

AN INTERVIEW WITH FRANK DAVEY

By Jessica Langston

Frank Davey is a Canadian writer, editor, and critic whose more recent publications include *Canadian Literary Power*, *Back to the War*, and the memoir, *How Linda Died*. An influential member of the Canadian literary scene, Davey was a co-founder of the *Tish* group and the editor of *Open Letter*.

JL: *In an interview (in Open Letter 4.3, qtd. in bpNichol's introduction in The Arches), you once commented: "I'm not a literary writer, I'm not writing about literary topics. I'm writing about my life and my experience with it . . .". Does postmodernism relate in any way to your life? Is it a theory/way of writing that somehow expresses your experience of living and, thus, informs your creative writing? Or do you even consider yourself to be a postmodern writer?*

FD: Living the last six decades has meant living in an exceedingly disjunctive period, one of great contrasts in literature and the way in which literature has been related to culture. When I made that statement I was responding viscerally against high modernism. I felt that many of the high modernist writers, or at least the later high modernists published in the 1950s, were writing an extremely pretentious literature that was derived from other literature and engaged primarily with literary topics. It touched every day life only with a great deal of disdain. In contrast to this high modernist detachment, I was using my experiences as a way of looking at a panorama of engagements with the world. In my writing I wasn't necessarily rejecting intellect or knowledge, but I was trying to focus on the disjunctive experiences, on how things juxtaposed in life. I was focused on one's experiences in relationships, one's experiences buying food, one's experiences travelling, or one's experiences with fellow writers and how all these experiences fit together or don't fit together and what these experiences have to say about each other.

JL: *So that sort of experience of disjunction is how you see yourself as a postmodern writer?*

FD: There are a lot of gaps, a lot of conflicts, and a lot of strange juxtapositions in this world. I wouldn't suggest that there haven't always been, but I think that one of the things about the last six decades is we've become more conscious of them, or perhaps as artists we've become more conscious of them because the world has become more conscious of them. Or maybe the world has become more conscious of them because artists and thinkers have foregrounded these conflicts. So much of the time a writer is contributing to a zeitgeist that is also a determinant in how one is constructing oneself.

JL: *Discussing the Canadian population, you typically decry any notion of a unitary citizenry, instead suggesting that Canada has many publics or constituencies, that, in a way, the margins have become the centre. Do you think that postmodernism alienates some or all of these so-called marginal groups?*

FD: I think there are people and groups of people in Canadian society who do not see themselves within postmodern theory or within postmodern work. That may be the fault of the proponents of postmodernism to make it clear where relevance resides. Or perhaps the fault lies with the people. Sometimes one can simply be blind to the causal relationships among cultural relationships, or one can become so preoccupied with one's own positions in society and the most visible and urgent parts of those, that one fails to see the larger picture. The variety of cultural-political – we should not separate those words – positions in Canadian society contributes to what I would think of as a postmodern cultural condition. And this variety of positions is something that has interested artists of postmodernism, something which they try to evoke in their work to bring it to public attention. So often in Canada it's small public groups that are attempting to claim Canada for themselves (for example, in Eastern Canada it is traditionally English-speaking citizens of British/Celtic descent). I think growing up in a British Columbia area, which was not at all British, but was substantially Hungarian and Mennonite, contributed to my sense of the heterogeneity of Canada and to how bizarrely British representations of Canada (which were coming from Ontario) compared to the kinds of experiences of the nation that I was having. Perhaps this contributed to my statement that I was not a "Literary writer" – capital L." I think I also learned very early that the more visible class divisions made by Eastern media—such as the *Toronto Star* or *Saturday Night*—were utterly different from the cultural practices that I was growing up amongst.

JL: *In Canadian Literary Power, you suggest that postmodernism has, since your first use of the term in From There to Here in 1973, become limited due to its lack of specificity. Do you think, though, that, due to this very vagueness, postmodernism is a more universally applicable idea than other ways of thinking about and theorizing literature, and, hence, is appropriate for a country composed of so many margins?*

FD: No, the danger is that postmodernism has become close to becoming an empty term, because when a term means so many things, and in so many contradicting ways, it ends up meaning nothing. This emptying of the term has not happened, however, just within Canada; it has happened internationally. So your question for me is whether the international appropriation, abuse, and exploitation of the term makes it more applicable to situation in Canada. The answer is no, it is not more applicable to Canada. I think that various international arguments around multiculturalism, the various debates around what that term means, make it more applicable. At least internationally, the term multiculturalism gets recognized as a term with Canadian history, related to Canada. Postmodernism does not.

