this photograph does not accurately represent an eventing scene, but rather is a pastiche of "civilized" English pastimes.

⁹⁶ My thanks go to Professor Alison Conway at Western University for critiquing an earlier version of this chapter and for pointing out this seeming discrepancy in the advertisement.

"Luc and His Father" challenges readers who recognize that the hounds are out of place in the Aquascutum advertisement to also recognize themselves in the story or to see the irony of their position as readers of a story with an anti-imperialist, anti-aristocratic ethos within the pages of a magazine whose function is to sell luxury products to an aspiring readership. The story's placement within the magazine does not undermine the advertisements, though. In "print campaigns for elite audiences," Stern argues, the use of irony is a successful advertising technique because "the pleasure of understanding" or "feeling of intellectual accomplishment" a reader experiences "may reinforce positive attitudes toward a brand" (30). Since the successful reader gets pleasure out of the discovery of that juxtaposition just as he or she gets pleasure out of the recognition of the pun in "thorough-bred" or the inappropriate inclusion of the hunting dogs, the story serves in the end to encourage the reader's identification with the products being advertised.

According to Stern, "socially mobile consumers" tend to be particularly receptive to the use of irony, as well as to "[a]ds that show consumers how to achieve intellectual and social status" (32; 34).⁹⁷ As Corey and Hamill have pointed out, contrary to the impression the magazine liked to give its advertisers, many *New Yorker* readers fell into this category; they were new members of the middle and upper middle class.⁹⁸ Historically *The New Yorker* may have presented itself as directed toward the economic and social elite, but its actual subscribers did not always fit that description:

⁹⁷ Stern supports this claim for the effectiveness of advertisements that make status-seekers feel intelligent with research dated primarily from the 1970s and 1980s – just a few years before and after the publication of this particular issue of *The New Yorker* – as well as the example of *The New Yorker* itself.

⁹⁸ "According to a 1946 *New Yorker* marketing pamphlet, the magazine's subscribers were apt to be 'at least all of the following: Intelligent, well-educated, discriminating, well-informed, unprejudiced, public-spirited, metropolitan-minded, broad-visioned and quietly liberal.' While *The New Yorker* was certainly aimed at upscale urban readers who were 'quietly liberal,' and the marketing department successfully convinced advertising agencies that the magazine was 'the national magazine of the leadership market' read by affluent urban consumers of elite goods, the actual social and economic profile of its readership was far more ambiguous and reflected the rapidly changing profile of what it meant to be middle-class in postwar America" (Corey 10).

While part of *The New Yorker's* allure was that it claimed to be pitched at what Ross called "the snob appeal market," this assertion was more of a mannerism than a reality . . . As George Douglas has explained in his history of *The Smart Magazines*, *The New Yorker* was created to reach a sizeable audience. It could not, therefore, really build its readership exclusively from the social elite because "there were simply not enough rich people to make a magazine profitable." Thus Ross had to make his pitch to middle-class readers with upper-class aspirations, or to those who "believed themselves witty and clever (a group that is never in short supply)." (Corey 5-6)

As the reader realizes the juxtaposition of the ideologies being espoused by Gallant's story and the advertisements that surround it, he or she is likely to feel pleasure over "getting it" and associate that pleasure with the product being advertised.

In *The World Through a Monocle*, Corey offers an example of a much earlier advertisement that encouraged a similar sense of intellectual accomplishment in readers that resulted in increased sales. She writes about the "overwhelming response to an advertisement featuring Alfred of New York shirts, into which advertisers had slipped 'a very tough little chess problem'" (208):

Within days the magazine had received thousands of responses to the chess problem—from "Bankers, Lawyers, Atomic Scientists, Business Executives, Government Officials, U.N. Delegates, Women, Teachers—in a word, from all kinds of bright people from all over the place.' Not only were readers trying to solve the chess problem, they were also buying Alfred of New York shirts in record numbers as delighted retailers ordered and reordered. This is a striking example of the way the magazine served its readership by conflating discerning consumption and intellectual sophistication. (208-09)

By deliberately appealing to readers' sense of intellectual accomplishment, advertisers like Alfred of New York and Aquascutum successfully negotiate the conflict between the ideologies implicit in their desire to sell elite consumer goods and those espoused in the editorial content of the magazine from the 1940s onward. In fact, Gallant's story may

well have encouraged the consumption of the products advertised around it.⁹⁹ It may seem counter-intuitive, but some advertisers cleverly drew readers' attention to their own privilege in order to reap the benefits of readers' sense of satisfaction or accomplishment over having recognized the tension created by the conflict between the ideologies espoused by the advertisements and Gallant's critique of them in "Luc and His Father." In agreeing to publish her work in *The New Yorker*, Gallant collaborated with, and inadvertently increased the strength of, an advertising department whose clients appealed to values that were anathema to those expressed in her own body of work in order to sell products and services to readers.

...

Exploring the publication histories of "Luc and His Father," "Orphan's Progress" and "Immortal Gatito" contributes new insights to our understanding of the work of Mavis Gallant and its role as a social text, as well as the evolution of *The New Yorker* as a magazine between the 1940s and the 1980s. Typescripts and galleys of stories, and correspondence between Gallant and her editors reveal a variety of tensions in the author-editor relationship, and the result of these tensions on Gallant's published work. These examples make it clear that disagreements between Gallant and her editors about how a short story ought to be structured, and about what was considered appropriate to print in a sophisticated magazine for "mixed company" significantly influenced the form in which Gallant's work appeared in print. These archival materials also reveal misconceptions on all sides in Gallant's relationships with her editors and with the magazine as an institution about cultural differences between Canada, the U.S. and France, as well as competing conceptions of the roles of nationalism and national identity in general.

⁹⁹ As Corey argues:

The separation of *The New Yorker's* advertising department from its editorial side ultimately played a part in making *The New Yorker* a superlative marketplace for expensive consumer goods . . . This disassociative sleight-of-hand served to increase the legitimacy of the magazine's editorial content and, ironically, its advertising content as well . . . An ad for a Cartier cigarette case or a pleasure cruise gained a certain heft when it ran side by side with a "Profile" of the U.N. Secretary General or a John Cheever short story. (195)

From the example of Mavis Gallant, we can extrapolate the productive role that conflict, tension, and disagreement can play in collaborative literary relationships. As Fein's analysis of transnational collaboration between asymmetrical powers emphasizes, this "shap[ing of] representation" is not always unilateral. By unknowingly collaborating with the magazine's advertising side, which was in conflict with both the editorial side and its ethos from the 1950s onward, Gallant contributed to, and influenced the reception of, *The New Yorker*. This collaboration borne out of conflict ensured that advertisers would continue to purchase space in the magazine, allowing *The New Yorker* to stay in business, and allowing the editorial side of the magazine to continue to purchase her work over a long career that continued until her death in 2014.

Gallant's relationship with *The New Yorker* had a significant impact on her work and played a crucial role in the development of her career as a full-time writer. In a 1977 interview, Gallant agreed with Hancock's statement that *The New Yorker* of the 1950s – the decade in which Gallant first began to publish fiction, and sought to establish a reputation for herself and earn her living exclusively by writing – was "the best magazine in the world" (32). Gallant's association with such a prestigious magazine imbued her work with symbolic capital, provided her with a way to make a living by writing, and offered a space to publish her work that was not available to her in Canada. As Gallant's interview with Lahiri reveals, editors at *The New Yorker* were some of her first readers.¹⁰⁰ For the woman who did not believe in writing as a hobby and who had vowed to make her living by writing fiction within two years of moving to Europe or to give it up entirely, without the encouragement and the livelihood that the magazine offered early on, scholars across the globe might have had much less Mavis Gallant fiction to "discover" decades later.

¹⁰⁰ Lahiri asks: "Who was the person who first read your writing and told you that you should keep going?" to which Gallant responds, "Just, 'Have you anything else you can show me?' Her name was Mildred Wood. She read the first story I sent to *The New Yorker*. I saw her twice, at *The New Yorker*, before I went to Europe" (124).

Works Cited

- Adler, Renata. *Gone: The Last Days of The New Yorker*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1999. Print.
- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso, 2006. Web.
- Angell, Roger. "Storyville." *The New Yorker* 27 June, 1994: 104-117. Web.
- "Background." The Canada Council for the Arts. 24 Oct. 2008. 12 Feb 2013. Web.
- Besner, Neil. "A Broken Dialogue: History and Memory in Mavis Gallant's Short Fiction." *Essays on Canadian Writing* 33 (Fall 1986): 89-99. Print.
- . *The Light of Imagination: Mavis Gallant's Fiction*. Vancouver: U of British Columbia P, 1986. Print.
- Blodgett, E.D. "Heresy and Other Arts: A Measure of Mavis Gallant's Fiction." *Essays on Canadian Writing* 42 (1990): 1-8. Print.
- Burkhardt, Barbara. *William Maxwell: A Literary Life*. Chicago: U of Illinois P, 2005. Print.
- Bryant, John. *The Fluid Text: A Theory of Revision and Editing for Book and Screen*. Ann Arbor: U Michigan P, 2002. Print.
- Chadwick, Whitney & Isabelle de Courtivron, eds. *Significant Others: Creativity and Intimate Partnership*. London: Thames & Hudson, 1993.
- "Collaboration." *Oxford English Dictionary*. Dec. 2012 ed. Web.
- Corey, Mary F. *The World Through a Monocle: The New Yorker at Midcentury*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1999. Print.
- Douglas, George H. *The Smart Magazines: 50 Years of Literary Revelry and High Jinks at Vanity Fair, The New Yorker, Life, Esquire, and The Smart Set*. Hamden,

Conn: Archon Books, 1991. Print.

Dvořák, Marta. "Mavis Gallant's Fiction: Taking the (Rhetorical) Measure of the Turning Point." *Varieties of Exile: New Essays on Mavis Gallant*. Ed. Nicole Coté. New York: Peter Lang, 2002. 63-74. Print.

Encyclopedia of Major Marketing Campaigns. Ed. Thomas Riggs. Detroit: Gale Group, 2000. Print.

Evain, Christine and Christine Bertail, interviewers. *Mavis Gallant on Her Work*. Paris: Publibook, 2009. Print.

Fabre, Michel. "'Orphan's Progress,' Reader's Progress: Voice and Understatement in Mavis Gallant's Stories." *Gaining Ground: European Critics on Canadian Literature*. Eds. Robert Kroetsch and Reingard M. Nischik. Edmonton: NeWest, 1985. 150-160. Print.

Fein, Seth. "Everyday Forms of Transnational Collaboration: U. S. Film Propaganda in Cold War Mexico." *Close Encounters of Empire: Writing the Cultural History of U.S.-Latin American Relations*. Eds. Joseph M. Gilbert *et al.* Durham, NC: Duke UP, 1998. 400-450. Print.

---. "Transnationalism and Cultural Collaboration: Mexican Film Propaganda During World War II." *Studies in Latin American Popular Culture* 17 (1998): 105-128. Web.

Gallant, Mavis. "Between Zero and One." 1975 TS. MS Coll 189 1.22 Thomas Fisher Rare Book Library, University of Toronto.

---. Convocation Address to Glendon College. 1984 TS. MS Coll 189 3.17 Thomas Fisher Rare Book Library, University of Toronto.

---. "The Events in May: A Paris Notebook I and II." *The New Yorker* 14 and 21 September, 1968. 58-124; 54-134. Web.

- . "The Flowers of Spring." *Northern Review* June-July 1950: 31-39. Print.
- . "From Cloud to Cloud." 1985 TS. MS Coll 189 2.22 Thomas Fisher Rare Book Library. University of Toronto.
- . "From Gamut to Yalta." 1975 TS. MS Coll 189 2.25 Thomas Fisher Rare Book Library, University of Toronto.
- . *Home Truths: Selected Canadian Stories*. Toronto: MacMillan, 1981.
- . "The Hunger Diaries: A Writer's Apprenticeship." *The New Yorker* 09 Jul, 2012. 48-53. Web.
- . "Immortal Gatito." *The New Yorker* 26 June, 1971. 47- 75. Web.
- . "Immortal Gatito" Corrections to Page Proofs. N.d. TS. MS Coll 189 3.12 Thomas Fisher Rare Book Library, University of Toronto.
- . "Immortal Gatito" Correspondence with Lawyers. 1970 TS. MS Coll 189 3.13 Thomas Fisher Rare Book Library.
- . "Immortal Gatito" Page Proofs. 1971 TS. MS Coll 189 3.11 Thomas Fisher Rare Book Library, University of Toronto.
- . "In Youth is Pleasure." 1975 TS. MS Coll 189 1.21 Thomas Fisher Rare Book Library, University of Toronto.
- . "In Youth is Pleasure." *The Selected Stories of Mavis Gallant*. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1996. 710-724. Print.
- . Interview. CBC Television. 24 January 1984. Thomas Fisher Rare Book Library, University of Toronto. VHS.
- . Interview with Geoffrey Hancock. "An Interview with Mavis Gallant." *Canadian Fiction Magazine* 28 (1978): 18-67. Print.

- . Interview with Jhumpa Lahiri. "Useless Chaos is What Fiction is About." *Granta* 106 (Summer 2009): 103-155. Print.
- . Interview with Stuart McLean. CBC Radio. 19 April 1981. Thomas Fisher Rare Book Library, University of Toronto. CD.
- . Letter to the author. 20 August, 2009. MS.
- . Letters from Sylvia Townsend Warner. MS. MS Coll 189 3.19 Thomas Fisher Rare Book Library, University of Toronto.
- . "Luc and his Father." 1982 TS. MS Coll 189 2.11 Thomas Fisher Rare Book Library, University of Toronto.
- . "Luc and His Father." *The New Yorker* 4 October, 1982. 40-74. Web.
- . "The Moslem Wife." *The New Yorker* 23 August, 1976. 28-45. Web.
- . Note re: "Expatriates or Not?" N.d. MS. MS Coll 189 4A.6 Thomas Fisher Rare Book Library, University of Toronto.
- . Note re: "The Fifteenth District." N.d. MS. MS Coll 189 3.6 Thomas Fisher Rare Book Library, University of Toronto.
- . Note re: "The Good Deed," "The Sunday After Christmas" and "The Captive Niece." N.d. MS. MS Coll 189 1.20 Thomas Fisher Rare Book Library, University of Toronto.
- . Note re: "Immortal Gatito." Correspondence with Lawyers. N.d. MS. MS Coll 189 3.13 Thomas Fisher Rare Book Library, University of Toronto.
- . Note re: "Immortal Gatito." Page Proofs. N.d. MS. MS Coll 189 3.11 Thomas Fisher Rare Book Library, University of Toronto.
- . Note re: "Luc and his Father." N.d. MS. MS Coll 189 2.12 Thomas Fisher Rare Book Library, University of Toronto.

- . Note re: "Orphan's Progress." 1980 MS. TS Coll 189 1.3 Thomas Fisher Rare Book Library, University of Toronto.
- . Note re: "Vacances Pax." 1980 TS. MS Coll 189 1.6 Thomas Fisher Rare Book Library, University of Toronto.
- . "Orphan's Progress." 1965 TS. MS Coll 189 1.3 Thomas Fisher Rare Book Library, University of Toronto.
- . "Orphan's Progress." *The New Yorker* 3 April, 1965: 49-51. Web.
- . *Paris Stories*. Ed. and intro. Michael Ondaatje. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 2002. Print.
- . *The Pegnitz Junction: A Novella and Five Short Stories*. New York: Random House, 1973. Print.
- . "Preface." *The Selected Stories of Mavis Gallant*. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1996. 9-19. Print.
- . "Speck's Idea." 1979 TS. MS Coll 189 Thomas Fisher Rare Book Library. University of Toronto.
- . "Things Overlooked Before." *The Affair of Gabrielle Russier*. New York: Knopf, 1971. 1-72. Print.
- . "Varieties of Exile." *The New Yorker* 19 January, 1976. 26-35. Web.
- . "Virus X." *The New Yorker* 30 January, 1965. 29-61. Web.
- . "What is Style?" *Canadian Forum* 62 (Sept. 1982). p. 6. Print.
- . "The Writer in the State." *Queen's Quarterly* 99.1 (Spring 1992): 91-104. Print.
- Genette, Gérard. *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*. Trans. Jane E. Lewin. New York: Cambridge UP, 1997. Print.

- Gill, Brendan. *Here at the New Yorker*. New York: Random House, 1975. Print.
- Godard, Barbara. "Modalities of the Edge towards a Semiotics of Irony: The Case of Mavis Gallant." *Essays on Canadian Writing* 42 (1990): 72-101. Print.
- Gray, Jonathan. *Show Sold Separately: Promos, Spoilers, and Other Media Paratexts*. New York: NYU P, 2010. Print.
- Hannah, Donald and Rutherford, Anna, Eds. *Commonwealth Short Stories*. London: Edward Arnold, 1971.
- Hammill, Fay. *Sophistication: A Literary and Cultural History*. Liverpool: Liverpool UP, 2010. Print.
- Hutcheon, Linda and Michael Hutcheon. "'All Concord's Born of Contraries:' Marital Methodologies." *Tulsa Studies in Women's Literature*. 14 (1995): 59-64.
- . "A Convenience of Marriage: Collaboration and Interdisciplinarity." *PMLA* 116.5 (Oct. 2001): 1364-76.
- Jackson, Kevin. *Invisible Forms: A Guide to Literary Curiosities*. London: Macmillan, 1999. Print.
- Keefer, Janice Kulyk. "Bridges and Chasms: Multiculturalism and Mavis Gallant's 'Virus X.'" *World Literature Written in English* 31.2 (Fall 1991): 100-111.
- . "La Dame Seule Meets the Angel of History: Mavis Gallant and Katherine Mansfield." *Tropes and Territories: Short Fiction, Postcolonial Readings, Canadian Writing in Context*. Eds. Marta Dvořák and W.H. New. Montreal: McGill-Queen's UP, 2007. 90-102. Print.
- . "Mavis Gallant's World of Women: A Feminist Perspective." *Atlantis* 10.2 (Spring 1985): 11-29. Print.
- . *Reading Mavis Gallant*. Toronto: Oxford UP, 1989. Print.

---. "Strange Fashions of Forsaking: Criticism and the Fiction of Mavis Gallant." *Dalhousie Review* 64 (1984-5): 721-35. Print.

