

GENDERED ECONOMIES
HUMOUR AND SENTIMENTALITY IN
SUNSHINE SKETCHES AND RILLA OF INGLESIDE

A Thesis

Submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies

University of Manitoba

in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Arts

by

Gabrielle Ceraldi

August, 1995



National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-612-13017-7

Canada

Name Gabrielle Kristina Ceraldi

Dissertation Abstracts International is arranged by broad, general subject categories. Please select the one subject which most nearly describes the content of your dissertation. Enter the corresponding four-digit code in the spaces provided.

Canadian (English)

SUBJECT TERM

0352

SUBJECT CODE

U·M·I

Subject Categories

THE HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

COMMUNICATIONS AND THE ARTS

Architecture 0729
Art History 0377
Cinema 0900
Dance 0378
Fine Arts 0357
Information Science 0723
Journalism 0391
Library Science 0399
Mass Communications 0708
Music 0413
Speech Communication 0459
Theater 0465

EDUCATION

General 0515
Administration 0514
Adult and Continuing 0516
Agricultural 0517
Art 0273
Bilingual and Multicultural 0282
Business 0688
Community College 0275
Curriculum and Instruction 0727
Early Childhood 0518
Elementary 0524
Finance 0277
Guidance and Counseling 0519
Health 0680
Higher 0745
History of 0520
Home Economics 0278
Industrial 0521
Language and Literature 0279
Mathematics 0280
Music 0522
Philosophy of 0998
Physical 0523

Psychology 0525
Reading 0535
Religious 0527
Sciences 0714
Secondary 0533
Social Sciences 0534
Sociology of 0340
Special 0529
Teacher Training 0530
Technology 0710
Tests and Measurements 0288
Vocational 0747

LANGUAGE, LITERATURE AND LINGUISTICS

Language
General 0679
Ancient 0289
Linguistics 0290
Modern 0291
Literature
General 0401
Classical 0294
Comparative 0295
Medieval 0297
Modern 0298
African 0316
American 0591
Asian 0305
Canadian (English) 0352
Canadian (French) 0355
English 0593
Germanic 0311
Latin American 0312
Middle Eastern 0315
Romance 0313
Slavic and East European 0314

PHILOSOPHY, RELIGION AND THEOLOGY

Philosophy 0422
Religion
General 0318
Biblical Studies 0321
Clergy 0319
History of 0320
Philosophy of 0322
Theology 0469

SOCIAL SCIENCES

American Studies 0323
Anthropology
Archaeology 0324
Cultural 0326
Physical 0327
Business Administration
General 0310
Accounting 0272
Banking 0770
Management 0454
Marketing 0338
Canadian Studies 0385
Economics
General 0501
Agricultural 0503
Commerce-Business 0505
Finance 0508
History 0509
Labor 0510
Theory 0511
Folklore 0358
Geography 0366
Gerontology 0351
History
General 0578

Ancient 0579
Medieval 0581
Modern 0582
Black 0328
African 0331
Asia, Australia and Oceania 0332
Canadian 0334
European 0335
Latin American 0336
Middle Eastern 0333
United States 0337
History of Science 0585
Law 0398
Political Science
General 0615
International Law and Relations 0616
Public Administration 0617
Recreation 0814
Social Work 0452
Sociology
General 0626
Criminology and Penology 0627
Demography 0938
Ethnic and Racial Studies 0631
Individual and Family Studies 0628
Industrial and Labor Relations 0629
Public and Social Welfare 0630
Social Structure and Development 0700
Theory and Methods 0344
Transportation 0709
Urban and Regional Planning 0999
Women's Studies 0453

THE SCIENCES AND ENGINEERING

BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES

Agriculture
General 0473
Agronomy 0285
Animal Culture and Nutrition 0475
Animal Pathology 0476
Food Science and Technology 0359
Forestry and Wildlife 0478
Plant Culture 0479
Plant Pathology 0480
Plant Physiology 0817
Range Management 0777
Wood Technology 0746