JL: *In your conversation with Beverley Daurio in The Power to Bend Spoons, you object to the perception of literary texts as purely aesthetic artifacts or as purely entertainment. Literary texts, you worry, are not seen as socially or politically powerful. Do you think that postmodern aesthetics—particularly if they are linked, as you suggest in Canadian Literary Power, with both individual political action and the avant-garde—contribute to or challenge this perception?*

FD: The postmodernism that has interested me has repeatedly challenged notions that texts were apolitical. I have to use the word "repeatedly" because artists are repeatedly up against the continuing commercialization of art, which seems to require the aestheticizing of art. That is,

when a work of art is commodified it is depoliticized into an aesthetic object which may either increase in value or make the individual who comes in contact with it appear more cultured, giving that individual more polish, more cultural credibility because he or she has read or seen a particular object. So the struggle against apoliticality is an ongoing one that reflects the complexity of art distribution in the 21st-century. Last time I counted, about ten years ago, seven or eight multinational corporations controlled 95% or more of English language publishing. This was the case because they can own a variety of even competing publishing companies as part of their portfolio – companies like Harper Collins, Penguin, and Pearson are owned by conglomerate companies that own a variety of other enterprises, not necessarily just in media.

JL: *So does writing in the postmodern style help alert readers to fact that texts can be political?*

FD: Yes. It can – but not necessarily. One is always running up against the idea that a postmodern style can be seen only as entertaining. For example, in my presentation last night there was an element of entertainment in the fact that I was presenting my paper as a performance. It is always necessary to have that entertainment element lead to a recognition of the ideological reasons for adopting such an artistic strategy. I am currently working on a paper on the Four Horsemen for a conference at the Sorbonne. bpNichol once told me about how they, the Four Horsemen, had once been on a radio show, and the DJ introduced them as “the zany four horsemen.” That introduction, according to Nichol, immediately aestheticized them. They were just “zany,” and zany is a word that was meant to make them appear attractive, but it is also diminishing and made them appear sort of shallow at the same time as attractive. That kind of packaging of postmodern art is something one is always contending with. It is part of the price of postmodern art pays for having adopted disjunctive strategies: they are unusual, they are shocking, they are surprising, and people enjoy being surprised, and thus entertained. However, then there is a tendency to stop at that level of entertainment and surprise and not continue to think about the implications of what has been surprising or to even ask should it have been surprising. When you ask “should it have been surprising?” you are asking an ideological question.

JL: *In Herb Wyile’s paper yesterday (“A House Divided: Commodification, Postmodern Relativism, and Historical Fiction”), he talked about noticing a growing conservatism amongst contemporary Canadian writers. Do you think that postmodernism has undergone a shift, has become appealing to a wider audience and so has become less political than it once was?*

FD: Let me dodge your question, by going back to panel that Herb was on. On that panel there was also a paper on theatre given by Jenn Stephenson (“Re-performing Microhistories: Postmodern Metatheatricality in Canadian Millennial Drama”), and there was a consensus that contemporary theatre was more radically ideological than recent fiction. It seems to me that conservatism may often be a matter of where the work is produced and who is producing it. Theatre in Canada exists locally; multinational corporations do not touch it. Theatre companies tend to be either parts of communities or cities. They are rarely even associated with provinces or regions; they tend to be quite local. I think that that leaves the artists in control of what they do and less beholden to commercial interests. The audiences of theatre are small, that means that playwrights and theatre groups don’t have to water down the product to attract the larger audiences that fiction does.

JL: *And, of course, it is different types of audiences. Certain types of people go to see theatre, particularly smaller theatre productions.*

FD: That's right. I think it is important to keep small publishing—whether small-theatre productions or small presses—alive. I have always resisted the notion that is often put forth in Canada that small publishing is to commercial publishing as primary school is to high school or as the farm team is in relation to major league baseball. I have always resisted such analogies because it seems me there is often a regression when a writer moves from a small publisher to a large publisher, that the work changes and not necessarily for the better. I think Michael Ondaatje's work was much more interesting when he was writing for small presses than now that he's writing for large multi-national presses.