Kiernan, Frances. "Fiction at The New Yorker." *American Scholar* 67.4 (Autumn 1998). Web.

Kunkel, Thomas. *Genius in Disguise: Harold Ross of The New Yorker*. New York: Random House, 1995. Print.

---, ed. *Letters from the editor: the New Yorker's Harold Ross*. New York: Modern Library, 2000.

Lee, Judith Yaross. *Defining New Yorker Humor*. Jackson: UP Mississippi, 2000. Print.

"Lovable Old Volcano." *Time Magazine* 6 Mar. 1950. Web. 11 Apr. 2013.

McGann, Jerome J. *The Textual Condition*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton UP, 1991. Print.

Mergenthal, Sylvia. "Doing Well in the International Thing? Mavis Gallant, 'The Ice Wagon Going Down the Street' (1963)." *The Canadian Short Story: Interpretations*. Ed. Reingard M. Nischik. Rochester, NY: Camden House, 2007. 191-202. Print.

Michaud, Jon. "Mavis Gallant: Fact Into Fiction." Double Take Blog. *The New Yorker* 2 Jul. 2012. Web. 22 Jan. 2013.

Nelson, Antonya and Deborah Treisman. "Waiting." *New Yorker: Fiction* 5 November, 2007. MP3 file.

Pratt, Mary Louise. "Arts of the Contact Zone." *Profession* 91 (1991): 33-40. Web.

---. *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation*. New York: Routledge, 1992. E-book.

Ross, Harold. Letter to K.S. White. 28 Apr. 1933. TS. *The New Yorker Records*. New York Public Library Humanities and Social Sciences Library, Manuscript and Archives Division. Box 14, File 15.

- Schaub, Danielle. *Mavis Gallant*. New York: Twayne, 1988. Print.
- . "Mavis Gallant's Irony and its Destabilizing Double Edge: Translating the Exile's Experience." *Varieties of Exile: New Essays on Mavis Gallant*. Eds. Nicole Côté and Peter Sabor. New York, NY: Peter Lang, 2002. 13-36. Print.
- Sadowski-Smith, Claudia. *Border Fictions: Globalization, Empire, and Writing at the Boundaries of the United States*. Charlottesville: U Virginia P, 2008. Print.
- Smythe, Karen. "The 'Home Truth' about Home Truths: Gallant's Ironic Introduction." *Double Talking: Essays on Verbal and Visual Ironies in Contemporary Canadian Art and Literature*. Ed. Linda Hutcheon. Toronto: ECW, 1992. 106-114. Print.
- Steinberg, Saul. "View of the World from 9th Avenue." *The New Yorker* 29 March, 1976. Cover. Web.
- Stern, Barbara B. "Pleasure and Persuasion in Advertising: Rhetorical Irony as a Humor Technique." *Current Issues & Research in Advertising* 12.1 (1989) 25-42. Web.
- Stevens, Peter. "An 'I' for an Evanescent Eye: The Personal and the Private—Autobiography, Essay and Story." *Transient Questions: New Essays on Mavis Gallant*. Ed. Kristjana Gunnars. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2004. 71-91. Print.
- Stone, Marjorie and Judith Thompson, eds. *Literary Couplings: Writing Couples, Collaborators, and the Construction of Authorship*. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 2007.
- Stillinger, Jack. *Multiple Authorship and the Myth of Solitary Genius*. New York: Oxford UP, 1991. Print.
- Treisman, Deborah. "Mavis Gallant: Fifty Years of Notebooks." Page-Turner Blog. *The New Yorker* 2 Jul. 2012. Web. 22 Jan. 2013.
- Weintraub, William. *Getting Started: a Memoir of the 1950s: with letters from Mordecai Richler, Mavis Gallant and Brian Moore*. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 2001. Print.

- Weisberg, Jessica. "Mavis Gallant's Double-Dealing Literary Agent." Page-Turner Blog. *The New Yorker* 11 Jul. 2012. Web. 22 Jan. 2013.
- Weiss, Allan. "Rediscovering the Popular Canadian Short Story." *Dominant Impressions: Essays on the Canadian Short Story*. Eds. Gerald Lynch and Angela Arnold Robberson. Ottawa: U Ottawa P, 1999. 87-97. Print.
- Woolford, Daniel. "Mavis Gallant's *Overhead in a Balloon*: Politics and Religion, Language and Art." *Studies in Canadian Literature* 14.2 (1989): 27-47. Print.
- Yagoda, Ben. *About Town: The New Yorker and the World It Made*. New York: Scribner, 2000. Print.
- York, Lorraine. *Rethinking Women's Collaborative Writing: Power, Difference, Property*. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 2002. Print.

Chapter 4

4 Collaborative Contexts: Reciprocal Influence in Alice Munro's Relationship with *The New Yorker*

The recent Nobel laureate (2013) Alice Munro, who has spent much of her adult life living in Southwestern Ontario town of her birth and sets much of her fiction in rural Huron County, is the third and final Canadian short story writer that this project explores. Like Mavis Gallant, Munro submitted her early fiction to *The New Yorker* for consideration in the 1950s, but she did not receive the same kind of encouragement from the magazine that Callaghan and Gallant did in the early stages of their literary careers. Munro's relationship with *The New Yorker*, which has now spanned four decades, did not begin until the 1970s, when she was already "established as a major writer" (Beran 82). As JoAnn McCaig makes clear in a 1999 article on Munro's relationship with her agent, Virginia Barber, "Canada was not Munro's first choice for marketing her work" ("Alice Munro's Agency" 81). McCaig continues, quoting from a *Paris Review* interview:

Munro admits: "I sent all my early stories to *The New Yorker* in the 1950's, and then I stopped sending for a long time and sent only to magazines in Canada" (233). The fact that the author sent to Canadian markets by default is clear in her next remark: "*The New Yorker* sent me nice notes though—pencilled, informal messages. They never signed them. They weren't terribly encouraging. I still remember one of them: 'The writing is very nice, but the theme is a bit overly familiar'" (233)." (McCaig, "Alice Munro's Agency" 81)

As Carol Beran explains, it wasn't until 1976, when Munro hired "Virginia Barber of New York," that *The New Yorker* began to accept her work. "Barber sold 'Royal Beatings' to the *New Yorker*, thereby beginning a long-standing relationship that now includes a contract for first refusal" (82). "Royal Beatings" appeared in the 14 March 1977 issue of the magazine. Munro was offered a right-of-first-refusal contract with *The New Yorker*

that same year (Beran, 205), and has published nearly sixty stories in the magazine since, the most recent being "Amundsen," which appeared in the 27 August 2012 issue.

Unlike those of Callaghan and Gallant, the dynamics of Munro's relationship with *The New Yorker* have already received sustained scholarly attention. By delving into Munro's archives, McCaig, Beran, and Robert Thacker have already begun to characterize Munro's relationship with the magazine in general terms. In *Reading In: Alice Munro's Archives* (2002), McCaig explores the role "cultural bankers" such as Barber, Robert Weaver, the editor of *Tamarack Review* and the host of CBC's *Anthology*, and editor and publisher Douglas Gibson played in promoting Munro's career. In "Alice Munro's Willa Cather" (1992), Thacker outlines the influence of an American regional writer on Munro's work, and explores the composition and editing process behind Munro's short story "Dulse" (1980), in which Cather plays a prominent role. Here Thacker's focus is not the role that *The New Yorker* and its editorial processes played in shaping "Dulse"; rather, he explores material in the Alice Munro Papers in order to reveal a process for which Munro is well known: obsessively revising her own work. In contrast, Beran's "The Luxury of Excellence: Alice Munro and the *New Yorker*" (1999) focuses specifically on the role that the magazine's editorial practices have played in shaping Munro's fiction and its reception.

In addition to noting the kinds of changes *The New Yorker* might be expected to make to Munro's work, such as Americanizing her spelling, Beran explores the effect of the magazine's "prudishness" and censorship of both vulgar language and depictions of sexuality on the representation of class in Munro's work (209). She focuses on the ways that toning down Munro's "earthy" language affects her stories' sense of place and their depiction of poverty, arguing that "Munro's depiction of lower-class people in rural Ontario becomes slightly less authentic when the genteel image of the *New Yorker* excises their characteristic impoliteness and deliberate lack of gentility" (209). She also

argues that, by labeling Munro's work as "FICTION,"¹⁰¹ the magazine offers readers an "invitation to escape reality" and read "Munro's stories of lower- and middle-class, non-affluent people . . . [as] . . . museum pieces or objects of anthropological or historical interest rather than of current significance to the reader" (217; 213). Beran espouses a teleological narrative about *The New Yorker's* approach to profanity and sexuality in which, thanks to the intervention of new, less conservative editors, the magazine became more open to using the kind of language it used to excise from Munro's stories. While Beran argues that in the 1990s editor Tina Brown "brought a new flavor to the magazine that has affected how Munro's stories appear" and that "allowed the *New Yorker* to be 'unblushing about sex,' (211) I will argue instead that through her persistent use of language that she knew the magazine would censor, it was Alice Munro herself who helped to shape its evolving editorial practice, and who created room at the magazine for an editor like Brown.

This chapter responds to, complicates, and builds upon many of the claims that Beran makes about Munro's relationship with *The New Yorker*. While her article touches briefly upon several Munro stories in order to catalogue *The New Yorker's* genteel substitutions for her more explicit language and graphic descriptions, I focus primarily on the publication process behind one particular story, "The Turkey Season" (1980), which Munro included in the 1982 collection *The Moons of Jupiter*, as an example of an exception to some of Beran's claims about *The New Yorker's* editorial practices. In my analysis of "The Turkey Season," I move beyond Beran's critique of the censorship of individual words and phrases in order to offer a more detailed, nuanced analysis of a particular period in Munro's long career as a *New Yorker* writer, and to explore some of the more substantive, structural and epistemological elements of the story that resulted from her relationship with one of her *New Yorker* editors, Charles McGrath. I deploy the

¹⁰¹ Here Beran performs a similar reading of the interactions between Munro's story and its paratext—the advertisements that surround it—as I do in my analysis of Mavis Gallant's "Luc and His Father." My characterization of the magazine as an authorial contact zone in is also similar to Beran's conception of the magazine; she posits *New Yorker* readers as members of an "imagined community" that is similar to the kind defined by Benedict Anderson (222).

archival evidence of McGrath's involvement in shaping this story in order to argue that "The Turkey Season" is a result of a dialogic process of collaboration, as well as to support the broader claim that this period in Munro's career marked a turning point for her work, one which *The New Yorker* played a significant role in encouraging. "The Turkey Season" is the result not just of editorial influence, but also of something closer to "full and equal partnership" between coauthors (London 9). The role McGrath played in shaping "The Turkey Season" is much less subtle than the ones that *The New Yorker* as an institution, or its editors, played in shaping the work, reception, and careers of Callaghan and Gallant. His work on "The Turkey Season" affected its theme, its perspective on the nature of knowledge, and, as a result, the narrator's understanding of sexuality, sexual desire, and sexual identity. While "The Turkey Season" might not be representative of the process that went into preparing all of Munro's *New Yorker* stories for publication, this story is a particularly good – if extreme – example of some features of the dynamic that often characterized the artistic relationship between McGrath and Munro, and represents the process and a performance of what might be conceived of as a genuinely collaborative relationship with an editor.

4.1 Munro and Her *New Yorker* Editors: Charles McGrath as "Ideal Editor"

As Beran points out, Munro's relationship with *The New Yorker* has brought her "prestige, money, and a wide audience for her stories" (205). In interviews, some with her own editors, Munro has spoken at length about her relationship with the magazine as an institution and the individual editors with whom she has worked. Despite Beran's careful documentation of the magazine's censorship of depictions of sexuality or "grotesque" bodies, in an interview with one of her editors, Alice Quinn, Munro claims that *The New Yorker* actually gave her more freedom to write what she wanted than the Canadian literary marketplace did. She claims that the magazine "got me the readership that I needed to feel encouraged, because in Canada I was for a long time seen as a sort of slightly outmoded writer. A regional writer who wrote a lot about a kind of life that is now passing." "One of the good things about *The New Yorker*," she continues, "was that it allowed you to write about any period in the past, and about any sort of people."

Publishing in *The New Yorker* has obviously been a crucial factor in Munro's achievement of critical, financial, and popular success, but her work has also been important to the success of *The New Yorker* as its various general editors over the last twenty-five years have taken the magazine in new directions away from its prudish past. McGrath has described Munro's contribution, not just to literature, but to the magazine, calling her one of "'the sinews that held the *New Yorker* together' throughout its many changes," and remarking that "It's sort of odd and ironic that this Canadian writer would become a *New Yorker* mainstay" (qtd. in Thacker, *Writing Her Lives* 317).

McGrath was Munro's first *New Yorker* editor, and he shepherded her work through a transitional phase in the late 1970s and early 1980s. He began editing Munro's work while the magazine was still under the general editorship of William Shawn. When McGrath became deputy editor of the magazine, Daniel Menaker, under the leadership of Robert Gottlieb as general editor, took over the task of editing Munro's work from 1988 to 1994 (Beran 209). Many of the letters, galleys, and typescripts in the Alice Munro Papers and New York Public Library's *New Yorker* Records record interactions between Munro and McGrath, or Munro and Menaker.¹⁰² Under the leadership of Tina Brown, whose editorship of the magazine lasted from 1992 to 1998 (Beran 211), the fiction editors Bill Buford (1996 to 2002) and Alice Quinn (1996 to 2000) worked with Munro. Because Quinn and Buford have edited stories that have appeared within *The New Yorker* more recently, so far little material about this period in Munro's career with the magazine is available in her archives. Under the current general editorship of David Remnick, Munro has worked with fiction editor Deborah Treisman, who took over this role in 1997.

Beran describes McGrath's career with the magazine, and Munro's relationship with him, in general terms early in her essay:

McGrath seems to have been an ideal editor for Munro. His letters to her generally follow the same pattern. He begins with compliments, frequently

¹⁰² As Chapter Three indicated, Menaker also edited some of Mavis Gallant's work.

reactions to the story being edited. Then, with much tentativeness and respect, he identifies a few editorial problems, generally regarding clarity or fact. For example, he suggests in a letter of 18 November 1976 that Munro specify the Canadian setting for an audience likely to assume a setting south of the border unless otherwise informed . . . He insists that he edits only for clarity, not to alter her style (18 Nov. 1976, AMP, MsC 37.2.30.1a); when he queries her on matters of style, he generally does so in a way that privileges the writer's art, asking, for example, if a repetition is intentional . . . Frequently, proofs from the *New Yorker* add clarifications such as "he thinks" or "she said" or request information about the relationship between the characters. At times, Munro provides an additional sentence or paragraph . . . At other times, she inks "no cut" in the margin. Often the editors restore cuts that she disagrees with. (205-06)

This long quotation introduces several of the issues that concern this chapter, including Munro's shifting relationship to place and regionalism by highlighting the specifically Canadian setting of her work for *New Yorker* readers, her resistance to editorial censorship, her tendency to re-write stories the magazine had already accepted for publication, and the "respect" and satisfaction that characterizes the editorial relationship between Munro and McGrath on both sides. Most important is the distinction Beran makes between issues of clarity and style. My analyses of McGrath's influence on "The Turkey Season" and "Meneseteung" challenge Beran's claim that she "found no evidence in the Alice Munro Papers that editorial demands by McGrath or Menaker were responsible for marked differences between the magazine version and the book version" (210). The example of "The Turkey Season" demonstrates that, in some instances, substantive changes McGrath and *The New Yorker* made to Munro's stories were indeed "responsible for marked differences" that are as significant as the "changes in narrative point of view" that Beran identifies as Munro's own "authorial" revisions (210).

4.2 The "Turkey Season" Composite: McGrath's Shaping of Munro's Relationship to Epistemology

"The Turkey Season" was published in the 29 December 1980 issue of *The New Yorker*. The story is narrated by an adult woman who remembers the Christmas season during

which, as a fourteen-year-old in the late 1940s, she worked gutting turkeys. The narrator describes the behaviour of her co-workers, particularly that of two middle-aged sisters – Lily and Marjorie – with whom she discusses sex and marriage. She also describes Gladys, the fragile sister of Morgan, who owns the turkey barn, and Herb Abbott, the patient, bachelor foreman about whose sexuality Lily, Marjorie, and the narrator speculate. The story centres on a scene in the turkey barn that Magdalene Redekop describes as "a grotesque parody of the nativity scene" (151). Brian, a turkey barn employee who has been hired because he is either Herb's friend, relative or lover, "had either done something or shown something to Gladys as she came out of the washroom and she had started screaming and having hysterics" (*Moons of Jupiter* 72). Immediately after this incident, Morgan runs Brian out of town. The story is representative of a turning point in Munro's literary aesthetic away from the documentary, and towards indeterminacy, the very aesthetic that scholars such as John Orange have argued characterizes Munro's *oeuvre* as a whole. Orange has described Munro's "underlying artistic vision" as one in which "patterns of interpretation of human experience, whether they are offered by memory, analysis, other people, or even by works of fiction, are all inadequate and often illusory" (93).¹⁰³ McGrath's editing of the story encouraged this shift.

As Thacker and other scholars have noted, it was Munro's "frequent practice" to rewrite stories after submitting them to *The New Yorker* (*Writing Her Lives* 386). Sometimes a rejection letter with notes would encourage Munro to re-work and re-submit a story, while at other times the revisions would be "unbidden," as McGrath characterized them in an email. Munro's own dissatisfaction with a story that had already been accepted

¹⁰³ Several other scholars echo Orange's statement about the tendency in Munro's stories to evade resolution or any sense of finality. Ailsa Cox, for example, writes: "The Canadian critic Linda Hutcheon claims that postmodern fiction is marked by a 'deliberate refusal to resolve contradictions'. Such contradictions multiply in Munro's work, especially in the *Open Secrets* collection. Whether Heather Bell has been abducted, or has vanished in a prank that went too far, can never be established. The alternatives coexist, and may even overlap, engendering further possibilities. The ending of this story, like that of 'The Jack Randa Hotel', points to an ongoing, unfinalized reality, running far beyond the page" (66).

for publication would sometimes cause her to alter its structure or change the narration from first to third person, or vice versa. During this revision process, Munro's stories usually became "tighter" – and sometimes more cryptic – as she removed expository and connecting material. In a 5 January 1978 interview on CBC's "Morningside," Munro described this process to Don Harron, saying: "When I go over things I keep taking out and taking out and perhaps I take out too much." "The Turkey Season" is an example in which McGrath believed Munro had "take[n] out too much" during the revision process (email). After the magazine had accepted the story, Munro sent McGrath a new, revised version. The version Munro wrote first¹⁰⁴ is significantly longer than the second,¹⁰⁵ and contains long passages that do not appear in the story that the magazine ultimately published.¹⁰⁶ Quoting from an interview with McGrath and one of his letters to Munro, Thacker writes that McGrath "told Munro . . . that 'the best story here is a combination'" (*Writing Her Lives* 386) of the two versions Munro had submitted. McGrath wrote to Munro, calling the version of the story he had created

a kind of composite made up from your two versions. I didn't keep track, exactly, but I would guess that it's about 50-50, new and old. In general, whenever it was a question of a word or a line, the second version almost always seemed to me finer or sharper, but in the case of some of the longer additions I sometimes felt that some of the spareness and understatement of the first version was preferable. (qtd in Thacker, *Writing Her Lives* 386)

¹⁰⁴ 396/87.03.4.20. n.d. Ts.