Biology

General 0306
Anatomy 0287
Biostatistics 0308
Botany 0309
Cell 0379
Ecology 0329
Entomology 0353
Genetics 0369
Limnology 0793
Microbiology 0410
Molecular 0307
Neuroscience 0317
Oceanography 0416
Physiology 0433
Radiation 0821
Veterinary Science 0778
Zoology 0472

Biophysics

General 0786
Medical 0760

EARTH SCIENCES

Biogeochemistry 0425
Geochemistry 0996

Geodesy 0370
Geology 0372
Geophysics 0373
Hydrology 0388
Mineralogy 0411
Paleobotany 0345
Paleoecology 0426
Paleontology 0418
Paleozoology 0985
Palynology 0427
Physical Geography 0368
Physical Oceanography 0415

HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES

Environmental Sciences 0768
Health Sciences
General 0566
Audiology 0300
Chemotherapy 0992
Dentistry 0567
Education 0350
Hospital Management 0769
Human Development 0758
Immunology 0982
Medicine and Surgery 0564
Mental Health 0347
Nursing 0569
Nutrition 0570
Obstetrics and Gynecology 0380
Occupational Health and Therapy 0354
Ophthalmology 0381
Pathology 0571
Pharmacology 0419
Pharmacy 0572
Physical Therapy 0382
Public Health 0573
Radiology 0574
Recreation 0575

Speech Pathology 0460
Toxicology 0383
Home Economics 0386

PHYSICAL SCIENCES

Pure Sciences

Chemistry
General 0485
Agricultural 0749
Analytical 0486
Biochemistry 0487
Inorganic 0488
Nuclear 0738
Organic 0490
Pharmaceutical 0491
Physical 0494
Polymer 0495
Radiation 0754
Mathematics 0405
Physics
General 0605
Acoustics 0986
Astronomy and Astrophysics 0606
Atmospheric Science 0608
Atomic 0748
Electronics and Electricity 0607
Elementary Particles and High Energy 0798
Fluid and Plasma 0759
Molecular 0609
Nuclear 0610
Optics 0752
Radiation 0756
Solid State 0611
Statistics 0463

Applied Sciences

Applied Mechanics 0346
Computer Science 0984

Engineering
General 0537
Aerospace 0538
Agricultural 0539
Automotive 0540
Biomedical 0541
Chemical 0542
Civil 0543
Electronics and Electrical 0544
Heat and Thermodynamics 0348
Hydraulic 0545
Industrial 0546
Marine 0547
Materials Science 0794
Mechanical 0548
Metallurgy 0743
Mining 0551
Nuclear 0552
Packaging 0549
Petroleum 0765
Sanitary and Municipal 0554
System Science 0790
Geotechnology 0428
Operations Research 0796
Plastics Technology 0795
Textile Technology 0994

PSYCHOLOGY

General 0621
Behavioral 0384
Clinical 0622
Developmental 0620
Experimental 0623
Industrial 0624
Personality 0625
Physiological 0989
Psychobiology 0349
Psychometrics 0632
Social 0451



**GENDERED ECONOMIES
HUMOUR AND SENTIMENTALITY IN
SUNSHINE SKETCHES AND RILLA OF INGLESIDE**

BY

GABRIELLE CERALDI

**A Thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of the University of Manitoba
in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of**

MASTER OF ARTS

© 1995

**Permission has been granted to the LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA
to lend or sell copies of this thesis, to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to
microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film, and LIBRARY
MICROFILMS to publish an abstract of this thesis.**

**The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive
extracts from it may be printed or other-wise reproduced without the author's written
permission.**

ABSTRACT

"Gendered Economies: Humour and Sentimentality in *Sunshine Sketches* and *Rilla of Ingleside*" reconsiders the widespread condemnation of sentimentality by examining the relationship between sentimentality and humour in two portraits of the Canadian small town.

Ideologically, humour and sentimentality are in direct conflict: Leacock and Montgomery use humour to mock the feminine, small-town values that sentimentality celebrates. Romance and nostalgia thus exist in tension with a modern, urban ethos that defines big-city life as a norm from which Mariposa and Glen St. Mary comically deviate.