JL: *At the end of your recent review of Pauline Butling and Susan Rudy's Writing in Our Time: Canada's Radical Poetries in English you raise some interesting questions about the connection between radical politics and poetics. You ask if poetry is "more closely linked to politics than other genres?" and whether "other genres [are] more often complicit with capitalist 'individualist' production?". You have written in many different genres, including poetry, literary criticism, pop culture, and political analysis, and, recently, a memoir. What is your experience vis-à-vis the questions you raised in your book review? Do you feel more able to explore politics through poetry than through other mediums? Do you feel that poetry allows more room to be radical?*

FD: Yes, but this is not necessarily a genre characteristic. This is a characteristic of the distribution of the work. That is, there are fewer material constraints imposed by the publishing apparatus and the distribution apparatus on poetry because the numbers of copies are so small compared to the those of fiction titles and non-fiction. So much more money has to be invested in a work of fiction or non-fiction – these are bigger books so to be financially feasible they require longer press runs. I remember when I was writing my book on Kim Campbell, *Reading Kim Right*, that in order to get such a book into Chapters bookstores we had to have a minimum of 2000 copies available because they wanted to have one or more in every one of their stores. So we immediately had to print at least 3000 because we obviously needed more than one bookstore chain's initial order. That is a big capital expense, and for Talon that was quite a big capital expense. If the publisher is going to invest that much money in a book they are often going to want to make sure that it appeals to a wide ideological audience, that it doesn't disturb the audience they hope to sell it to. That means that the writer has to be more subtle, perhaps, in making visible his or her ideological positions in fiction and non-fiction than in poetry. Also when writing fiction or non-fiction, one is pressured to be less radical—less non-familiar—in form.

JL: *In the past, you have discussed the Canadian long poem and its relationship to truth. In "Countercontextuality in the Long Poem" (a paper delivered at the Long-liners Conference) and in Reading Canadian Reading, you suggested that the documentary poem, in particular, has a complex relationship with the act of truth-telling. On one hand, the very term "documentary" seems to promise a sort of easily referable and verifiable truth and authority. On the other hand, because the documentary poem foregrounds both the written-ness of the documents it contains*

and the written-ness of the “countertext” surrounding these documents, it refuses one absolute truth or meaning. You point to Lionel Kearns’s Convergences as an example of this typically postmodern message that “there is no ‘reality’.” I am wondering if you constructed your own documentary long poem, The Clallam, to underline this same idea. If so, were you being consciously postmodern or is this postmodern aspect only apparent in retrospect, if at all?

FD: Kearns’s *Convergences* is a wonderful example of the way in which truth can be multiple and the way in which even the use of documents does not support a singular reading. The contrast between Kearns’ work and Livesay’s theorizing about the documentary poem is instructive.

I was aware at the time that I was writing *The Clallam* that I was writing a book about representations, about how the event had been represented and then not represented. That is, it was a celebrated shipwreck when it occurred, one that was represented from a very particular point of view, to the advantage of the newspapers, and to the advantage of the ship owners. It was represented in the coroner’s inquiry, which I found the hand-written records of in the BC archives. And then the sinking of *The Clallam* became sort of non-represented. It dropped out of history and memory.

I was also writing against E.J. Pratt who only wrote about celebrated shipwrecks. Pratt is best remembered for his poem about the sinking of the *Titanic*, but he also wrote about the passenger liner *Roosevelt*’s celebrated rescue of the sailors from the *Antinoe*. I was also writing against a sort of tradition of continuous and plausible narrative poetry that Pratt represents. *The Clallam* is constructed in short, discontinuous passages. Finally, I was also writing against the modernist requirement of impersonality in the accounting of many things relating to history. So there are personal intrusions into the text which break up the narrative. So, was I aware of *The Clallam* being a postmodern work? I was aware of writing a disruptive and re-historicizing work. I don’t know whether anyone (I suppose some—once postmodernism came to be defined) have thought “how can I be postmodern?” But it seems to me that’s probably not the best way to create an artistic text, worrying about making sure someone comes along after you and says “that’s postmodern.” I’ve been involved in a kind of disruptive poetics project since the founding of *Tish* in 1961, and by the time I was writing *The Clallam* I had a much greater sense of what that project was than I had in 1961.