¹⁰⁵ 38.9.29. n.d. Ts.

¹⁰⁶ When I asked him about the order in which these versions were composed, McGrath replied: "The shorter came second, as I recall. And it was also unbidden. Munro rewrite [sic] the story on her own, as she sometimes did, and not in response to any editorial suggestion. I did think that certain parts of the first version were better and she allowed me to paste them in." Throughout this analysis of the differences between these two drafts I will refer to the long draft of the story (396.87.03.4.20) as the first version, and its shorter incarnation (38.9.29) as the second.

The letter continues and offers some insight into why he felt it was necessary to use the "miles of Scotch tape"¹⁰⁷ that he did to create a "hybrid" of the two stories.¹⁰⁸ He tells Munro that the story "manages to suggest a great deal without actually spelling things out," but that "In some instances, in fact, I think your efforts to 'open' the story actually had the reverse effect: they seemed to narrow the focus by making the story too 'local' – too specifically of a certain time or place" (38.3.4.8a). Thacker briefly explores some of the issues that McGrath raises in the letter that accompanied the author's proofs he sent Munro, including the need to "peg" the story and significantly soften some of the profane language, but does not describe how Munro's two versions of the story differed. "Narrow" and "open" accurately describe the significant differences between two complete typescripts of "The Turkey Season" in the Munro archives; the longer version contains digressive passages that do not appear in the version that the magazine ultimately published.

The elements McGrath chose to keep or to eliminate in his creation of the composite version of "The Turkey Season" affect the story's conception of the usefulness of, and the narrator's access to, knowledge and facts. McGrath used the second, shorter version of Munro's story as his base, but incorporated phrases and passages Munro had cut from the longer, first version to restore a degree of uncertainty and open-endedness to the story. For example, in Munro's second version of the story the narrator leads us to believe that her memory of the events at the turkey barn is infallible, telling us: "Herb Abbott was the one who took the picture" (38.9.29.f11). In contrast, the narrator in the first version betrays the fact that she may not know this for sure through her phrasing: "Herb Abbott *must have been* the one who took the picture" (396/87.03.4.20.f14 my italics). In the composite version, McGrath places "must have been" back in the text.¹⁰⁹ McGrath's major contribution to "The Turkey Season" is to return an element of

¹⁰⁷ Letter to Alice Munro from Charles McGrath. 6 June 1980. Alice Munro Papers, 38.2.4.7. Ts.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, 17 June 1980. 38.3.4.8b. Ts.

¹⁰⁹ "The Turkey Season," 9 June 1980. Alice Munro Fonds, Manuscripts and Archives Division, University of Calgary Library. Ts.

uncertainty and doubt to the text: about characters' motives, about science, about definitions of sexuality, about the details of the events that take place in the turkey barn, and about the reader and the narrator's ability to explain them. By making editorial decisions that, rather than clarifying the story, result in "marked differences" in the story's meaning as a result of its depiction of knowledge and understanding (Beran 210), McGrath exceeds the traditional boundaries of the role of editor, and becomes a co-creator or collaborator in the creation of this story.

One of the significant differences between Munro's two versions of "The Turkey Season" is that the first is far more invested in "narrative indeterminacy" and the refusal of "definitive interpretations" than the second. McGrath encouraged Munro to pursue this indeterminate element in her fiction by reinserting passages that helped to achieve this quality or effect into the second version of her story. By reinserting select phrases and entire paragraphs Munro had cut from her second version of the story, McGrath helped to strengthen "The Turkey Season's" thematic unity, emphasizing the narrator's changing perspective on the nature of knowledge and her own understanding of religious experience and sexuality. Most important, McGrath did so during an important phase in Munro's career. Like Orange, Coral Ann Howells' "main interest" in Munro's work is in her "experiments with the short story form and her shifts of emphasis toward increasing indeterminacy and multiple meanings, always contained within a realistic and domestic framework" (146). She sees this attempt[t] to represent . . . the complex layering of the way things are or rather the way things might be interpreted from different perspectives," as an element of Munro's fiction that has become more emphatic with time, citing Munro's own claim that "'The older I get (she is sixty-six) the more I see things as having more than one explanation'" (9). Pilar Somacarrera identifies the primary source of this indeterminacy in Munro's writing as the "modalized statements conveying the narrator's attitude towards the reliability of the narrated events." For example, in *Who Do You Think You Are?*, the narrator uses "expressions of epistemic certainty," such as "'her father must have got rid of them' (RB2)" or "'But he must have had a home-loving nature' (HF 63)" only in hindsight, and only about her father (qtd. in Somacarrera). Even in these instances, however, the use of "must have" rather than "did" indicates a certain equivocation or uncertainty on the part of the mature narrator. The moment that Howells

suggests marks this shift in Munro's characteristic aesthetic through "an amplification" of "structures of narrative indeterminacy" (11) coincides with a key juncture in her career: the beginning of her relationship with *The New Yorker*, and with McGrath in particular. Howells pinpoints the publication of *The Moons of Jupiter* as "the most significant turning point in Munro's fiction-writing career" (67) and in this journey towards "allow[ing] more and more possible meanings to circulate in every story while refusing definitive interpretations or plot resolutions" (10).¹¹⁰ The fact that the collection, which includes a story in which McGrath clearly encouraged Munro to pursue one literary direction (based in indeterminacy) over another (based in the documentary), is associated with such a significant shift in Munro's writing suggests that one of the unique features of Munro's aesthetic was developed in collaboration with fellow short-story writer McGrath. Munro's association with *The New Yorker* did more than just shape the published form of individual stories; it played a role in the very development of Munro's distinctive literary aesthetic.

An analysis of the editorial process behind the publication of "The Turkey Season," which is in many ways about the unsaid and the unsayable, not only reveals how this theme emerged through revision, but also demonstrates the role McGrath as editor played in shifting the epistemological grounding of the story. Urjo Kareda describes *Moons of Jupiter* as "a transitional volume," arguing that Munro's "great achievement is to make us accept our inability to know" (quoted in Thacker *Writing Her Lives* 393). It is

¹¹⁰ Howells writes:

In the early collections and whole book story sequences up to *The Beggar Maid* (1978) Munro works within the tradition of documentary realism, registering surface details of daily life and then disrupting those realistic conventions by shifts into fantasy, suggesting alternative worlds that coexist within the same fictional space. Endings are a significant feature in many of these stories, where something extra is added – some insight or additional detail of information . . . The major shift in her storytelling methods in the 1980s, which I identify with *The Moons of Jupiter* and *The Progress of Love*, is an amplification of this principle. Instead of placing the supplement at the end, supplementarity pervades the whole narrative through time shifts and shifts in narrative perspective, unsettling the story at every stage of its telling. The story becomes a series of 'arrangements, disarrangements and earnest deceptions' where multiple and often contradictory meanings have room to circulate in structures of narrative indeterminacy. (10-11)

this reflection upon the inability to know that McGrath's revision of Munro's story intensifies. In this story, elements often considered distinctive to Munro's authorial persona or style have actually been developed in concert with McGrath.

In "The Turkey Season," as it was published in the magazine, the narrator expresses doubts about the usefulness of comprehensive categories, definitions, and explanations. Héliane Ventura writes that the story's "plot is built around an undisclosed incident": what exactly transpires between Brian and Gladys that causes her to go into hysterics (52). The narrator is also unsure about the nature of the relationship between Brian and Herb Abbott. As a result of the narrator's own uncertainty, the reader also finds no truth or essential meaning at the centre of the events or experiences of the story. In her comparison of Munro's and Margaret Laurence's use of photographs in their fiction, Deborah Bowen suggests that the resistance to interpretation that Roland Barthes attributes to photographs in *Camera Lucida: Reflections on Photography* applies not just to the photograph the narrator of "The Turkey Season" describes at the end of the story, but also to the narrator's description of the events leading up to the photograph being taken. In the published version of "The Turkey Season," Munro and her narrator thwart the reader's attempts to, as Lorraine McMullen puts it, "use . . . surface details," such as those in the photograph, "to reveal the essential" (qtd in Bowen). At the end of the story, both the narrator and the reader are left with surface details revealed by the photograph, but these details fail to provide insight into the events of the story.

McGrath is correct when he suggests in his letter to Munro that, for the most part, her writing in the second version is "finer or sharper" than in the first (38.3.4.8a). The second version is more compact, and takes series of short sentences in the first version and combines them to form single, more complex sentences. The narrator herself relays compressed descriptions of characters' conversations and responses to events that, in the first version, were presented through dialogue between the narrator and her co-workers. As a result of the excision of so much dialogue, however, Munro's second submission lacks the effect of the first version of suggesting that there are various perspectives on, or interpretations of, the mysterious event at the centre of this story. By offering more definite descriptions of events through the narrator rather than a plurality of perspectives

through dialogue, the second version becomes less focused on the inadequacy of definitions and the uncertain nature of "truth" and knowledge than the first. In several cases, though, McGrath re-introduces some of the uncertainty and open-endedness of the first version into the composite. Whereas in version two of the story the narrator presumes to know Marjorie and Lily's motivations, making claims such as, "When they talked about Gladys being after [Herb] they really wanted to talk about sex" (38.9.29.f5), the narrator's claim in the first version betrays that she does not have access to her co-workers' thoughts: "When they talked about Gladys being after him they *must have* really wanted to talk about sex" (396.87.03.4.20.f5 *my italics*). By reinserting "must have" into his composite, McGrath introduces some of the tentativeness and uncertainty that characterizes Munro's first version back into the story.

The strongest indication of the failure of theories and facts to explain the world the narrator experiences – and the longest digression – in the first version of the story comes in a description of a discussion about the Ice Age that the narrator has with Marjorie and Lily. She is anxious to "point out the contradictions" in Marjorie and Lily's theories about raising daughters, but does not, because

I had already found out how it was when you tried to argue. They never conceded. Never. And I had had a very bad time with them about the Ice Age. Cold weather had set in and Lily had said she felt it into her marrow, she felt like we were going to be frozen for all eternity. Then showing off a bit but really thinking it would interest them I said, "Once, this whole countryside was covered with ice. It would be about a mile thick."

"Go on!" they said.

"It was. That was the Ice Age. It was about fifteen thousand years ago." I went on telling them where it came from, how long it lasted, how it retreated, and they kept laughing and saying, "Go on!" until I was shrill and exhausted and altogether desperate.

"You don't believe there was an Ice Age? You can go look it up in a book!"

"I'm not going to waste my time," said Marjorie.

"But there was!" There really was! Do you think I'm making it up?"

"We think you're crazy," Lily said. "How come it isn't in the Bible?"

I knew enough not to say anything against [sic] the Bible's authority. I was trying to get calmed down. I thought there must be a way to persuade them. "The Bible isn't about Canada," I said.

In the end they won. However I argued, they laughed, and started calling me Ice Age, running the words together till it sounded something like the icing on a cake. I was nearly crying with rage. It seemed to me some authority should appear with a sledge-hammer, and make them admit – no, make them understand, - that there had been an Ice Age. (396.87.03.4.20.f9-10).

This passage only appears in this first version of the story. A reader of this version would presumably sympathize with the narrator and her frustration at her coworkers' refusal to believe what is a "fact," but more important, what this passage reveals is that the "truth" is not always useful. The narrator's access to it here interferes with her attempt to impress these grown women. As a result of this discussion in which Marjorie and Lily refuse to accept the facts that the narrator presents, the passage that immediately follows pits two "truths" against one another in a way that undermines the very concept and suggests that human beings often manipulate it for their own purposes. In the first version of the story, Munro writes:

Lily said she never let her husband come near her if he had been drinking. Marjorie said that since the time she had had her trouble she had never let her husband come near her, period. Lily said it was only when he'd been drinking that he tried to get smart with her, anyway. I could see that it was a matter of

pride not to let your husband come near you but I couldn't quite believe that 'come near' meant 'have sex'. The idea of Marjorie and Lily being sought out for such purposes was as impossible for me to accept as the Ice Age was for them. They had lost some of their teeth, their stomachs sagged, they had moles on their faces. I decided to take 'come near' literally. (396.87.03.4.20.f10)

Because the earlier reference to the Ice Age has been eliminated from the second version of the story, both it and the composite version published by *The New Yorker* describe the "idea of Marjorie and Lily being sought out" as "seem[ing] grotesque" to the narrator, rather than impossible, as it is in the first (38.9.29,f8). This change softens the passage's challenge to both the narrator's and Marjorie's and Lily's sense of what constitutes fact. Access to this passage in Munro's first version of the story reveals that the epistemological theme that Munro seems to have discarded in the second version was present in the first, and how the final, published version of "The Turkey Season" evolved into a meditation on the nature of knowledge. It also offers insight into the narrator's development from a fourteen-year-old girl who is invested in verifiable facts, to an adult woman who rejects, or is no longer solely interested in, facts, definitions, and labels.

Thematically, the story focuses on whether or not finding out the "facts" is a useful or ethical pursuit. The changes McGrath made to Munro's second submission help to reinforce this theme. The narrator's certainty about the Ice Age is not only useless in helping her to develop a relationship with Marjorie and Lily, but also challenged when juxtaposed with what is a fact for Marjorie and Lily but is as impossible for the narrator to believe as the Ice Age is for them. Most of the other sustained meditations on the nature of knowledge throughout the story centre on definitions and conceptions of homosexuality and the nature of Herb's relationship with Brian. As the narrator in Munro's first version of the story states about her ability to categorize or label Herb:

What about Herb? I've explained all this to show why the homosexual definition would not offer itself, to me or to Lily or Marjorie. It did later, to me, and I accepted it. Then I put it by. It isn't any use to me. Probably he was, but maybe he was not. (Even considering the episode of Brian I think that). *The definition is*

no explanation, finally. Herb is not a puzzle so arbitrarily solved.
(396/87.03.4.20.f6 my italics)

In what is an exception to the general trend, in this case Munro's second version of the story is less definitive and more open-ended than the first. The second version bypasses the question of the narrator's in/ability to categorize Herb as homosexual, and instead focuses on the narrator's conception of knowledge rather than the search for an explanation: "I don't want to go into the question of whether Herb was homosexual or not because the definition is of no use to me. I think that probably he was; but maybe he was not. (even considering the episode of Brian I think that). He is not a puzzle so arbitrarily solved" (38.9.29.ff5-f6). In this version, the narrator deliberately chooses not to try to categorize Herb's sexuality, and Munro excises the first version's suggestion that, even though definitions fail her, the narrator continues to search for an "explanation." These changes alter the meaning of the last line that both versions share, that Herb "is not a puzzle so arbitrarily solved." In the first version, this line reads as a failed attempt to "solve" the puzzle of Herb's individual and sexual identity; in the second, it reads as a preemptive refusal to attempt to explain or label Herb's behavior that is based on doubt about how useful this information might be, or that such knowledge could ever be accessed. In this example the second version of the story highlights the contingent nature of knowledge and facts, and it is this version¹¹¹ that McGrath chooses to use in his composite full of qualifiers that highlight the ways that people, in addition to situations and facts, often defy categories and definition.

The narrator's loss of faith in categories and definition is again highlighted near the end of the story when she attempts to explain the meaning of Herb's facial expression during an incident in which "Herb looked somewhat unlike himself . . . when Morgan was cursing out Brian." Although there are minor differences in punctuation between them, in all three versions of the story the narrator explains that "[l]ater when I knew so much more, at least about sex, I decided that Brian was Herb's lover, and that Gladys

¹¹¹ With the exception of McGrath's own substitution of "what happened later" for "the episode of Brian."

really was trying to get attention from Herb, and that was why Brian had humiliated her—with or without Herb's connivance and consent" (*New Yorker* 44). The word "decided" here puts the emphasis on the narrator's interpretation of the situation rather than its facts. The differences in the paragraphs that follow this interpretive decision in all three versions of the story highlight its shifting focus on the nature of knowledge as it evolved throughout the editing process. In the first version, Munro writes:

Later still I gave up on explanations. I can't trust them. I can't be sure. All I can be sure of is my own faithful, mystified, concentration on Herb, my need to catch him and discover him, in some way, then if possible move in and stay close to him . . . I would still like to know things. Never mind facts. Never mind theories, either. Truth is what I'm after. (396/87.03.4.20.f16-f17)

The narrator moves from rejecting definitions in favour of explanations, to rejecting explanations altogether while still insisting upon the existence of a "Truth" of some kind that exceeds or transcends facts. This passage in Munro's second version of the story is more specific; rather than giving up on explanations because they are untrustworthy, the narrator lets go of this particular explanation and instead focuses on the personal feelings and responses to the situation that she does have access to:

Later still I dropped that explanation and decided I wasn't very interested in that part of the story, which I could never really know. What I was interested in was my own, faithful, mystified concentration on Herb; my need to catch him out, discover him, and then, if I got the chance, move in and stay close to him . . . I would still like to know things. Never mind facts. (38.9.29.f12-f13)

In this version, the narrator's sense of what kind of knowledge might be possible is much more vague and tenuous. She may have only given up on this particular explanation rather than explanations in general, but she is more dubious about what kind of knowledge she is capable of accessing. Rather than "Truth," she aims to "know" only "things."