This ideological tension is resolved only on the emotional level. *Sunshine Sketches* and *Rilla of Ingleside* carefully juxtapose humour and sentiment in order to achieve a certain emotional response: Leacock, operating within what Hélène Cixous would call a masculine economy, uses humour to restrain sentimental tears, while Montgomery alternates between laughter and pathos in order to produce a feminine overflow of emotion.

The purpose of such sentimental emotion is to draw readers into a transformative reading experience. In *Sunshine Sketches*, the narrator acts as an intermediary between town and reader, purging both of self-deception and hypocrisy. Montgomery, for her part, educates readers toward a mature, sacrificial vision by recreating the experiences of World War I, allowing readers to engage in a process of illusion-building and illusion-breaking that leads to growth and transformation.

Sentimental humour is thus a marginal discourse that explores alternatives to prevailing ideologies, values, and reading techniques.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My heartfelt thanks to Dr. David Williams for all the ways in which he has challenged me to undergo my own transformation during the writing of this thesis. I have benefited incalculably from his wisdom, encouragement, and generosity.

I also wish to thank

Professors Robert Smith and Gerald Friesen for agreeing to serve on my examining committee. Their insights have been both exciting and challenging.

The University of Manitoba for the financial support of U of M Graduate Fellowships, 1993-94 and 1994-95.

The Winnipeg Foundation for the financial support of the Senator Thomas Alexander Crerar Scholarship for 1993-94.

The IODE for the financial support of the Wilhelmina Gordon Foundation Scholarship in English for 1993-94.

My husband James for his unfailing patience, sympathy, and humour.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

1

CHAPTER ONE

Celebration and Contempt
The Ideology of Sentiment and Humour

14

CHAPTER TWO

Careful Cooperation
The Emotional Impact of Sentimental Humour

48

CHAPTER THREE

Tales of Transformation
Remaking the Reader Through Sentimental Humour

75

CONCLUSION

109

NOTES

114

BIBLIOGRAPHY

118

The final stage of the development of humour is reached when . . . humour and pathos mingle and become one. To the Creator perhaps in retrospect the little story of man's creation and his fall seems sadly droll.

Stephen Leacock, *Essays and Literary Studies*

There is a place for satire--there are gangrenes that can only be burned out--but leave the burning to the great geniuses. It's better to heal than to hurt.

L. M. Montgomery, *Emily Climbs*

INTRODUCTION

In the opening pages of *Sunshine Sketches of a Little Town*, Stephen Leacock mockingly compares the Mariposa Belle to the *Lusitania*: the tiny steamer is "tied to the wharf with two ropes of about the same size as they use on the *Lusitania*" (13). It is a classic Leacockian joke--only a Mariposan could take pride in the fact that the *ropes*, though not the ship itself, are of world-class size and strength. This harmless little joke has a darker undertone, however, that Leacock could not have planned; like the leak-prone Mariposa Belle, the *Lusitania* is remembered most because it sank. Hit by a German torpedo in 1915, the *Lusitania* did not merely settle into the six-foot depths of Lake Wissanotti; it sank into the Atlantic, taking down with it over a thousand passengers (Winks 682). In retrospect, Leacock's lighthearted and unconsciously grim comparison conveys to the reader like nothing else could that this sweet, sunny, self-important little town belongs to the world before the war. As Guy Vanderhaeghe points out, Mariposa is "a town that has no inkling that it will soon send its sons to perish in the bloody mud of Flanders" (20).