JL: *Save for its being poetry, The Clallam could be seen as an example of what Linda Hutcheon has labeled “historiographic metafiction.” In fact, Hutcheon does argue that the documentary long poem developed parallel to this particular type of fiction. Hutcheon links the genre of “historiographic metafiction” with postmodernism and its rejection of grand narratives, such as capital-H History. In your critical writing, there is a similar distrust or, at least, wariness of these types of continuous, unified narratives. In particular, you frequently challenge critics that would like to create for Canadian literature a narrative of progress, and you seem equally wary of criticism that attempts to define Canada as a nation through its literature and vice versa. Can you comment on the connection or disconnect between history and nation in more recent Canadian literature.*

FD: I see contemporary writing as not having a lot to do with the nation or not having the nation on its mind, except in the way in which constituent parts might contribute to the nation. At the same time, there’s a global body of fiction that has little to do with nationalism because it’s being

written for international markets. At the conference this weekend some participants called such fiction ‘NAFTA fiction,’ and NAFTA fiction doesn’t have too much to do with the nation. Some recent work, certainly Erin Mouré’s poetry on citizenship, is speaking to a sort of national project, including Canadian national projects. Work like that of Fred Wah is pointing out other ways in which the nation is constructed than those that seem evident to writers in other parts of the country, particularly those committed to explicitly nationalist projects. The nationalist project, however, is not very visible these days. Margaret Atwood’s *Survival* is not a book that is spoken about with a great deal of respect, or at least not in academic circles. Although I suspect *Survival* may still be influential in the teaching of Canadian literature in high schools, so that there may be a sort of a barely visible Canadian nationalism that is being taught in public schools through the literature or a barely visible nationalist understanding of literature that is being taught in public schools. Still, this sort of nationalist project doesn’t appear in the discussions among writers or among interpreters of contemporary writers.

JL: *That’s interesting because it seems to me there is still a lot of literature coming out that is connected with the nation and with history. I’m thinking of Margaret Sweetman’s Fox, R.H. Thomson’s Lost Boys, Marilyn Bowering’s “Grandfather was a Soldier.”*

FD: The question is whether or not this literature is nationalist or whether these works are not instead ways of multiplying the nation or diluting the nation by arguing for the inclusion of yet another perspective, or arguing for the importance of events in Canadian history other than those that have conventionally been used to represent that history. I think that the Canadian nation is still worth contending for. In fact, it is the only political instrument to which Canadians have access. So it shouldn’t be surprising that Canadians from various parts of the country would say: “Hey, I want to be part of this too. I want to be heard. I want this particular history to be included in the national history.” What I see less visible is a sense of the homogeneity of Canada and of Canadian literature. We’re long past the time when Margaret Laurence would talk about Canadian writers as a “tribe.” Now they’re quite a fractious group, and many don’t enjoy being treated as parts of a single entity. There’s a difference between a community and a totality. Communities can contain diverse points of view; sometimes they may even be paralyzed by disagreements, but, ultimately, if they’re going to survive, they have to negotiate and find ways of representing diverse interests. My point of view has always been that it’s important to foreground those diversities of interests so that they can be negotiated, so that contentions can be taken into account, rather than being papered over, and one group squashing the other and using its views to represent the whole.