In the third version of the story, McGrath's composite, the typesetting of the page upon which this passage appears (f17) is noticeably different from the others, and seems to take as its source a different version of the story than Munro's second draft. It appears as though Munro, or someone, might have written a third draft, at least of this one page, and that McGrath used this version rather than the final pages of Munro's second draft as his base. In the composite version, the passage reads:

Later still I backed off from this explanation. I got to a stage of backing off from the things I couldn't really know. It's enough for me now to just think of Herb's face with that peculiar, stricken look; to think of Brian monkeying in the shade of Herb's dignity; to think of my own mystified concentration on Herb, my need to catch him out, if I could ever get the chance, and then move in and stay close to him . . . I would still like to know things. Never mind facts. Never mind theories, either. (396/87.03.4.21.f.22)¹¹²

On the typescript, McGrath has reinserted the phrase "Never mind theories, either" from Munro's first version of the story, in pencil. This version, while markedly different from both Munro's first and second drafts, combines the parts of both in which the narrator undermines definitions and challenges the nature of knowledge. In this version, she gives up both her attempt to explain Herb's behaviour and explanations in general. She recognizes that she may never have access to certain facts, and that her theories and explanations, therefore, are not useful. As in the second version, she focuses her attention on her own relationship to the situation instead, not because that is the only information she has access to, but because her memory of an image, of Herb's face, is "enough." In this meditation on the photograph, the narrator focuses on the image for its own sake rather than for the truths or explanations she might find by studying it. Thanks to McGrath's editing, the narrator's rejection of a belief in absolute knowledge is the most all-encompassing in this third version.

¹¹² My own pagination here does not coincide with the page numbers located in the top, right-hand corner of this draft because McGrath has integrated his own, unpaginated "inserts" into the draft, and because there are two pages marked "17."

In addition to emphasizing the tenuous nature of knowledge in "The Turkey Season" in the story's digressions about facts, theories, definitions and explanations, McGrath's composite also removes information from, or adds qualifiers to, the second version of the story, which he describes as too "narrow," in order to "open" it up again. In the passage about defining Herb's relationship with Brian, for example, McGrath removes the narrator's reference to "the episode of Brian," which Munro included in both of the versions that she submitted, and inserts the less-specific phrase "what happened later" (396.87.03.4.21.f7). McGrath's composite vaguely foreshadows the events of the story near its beginning rather than directly telling readers what to expect. As a result, readers, like the narrator and other characters, must also work to create meaning out of an incomplete set of facts. In a similar instance, McGrath adds complexity to Brian's character and removes some of the certainty from the narrator's descriptions of him. When Brian swears inside the turkey barn in the second version of the story, the narrator explains that "his saying this seemed not careless but flaunting, pure provocation" (38.9.29.f8). The hybrid version, like the first one, suggests that Brian's motives are more alloyed than "pure," and that he is "mixing insult and provocation" (396.87.03.4.21.f11 and 396.87.03.4.20f11). In describing Brian in Munro's second version of the story, the narrator also muses: "Perhaps he should have been put on a stage with a microphone and a guitar, and let grunt and howl and wriggle and excite, and he would have been a true celebrant" (38.9.29.f9). Once again McGrath's composite version of the story is more tentative and hypothetical. It reads: "Perhaps *if he had been* put on a stage with a microphone and a guitar, and let grunt and howl and wriggle and excite, and [sic] he would have *seemed* a true celebrant" (396/87.03.4.21.f15-16 my italics). This phrasing is closer to that used to describe Brian in Munro's first version of the story (396/87.03.4.20.f11). Throughout the second version of her story, Munro "narrow[s]" events, motives, and interpretations of them by using more concrete, definite descriptions. The composite that McGrath constructed functions to reverse this shift.

In several cases, these added qualifiers shift the story's representation of homosexuality. In most instances throughout McGrath's composite, whenever the

narrator reflects upon the townspeople's understanding of, and feelings about, homosexuality during the 1940s,¹¹³ McGrath opts to incorporate the least definite descriptions from each of Munro's versions. This choice, once again, reinforces the limitations of the narrator, and of knowledge in general, this time through an indirect questioning of sexual epistemologies, or the ability to know and articulate the desires and identities of others. McGrath softens the townswomen's reading of homosexuality as a failure or sin, and instead highlights sexual difference with less judgment. He cuts Munro's initial reference to "the sissie-men, as they were politely called" (396/87.03/4.20.f6), and restores her reference to sex with men as one of the "other detours" a gay man "might take" rather than the reference to "darker" detours to which the narrator refers in her second version of the story (38.9.29.f5, 396/87.03.4.21.f7). Herb, after all, is presented by the narrator as honorable, dignified, nurturing, and admired by the other turkey gutters;¹¹⁴ the use of "other" instead of "darker" softens the narrator's description of the townspeople's perception of homosexuality in general. In version one of the story the list of gay men the narrator describes includes "an elegant, light-voiced-wavy-haired paper-hanger who had set himself up as an interior decorator." Version two refers to a "paper-hanger who called himself an interior decorator," and this is the phrasing that McGrath opts to keep. There is a tone of doubt inherent in the phrase "called himself"; it suggests that the townspeople believe the paper-hanger might be someone other than the person he presents himself to be, but does not explicitly state what that something else might be, since, according to the narrator, the residents of

¹¹³ Munro "pegs" the time period and place after being asked to do so in the galleys of the story (38.9.30.f5) and in letter from McGrath dated 1 December, 1980, but not in any of the typescripts, including McGrath's composite. In his letter, McGrath writes:

I think that it might help to explain the "wartime" reference on 12, and also attitudes about language and sex throughout, if you could place the story more precisely in time. The most likely spot to do that, it seems to me, is there on galley 5 where I've indicated – just a date would do it, I think – though there might also be something to be said for adding "in Logan, Ontario," or some such. (38.3.4.12b).

¹¹⁴ As Redekop notes, during Herb's gutting lesson to the narrator, "Although the turkey in question has testicles, Herb issues the order "'Knees up, Mother Brown'" (5). Herb is decidedly not one of the "turkeys" of the story, but juxtaposition of the turkey's male anatomy with the label "mother," Redekop argues, reflects Herb's own role in the "family" of the Turkey Barn.

Logan are more focused on gay men's failure to perform traditional masculinity than the sex of their romantic partners. Once again, the composite version of "The Turkey Season" undermines facts and opts instead for uncertainty about the identities and motivations of others.

The introduction to "The Turkey Season" in *Meanwhile, in Anther Part of the Forest* highlights this reticence on the part of the narrator to reveal facts as fact. Alberto Manguel and Craig Stephenson refer to the

technique of giving the impression of reality through a narrator who appears to have a faulty knowledge of the story. Hesitations, slips of memory, errors of description" they write, "become part of a subtle fabric that somehow captures, more precisely than a full and confident recording, the story the narrator sets out to tell . . . By telling the story of "The Turkey Season" through a recalcitrant narrator, [Munro] . . . denies us the comfort of an all-powerful, all-knowing voice deciding what things are and should be. (192)

If Orange is correct in his assertion that Munro's "underlying artistic vision" is characterized by the inadequacy of "patterns of interpretation," then McGrath's changes to Munro's second version of the "The Turkey Season" in order to reinsert failed analysis, uncertainty, and to undermine the trustworthiness of "facts" helped to make the story a little more "Munrovian" than it might otherwise have been.

4.3 "The Turkey Season" as Formative Exception: Epistemology in "Meneseteung"

In "Transnational American Studies and the Limits to Collaboration," Jane Desmond identifies what she argues are several limits or impediments to collaborative work across national boundaries. One of these limits, she claims, is "Different and at times incompatible methodologies and epistemological values" (19). As my analysis of Gallant's work in Chapter Three demonstrates, *The New Yorker* usually privileged linearity, clarity, and intelligibility over the kind of epistemological indeterminacy that McGrath encouraged in "The Turkey Season." McGrath's resistance to the magazine's established approach to epistemology in this case proves to be somewhat of an anomaly when considered in relation to some of Munro's other *New Yorker* stories. The

publication process surrounding "Meneseteung" helps to explicate the magazine's more common approach to the nature of knowledge in her work. The story, in which a narrator describes the life and work of a nineteenth-century poet named Almeda Joynt Roth, appeared in the 11 January 1988 issue of *The New Yorker*, and in the 1990 collection *Friend of My Youth*. It centres on an evening during which Roth begins to make grape jelly, and dumps "the hot pulp" "into the cheesecloth bag, to strain out the juice" overnight (33) and the following morning, when Roth awakens to find what she believes is the body of a dead woman on her property. In calling on her neighbor Jarvis Poulter for help, she makes him feel needed and awakens his protective instincts, causing him to declare his intention to court her by announcing that he will walk her to church that morning. Out of shock over her encounter with the woman who, it turns out, is only passed out from drink, not dead, or perhaps out of fear of the consequences of Poulter's declaration, Roth takes too much nerve medicine, passes the day in a laudanum stupor and misses – perhaps deliberately – her opportunity to begin a courtship with Poulter.

As Sabrina Francesconi, Dermot McCarthy, and Thacker all point out, the story appears in a different version in *Friend of My Youth* than it does in *The New Yorker*. Thacker claims that Munro's archives serve as evidence of her constant tinkering with the endings of her stories (*Writing Her Lives* 563),¹¹⁵ but in this instance, the "tinkering" was not Munro's. In a 1976 *Paris Review* interview in which her fellow *New Yorker* writer John Cheever describes an instance in which he was irritated with the magazine's attempt to remove the ending from his story "The Brigadier and the Golf Widow," Annette Grant hints at the public belief that this is a common tactic that the magazine employs: "It's the classic story about what *The New Yorker* is rumored to do—'remove the last paragraph and you've got a typical *New Yorker* ending.'" In preparing "Meneseteung" for publication, Munro's editors did just that. The last paragraph of the story in *The New*

¹¹⁵ Thacker writes: "There, not at all surprisingly, anyone can see Munro working on her endings – perpetually, as she always has, sometimes in concert with an editor, sometimes in defiance of an editor screaming for final delivery of a perfectly fine existing ending, sometimes alone: the endings of her stories always matter, they get the most attention, the most frequent changes" (*Writing Her Lives* 563).

Yorker's version begins with the narrator's satisfaction at finding Almeda Joynt Roth's gravestone and being vindicated in her hypothesis that her family referred to her as "Meda" and becomes a meditation on the search for knowledge. It reads:

I thought that there wasn't anybody alive in the world but me who would know this, would make the connection. And I would be the last person to do so. But perhaps this isn't so. People are curious. A few people are. They will be driven to find things out, even trivial things. They will put things together, knowing all along that they may be mistaken. You see them going around with notebooks, scraping the dirt off gravestones, reading microfilm, just in the hope of seeing this trickle in time, making a connection, rescuing one thing from the rubbish. (38)

The version published in *Friend of My Youth* includes the following lines at the end of this paragraph: "And they may get it wrong, after all. I may have got it wrong. I don't know if she ever took laudanum. Many ladies did. I don't know if she ever made grape jelly" (73). Francesconi claims that since in this version the narrator "concludes the story admitting her own limits and thus questioning her own reliability," it "ultimately leaves the reader with more doubts and uncertainties." As McCarthy explains, these final lines "'un-writ[e]' all that came before them. The episode with the laudanum and grape jelly is the central episode in the story in which Almeda finally connects with the world that has attracted and repulsed her all her life." To undermine the veracity of the scene that the narrator has described leaves both the reader and the narrator "drifting in indeterminacy" (McCarthy).

Despite the fact that scholars have tended to refer to these final lines that appear in *Friend of My Youth* as a new addition, archival evidence suggests that the version of the story Munro submitted to *The New Yorker* already included these last lines, and that the difference between the version published in the magazine and that included in *Friend of My Youth* marks a return to the story's original form.¹¹⁶ The magazine's galleys for

¹¹⁶ McCarthy refers to the version of the story "as it appeared in *The New Yorker*" as "the original ending," while Thacker comes closer to the truth about the publication process writing:

"Meneseteung" include the very lines: "I don't know if she ever took laudanum. Many ladies did. I don't know if she ever made grape jelly." On galley 21, an editor has crossed these lines out and queried Munro "Let's discuss ending?" In response, Munro has simply indicated that she is happy with the ending as it is; she rewrites the same lines that have been crossed out (753/04.3 – 3.2).

This undercutting that the version of the story published in *Friend of My Youth* performs is a rhetorical move that scholars often associate with Munro's work in general. Catherine Sheldrick Ross, for example, writes:

Munro, who has always distrusted resolutions and final explanations, tends to undercut interpretations with comments such as, "So she thought." Janet, in "The Stone in the Field," says, "I no longer believe that people's secrets are defined and communicable" (35). Similarly, the narrator of "The Turkey Season" says, "I got to a stage of backing off from the things I couldn't really know" (74). (87)

Ross's inclusion of "The Turkey Season" – a story whose final form was heavily influenced by McGrath – in her list of examples that demonstrate Munro's tendency to evade clarity and the pinning down of facts reiterates the importance of McGrath's contribution towards Munro's development of this particularly "Munroian" aesthetic and structural trait. The same kind of indeterminacy does not appear in the magazine's version of "Meneseteung" because, in this case, as in others, her editors¹¹⁷ adhered more closely

Munro, the creator, the person who, between the first publication of "Meneseteung" in the *New Yorker* and its inclusion in *Friend of My Youth*, made a change—as she often has done (in *The Love of a Good Woman*, notably, she even points out the extent of the changes between the *New Yorker* publication of the stories and their appearance in the book) . . . when 'Meneseteung' appeared in *Friend of My Youth*, Munro dropped the phrase "knowing . . . mistaken," and this additional paragraph had been added (or reattached once the editors at the *New Yorker* had been satisfied). ("Introduction" 2-3)

In *Alice Munro: Writing Her Lives*, Thacker clarifies that these lines were cut for publication in *The New Yorker* and then restored (436).

¹¹⁷ It was likely Charles McGrath who, once again, edited "Meneseteung," and it was probably the last Munro story that he edited. As Beran points out, Menaker began editing Munro's work beginning with

to the magazine's conventional, clear aesthetic, and removed this undercutting from the story.

This editorial choice makes visible the working of the "incompatible . . . epistemological values" that Desmond describes (19). Five years after the publication of *The Moons of Jupiter*, Munro clearly continued (and would continue) to use this undercutting tactic in her work. A behavior that I will later argue characterized Munro's approach to profanity and depictions of sexuality is also evident here. She indicates her conviction in the indeterminate ending by indicating on the galleys that she would like to see it published as it stands. The example of "Meneseteung" reveals Munro struggling against McGrath for the right to keep an aesthetic characteristic of her writing that, seven years earlier, he himself had encouraged and helped her to develop.

4.4 The Editor as Co-Creator: Theorizing Dialogic Collaboration in "The Turkey Season"

It is clear that Munro's relationship with *The New Yorker*, and with McGrath in particular, helped to shape representations of the nature of knowledge in her work. In order to support a reading of this relationship as collaborative, however, it is necessary to also explore the power dynamic between Munro and McGrath, and both the author's and editor's responses to the transformation of "The Turkey Season." Interviews and archival documents offer (limited) access to the conversations that took place between Munro and McGrath during and after the process of preparing "The Turkey Season" for publication, and support a reading of the production process behind the story as close to what Andrea Lunsford and Lisa Ede, in *Singular Texts/Plural Authors*, refer to as dialogic collaboration. Despite the distinction York and other scholars make between "implicit" collaboration and co-signed, explicitly collaborative works (157), and the fact that Munro

"Five Points" (March 14, 1988), the story that was published just after "Meneseteung" (January 11, 1988), and which also appears in *Friend of My Youth* (1990). Thacker writes: "During 1987 McGrath bought 'Oh, What Avails' and 'Meneseteung' while returning 'Pictures of the Ice' and 'Five Points.' A revised version of the latter story, bought early in 1988, was the first Munro story Menaker edited (*Writing Her Lives* 433).

is identified as retaining "authority" over the text as its sole author, it is possible to conceive of this particular story as the product of a dialogic process.

As London argues in *Writing Double: Women's Literary Partnerships*, "an authorial signature is not an accurate index to a collaboration's existence" (18). Although "The Turkey Season" is not co-signed, and authorship is attributed only to Munro, Munro herself acknowledges the collaborative elements of its composition in the "Introduction" to her *Selected Stories*:

I should mention here that I don't always have to do all this work by myself. An editor who is also an ideal reader can work with you on these final shifts and slants in a seamless, amazing collaboration. Charles McGrath and Dan Menaker, at *The New Yorker*, have helped me wonderfully in this way—particularly in "The Turkey Season" (Charles) and "Vandals" (Dan)." (xvi)

In their Introduction to *Singular Texts/Plural Authors*, Lunsford and Ede offer a useful, practical definition of collaboration and its "distinguishing features" as determined by researchers at Purdue University: "(1) production of a shared document; (2) substantive interaction among members; and (3) shared decision-making power over and responsibility for the document" (14-15). As an analysis of the production process that surrounded "The Turkey Season" has already demonstrated, both Munro and McGrath shared in the production of the story, and interacted via letter in order to do so. Their discussions about that process suggest that their interactions were also characterized by "shared decision-making power and responsibility for" the story. In *Rethinking*, York points out the relationship between the marketability of a text and its seeming adherence to the tradition of singular authorship. She writes:

The market exerts its power by insisting on a single, preferably recognizable, authorial name. George Landow, connecting the rise of print media and 'notions of intellectual property,' cites the example of Nancy Mitford's collaboration with her husband on *The High Cost of Death*: 'Only her name appears because the publisher urged that multiple authors would cut sales' (93). (qtd in York 14)

The literary identity of *The New Yorker's* "Alice Munro" has been shaped and branded in particular ways in order to sell a product, but behind that "product" lie the interventions of McGrath and other editors at the magazine.