Published in 1912, *Sunshine Sketches* took only three years to go hopelessly out of date. The world depicted in Leacock's pages passed away suddenly and irrevocably with the outbreak of World War I, and its literature disappeared along with it. L. M. Montgomery's *Rilla of Ingleside* tells a much wider story of small-town Canada, showing the effect of the First World War on Glen St. Mary, a small Maritime town very much like Mariposa. A character in that novel, Gertrude Oliver, comments on the gulf separating wartime experience from the literature of the old, peaceful world, remarking that "everything written before the

war seems . . . as ancient as the Iliad" (153). Despite its later publication, however, *Rilla of Ingleside* fits no better than *Sunshine Sketches* into the post-war tradition of "hard-edged" modernism. Unabashedly idealistic and sentimental, Montgomery's novel celebrates the courage and self-sacrifice of both the boys at the front and the stalwart women who stay behind to "keep the home fires burning."

With their unique blends of humour and sentimentality, Leacock and Montgomery stand apart from the twentieth-century mainstream of intellectual, ironic literature, born of the "horror-filled and nightmarish experience of the infantryman" (Clark 138). Of course, the sunshine of Leacock's sketches can be "excused" by the fact that he wrote before the war could shatter his Victorian illusions. Montgomery's case is less straightforward. Though deeply troubled by the war, Montgomery retained her faith in the meaningfulness of existence, hanging on to a desperate conviction that the war would represent the birth pangs of a new and better era, that inevitably, "a country whose sons are ready to lay down their lives in her defence will win a new vision because of their sacrifice" (*Rilla* 51). While the war-weary modernist writes out of a sense of alienation in the modern waste land, Montgomery celebrates the traditional bonds of family and community, depicting the qualities that would characterize a utopia worthy of all the blood that has been shed for it.

The chasm between sentimental and modernist literature reflects a widening cultural gulf between men's and women's experiences. Modernism was born in the mud of Flanders, arising out of the horror of trench warfare, an experience that shaped a generation of young men. For women, however, the Great War was a time of unprecedented freedom and personal growth, rather than a nightmare of poison gas attacks and shell-shock. In "Soldier's

Heart: Literary Men, Literary Women, and the Great War," Sandra Gilbert maps out the cultural split created by the war, and discusses the "misogynist resentment with which male writers defined this Great War as an apocalyptic turning point in the battle of the sexes" (426). Interpreting the war as a "ritual of sacrifice to their [sisters'] victorious femininity" (424), men returned home and launched a witch-hunt against all vestiges of Victorian, feminine, patriotic sentimentality.

This new, hostile climate created a knee-jerk critical response to sentimentality that has long outlasted the post-war era. In the decades that followed the war, Leacock and Montgomery came to be seen as best-selling misfits, popular authors who were out of step with the mainstream of Canadian fiction. Leacock's books of humour became the cash cow of the New Canadian Library when it was founded in the 1950's, and were grudgingly tolerated for their undeniable financial value (Malcolm Ross 125-27). Montgomery, meanwhile, was consigned to critical oblivion until nearly 25 years after her death, falling victim to anthology editors who "performed as modernists purging Canadian literature of its residue of Victorian sentimentality" (Gerson 61). Both writers became, to varying degrees, an embarrassment to the CanLit establishment. Perhaps because of their continuing popularity with ordinary readers, Leacock and Montgomery were made the scapegoats of a critical modernism which dismissed sentimental literature as low-brow and uncultured.

Even the friendlier critics of recent decades have had to decide whether to deny the sentimentality of these texts, or to apologize for it. Clara Thomas presents a popular solution to the problem when she claims that Leacock is primarily a humorist, with only "an occasional excursion into sentimentality" (97). Similarly, Montgomery's critics, though

unable to dismiss her all too evident use of sentimental formulae, claim that her work is redeemed by flashes of impish humour: "Because the comic tends to overshadow the sentimental, these novels continue to entertain long after other popular novels of the period have been forgotten" (Wiggins 63). Both Thomas and Wiggins assume that humour can be a valuable antidote to sentimental tears, counteracting their dangerous effects.

Equally interesting are critical attempts to erase any trace of sentimentality from these works, to transform Leacock and Montgomery into well-behaved modernists. Dennis Duffy, for instance, claims that *Sunshine Sketches* "mapped a flat, modernist world. Leacock bled away any significance and resonance from social and religious institutions, and finally from language itself" (11). In parallel fashion, Eve Kornfeld and Susan Jackson argue from a feminist perspective that Montgomery's novels do not uphold traditional values of family and the home, but instead encourage women to be "quietly ruthless [and] subtly vicious" (140). The most astonishing thing about these comments is that they are meant to be terms of praise.