JL: *To go back to an earlier set of concerns: in “Surviving the Paraphrase,” you talk about the limited type of criticism produced by most Canadian literary scholars, arguing that, primarily, Canadian literary criticism has been focused on tracing thematic patterns. Do you think that postmodernism has allowed us to move past this type of thematic criticism by virtue of its being seen, more recently, as a wholly aesthetic genre and also by virtue of its being against meta-narratives, such as national identity narratives? Or has postmodernism just provided a new way for critics to identify and label Canada through its literature, i.e., by allowing us to see Canada as a postmodern country?*

FD: Quite often, academic papers summarize the thematic content of a literary work, and one loses consciousness of the fact that it is a literary work. Those papers often look for explicit declarations of the theme. They look for the moment in the novel when the character seems to be a mouthpiece for the author, and the author has finally said “okay, stupid readers, I’ll tell you what this book is about.” The critic seizes on that moment as the key to an understanding of the book. This type of interpretation does not seem to me to have much to do with the reader’s experience. The reader is reading chapters, sentences, words, and trying to put together an understanding of the book on the basis of those material parts. Thematic criticism loses a sense of the materiality of the book, and of how interpretations are created through the reading process, through the encounter with that materiality. Postmodernism—if we understand it as a way of writing—often makes things difficult for such criticism by foregrounding a text’s materiality. But, as you point out in your question, postmodernism—understood as a cultural attitude toward metanarratives—can encourage a return to a theme-based criticism that searches for such attitudes within texts and links them to generalizations about the nation. Postmodern writing, especially poetry, however, often works against such criticism by foregrounding a text’s materiality. It’s curious how so many critics routinely evade the materialities of texts—and avoid poetry as well, probably because it is the genre in which the material textual aspects are most likely to be highly visible.

JL: *In your conference paper, “Misreadings and Non-Readings of the Canadian Post-modern,” you talked about how critics talk about postmodernism but do not write in a postmodern style. So what would that look like?*

FD: If, in fact, they want to valorize the epistemology of postmodern texts, they would seem to me to be often involved in a contradiction, where they are valorizing this epistemology but are using one themselves that conflicts with it. If you are praising the epistemology of a Robert Kroetsch poem or novel, you can be in a situation where the epistemology of that novel or poem is actually discrediting the epistemology of your own critical writing. This contradiction might be something that critics should talk about sometime or at least recognize. Kroetsch himself takes it very seriously. Reading his essays you realize that he does not want to be caught in a hypocritical position, and there is always some stylistic adventure in his essays, which is implicitly acknowledging the insufficiencies of a positivist epistemology. A lot of his essays are as disjunctive or indeterminate as his fiction and poetry.

Karis Shearer has suggested to me that this problem of critics not using the epistemology that they are praising is partly due to the separation in our universities of the critical and the creative. Creativity has been separated from analytical intelligence. Creative writing departments are often included in Fine Arts faculties, and English departments, even when they offer creative writing courses, segregate those courses or often do not give ‘major’ credit for them. So there has been a separation established between the discourses of criticism and the discourses of the creative uses of language. The implication is that it would be improper to be both a poet/novelist and a critic, or if you were, you’d best have two different personalities and write in two radically different discourses, even though the implications of those two different discourses might be in conflict. It is also true that you do have to change your discourse when you are addressing different audiences; as speakers we are constructed partially by the audiences that we are addressing or by the conversational community that we are among. The discourse of criticism and poetry are going to be different. However, at the level of how meaning is constructed and at the level of

other epistemological questions, there is no such necessity, and, in fact, it would seem to me there is also a deficit created when you are praising one discourse and using another, or when you are praising a discourse that discredits your own.

JL: *In your review of Trans.Can.Lit: Resituating the Study of Canadian Literature, you write that several recent essay anthologies (i.e., Sugar's Unhomely States and Home-Work) seem to be suggestive of a shift towards the dominance of post-colonial theory in Canadian studies. Do you think that, by moving towards post-colonial studies, Canadian studies will be moving away from postmodernism? Or do you think that post-colonialism and postmodernism are inextricably linked? What do you perceive as the key differences and similarities between post-colonialism and postmodernism?*

FD: There has been a crisis internationally in post-colonial studies, in which various post-colonial scholars have talked about the possible demise of post-colonial studies and its replacement by globalization studies or diasporic studies. These shifts certainly seem to be happening in Anglo-American scholarship. There has been a parallel shift in post-colonial studies in Canada as scholars increasingly present themselves as Canadianists as well as post-colonialists – perhaps seeing Canadian as offering the more secure professional future. There has not been much evidence of interest in postmodernism here – post-colonialists tend to seek ethical clarity; postmodernists usually see ethics as a site of complexity and ambiguity.