In *Writing Double*, London espouses an idealized conception of collaboration as a "full and equal coauthorship" (9). Lunsford and Ede use the concept of the dialogic mode of collaboration, which they define in contrast to the hierarchical mode they found in most of the professional settings in which group writing occurs that they surveyed, to explicate their own collaborative writing practice (133). They write:

This dialogic mode is loosely structured and the roles enacted within it are fluid: one person may occupy multiple and shifting roles as a project progresses . . . those participating in dialogic collaboration generally value the creative tension inherent in multivoiced and multivalent ventures . . . In dialogic collaboration, this group effort is seen as an essential part of the production—rather than the recovery—of knowledge and as a means of individual satisfaction within the group. (133)

Although Harold Ross suggested to Katharine White that *New Yorker* editors should "regar[d] [them]selves pretty much in the role of collaborators" (*The New Yorker* Records, 14.15, Ts.), the hierarchical power dynamic between Callaghan, Gallant, and their *New Yorker* editors resulted in a co-authorship that could never be as "equal" as the one London envisions.¹¹⁸ The power dynamic between Munro and McGrath however, was closer to what Lunsford and Ede identify as dialogic. As York suggests of the co-signed collaboration between Carol Shields and Blanche Howard in the novel *A Celibate Season*, even though Munro and McGrath "may have occupied positions of unequal power," "The Turkey Season" is still "a product of exchange and negotiation" (104).

¹¹⁸ See the discussion of coercion in the editing of Mavis Gallant's "Orphan's Progress" in Chapter Three, particularly Ross' November 30, 1945 letter to Mrs. Norton Baskin in which he outlines the risk of *The New Yorker* rescinding its offer to purchase a story if an author is unwilling to make changes upon which an editor insists (Kunkel 281-282).

McGrath's comments about "The Turkey Season" reveal both his satisfaction with the process of collaboration – a process characterized by consensus-building between Munro and McGrath – and his shifting roles and relationship to "authority" over the story. Lunsford and Ede outline this comfort with fluid roles, in contrast to the "vigilant awareness of status difference" (Nesbitt and Thomas 32) that can sometimes be characterized by the rigidly defined roles of author and editor, as a necessary component of dialogic collaboration. McGrath indicated his satisfaction with the process behind preparing the story in an interview. Thacker writes that McGrath "now recalls [working on "The Turkey Season] as one of *the* moments in his work with Munro, and he concedes that his own combination of the two versions of the story fuels his pleasure" (*Writing Her Lives* 389). This focus on deriving pleasure from process is one of the characteristics that Lunsford and Ede identify as part of a dialogic collaborative process. Like Beran, who describes McGrath as the ideal editor for Munro, Thacker describes the literary relationship between Munro and McGrath as one based on mutual respect rather than coercion (*Writing Her Lives* 388).¹¹⁹ Although the author/editor relationship was, formally, a hierarchical one in the sense that the editor held more institutional power than the author and both had defined roles, the fact that Munro, unlike Callaghan or Gallant, was already an established writer when she began publishing in *The New Yorker* helped to reduce the power differential between her role and McGrath's, thus freeing McGrath to abandon the hierarchical approach other *New Yorker* editors have used and adopt a more fluid role in relation to Munro's work.

McGrath's letters to Munro indicate that the distinctions between their roles were not always as clear as might be expected, and that a shift in McGrath's approach to the ownership of the story took place as McGrath the editor, a short story writer in his own right, came to see himself as McGrath the collaborator. By referring to "his own combination" in his interview with Thacker, McGrath asserts some authority over the story that, in other instances, he has suggested belongs solely to Munro. In the 17 June

¹¹⁹ Thacker writes: "Not too far into their writer-editor relationship, McGrath recalls, 'the trust kicked in.' They sensed that they were both working in the same direction" (*Writing Her Lives* 388).

1980 letter to Munro in which he describes having created a composite from Munro's two stories, McGrath makes it clear that the story is still Munro's, and that she has the right to accept or reject the changes he has made, writing "But you should be the judge of all this . . . You should use the clean proof for your notes and corrections, and anything that doesn't seem right to you we can easily fix or restore" (38.2.4.8a). In an email outlining the order in which Munro composed her two versions of the story, McGrath also defers to Munro as retaining authority over the story, writing: "I did think that certain parts of the first version were better and she allowed me to paste them in." His use of "allowed" here reveals the reversal of the magazine's usual power dynamic between authors and editors in which editors hold the power to demand changes to, or reject, a story. McGrath's notes to Munro about the story highlight the fluidity of McGrath's own sense of his role in the production of this story as he shifts between seeing himself as editor and as collaborator. As the letter to Munro about the changes to the story continues, McGrath places himself in the role of creator being judged by Munro as editor, and hoping that she will approve of his work, writing: "I'm eager to hear how this hybrid strikes you" (38.3.4.8a-8b). Similarly, the letter in which he discusses the galleys of the story and suggests minor changes concludes with: "And that really is everything. Except to say that I really love this story, and I'm extremely proud of how it turned out" (38.3.4.12b). This expression of pride suggests, again, his significant contribution to the story: that McGrath feels partially responsible for, and shares in, the success of the final product in a way that undermines the conventional understanding of Munro alone as author of the work. He does not specify that he is proud of Munro or her work; rather he implies that he is proud of *their* story as the product of a collaborative process.

Munro's comments about "The Turkey Season" reveal that she too was satisfied with both the process of determining the story's final form and the final product itself. When asked, in an interview with Geoff Hancock (1982), about the stories Munro is happiest with, one of the three stories she mentions is "The Turkey Season," stating that she "thinks" the story "works pretty well" (82). Munro's reference to McGrath's "seamless collaboration" with her on the story suggests that she was not only comfortable with the editorial process in this instance, but also its result. The argument for Munro's satisfaction with McGrath's handling of this story is made more compelling when it is considered in

contrast with explicit statements of dissatisfaction she has made about other *New Yorker* editors' treatment of her work. Both Thacker and Beran, in their explorations of the changes *The New Yorker* made to stories included in the collection *The Love of a Good Woman* (1998), note that Munro drew attention to these changes in her "Author's Note": "Stories included in this collection that were previously published in *The New Yorker* appeared there in very different form" (Thacker 477; Beran 211; Munro n.pag). This note, combined with her decision to restore several of the stories that appear in this collection to a form that is closer to the stories as she initially submitted them to the magazine, suggests that she was not satisfied with the editorial influence on, or interference with, these stories. In *The Moons of Jupiter*, the collection in which "The Turkey Season" appeared, Munro makes no such comment. In fact, Beran notes, "The Macmillan typescript of *The Moons of Jupiter* suggests how satisfied Munro was with editing by the *New Yorker*: of the five stories that appeared in the magazine, four were given to Macmillan directly from the pages of the magazine without further revision" (206).

"The Turkey Season" represents an example in which the relationship between a *New Yorker* author and editor approaches something close to a dialogic collaboration, but this example is not representative of Munro's relationship with the magazine throughout her career. Rather, it is an extreme example that functions to demonstrate the influence that editors at the magazine had on Munro's development as a writer at a pivotal juncture in her career.¹²⁰ Lunsford and Ede claim that hierarchical modes of collaboration dominated the examples they studied, but they also, occasionally, came across "dialogical modalities—if not pure examples of dialogic collaboration" (134). Although in the 1990s the power dynamic between Munro and her *New Yorker* editors would become more hierarchical, as her comments about *The Love of a Good Woman* reveal, at this point in

¹²⁰ As Thacker writes: "Even though most of Munro's stories have scarcely needed such extensive reorganization, what McGrath did with "The Turkey Season" should be seen as indicative of the role of the *New Yorker* in Munro's development. . . . Thus from *The Moons of Jupiter* on, the editors at the *New Yorker* have played an important role in Munro's career" (*Writing Her Lives* 389).

Munro's relationship with the magazine she was, at least in practical terms, on an equal footing with her editor.

4.5 Reciprocal Influence: The American South and Munro's Role in Shaping Editorial Practice

As I stated in the introduction to this chapter, Beran has explored the effect of *The New Yorker's* "prudishness" and censorship of both vulgar language and depictions of sexuality on the representation of class (209), claiming that, thanks to the intervention of new, less conservative editors, the magazine became more open to using the kind of language it formerly censored from Munro's stories. While I will ultimately complicate this claim by suggesting that Munro played a role in opening the magazine up to the use of less genteel language, the example of "The Turkey Season," a story that was published before this transition to an openness to profane language and graphic depictions of sex took place, appears to support Beran's general claim about the magazine's censorial policies and their effect on Munro's work. Beran argues that the less-gritty presentation of Munro's stories within *The New Yorker* encourages readers to indulge in nostalgia for a lost, seemingly pastoral past (217; 213). Beran, I believe, overstates the case here. What is at stake in the magazine's publication of Munro's work is not the suspension of readers' critical faculties, but rather an issue of genre. The Alice Munro presented by *The New Yorker* is a less gothic, but more regional, author.

Lunsford and Ede describe collaborative writing as a process that involves learning to negotiate the dynamic between each author's individual voice in order to develop what is simultaneously a singular voice that represents both co-authors and a polyphonic chorus that is more than the sum of its (two) parts. They write: "we came ineluctably to hear within ourselves a large polyphonic chorus rather than just a duet" (xi) and, paradoxically, "In collaborating on writing this book we searched for a single voice—a way of submerging our individual perspectives for the sake of the collective 'we'" (1). In working together, McGrath and Munro also produce a third voice: the author construct or function that is "*The New Yorker's* Alice Munro." This "voice" is distinct from the voices of either McGrath or Munro as she is published in her short story collections. Because of the magazine's conservative editorial policies surrounding vulgarity, the work of *The New Yorker's* Alice Munro has a different relationship to place and to class than the work published by Alice Munro in her collections does: one that has

the potential to alter readers' generic interpretation of these stories. In the first decade of Munro's relationship with *The New Yorker*, the magazine emphasized her stories' regional characteristics while downplaying their gothic ones.

In "Alice Munro and the Anxiety of American Influence," Thacker suggests that Canadian critics' tendency to ignore the influences of writers of the American South on Munro's work stems from "anti-American attitudes," claiming that, with the exception of J.R. (Tim) Struthers' "Alice Munro and the American South" (1975) and Klaus P. Stich's study on the connection between Munro and Willa Cather, "no one to my knowledge has attempted to connect Munro's work to that of McCullers, O'Connor, Price, Morris, or several other American writers whom she has acknowledged as influences" (137;134). Munro recognizes the influence of these Southern Gothic writers in two interviews from which Struthers quotes at the beginning of his essay:

As a girl, Alice Munro lived in Huron County in rural Southwestern Ontario.

In an interview with Graeme Gibson, Munro remarked that

. . . the writers who first excited me were the writers of the American South, because I felt there a country being depicted that was like my own. I can think of several writers now who are working out of Southwestern Ontario. It is rich in possibilities in this way. I mean that part of the country I come from is absolutely Gothic. You can't get it all down. (qtd in Struthers 196)

Munro discusses the relationship between the American South and her own writing in greater detail with Mari Stainsby: "If I'm a regional writer, the region I'm writing about has many things in common with the American south" (qtd in Struthers 196). These two interviews highlight two of the characteristics Munro's work shares with the works of American writers such as Eudora Welty, Flannery O'Connor, and Carson McCullers: a focus on a particular region or place, and the gothic depiction of life and the inhabitants of that place through the grotesque. As Sarah Gleeson-White argues in her analysis of "grotesque" works in the essay "A Peculiarly Southern Form of Ugliness," like Munro, "Eudora Welty, Carson McCullers, and Flannery O'Connor have all acknowledged in one way or another the ugliness that saturates their fictional worlds, an ugliness that is so

frequently embodied—literally—in their female characters "(46). Beran has made clear, and the example of "The Turkey Season" demonstrates, though, that Munro's editors at *The New Yorker* habitually excised or toned down these grotesque descriptions in her work, especially when they referred to the female body.

Beran thoroughly documents the magazine's frequent requests that Munro tone down profane, disturbing or sexually explicit passages, beginning with references to "toilet noises" and "pickled arseholes" in "Royal Beatings," the first story she published with the magazine in 1977. "The Turkey Season" is also a good example of the phenomenon that Beran describes. It was McGrath who was responsible for conveying the idiosyncratic "naughty words" policies of Harold Ross, and later William Shawn, to Munro. In his discussion of the collection *The Moons of Jupiter*, W.R. Martin writes that this is one of the most successful stories in the volume: "Its vivid images horrify, and the low dialogue is utterly convincing; it has a taut dramatic structure producing a climax that brings together the various threads" (137). Martin's description of the "low dialogue" only applies to the story as it was published in *The Moons of Jupiter*, however, not the version that was published in *The New Yorker*. As the example of Del Jordan in *Lives of Girls and Women*, who is tempted to poke the eye of a dead cow, demonstrates, Munro's young female characters are often fascinated with the grotesque, and with the physical elements of death in a way that is almost scientific, and certainly unconventional for their gender and time period. By softening the narrator's description of some of the elements of "The Turkey Season" that he perceived as grotesque, such as dismembered turkey carcasses or sexually active middle-aged women, McGrath makes the narrator's observation of them appear less intense. McGrath's choices have the effect of gentrifying Munro's characters in a way that narrows (if only slightly) the gap between their rural ways of speaking and that of the magazine's (primarily) educated, urban audience. The changes make Munro's story more palatable to sensitive readers, but less characteristically grotesque and gothic.

When presented with a choice in Munro's first and second versions of the story between a more rural or idiomatic line of dialogue and one that is slightly more genteel, concise, or formally expressed, McGrath often chose the more formal option. Many of these choices apply to Herb, whom the narrator respects and sees as gentle and, in some

ways, above the level of the other townsfolk in his behaviour and sense of decorum.¹²¹

These choices not only tighten the dialogue; they also heighten the reader's sense of Herb as articulate, and therefore different from the rest of the turkey crew. In a similar fashion, McGrath opts to use the narrator's description of turkey tendons that is a complete sentence (from the first version) rather than the one that is a fragment (from the second version) but chooses, like Munro does in her second version of the story, to eliminate the word "writhing."¹²² These choices result in a sentence that is less graphic, and thus less likely to make a genteel *New Yorker* audience uncomfortable. They also give readers a sense of the narrator as someone who, in contrast to Del Jordan, is *not* inordinately interested in grotesque things such as turkey carcasses. The choice of a complete sentence over a sentence fragment also suggests that, like Herb Abbott, the narrator is educated, and hence separate from the rural speech patterns of Logan, Ontario. McGrath's choice to use the word "washroom" from Munro's second version of the story (38.9.29.f4 and 396.87.03.4.21.f5) rather than the less refined, and more graphic "toilet" from the first version (396/87.03.4.20.f4) has a similar effect.

The narrator's gentility and difference from the rest of the turkey-gutting crew is once again reinforced when she introduces Brian into the story. In typescript versions of the story, the narrator uses Brian's own profane language to establish his character.

Munro writes:

He had worked on a lake boat last summer. He said he had got sick of it, though, and quit.

What he actually said was, "yeah, fuckin' boats, yeah well, I got sick of that."

¹²¹ For example, McGrath chooses to use Herb's phrases "Knees up, Mother Brown. Now" rather than "Knees up Mother Brown. Now then," or "Break the strings, as many as you can" rather than "Break the strings now, as many as you can," or "Nice pair of earrings" instead of "Make nice earrings" in reference to the turkey's testicles (396/87.03/4.21.f2-f3; 396/87.03.4.20.f2-f3; 38.9.29.f2-f3).

¹²² Munro's first version reads: "Pearly-white strings, pulled out of the shank, were writhing and creeping about on their own" (396/87.03.4.20.f2). The second reads: "Pearly-white strings, pulled out of the shank, creeping about on their own" (38.9.29.f2).

Language at the Turkey Barn was coarse and free but the word fuck was not used lavishly there, at least not in the gutting-room in front of women, and his saying this seemed not careless but flaunting, mixing insult and provocation.

(396/87.03.4.20.f10-f11)

Given the magazine's naughty words policy, the profanities in Brian's and other characters' dialogue were unlikely to, and did not, make it into publication. In his 17 June 1980 letter to Munro that accompanies the galleys of the story based on McGrath's composite version, McGrath writes: "There's still the problem of 'shit' and 'fuck' (galleys 3 and 9, I believe), about which Mr. Shawn remains unyielding. (I can't defend this policy, but I can't change it, either, and I'm grateful for your patience and understanding.)" (38.3.4.8b). In the galleys themselves, McGrath leaves "the problem" to Munro, writing "Your fix" beside the lines in which Brian's dialogue has been removed, but offers a suggestion of his own (38.9.30.f9). When published in the magazine, Brian's use of "fuck" is not merely replaced with an alternative, less profane word. Instead, Brian's profanity is only described. The published version reads:

He had worked on a lake boat last summer. He said he had got sick of it, though, and quit.

Language at the Turkey Barn was coarse and free, but in telling us this Brian used an expression that is commonplace today but was not so then. It seemed not careless but flaunting, mixing insult and provocation. (*New Yorker* 40)

This toned-down passage is almost absurd in its gentility, and does not provide enough information for the reader to infer which expression Brian might have used. Once again, it serves to highlight the educated narrator's difference from the rest of the crew. In its preciousness, though, this substitution replaces the narrator's remembrance of her teenaged fascination with Brian and Herb with disdain, and elides the more gothic

elements of the narrator's own poor, rural upbringing.¹²³ This prudishness more closely aligns the narrator with the presumed target market of the magazine than to her co-workers.¹²⁴

Although a heightening of the class distinctions and educational gulf between the narrator (who remembers this story in adulthood) and the rest of the crew would make sense within the context of the story, other changes to the tone of the story are less easily rationalized. Marjorie's and Lily's dialogue, for example, is also tightened and made less vulgar. In the first version of the story Munro submitted, the narrator uses Lily and Marjorie's coarse language to give the reader a stronger sense of them as characters. Munro writes:

They sang at their work and talked abusively and intimately to the turkey carcasses.

"Don't you nick me now, you old bugger!"

¹²³ McGrath also opts to tone down some of the implied sexuality of the story. Munro's first version of the story suggests that Brian "never learned gutting so that he could do it reliably. Herb took him off that and told him he was to sweep and clean up, make packages of giblets and help load the truck" (396/87.03.4.20.f12). Munro's second draft of the story, however, is more explicit in its description how Brian fails, or at least pretends to fail, as a gutter: "Brian was not a good gutter. He said his hands were too big. I can't squeeze it in, he kept saying, no, I can't squeeze it in. He made many appropriate twists and thrusts. So Herb took him off gutting, told him he was to sweep and clean up, make packages of giblets and help load the truck" (38.9.29.f9). Brian's veiled boast about being well-endowed here provides an appropriate context and background for the exhibitionism he later displays towards Gladys, but this suggestive description appears to have been too blatantly sexual to make into the pages of *The New Yorker*; it does not appear in the version of the story published in *The New Yorker*, nor does it make it into McGrath's composite. McGrath keeps the phrase "He said his hands were too big," but cuts any description of Brian's suggestive gestures (396/87.03.f12).