Whether through attack, apology, or denial, modernists and postmodernists alike have implied that sentimental texts are all tarred with the same brush. Popular audiences, on the other hand, continue to cherish sentimental books and movies, ignoring the disdain of critics. *Sunshine Sketches* and *Rilla of Ingleside* are two texts that have survived the twentieth century in spite of their sentimental elements--or perhaps because of them. For, in its attack on sentimentality, modernism may have been guilty of throwing out the baby with the bath(os) water. By examining how sentimentality works in these texts, and how it relates to the humour that accompanies it, I seek to rescue the "baby," and to understand the appeal of

sentiment. My task is complicated by the slippery nature of the terms. Frank H. Ellis points out that, faced with the task of defining sentimentality, professors often collapse into metaphor: "Sentimentality is something with a mainspring, or a taproot, or a core, or something like an Irish wake or a 'many branching upas tree' the sap of which is deadly poisonous" (4). Originally defined in the eighteenth century as a belief in the essential goodness of humanity, sentimentality came to be associated in the nineteenth century with literature that depicts and glorifies a feminine, domestic space. Texts like *Sunshine Sketches* and *Rilla of Ingleside*, which take a nostalgic and celebratory look at such obsolete institutions as the small town and the family farm, fall within this basically ideological definition. Sentimental idealization of the domestic sphere likewise comes under fire from feminists who object to the glorification of the "Angel in the House," and from masculinist critics who have already dismissed the domestic as trivial.

Such criticism reveals that literary celebration of traditional values can be a source of vulnerability. It is easier--and safer--to satirize than to affirm. Modernist ideology holds that literature should be critical rather than celebratory, that it should destabilize and unsettle the reader. To say that a text is comforting and reassuring is modernist condemnation in no uncertain terms. This critical preference for literary "shell-shock" has persisted and developed into a kind of post-atomic postmodernism in which all our old, comfortable assumptions and ideals are swept away in the deconstructive fission of humanist values. But even in her own time, Montgomery resisted the idea that the artist must shock the reader out of safe and familiar values. In one of her journal entries, she contrasts her point of view with that of Morley Callaghan:

Callaghan's idea of 'Literature' seems to be to photograph a latrine or pigstye meticulously and have nothing else in the picture. Now, latrines and pigstyes are not only malodorous but very uninteresting. We have a latrine in our backyard. I see it when I look that way--and I also see before it a garden of color and perfume . . . a velvety pine . . . a river of silver and aquamarine. . . . These things are as 'real' as the latrine and can all be seen at the same time. Callaghan sees nothing but the latrine and insists blatantly that you see nothing else also. If you insist on seeing sky and river and pine you are a 'sentimentalist' and the truth is not in you. (3: 387)

Sentimentality of this kind, which depends on selective vision, has been accused of dishonesty, of underplaying serious problems and allowing readers to "feel absolved after a good cry" (Lynch 51). But a hard-hitting modernist novel which puts the reader into the "trenches" of post-war experience can just as easily give absolution to those who did not suffer the war. Where modernist art assaults the reader's sensibilities, the literature of sentimentality may well inspire such sensibilities. For the latter seeks to heal and to strengthen by finding beauty in the natural world, or by locating health in human community. At the very least, it can be said that models of healthy, functioning communities are as useful to human life as magnifying glasses which spy and root out filth and corruption.

Conventional wisdom assumes that satiric, subversive literature provokes action, while sentimentality produces only idle tears. In the eighteenth century, however, "Sentimentalism fostered a benevolence that led to social reforms seldom envisioned in earlier times--to the improvement of jails, to the relief of imprisoned debtors, to the establishment of foundling

hospitals and of homes for penitent prostitutes, and ultimately to the abolition of the slave trade; *but* it also encouraged a ready flow of feeling and tears and a capacity to respond to the joys and sorrow of others" (Abrams, *Norton* 1772, emphasis added). The word "but" seems to imply that even such palpable social gains may not compensate for the dire emotional consequences of sentimentalism.