The second problem here is that, internationally, post-colonial studies does not recognize Canada as a post-colonial country, any more than it sees the United States as a post-colonial country. International post-colonial studies has felt that what they call invader-settler societies, such as Canada, Australia, the United States, and New Zealand, are societies that have continued to be imperialist. When these countries became independent, they did not leave colonialism, rather independence itself becomes the colonizing force, and the Aboriginal peoples of those countries remain as exploited as they began to be when the first European settlers came to those places. Post-colonialism does not recognize the perception of Canadian experience during the 1910s, 20s, and 30s as being exploited and colonized by British, as a true colonial situation. International post-colonialism does not perceive Canada as becoming more and more independent throughout 20th century and, therefore, as becoming a post-colonial society. So there is this big question in post-colonial studies about the appropriateness of the term post-colonialism to Canadian literature. Of course, the term post-colonial cannot be applied to Canadian Aboriginal literature because, for all intents and purposes, Canadian Aboriginals are still a colonized people. “Post-colonial” also cannot be applied to Canadian literature by writers of Anglo-Celtic, European descent because those people are now perceived as colonizers. It might be applicable to non-white immigrants’ writing. Considering the treatment of the Chinese, the application of the head tax and the ban of female immigration, and considering the discrimination against immigration from India, literature by writers such as Rohinton Mistry, Dionne Brand, Fred Wah might be considered post-colonial. Given the current achievement of Chinese and South Asian literature in Canada, I would put them in a tradition which is post-colonial in status.

JL: *And what about postmodernism versus post-colonialism in Canada?*

FD: Postmodernism, to the extent that it is against centralizing agendas might see Alberta, for instance, in Kroetsch's work as being in a colonial position in relation to Ontario. And so that the emergence and celebration of prairie culture can be constructed as post-colonial, using post-colonialism as a metaphor, I suppose. And I think a lot of the similarities in Canadian postmodern literature with post-colonialism are based on that de-centralizing. George Bowering's *Burning Water* is interested in the history of BC within a nation that has been preoccupied with the Battle of the Plains of Abraham. *Burning Water* becomes postcolonial by de-centering the historical narrative of the construction of Canada. But the argument that postmodernism in Canada contains a post-colonialism internal to Canada does not meet with a great deal of approval in post-colonial circles; it is an argument amongst postmodernists.

It seems to me that when post-colonial scholars become Canadianists there is a conflict of interest. In Cynthia Sugar's anthologies, Stephen Slemon is one of the scholars that most clearly articulates the problems which that conflict produces, also Alan Lawson, whom he cites. Both are very clear on this whole conflict between international post-colonial studies and Canadian post-colonial studies and the conflict between post-colonialism and Canadian studies.

The other problem when post-colonial scholars try to become Canadian scholars is that because the post-colonial field is post-Second World War their reading of Canadian literature tends to be confined at most to literature after the Second World War and, in practice, Canadian literature after 1970. So the tendency for post-colonial readings of Canadian literature is not to place these readings within the larger context of Canadian literature -- or, worse, it is to misrepresent that larger context because the critic is aware only of some high profile, parodic elements of it, for instance, Susanna Moodie.

JL: *I have been reading How Linda Died. It is such a loving tribute to your wife. I liked the every-dayness of it; you do such a nice job of cataloguing the every-dayness of your life.*

FD: I think I was aware of the discursive problems that we've been talking about regarding the criticism of postmodern literature that is not itself postmodern. One of the things that I was thinking of when writing the memoir was the whole postmodern debate around identity and how identity is constructed. I would argue that *How Linda Died* approaches being a postmodern memoir because of the way it deals with expressions of identity. The diary structure enabled me to make all kind of radical juxtapositions in the text so that, if you were to stand back from the text, you would see it as the construction of a long poem not just because one day is so different from another, but also because I allowed some days to continue and others to begin with a singularity or to evolve into a recollection rather than into a present-day narrative.

JL: *Plus there's a lot of absence in the entries, a lot of the parts of the days that aren't there. Even the space between the entries...*

FD: Some days are not there at all. And toward the end there are all those dreams, which I don't always interpret. Instead of having a very formal conclusion, I end the book with material that is up for interpretation, which I suspect is postmodern. I did intend that to be an indeterminate ending, although as with *The Clallam* I wasn't consciously trying to be 'postmodern'.