¹²⁴ Munro partially restores the profanity to the version of the story that was published in *The Moons of Jupiter*. Munro's archives contain pages of the published version of this story torn from the magazine on which Munro, writing by hand, has partially restored this passage, presumably in preparation for the publication of the story in *The Moons of Jupiter*. The restored version reads:

He said he had got sick of it, though, and quit.

What he said was, "Fuckin boats I got outta that." His saying this seemed not careless but flaunting, mixing insult and provocation. (38.9.31f5)

"Aren't you the regular old shit-factory!" (396/87.03.4.20.f3-f4).

Although it is Mr. Shawn who insisted on replacing the word "shit" with the less vulgar "crap," McGrath is the one who chose to use the phrasing from Munro's second draft that eliminates the word "regular" from the description of Marjorie's and Lily's conversations with the turkeys they gut. "Regular," like "now" and "then" in Herb's speech, is not necessary to the meaning of the dialogue, but the use of extra syllables adds a rural element to their dialogue. As Ailsa Cox has explained, "Munro makes extensive use of what Bakhtin calls 'speech genres' – the familiar conventions appropriate to a particular context When registers clash, they often indicate social ideological conflict" (45). In choosing tighter over more idiomatic dialogue, McGrath gentrifies characters' speech and, to a certain extent, mutes the ideological, class and intellectual diversity of the story's characters. Although the toned-down "options" McGrath chooses quite often come from one of the two versions that Munro sent to McGrath, the way that he combines these two versions works to purge some of the grittiness, raw sexuality and unrefined speech patterns from the story in a way that, at times, undermines Munro's characters' "deliberate lack of gentility" (Beran 209).

Beran's critique of the ways in which the magazine has "toned down" Munro's stories has a lot of merit, but Munro's responses to attempts to make her work more genteel also serves as an example of the ways in which her relationship with *The New Yorker* has given her the opportunity to shape editorial practice at the magazine. As Beran herself admits: "Munro knew of the magazine's conservative policies before the publication of her first story there, yet she continued to send her editors stories containing the types of language and description that she knew they would censor" (210). This perseverance is evident in her consistent reinsertion of profanity, as occurs in the galleys of "The Turkey Season," when her editors attempt to remove or "tone down" this kind of language in her work. On the composite galley of the story below McGrath's note, "I'm still negotiating on this!" for example, Munro writes the words "shit factory" back into the description of Lily and Marjorie's conversation (f3), just as she reinserts the sentence "what he actually said was 'Fuckin' boats, I got outa that" even though, ultimately it was McGrath's significantly toned down alternative that the magazine printed (f9). By

consistently submitting work that contained profane language and graphic descriptions, and consistently reiterating on galleys her desire to see that exact language and description printed, Munro may have actually played a role in the loosening up of editorial practice at *The New Yorker*. Beran concedes that, by the time Munro published "Five Points" in 1988, she was permitted to print a post-coital scene Beran describes as "fairly explicit," and a male character, Neil, is permitted to say "shit" (209).

Beran argues that it was the hiring of Tina Brown as general editor of the magazine in the 1990s, and her "editorial policies" that "meant less censorship of previously restricted types of language and description" for Munro (213). Over time, though, it appears that Munro's response to the consistent censorship of her grotesque descriptions helped to shape these editorial policies. Beran lists "[t]he repeated reference to 'the rat' between Dina's legs in 'Lichen'" (1984) being changed to "'the pelt'" as one of several examples of the magazine's attempts to "tone down" Munro's language (207-208), but I see the inclusion of this description at all as a coup for Munro. McGrath expressed admiration for "Lichen," but suggests Munro alter some of imagery in the story, writing:

the editing in this case consists mostly of my querying or toning down some of the crotch imagery. I've done this in a couple of places, of course (in that line about "beaver," for example), for the sake of upholding the magazine's usual prudishness in these matters, but in some cases I've been more concerned—more seriously concerned—to keep the whole theme from seeming too insistent or obvious. The real magic of this story, it seems to me, is the way it earns and then miraculously effects the transformation of pubic hair into lichen, but I think it should happen effortlessly and almost invisibly—as it does in the photograph—and without, say, the additional reference to the rat between Diana's legs. (15 October 1984. 396/87.3.2.13)

Despite McGrath's suggestion, the reference to "the rat between Diana's legs" stayed. In recounting "what passes between [McGrath and Barber] as a raucous conversation" in a 27 September 1984 letter to Munro, Barber wrote: "He [McGrath] claims you've broken new ground at the New Yorker which has never before referred or alluded to crotch shots.

Mr. Shawn said, 'the central image gave me misgivings, but the writer has earned the right to use it.' SO, you've a dirty mind Alice Munro, but it's a talented dirty mind and that's O.K." (396/87.3.2a.I).¹²⁵ Munro's editors at *The New Yorker* may have limited her use of profanity and shaped the portrayal of sexuality in her stories, but eventually her stature as a writer, combined with the trust she had earned from her editors and a refusal to preemptively capitulate to the magazine's conservative mores in her submissions, put her in an ideal position to be able to help shape editorial practice. Beran argues that Brown's editorship of *The New Yorker* helped to make the magazine open to frank depictions of sexuality (211). It is likely, though, that Munro's work helped to pave the way for an editor like Brown. The fact that Menaker refers to Munro as "a kind of trailblazer, structurally and aesthetically" (qtd in Timson), reinforces this reading of Munro's work as helping to shape editorial practice at the magazine.

4.6 "World Famous in Canada": Munro's Regionalism as a Marketing Tool

Within the pages of *The New Yorker*, Munro's work has become more closely associated with regional fiction, and with a particular region of Canada, than with the gothic or the grotesque. This generic phenomenon lends insight into a specific stage of the magazine's shifting relationship with setting in the fiction that it published. As the example of Callaghan demonstrates, in its early years, the magazine often rejected or altered the setting of fiction not set in "Manhattan." In the years after the Second World War, editors rejected Gallant's early work as too specifically Canadian in tone and setting, but ultimately came to accept stories set Connecticut, New York, and Florida, as well as Montreal and the urban centres of Europe. In the late 1970s when Alice Munro began her career with the magazine, *The New Yorker* appears to have especially sought out what, from its home in New York, it perceived as "regional" fiction.

¹²⁵ Thacker also outlines the exchange between McGrath, Barber and Munro over the depiction of the "crotch shot" in "Lichen" in *Alice Munro: Writing Her Lives* (410).

The consistent choice to peg Munro's stories as taking place in "Logan, Ontario" heightens the sense of these stories' settings' difference from the urban, affluent lives of *The New Yorker's* presumed audience.¹²⁶ Beran has argued that, combined with the explicit presentation of Munro's work as fiction in the magazine, the focus on her stories' settings as "other" and "safely out of reach in the 1950s," along with the advertisements and cartoons that "provide escape from the difficult problems presented" in her work, draw attention away from Munro's "social commentary" (Beran 222-23).¹²⁷ As my study of the presentation of Mavis Gallant's stories within the pages of the magazine demonstrates, however, it seems unlikely that surrounding a literary work with advertisements for luxury goods offers a strong enough inducement for readers to completely suspend their ability to think critically when approaching Munro's work. What the "pegging" of Munro's work does do, however, is intensify, and make easily recognizable, "*The New Yorker's* Alice Munro" as a "brand."

The magazine once known for only publishing fiction set in locations to which a New Yorker might travel has deliberately presented Munro's work as regionalist. In a 1994 article by the fiction editor Roger Angell about what makes a *New Yorker* story, Angell seems to suggest that stories – particularly series of stories – with a recognizably regional setting are especially attractive to *New Yorker* readers and editors. He writes: "Now and then, a writer stakes out an entire region of the imagination and of the countryside—one thinks of Cheever, Salinger, Donald Barthelme, and Raymond Carver, and now Alice Munro and William Trevor—which becomes theirs alone, marked in our minds by unique inhabitants and terrain" (107). We can see in Angell's use of "theirs" and

¹²⁶ As "Theory and Practice of Editing New Yorker Articles" indicates:

Another one of Mr. Ross' theories is that a reader picking up a magazine called *The New Yorker* automatically supposes that any story in it takes place in New York. If it doesn't, if it's about Columbus, Ohio, the lead should say so. "When George Adams was sixteen, he began to worry about girls" should read "When George Adams was sixteen, he began to worry about the girls he saw every day on the streets of Columbus" or something of the kind. More graceful preferably. (123.6.f2)

¹²⁷ Robert McGill makes a similar argument about the dangers of depicting small town life as idyllic in "Somewhere I've Been Meaning to Tell You: Alice Munro's Fiction of Distance."

"terrain" an emphasis on the salability of uniqueness. Rather than diminishing readers' experience of Munro's depiction of the rural poor in her work, *The New Yorker's* insistence upon "pegging" has emphasized the role of place in Munro's fiction. In intensifying readers' association of Munro with the genre of regionalism rather than the gothic, the magazine may well have helped to develop the familiar branding or shorthand with which her work is often described: "Munro Country" (Strayed).

The New Yorker helped to solidify readers' association of Munro with a particular geographical region during a period in which Munro's own perception of her work as regionalist was still evolving. Ross claims that in Munro's "early writing place mattered more than people—southern gothic writers taught her the importance of writing about her own region" (57). Munro herself tentatively accepted the label of regional writer in her 1971 interview with Stainsby (qtd in Struthers 196,). By 1982, however, the year *The Moons of Jupiter* was published and after Munro had been publishing with *The New Yorker* for a few years, she more or less rejected this regionalist label in an interview with Hancock, saying, "A lot of people think I'm a regional writer. And I use the region where I grew up a lot. But I don't have any idea of writing to show the kinds of things that happen in a certain place. These things happen and the place is part of it. But in a way it's incidental" (qtd in Howells, 3). After nearly two more decades of publishing with *The New Yorker*, however, Munro appears to have embraced the categorization of her work as regionalist or, at the very least, accepted that marketing her work in this way has been successful. In her 1998 Introduction to her *Selected Stories*, she responds to the question "Are you a regionalist?" by writing:

The reason I write so often about the country to the east of Lake Huron is just that I love it. It means something to me that no other country can—no matter how important historically that other country may be, how "beautiful," how lively and interesting. I am intoxicated by this particular landscape, by the almost flat fields, the swamps, the hardwood bush lots, by the continental climate with its extravagant winters. I am at home with the brick houses, the falling-down barns, the occasional farms that have swimming pools and airplanes, the trailer parks, burdensome old churches, Wal-Mart, and Canadian Tire. I speak the language.

When I write about something happening in this setting, I don't think I'm choosing to be confined. Quite the opposite. I don't think I'm writing just *about* this life. I hope to be writing about and *through* it. (x-xi)

This statement reflects Munro's very different relationship to place from that of either Callaghan or Gallant. Unlike Callaghan, who considered himself an American in intellectual spirit, and Gallant, who actively rejected the attachment of any national affiliation to her work, Munro is comfortable both depicting a Canadian setting and identifying herself as a Canadian author, but does not advocate for any kind of literary nationalism. For *The New Yorker*, however, "place" does not appear to be "incidental;" *The New Yorker's* Alice Munro has been actively constructed as a regional writer.

As I have argued throughout this chapter, Munro's well-established literary reputation put her in a position to negotiate with her editors at the magazine. Beran is inclined to read editorial intervention in Munro's work as an act of corruption, but Munro readily "authorized" the "pegging" of her work. Since she tried, without success, to publish her work with the magazine early in her career, Munro was presumably aware of the benefits of being a "*New Yorker* writer," and was will willing to exchange some authorial and generic autonomy for the privilege. The cover design of *The Moons of Jupiter* serves as just one example of the ways in which association with *The New Yorker* has contributed to Munro's critical, financial, and popular success. In his discussion of the recognizable typeface Rea Irvin designed for the magazine, Yagoda points out that it is often used to advertise products because it connotes a certain "upscale urbanity" (13). One of the examples of this phenomenon that he cites is the cover of Alice Munro's collection *The Moons of Jupiter*. The 1991 Vintage Contemporaries edition of *The Moons of Jupiter* prints the collection's title in the Irvin typeface on its cover and spine, a design decision that was likely made with highlighting Munro's connection to the magazine, and thus helping readers to recognize her name and work, in mind. As Thacker points out in an allusion to Mordecai Richler, before publishing with *The New Yorker*, Munro, who is now readily recognized as one of the world's best short story writers in the English language, was only "world famous in Canada" ("Canadian Literature's 'America'" 135). Rather than demonstrating the kind of tension between understandings of nation that

Gallant's editorial relationships do, Munro's relationship with McGrath, by intensifying her oeuvre's association with Huron County, functioned to make her work more readily marketable.

4.7 Munro as Regionalist and Attempts to Avoid Canadian Literary Nationalism

In *Border Fictions: Globalization, Empire, and Writing at the Boundaries of the United States*, Claudia Sadowski-Smith suggests that "The ways in which publishing industries shape the hemispheric production of literature need to be examined further to avoid reinforcing the mechanisms of the literary marketplace in the academic realm" (143). She argues that the treatment and reception of Munro's work reinforce the mechanisms of the literary marketplace, writing: "Even though the writing of Alice Munro, for example, clearly shows the influence of her home – Huron County, Ontario – with protagonists and towns reflecting that part of Canada, the specificity of this location is marginalized every time she is included in collections of the best U.S. American short stories" (142).

Thacker, however, critiques this type of thinking, and argues:

Canadian academics of nationalist leanings – and without question this describes most critics of Canadian literature – certainly share the values of their larger society and . . . have probably a stronger sense of wariness toward the United States and its influences than the so-called "person on the street" who is not professionally engaged in what in Canada are called "the cultural industries." ("Gazing Through," 77)

In both her fiction and in her stewardship of her authorial brand, Munro the regionalist manages to express comfort with her identity as a Canadian writer while rejecting the literary nationalism Thacker attributes to scholars of Munro's work.

Rather than revealing editors' attempts to de-nationalize her work or demonstrating tension between understandings and conceptions of nation, the Munro archives reveal an author who actively rejects nationalist readings of her authorial position as marginal. Unlike Callaghan and Gallant, Munro does actively identify herself

as a Canadian writer, and attributes characteristics of her work and the trajectory of her career to her position as a Canadian and as a woman. In a recent *New York Times* article about Munro's official retirement from writing, McGrath quotes Munro, whom he claims "knew absolutely that she wanted to be a writer" from the age of 14, "But back then you didn't go around announcing something like that . . . You didn't call attention. Maybe it was being Canadian, maybe it was being a woman. Maybe both." Similarly, Munro identifies herself with Canadian culture in a recent interview with Mark Medley in the *National Post* in which she critiques the colonial attitudes of scholars whom she encountered early in her career, before Canadian literature was established as a legitimate field of study.¹²⁸

¹²⁸ The exchange between Medley and Munro was as follows:

Post: In your acceptance speech, you said that when you started writing, there was a lack of Canadian writers.

Munro: Well, there were a lot of people who didn't believe there was such a thing as a Canadian writer. It was a very odd thing, that there was such a feeling of — Doug, what would you say that feeling was?

Douglas Gibson, Munro's longtime publisher, who's standing nearby, joins the conversation.

Gibson: You have the amazing story of being at a cocktail party in Vancouver, where a professor said loudly and confidently, 'Of course, I never read fiction by Canadians.'

Munro: Yes, that's what he said!

Gibson: And that was regarded as a normal thing to say. Is anyone saying that aloud today?

Munro: Yes, that proved, to him, that he was a 'serious' person. And I think the same thing would apply to women. I remember lots of times hearing a man say, 'Of course, I never read anything written by a woman.'

Gibson: Really?

Munro: Oh sure!

Post: Did you take it personally?

Munro: No. But I thought that's the kind of jerk he is, that's all.

Munro's response, to identify professors who refused to read literature written by Canadian women as "jerks," indicates implicitly that Munro identified her own work with Canada and Canadianness. Despite

Munro has, as Thacker claims, "deliberately remained a sideline observer of the politics of 'CanLit'" (*Writing Her Lives* 381). In the Introduction to her *Selected Stories*, Munro describes the kind of writer her readers imagine her to be: "I keep an eye on feminism and Canada and try to figure out my duty to both." Her facetious tone in this passage, along with the line "This isn't exactly the kind of writer I'd like to be, but I wouldn't mind being a little more that way" (ix), suggests quite the opposite: that Munro is concerned, not with the larger implications of the ways in which she represents Canada or women, but rather, with depicting the individual human complexity of characters who happen to live in Canada. Munro revealed this ability to negotiate identification as a Canadian writer with a refusal to promote Canadian literature for its own sake early on. Thacker quotes the interview in which Munro identifies "the writers of the American South" as her primary influences in order to point out the "crucial" "tag line" which followed the list of authors' names: "'I'm sorry these are all Americans but that's the way it is'" (133-4). Here, Munro demonstrates an awareness of the expectation that she will name other Canadian writers as her primary literary influences, and apologizes (in a stereotypically Canadian fashion) for her failure to do so, but ultimately refuses to capitulate to that nationalist expectation. This response suggests that, even early in her career, Munro was "an artist utterly beyond *any* chauvinism" (Thacker, *Writing Her Lives* 141). She was so comfortable with, and confident about, her identity as a Canadian writer that she was open to American literary influence, and did not feel the need to participate in the promotion of Canadian literature for its own sake.

Munro's resistance to nationalism would inform her decision to actively intervene in the representation of her position as a Canadian author as marginal to that of American publishers, agents, and editors. In at least one instance, Munro has used her authority over her own archival material to withhold consent to quote from the material located within it in order to hinder the publication of overtly nationalist scholarship. In her 1999 article,

this identification, however, and her choice to consistently set her stories within an identifiably Canadian context, Munro is not an active nationalist.