Abrams' words reveal the underlying distrust of emotion that often motivates seemingly ideological objections to sentimentality. When this distrust is admitted openly, it is often in terms that are curiously self-contradictory. A stock criticism of sentimental literature is that it is unsuccessful in achieving the desired emotional response. Scenes that are evidently meant to be heartbreaking are instead perceived as exaggerated and ludicrous; readers "respond with jeers instead of tears to once celebrated episodes of pathos" (Abrams, *Glossary* 192). On the other hand, sentimental texts that are successful in provoking tears meet with even greater hostility. According to Nina Baym, sentimentality "denotes private, excessive, undisciplined, self-centered emotionality" (xxix). Hanna Schwarz-Eisler goes further, stating that sentimentality is "by definition, the pouring out of emotions felt at a nostalgic moment; an affected, foolish, mawkish, insincere emotion" (33). The deepest horror of the sentimental seems to arise from a fear of emotion and a need to control it.

Open hostility to the sentimental often serves, indirectly, to acknowledge its emotional and ideological power. More insidious, however, is the superficially friendly but condescending line of criticism that recognizes the mass appeal of sentimentality, but denies the text's ability to challenge or transform its audience. Sentimentality has frequently been viewed as a commercial product, designed to pander to its audience; its power to inspire

through a redemptive, healing vision is thus dismissed as mere wish-fulfilment. To such critics, reading a sentimental text is an activity on a level with playing cards or eating a chocolate bar: a harmless pleasure for the "ordinary straightforward somewhat simple-minded reader" (Phelps 86). Sentimentality is indeed harmless, in that it does not attack traditional values and beliefs, but that does not mean it has no impact on readers; in fact, it seeks to heal the isolation of a modern, urban lifestyle which has alienated us from the communal, familial values that sentimentality returns to as a source of hope.

Objections to sentimentality are diverse and occasionally contradictory, since each objection implies its own definition of this very complex term. Humour likewise has several definitions, many of which place it in direct opposition to sentimentality. It typifies individualistic, rationalistic, male values, while sentimentality emerges from the feminine values of love and community. Sentimentality celebrates uncritically; humour mocks and denigrates. Sentimentality evokes tears; humour provokes laughter. Sentimentality seeks healing and reconciliation; humour thrives on adversarial aggression. A text that incorporates both humour and sentimentality thus presents an interesting problem: will the two conflict? Or will they simply cancel each other out? My discussion of *Sunshine Sketches* and *Rilla of Ingleside* attempts to answer these questions by focusing on three crucial areas that define humour and sentimentality: ideology, emotion, and potential for transformation.

On an ideological level, humour and sentimentality are in obvious conflict. Leacock and Montgomery use humour in these texts to mock the small town and its values. Mariposa and Glen St. Mary are home to characters who exhibit all the vices of small-town life: petty

feuding, malicious gossip, and an insatiable interest in the affairs of one's neighbours. Humour in *Sunshine Sketches* derives from the gap between the mask of sentimental virtue that all Mariposans wear, and the reality of their self-interest and hypocrisy. Although Montgomery's humour is not as biting as Leacock's, it too focuses on the gap between the way her characters see themselves, and the way they are seen by the reader; the residents of Glen St. Mary, like those of Mariposa, firmly believe their little burg to be the hub of the Western world. Another target for mockery is romantic love; Rilla Blythe and Zena Pepperleigh represent romantic womanhood, caught up in absurd and unrealistic dreams of being carried away by an enchanted prince. Finally, Leacock and Montgomery take aim at old-fashioned characters who are chronically behind the times, characters who deal with their obsolescence either by trying desperately and vainly to catch up with modern life, or by trying to arrest the flow of progress, fending off automobiles with pitchforks.