Works Cited

- Atwood, Margaret. *Survival: A Thematic Guide to Canadian Literature*. Toronto: Anansi, 1972.
- Bowering, George. *Burning Water*. 1980. Toronto: Penguin, 1994.
- Bowering, Marilyn. *Grandfather Was a Soldier*. Victoria; Toronto: Porcépic Books, 1987.
- Butling, Pauline and Susan Rudy. *Writing in Our Time: Canada's Radical Poetries in English (1957-2003)*. Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier UP, 2005.
- Davey, Frank. *The Clallam; or, Old Glory in Juan de Fuca*. Vancouver: Talonbooks, 1973.
- . *From There to Here. Our Nature, Our Voices II : A Guide to English-Canadian Literature Since 1960*. Erin, Ont.: Press Porcepic, 1974.
- . *Surviving the Paraphrase: Eleven Essays on Canadian Literature*. Winnipeg: Turnstone, 1983.
- . *The Arches: Selected Poems* . Ed. bpNichol. Vancouver: Talonbooks, 1980.
- . "Countertextuality in the Long Poem." *Open Letter* 6th Ser. 2-3 (1985): 33-41.
- . *Reading Canadian Reading*. Winnipeg: Turnstone, 1988.
- . *Reading Kim Right*. Vancouver : Talonbooks, 1993.
- . *Canadian Literary Power*. Edmonton : NeWest Publishers, 1994.
- . Interview with Beverly Daurio. *The Power to Bend Spoons: Interviews with Canadian Novelists*. Ed. Beverley Daurio. Toronto : Mercury Press, 1998. 210-30.
- . *How Linda Died*. Toronto: ECW Press, 2002.
- . *Back to the War*. Vancouver : Talonbooks, 2005.
- . "Some Writing in Our Time." *Canadian Poetry* 56 (Spring Summer 2005): 120-32.
- . "Roads Not Yet Taken." *Canadian Poetry* 61 (Spring Summer 2008):
- . "Misreadings and Non-Readings of the Canadian Post-modern." Re:Reading the Postmodern. Canadian Literature Symposium. University of Ottawa, Ottawa. 11 May 2008.
- Hutcheon, Linda. *The Canadian Postmodern: A Study of Contemporary English Canadian Fiction*. Studies in Canadian Literature Series. Toronto: Oxford UP, 1988.
- Kamboureli, Smaro and Roy Miki, eds. *Trans.Can.Lit: Resituating the Study of Canadian Literature*. Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier UP, 2007.
- Kearns, Lionel. *Convergences*. Toronto: The Coach House Press, 1984.
- Livesay, Dorothy. "The Documentary Poem: A Canadian Genre." *Contexts of Canadian Criticism*. Ed. Eli Mandel. Chicago and London: U of Chicago P, 1971. 267-81.
- Pratt, E.J. *Selected poems*. Eds. Sandra Djwa, W.J. Keith and Zailig Pollock. Toronto : U of Toronto P, 2000.
- Stephenson, Jenn. "Re-performing Microhistories: Postmodern Metatheatricality In Canadian Millennial Drama." Re:Reading the Postmodern. Canadian Literature Symposium. University of Ottawa, Ottawa. 11 May 2008.
- Sugars, Cynthia, ed. *Home-Work: Postcolonialism, Pedagogy, and Canadian Literature*. Ottawa: U of Ottawa P, 2004.
- . *Unhomely States: Theorizing English-Canadian Postcolonialism*. Peterborough, ON: Broadview Press, 2004.
- Sweatman, Margaret. *Fox*. Winnipeg: Turnstone Press, 1991.
- Thomson, R.H. *The Lost Boys*. Toronto: Playwrights Canada Press, 2001.
- Wyile, Herb. "A House Divided: Commodification, Postmodern Relativism, and Historical Fiction." Re:Reading the Postmodern. Canadian Literature Symposium. University of Ottawa, Ottawa. 11 May 2008.

© Jessica Langston. The content of this document may not be reproduced or distributed, in whole or in part, without permission from the author.