McCaig quotes from Munro's archive to argue that, because of the asymmetrical power relationship between Canada and the United States, Munro's career would have stagnated without the help of her American agent, Barber, since Weaver had failed to help Munro to publish in the United States. McCaig also claims that what Barber perceived as stumbling blocks on the road to Munro's literary ascent stemmed from national difference:

Munro's nationality was also starting to be seen as a handicap to be overcome. Like her gender, her Canadianness was something that needed to be suppressed in order for her to achieve authority. For example, Barber confessed to disappointment at being unable to find an American publisher for one of Munro's works: "OK, we will send *Tamarack Review* 'Working for a Living,' but I'm not happy about that. The piece deserves a Universal Showcase and our failure to sell it has been a real frustration for us" (AMP, MsC 38.3.63.52). (McCaig, "Alice Munro's Agency" 96).

Metcalf used McCaig's article to support his own controversial claims in a 2000 *National Post* article entitled "Canada's Successful Writers Must Rely on Blessing from U.S. First" in which he argued that "Canadian society is incapable of making a book a 'classic'; cannot 'elect,' as it were, books of significance" and that "Alice Munro's career is an American construct, that her popularity in Canada is a result of American endorsement." Metcalf's incendiary claims sparked strong responses within the pages of the *National Post* from cultural workers and their family members, including Munro herself, who defended Weaver and criticized McCaig's scholarship, writing: "Robert Weaver did not function as my agent in the United States because he is not an agent . . . I do not understand why Mr. Weaver should be faulted, but I do know that the academic essay that Mr. Metcalf quoted in his article is riddled with bizarre assumptions and was written with blatant disregard for fact" ("Alice Munro Writes"). The preface to McCaig's monograph, *Reading In: Alice Munro's Archives*, an extended version of the article McCaig had previously published, outlines the history of this controversy, and states bluntly: "This is not the book I wanted to publish. This is not the book I originally wrote." She explains that, since Munro, Barber, and Knopf editor Ann Close "declined"

to give [her] permission to quote from their correspondence" in her book, she had been forced to "drastically" edit it for publication. That Munro appears to have granted permission for other scholars, such as Thacker and Beran, to quote from her archives implies that, in this instance, her refusal is a response to the nationalist backlash that discussion of McCaig's initial article sparked, and in which Munro wants no part.

In avoiding participating in debates about national literatures by denying permission to quote from her archives, Munro actively refuses readings that suggest that her position as a Canadian within the U.S. literary establishment is a marginal one. Stephen Henighan's post-NAFTA argument in *When Words Deny the World* that being Canadian is a literary liability may be based on his own and other writers' experiences of being told that their work is "too Canadian" to be marketable (91), but Munro has managed to simultaneously acknowledge her Canadianness, profit from her association with an American literary institution, and, on occasion, even influence the editorial practices of that institution.

On 19 January 1979, while preparing to publish the collection *Who Do You Think You Are?*, Munro received a letter from Close about the "question of title." McCaig quotes from the letter:

We (Bob, Ginger and I, plus others here) would very much like to call the book *The Beggar Maid*, with a subtitle: Stories of Flo and Rose. I'm not sure that I can quite tell you why I think that title is better for the U.S. edition, but I will try. *Who Do You Think YOU Are?* with that jacket [presumably, the Canadian edition with the reproduction of Ken Danby's *The Sunbather*] seems to me just right for the Canadian book. There is something a little sassy about it, and the art work is immediately known there, so I would guess that it hits just the right note of national pride and recognition. Here we need to establish you as a Canadian, yes, but mainly as a writer of distinction. *The Beggar Maid* seems to us all a more memorable title, and will hopefully remind people of the story in the *New Yorker*, which as you know from Ginger got an enormous response. (AMP, 38.1.3.6a) (qtd in McCaig, "Alice Munro's Agency," 97)

This letter, like the response to the announcement of Munro's being named as a Nobel Laureate, highlights several of the factors that have affected the reception of Munro's work in North America. These factors include, among others, perceptions of national difference, the strategic design of the covers for her collections of short stories, and association with *The New Yorker*. Throughout her career, both before and after she began publishing with the magazine, Munro has written primarily about the Southwestern Ontario communities with which she is familiar, and publically claimed her identity as a Canadian writer. She has done so while submitting her stories primarily to an American publication. At an important point in Munro's career, when both her literary aesthetic and her reputation were in transition, Munro worked with McGrath, a representative for a magazine with one of the strongest fiction rosters in the world. This relationship, which intensified readers' focus on her regional settings, allowed Alice Munro to develop her current position as – in the words of Close – "a Canadian, yes, but mainly as a writer of distinction" (McCaig 97).

Works Cited

- Alice Munro Papers. Special Collections Division, University of Calgary Library.
Accessed 10-23 December 2009.
- Angell, Roger. "Storyville." *The New Yorker* 27 June, 1994: 104-117. Web. 22 Oct. 2013.
- Barber, Virginia. Letter to Alice Munro. 27 Sept. 1984. TS. The Alice Munro Papers. Special Collections Division, University of Calgary Library. 396/87.3.2a.I.
- Beran, Carol L. "The Luxury of Excellence: Alice Munro in the *New Yorker*." *The Rest of the Story: Critical Essays on Alice Munro*. Ed. Robert Thacker. Toronto: ECW, 1999. 204-232. Print.
- Bowen, Deborah. "In Camera: The Developed Photographs of Margaret Laurence and Alice Munro." *Studies in Canadian Literature* 13.1(1988): 20-33. Print.
- C.K. Squires of Stockholm. "The New Yorker. . ." Profile of the magazine. 1961. TS. The New Yorker Records, Humanities and Social Sciences Library, Manuscripts and Archives Division, New York Public Library. Box 1324, File 5.
- Cheever, John. "The Art of Fiction No. 62." Interview by Annette Grant. *The Paris Review* 67 (1976): n.pag. Web. 19 July 2013.
- Corse, Sarah M. *Nationalism and Literature: The Politics of Culture in Canada and the United States*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1997. Print.
- Cox, Ailsa. *Alice Munro*. Tavistock, UK: Northcote House, 2004. Print.
- Desmond, Jane. "Transnational American Studies and the Limits to Collaboration: Implications Drawn from the Russian-U.S. Relationship." *Post Soviet American Studies* 41.2/2 (2003): 17-27. Web. 22 Jun 2013
- Douglas, George H. *The Smart Magazines: 50 Years of Literary Revelry and High Jinks at Vanity Fair, The New Yorker, Life, Esquire and The Smart Set*. Hamden:

Archon Books, 1991. Print.

Ede, Lisa and Andrea Lunsford. *Singular Texts/Plural Authors: Perspectives on Collaborative Writing*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1990.

Francesconi, Sabrina. "Negotiation of Naming in Alice Munro's 'Meneseung.'" *Journal of the Short Story in English* 55 (2010): n. pag. Web. 20 July 2013.

Garreau, Joel. *The Nine Nations of North America*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1981. Print.

Gibbs, Wolcott. "Theory and Practice of Editing New Yorker Articles." c. 1940. TS. *The New Yorker* Records. New York Public Library Humanities and Social Sciences Library, Manuscript and Archives Division. Box 123, File 6.

Gleeson-White, Sarah. "A Peculiarly Southern Form of Ugliness: Eudora Welty, Carson McCullers, and Flannery O'Connor." *Southern Literary Journal* 36.1 (2003): 46-57. Web. 22 Oct. 2013.

Hanly, Charles. "Autobiography and Creativity: Alice Munro's Story 'Fits.'" *Reflections: Autobiography and Canadian Literature*. Ottawa: U Ottawa P, 163-174

Henighan, Stephen. *When Words Deny the World: The Reshaping of Canadian Writing*. Erin: The Porcupine's Quill, 2002. Print.

Howells, Coral Ann. *Alice Munro*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1998. Print.

Kiernan, Frances. "Fiction at *The New Yorker*." *American Scholar* 67.4 (1998). Web. 20 Jun 2013.

Kunkel, Thomas. *Genius in Disguise: Harold Ross of The New Yorker*. New York: Random House, 1995. Print.

Laird, Holly. "'A Hand Spills from the Book's Threshold': Coauthorship's Readers." *PMLA* 116.2 (2001): 344-353. Web. 22 Oct. 2013.

- London, Bette. *Writing Double: Women's Literary Partnerships*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1999. Print.
- Manguel, Alberto, and Craig Stephenson. "Introduction to 'The Turkey Season.'" *Meanwhile, in Another Part of the Forest: Gay Stories from Alice Munro to Yukio Mishima*. Ed. Alberto Manguel and Craig Stephenson. Toronto: Knopf, 1994. 192. Print.
- Martin, W.R. *Alice Munro: Paradox and Parallel*. Edmonton: U of Alberta P, 1987. Print.
- McCaig, JoAnn. "Alice Munro's Agency: The Virginia Barber Correspondence, 1976-1983." *The Rest of the Story: Critical Essays on Alice Munro*. Ed. Robert Thacker. Toronto: ECW, 1999. 81-102. Print.
- . *Reading In: Alice Munro's Archives*. Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier UP, 2002. Print.
- McCarthy, Dermot. "The Woman Out Back: Alice Munro's 'Meneseteung.'" *Studies in Canadian Literature* 19.1 (1994): n. pag. Web. 20 July 2013.
- McGann, Jerome J. *The Textual Condition*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton UP, 1991. Print.
- McGill, Robert. "Somewhere I've Been Meaning to Tell You: Alice Munro's Fiction of Distance." *Journal of Commonwealth Literature* 37.1 (2002): 9-29. Print.
- McGrath, Charles. "Alice Munro Puts Down Her Pen to Let the World In." *New York Times* 1 July 2013. Web. 20 July 2013.
- . Letter to Alice Munro. 2 June 1980. TS. The Alice Munro Papers. Special Collections Division, University of Calgary Library. 38.2.4.7.
- . Letter to Alice Munro. 17 June 1980. TS. The Alice Munro Papers. Special Collections Division, University of Calgary Library. 38.2.4.8.
- . Letter to Alice Munro. 1 Dec. 1980. TS. The Alice Munro Papers. Special Collections Division, University of Calgary Library. 38.2.4.12.

- . Letter to Alice Munro. 15 Oct. 1984. TS. The Alice Munro Papers. Special Collections Division, University of Calgary Library. 396/87.3.2.13.
- . "Re: READER MAIL: Charles McGrath – NULL." Message to Nadine Fladd 26 April 2010. E-mail.
- Medley, Mark. "Alice Munro: 'It's nice to go out with a bang.'" *National Post* 19 June 2013. Web. 20 June 2013.
- Metcalf, John. "Canada's Successful Writers Must Rely on Blessings from the US. First." *National Post* 17 June, 2000: E4-5. Web. 19 Aug. 2010.
- Munro, Alice. "A Conversation with Alice Munro." By John Metcalf. *Journal of Canadian Fiction* 1.4 (1972): 54-62. Print.
- . "Alice Munro Writes." *National Post* 29 June 2000: A15. Web. 19 Aug. 2010.
- . "Amundsen." *The New Yorker* 27 Aug. 2012. Web. 26 July 2013.
- . "An Interview with Alice Munro." By Geoffrey Hancock. *Canadian Fiction Magazine* 43(1982): 74-114. Print.
- . "Go Ask Alice." Interview by Alice Quinn. *The New Yorker* 19 Feb. 2001. 8 May 2010. Web. 22 Oct. 2013.
- . "Introduction." *Selected Stories*. Toronto: Penguin, 1998. ix-xvii. Print.
- . *Lives of Girls and Women: A Novel*. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson, 1971. Print.
- . "Lying Under the Apple Tree." *The New Yorker* 17 June 2002. 88-114. Web. 22 Oct. 2013.
- . *The Love of a Good Woman*. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1998. Print.
- . "Meneseteung." *Friend of My Youth*. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1990. 50-73. Print.

- . "Meneseteung." *The New Yorker* 11 Jan. 1988. 28-38. Web. 22 Oct. 2013.
- . Galleys of "Meneseteung." TS. The Alice Munro Papers. Special Collections Division, University of Calgary Library. 753/04.3 – 3.2.
- . *The Moons of Jupiter*. New York: Vintage, 1991. Print.
- . "Munro on 'Morningside.'" Interview by Don Harron. *Morningside*. CBC. 5 Jan. 1978. Radio.
- . "On 'Dear Life': An Interview with Alice Munro." By Deborah Treisman. "Page-Turner": *The New Yorker Online* 20 Nov. 2012. Web. 26 July 2013.
- . "The Real Material: An Interview with Alice Munro." By J.R. (Tim) Struthers. *Probable Fictions: Alice Munroe's Narrative Acts*. Ed. Louis K. MacKendrick. Downsview, Ont.: ECW, 1983. 5-36. Print.
- . "Royal Beatings." *The New Yorker* 14 Mar. 1977. 36-44. Web. 22 Oct. 2013.
- . *Selected Stories*. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1996. Print.
- . *Something I've Been Meaning to Tell You*. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson, 1974. Print.
- . "The Turkey Season." *The New Yorker* 29 Dec. 1980. 36-44. Web. 22 Oct. 2013
- . "The Turkey Season" (with holograph revisions). *The New Yorker* 29 Dec. 1980. 36-44. The Alice Munro Papers. Special Collections Division, University of Calgary Library. 38.9.31.
- . Draft of "The Turkey Season." n.d. TS. The Alice Munro Papers. Special Collections Division, University of Calgary Library. 38.9.29.
- . Draft of "The Turkey Season." n.d. TS. The Alice Munro Papers. Special Collections Division, University of Calgary Library. 396/87.03.4.20.
- . Draft of "The Turkey Season." n.d. TS. The Alice Munro Papers. Special Collections

Division, University of Calgary Library. 396/87.03.4.21.

---. Galleys for "The Turkey Season." 9 June 1980. TS. The Alice Munro Papers. Special Collections Division, University of Calgary Library. 38.9.30.

---. *The View from Castle Rock*. Toronto: Penguin, 2006. Print.

---. "What Is Real." *Canadian Forum* 62 (September 1982): 5, 36. Print.

Nesbitt, Paula D. and Linda E. Thomas. "Beyond Feminism: An Intercultural Challenge for Transforming the Academy." *Common Ground: Feminist Collaboration in the Academy*. Ed. Elizabeth G. Peck and JoAnna Stephens. Albany: SUNY P, 1998. 31-49. Print.

Orange, John. "Alice Munro and a Maze of Time." *Probable Fictions: Alice Munro's Narrative Acts*. Ed. Louis K. MacKendrick. Downsview: ECW, 1983. 83-98. Print.

Osachoff, Margaret Gail. "'Treacheries of the Heart': Memoir, Confession, and Meditation in the Stories of Alice Munro." *Probable Fictions: Alice Munro's Narrative Acts*. Ed. Louis K. MacKendrick. Downsview: ECW, 1983. 61- 82. Print.

Redekop, Magdalene. *Mothers and Other Clowns: The Stories of Alice Munro*. London: Routledge, 1992. Print.

Ross, Catherine Sheldrick. *Alice Munro: A Double Life*. Toronto: ECW, 1992. Print.

Ross, Harold. Letter to K.S. White. 28 Apr. 1933. TS. *The New Yorker* Records. New York Public Library Humanities and Social Sciences Library, Manuscript and Archives Division. Box 14, File 15.

Rowe, John Carlos. "Postnationalism, Globalism, and the New American Studies." *The Futures of American Studies*. Ed. Donald E. Pease and Robyn Wiegman. Durham: Duke UP, 2002. 167-182. Print.

- Sadowski-Smith, Claudia. *Border Fictions: Globalization, Empire, and Writing at the Boundaries of the United States*. Charlottesville: U of Virginia P, 2008. Print.
- Somacarerra. "Exploring the Impenetrability of Narrative: A Study of Linguistic Modality in Alice Munro's Early Fiction." *Studies in Canadian Literature* 21.1 (1996): n.p. Web.
- Steinberg, Saul. "View of the World from 9th Avenue." *The New Yorker* 29 March, 1976. Cover. Web. 22 Oct. 2013.
- Steele, Appollonia and Jean F. Tenere, eds. *The Alice Munro Papers: First Accession*. Canadian Archival Inventory Series, no. 7. Calgary: U of Calgary P, 1986. Print.
- . *The Alice Munro Papers: Second Accession*. Canadian Archival Inventory Series, no. 12. Calgary: U of Calgary P, 1987. Print.
- Stich, Klaus P. "Letting Go with the Mind: Dionysus and Medusa in Alice Munro's 'Meneseteung.'" *Canadian Literature* 169 (2001): 106-125. Web. 22 Oct. 2013.
- Stillinger, Jack. *Multiple Authorship and the Myth of Solitary Genius*. New York: Oxford UP, 1991. Print.
- Strayed, Cheryl. "Munro Country." *The Missouri Review* 32.2 (2009): n. pag. Web. 23 July 2013.
- Struthers, J.R. (Tim). "Alice Munro and the American South." *Canadian Review of American Studies* 6 (1975): 196-204. Web. 22 Oct. 2013.
- Thacker, Robert. "Alice Munro and the Anxiety of American Influence." *Context North America: Canadian / U.S. Literary Relations*. Ed. Camille La Bossière. Ottawa: U of Ottawa P, 1994. 133-144. Print.
- . *Alice Munro: Writing Her Lives: A Biography*. Toronto, McClelland & Stewart, 2005. Print.
- . "Alice Munro's Willa Cather." *Canadian Literature* 134 (1992): 42-47. Web. 13 May

2013.

---. "Canadian Literature's 'America.'" *Essays on Canadian Writing* 71 (2000): 128-39. Print.

---. "'Clear Jelly': Alice Munro's Narrative Dialectics." *Probable Fictions: Alice Munro's Narrative Acts*. Ed. Louis K. MacKendrick. Downsview, Ont.: ECW, 1983. 37-60. Print.

---. "Gazing Through the One-Way Mirror: English-Canadian Literature and the American Presence." *Colby Quarterly* 29.2 (1993): 74-87. Print.

---. "Go Ask Alice: The Progress of Munro Criticism." *Journal of Canadian Studies/Revue d'Etudes Canadiennes* 26.2(1991): 156-70. Print.

---, ed. "Introduction: Alice Munro, Writing 'Home': 'Seeing This Trickle in Time.'" *The Rest of the Story: Critical Essays on Alice Munro*. Ed. Robert Thacker. Toronto: ECW, 1999. 1-20. Print.

---. "'So Shocking a Verdict in Real Life': Autobiography in Alice Munro's Stories." *Reflections: Autobiography and Canadian Literature*. Ed. K. P. Stich. Ottawa: U of Ottawa P, xii, 1988. 153-161. Print.

Timson, Judith. "Merciful Light." *Maclean's* 7 May 1990. Web. 22 Oct. 2013.

Treisman, Deborah. "re: doctoral research on Canadian writers in the New Yorker." Message to Nadine Fladd 20 Sept. 2007. E-mail.

Ventura, Héliane. "Re-Writing the Nativity in Alice Munro's 'The Turkey Season.'" *Open Letter* 13.2 (Spring 2007): 52-61. Print.

Yagoda, Ben. *About Town: The New Yorker and the World It Made*. New York: Scribner, 2000. Print.

York, Lorraine. *Rethinking Women's Collaborative Writing: Power, Difference, Property*. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 2002. Print.

Chapter 5

5 Conclusion

In January of 2011, The McIntosh Gallery at Western University hosted The Windsor Printmaker's Forum National Touring Exhibition, *Sense of Place*. As part of the exhibition, the Toronto-based author Nino Ricci and the Windsor- and Cape Breton-based Alistair MacLeod read from their work and spoke about "sense of place" in both their own lives and their fiction. During this reading, MacLeod, who has lived in Saskatchewan, Nova Scotia and Ontario, but has also studied and taught in the United States, recounted an anecdote about attending a party in New York City. The party was hosted by Scribner's, and was designed to celebrate authors who had published in the yearly anthology of *The Best American Short Stories*. The partygoers had been provided nametags; another guest came up to MacLeod, read his nametag, and exclaimed: "Alistair MacLeod, I thought you died?" MacLeod, who had lived in the U.S. for six years prior to this event responded: "No, I didn't die; I just went back to Canada."

MacLeod's anecdote demonstrates what Pier Paolo Frassinelli, Ronit Frenkel, and David Watson refer to in their introduction to *Traversing Transnationalism* as "the irreducible persistence of the national" (5). Although *The New Yorker* has long since disregarded its practice of using William Maxwell's imaginary map of Manhattan to guide its acceptance or rejection of fiction submissions, it is clear that within the New-York centric publishing industry as a whole, a literal crossing of national boundaries into Canada can, and sometimes still does, result in a figurative death, or a falling off of the radar. Macleod's experience demonstrates that in order to fully understand contemporary Canadian authors' works, critics must engage with the history of the literary production of those works, even – and perhaps especially – when those works or their authors cross national borders.

As this project has demonstrated, nationalist frameworks inform not only the production, publication and circulation of literary works, but also the study of them. Like Paul Jay in *Global Matters*, I too "aim to question the default narrative for historicizing

English . . . in which the history of . . . literature is studied through the lens of conventional national histories . . .with relatively little attention paid to the transnational forces at work in their production" (5). As a doctoral candidate in Canadian literature, I have a vested interest in studying literary works as artifacts of a national culture. Rather than arguing for the wholesale eradication of national differences in the study of literature, I am, through this project, advocating a less insular approach to the study of Canadian (and, by extension, American) literature.

This project has theorized a correlation between the ways that three authors negotiate their relationships to place and nationalism and the ways in which they negotiate the dynamic between author and editor or react to the idea of giving up authorial control. As I stated in my Introduction, I have used the work of Callaghan, Gallant, and Munro both because of the wealth of archival material about their interactions with *The New Yorker* that as well as each individual author's role as representative of important periods in *The New Yorker's* history. The study of these three authors together offers a preliminary, and by no means exhaustive, history of the impact of intersection of transnationalism and collaboration on the Canadian short story. A companion study is warranted to explore the transnational influences on the work of *New Yorker* contributors who are usually identified as American authors is also warranted. Ernest Hemingway, as an American journalist who lived in Canada for a time and wrote for the *Toronto Star*, might be an appropriate, contrapuntal supplement to my study of the Canadian Callaghan's writing for the journalism-influenced *New Yorker*. Given Hemingway's, Callaghan's, and Gallant's association with Paris, this supplement might help to reveal the role that Canada has played in the development of transatlantic modernism: a topic that is not frequently a part of discussions of cosmopolitanism and the transnational nature of modernism in general. Fortunately, these types of discussions are becoming more common through the work of organizations such as the Editing Modernism in Canada (EMiC) project.

Throughout the preceding chapters, I have outlined the role that *The New Yorker's* "imaginary map of Manhattan" played in determining what fiction the magazine accepted or rejected, and in shaping the fiction that it did accept (Yagoda 220). This map was

based upon the cities and regions a New Yorker might visit in person, presumably travelling by train, car, or steamship. Today's authors and readers are no longer bound by the geographical limits posed by these forms of travel, and so I postulate a different kind of literary geography for Canada, one that is based not on literal, physical borders, but on sites of intellectual and creative connection. Both the narratives of individual stories and the production and reception of stories in general, can be mapped as a webbed network, or a series of connected nodes. These nodes are the creative and intellectual communities, or literary contact zones, that are a necessary part of the creation, distribution, and study of literature: the sites of connection may be physical ones, such as cities; organizational or institutional ones, such as *The New Yorker*; or technological ones that make new ways of producing or accessing literature possible.

In addition to a study of the "*New Yorker* short story," there is also room for a study of the ways that transnational publication has affected the negotiation of ideas of place, culture and nation in the work of *New Yorker* poets. One of the poets it would be most interesting to study in this context, Elizabeth Bishop, is not traditionally considered a "Canadian" poet, and in fact identifies as American. Nonetheless, she has frequently published work that is explicitly about Canadian spaces and provinces within the magazine. Much of Bishop's work, both fiction and poetry, is "about" place, and entitled or "pegged" immediately after the title in order to reflect the setting of the poem or story. Bishop spent part of her childhood in Nova Scotia, and returned there for long stays on several occasions as an adult. The magazine published Bishop's work that is set in America, for example: "North Haven," "View of the Capitol from the Library of Congress," as well as the short story "The U.S.A. School of Writing." Surprisingly, given the magazine's initial focus as a local magazine, work set in Brazil (for example, "Santarém," "A trip to Vigia," or "Pink Dog" which is pegged "Rio de Janeiro") or Canada ("Cape Breton," "The Moose," "In the Village,") also features heavily among Bishop's *New Yorker* publications. In 2001, Joelle Biele edited and published *Elizabeth Bishop and The New Yorker: The Complete Correspondence*. The fact that the magazine posthumously published work of Bishop's such as the poem "Foreign-Domestic," as well as poems about Bishop's connection to Canada, such as James Merrill's "Overdue Pilgrimage to Nova Scotia," which refers to the "Canadian reader" Bishop might have

encountered there (line 7), suggests that an analysis of this correspondence in order to gain further insight Bishop's own negotiation of space, nation and place, as well as *The New Yorker's* role in shaping, or representing that negotiation, would prove worthwhile. It would be interesting to explore whether or not these same geographical guidelines imposed upon *New Yorker* fiction also applied to poetry, and how much influence the magazine's editors had on poets' work.

Future studies of literary and artistic collaborations that negotiate nation and place might also move beyond the printed page of *The New Yorker* to explore other genres and media, such as film. Walkowitz cites and teases out Gauri Viswanathan's question "Where is English literature produced?" asserting that it "asks us to consider that the location of literature depends not only on the places where books are written but also on the places where they are classified and given social purpose" (527). The notion of transnational collaboration, whether editorial, institutional, or paratextual, not only allows scholars to think through representations of national and regional difference, but also throws into relief how the creative and institutional processes reshape, complicate, and at times even transgress national difference and its representations. Like my analysis of the role of conflict on an individual, aesthetic level in Gallant's collaboration with the institutional structures of the magazine, such as its advertising department, Ben Urwand's book *The Collaboration: Hollywood's Pact with Hitler* explores an even more obvious and unsettling form of political, ideological conflict through the intersection of the two seemingly disparate meanings of the term "collaboration." Using the film *All Quiet on the Western Front* as a representative example, Urwand explains in an interview that throughout the 1930s after Hitler's rise to power, Hollywood film studios allowed German government officials to censor portions of their films that portrayed the Third Reich in ways that officials considered objectionable. The Hollywood studios did so, according to Urwand, in order to avoid losing the right to distribute their films in Germany. He explains:

a censorship meeting was held and they suggested a series of cuts that should be made. One year later, Carl Laemmle, the head of Universal Pictures, came up with a new version of the film that contained none of the objectionable scenes.

And the German censor said, we will screen this film in Germany, if you agree to make these cuts in all of the versions that will be screened around the world, which, of course, included the United States. (in Garfield)

Nazi censorship of films such as *All Quiet on the Western Front* affected the way that Germany and the United States were presented not just to German citizens, but to citizens of the United States and the rest of the world, as well.

Urwand's study highlights the importance of continued study of not just the "texts" – whether fiction or film – that get produced, but also the production of those texts, and the economic and institutional frameworks of companies that produce art for profit in particular. Of course, there are significant historical and generic differences at play here that an extended study of the topic that includes multiple genres and media would need to take into account. In this case, an analysis of transnational collaboration would need to be sensitive to the differences between the institutional independence of *The New Yorker* and relative autonomy of its editors and the active involvement of the U.S. government in foreign policy and its effect on the cultural climate under which these war-time films were produced. In addition, a more wide-ranging study of this topic would need to take into account generic differences between legal and artistic conceptions of authorship in film and fiction; film's history of perceiving the director of a film as an *auteur* with a singular vision is much shorter than literature's devotion to the concept of the solitary author (see Truffaut, for example).

I have asked, and attempted to answer the question: "Where is Canadian literature produced?" As North America moves away from printed books and publishing houses with editors ensconced in brick-and-mortar offices, however, the answer to that question may no longer be a city, province or country that can be identified on a map, but rather a technology or a method. The work habits of the millennial generation and the existence of online, collaborative encyclopedias such as Wikipedia suggest that, although collaboration is as old as authorship itself, this writing practice is likely to become more ubiquitous, and more openly acknowledged, as the twenty-first century progresses. The shifting nature and conditions of authorship will need to change the way scholars

approach the study in at least two ways that Walkowitz identifies. She argues that "the location of any literary work is achieved and unfinished, indebted to a network of past collaborations and contestations, and to collaborations and contestations that have not yet taken place" (543). One platform that attempts to harness the powers of digital media and multiple authorship in order to transcend the traditional role of place in publishing is the online "Penguin community:" *Book Country (book country)*. The site offers its members the opportunity to participate in what Bob Garfield, in a recent "On The Media" interview with Penguin Random House's Global Digital Director, Molly Barton, calls "virtual workshopping."

According to Garfield, the site "enables thousands of writers" across the U.S. "to exchange manuscripts and notes." Without having to make the "move to Brooklyn," writers can now find a literary community in which to participate. In contrast to *The New Yorker* and its history as a local magazine, Barton explains that the concept of the "book country" site, and its title, function as an attempt to transcend physical space, particularly New York as the epicenter of North American publishing:

When I came to New York to work in book publishing, there was a festival at the time called New York is Book Country. So the website was based a lot on those early experiences trying to acquire fiction and nonfiction for trade and academic publishing houses, and wanting to democratize the process and create a site where anywhere is book country; your desk is book country. You don't need to move to Brooklyn, you don't need to go to a colony. You can just come and join the community online. (in Garfield)

Within the site, writers build communities with other writers working on similar projects, and offer and receive feedback from one another. Barton claims that members "take their book through an average of six drafts on the site and get feedback from more than five other members" (in Garfield). Like Munro's collaboration with McGrath, this workshopping method blurs the lines between the roles of the author and that of editor; it is conceivable that that respondents who offer notes on a text may have a significant influence on another author's work without being credited as a co-author *or* as an editor.

Admittedly, this online community is designed to generate profits for Penguin Random House by selling members packages of services to help them self-publish their newly-workshopped texts. This collaborative community serves primarily authors who self-publish, and write in traditionally less high-brow genres – such as romance and science fiction – than do the authors whom *The New Yorker* publishes. As London points out in *Writing Double*, "the higher literary values associated with a work, the less collaborative authorship has generally been credited" (3). What is interesting about this site, though, and what merits further study, is the way that the move towards digital technologies and away from the printed page – especially the local newspaper or magazine – might shape the representation of, and relationship to, geographical space, national cultures, and regional fiction within the "pages" of the texts these technologies help to produce.

These varied examples of the ways in which scholars of Canadian and American literature, textual studies, and collaborative authorship might further the inquiry into the role that transnational collaboration plays in the creation of literature and other art forms suggest that the current theoretical and technological climate is conducive to the development of this sub-field at the intersection of North American and textual studies. As I have explored the processes behind both the production and the distribution of Morley Callaghan, Mavis Gallant and Alice Munro's stories, and as I have encountered other scholars' and journalists' explorations into these same processes for Hollywood film, *New Yorker* poets, and online writing communities, it has become clear to me just how crucial having access to the conversations that take place between collaborators and colleagues as part of the creative process has been to shaping my understanding of the concepts of authorship and literature. While it is easy to record conversations that take place in an online environment for posterity's sake and for later analysis, the records of many of the conversations that took place at *The New Yorker*, even through formal correspondence, have already been lost to time. It is my hope that, as the global effort to digitize authors' archives continues, the destruction and disappearance of records of communication between the people involved in producing literature will become less frequent, and access to those records will increase. This dissertation will, I hope, stimulate new critical dialogue about how and why these transnational conversations take place.

Works Cited

- Beran, Carol L. "The Luxury of Excellence: Alice Munro in the *New Yorker*." *The Rest of the Story: Critical Essays on Alice Munro*. Ed. Robert Thacker. Toronto: ECW, 1999. 204-232. Print.
- Bishop, Elizabeth. "Cape Breton." *The New Yorker*. 18 June 1949. 24. Web.
- . *Elizabeth Bishop and The New Yorker: The Complete Correspondence*. Ed. Joelle Biele. New York: Farrar, Strauss and Giroux, 2011. Print.
- . "Foreign-Domestic." *The New Yorker*. 19 Aug. 1996. 47. Web.
- . "In the Village." *The New Yorker*. 19 Dec. 1953. 26-34. Web.
- . "The Moose." *The New Yorker*. 15 July 1972. 27. Web.
- . "North Haven." *The New Yorker*. 11 Dec. 1978. 40. Web.
- . "Pink Dog." *The New Yorker*. 26 Feb. 1979. 32. Web.
- . "Santarém." *The New Yorker*. 20 Feb. 1978. 40. Web.
- . "A Trip to Vigia." *The New Yorker*. 6 June 1983. 34-38. Web.
- . "The U.S.A. School of Writing." *The New Yorker*. 18 July 1983. 32-38. Web.
- . "View of the Capitol from the Library of Congress." *The New Yorker*. 7 July 1951. 17. Web.
- Book Country: A Penguin Community*. Penguin Random House 2013. 10 Sept. 2013. Web.
- Callaghan, Morley. *That Summer in Paris: Memories of Tangled Friendships with Hemingway, Fitzgerald and Some Others*. New York: Coward-McCann, 1963. Print.

- Frassinelli, Pier Paolo, Ronit Frenkel, and David Watson. "Transversing Transnationalism." *Traversing Transnationalism: The Horizons Of Literary and Cultural Studies*. Ed. Pier Paolo Frassinelli and Ronit Frenkel. Amsterdam: Editions Rodopi B.V., 2011. 1-14. Print.
- Gallant, Mavis. "Preface." *The Selected Stories of Mavis Gallant*. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1996. IX-XIX. Print.
- Garfield, Bob. "Syria Coverage, Nazi Collaborations with Hollywood, and More." *On The Media Podcast*. WNYC. 6 Sept. 2013. MP3 file.
- Jay, Paul. *Global Matters: The Transnational Turn in Literary Studies*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 2010. Print.
- London, Bette. *Writing Double: Women's Literary Partnerships*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1999. Print.
- MacLeod, Alistair. "The Windsor Printmaker's Forum National Touring Exhibition: *Sense of Place*." Western University, London, ON. 30 Jan. 2011. Reading.
- Merrill, James. "Overdue Pilgrimage to Nova Scotia." *The New Yorker*. 23 Oct 1989. 50. Web.
- Munro, Alice. "Introduction." *Selected Stories*. Toronto: Penguin, 1998. ix-xvii. Print.
- Truffaut, François. "A Certain Tendency of the French Cinema (1954)." *Auteurs and Authorship: A Film Reader*. Ed. Barry Keith Grant. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2008. 9-18.
- Urwand, Ben. *The Collaboration: Hollywood's Pact with Hitler*. Harvard UP, 2013. Print.
- Walkowitz, Rebecca L. "The Location of Literature: The Transnational Book and the Migrant Writer." *Contemporary Literature* 47.4 (2006): 527-545.

Yagoda, Ben. *About Town: The New Yorker and the World It Made*. New York: Scribner, 2000. Print.

Curriculum Vitae

Name:	Nadine Fladd
Post-secondary Education and Degrees:	<p>Wilfrid Laurier University Waterloo, Ontario, Canada 2001-2005 B.A.</p> <p>University of Western Ontario London, Ontario, Canada 2005-2006 M.A.</p> <p>University of Western Ontario London, Ontario, Canada 2007-2014 Ph.D.</p>
Honours and Awards:	<p>Gold Medal in English (Wilfrid Laurier University) 2005</p> <p>Social Science and Humanities Research Council CGS Master's 2005-2006</p> <p>Hugh MacLachlan Scholarship (Wilfrid Laurier University) 2006</p> <p>Graduate Thesis Research Award 2010</p> <p>Arts and Humanities Alumni Graduate Award 2010; 2011</p> <p>Ontario Graduate Scholarship 2005-2006 (declined); 2011-2012</p>
Related Work Experience:	<p>Teaching Assistant University of Western Ontario 2005-2006; 2007-2011</p> <p>Instructor University of Western Ontario 2012</p> <p>Instructor Laurentian University</p>

2012-2013

Instructor
Sheridan College
2013-2014

Peer-Reviewed Publications:

"Stunning and Strange": Iceland as Memory and Prophecy in Alice Munro's "The Bear Came Over the Mountain" and Sarah Polley's "Away from Her." *Double-Takes: Intersections Between Canadian Literature and Film*. Ed. David R. Jarraway. Ottawa: U of Ottawa P, 2013. 59-76. Print.

"Getting Feedback to Feed Forward: Incorporating Revision into Upper-Year English Papers." *TIPS: Teaching Innovation Projects Journal* 1.2 (2011). Web.