Humour in these texts satirizes small-town, romantic, old-fashioned characters from an urban, rational, modern point of view. Such mocking contempt is undercut, however, by sentimental passages that validate the very ideals that humour denigrates. In the sentimental mode, Montgomery and Leacock celebrate the small town as the backbone of Canada, revealing that true virtues can often be found alongside false ones. The enchantments of romantic love are also shown to be a real source of strength and continuity. In nostalgic epilogues to *Rilla of Ingleside* and *Sunshine Sketches*, Montgomery and Leacock reveal a deep attachment to the past that is in conflict with their mockery of old-fashioned ways.

These ideological tensions do not prevent Leacock and Montgomery from combining humour and sentimentality in order to achieve certain emotional effects. Both authors

incorporate into their stories a parodic plot line that affirms sentimental claims in scenes that nevertheless are broadly comic. In *Sunshine Sketches*, the relationship between Peter Pupkin and Zena Pepperleigh parodies the romantic conventions of *Romeo and Juliet* and the sentimental novels that Zena devours whenever her father's back is turned. But the result of the parody is to confirm Peter and Zena's sentimental belief that their love is truly "fore-ordained." Similarly, the parodic plot in *Rilla of Ingleside* unexpectedly confirms the sentimental importance of the small town by replaying the First World War on the domestic front. Humorous episodes anticipate major events on the world stage, with Germany, the United States, and Canada being represented in Glen St. Mary by Whiskers-on-the-moon, Mary Vance, and Susan Baker. Both of these parodies are often hysterically funny, yet laughter arises from the affirmation of sentiment, rather than the denigration of it. Such humorous affirmations resolve the tension between humour and sentimentality in a sudden burst of joy.

These parodic scenes prove that humour and sentiment can be combined to produce a positive emotional response. Leacock and Montgomery frequently juxtapose pathos with humour in order to control the reader's response, but they do so for very different purposes. Leacock's humour intervenes to end the sentimental moment before the reader's emotions can be engaged. Montgomery, by contrast, alternates between comic and sentimental scenes, using humour to cleanse the reader's emotions, making way for a fresh outpouring of sentimental tears. While Leacock aims for a golden mean of emotional moderation, Montgomery creates a pendulum effect; laughter and grief become ever more intense as her novel progresses. These differing approaches can be linked to Hélène Cixous's distinction

between masculine and feminine economies. Leacock's rigid restraint is characteristic of the masculine, while Montgomery's emotional excess reveals a feminine fluidity.

Sentimentality has often been accused of indulging in emotion for its own sake, but Leacock and Montgomery align themselves with a sentimental tradition that uses emotion to transform the reader through an inspiring moral vision. In *Sunshine Sketches*, Leacock focuses on characters whose own practice of reading is a model of what not to do: Jeff Thorpe and Dean Drone read about Cuba and Greece in order to lift themselves above Mariposa life; inevitably, they are painfully disillusioned when events force them back into the little town which, if they only knew it, is where they really belong. Zena Pepperleigh, by contrast, uses her reading to transform her world and to reconcile herself with it. Leacock's humour of reconciliation allows us to follow Zena's example, purging Mariposa of the hypocrisy that obscures its virtues as effectively as it hides its vices. As a result, the town that emerges in the "Envoi" is one that we can come home to with no reservations.

Leacock includes the reader in this process of reconciliation by addressing us directly, creating a communicative triangle between reader, narrator, and town that corresponds to Mikhail Bakhtin's model of sociological poetics. The shifting relationships among the three corners of that triangle gradually draw reader and town together. Leacock thus invites us to share the town's transformation, urging us to see in his satire a mirror for our own self-deceptions, and to find in his sentimentality an impetus to create in our own lives the kind of interdependent, communitarian relationships that ultimately redeem Mariposa.

Rilla of Ingleside also works to transform readers; the novel recreates the experience of living on the home front during the First World War. As we read letters, dispatches, and

newspaper headlines, we go through a process of anticipation and retrospection that Wolfgang Iser describes as an essential element of a transformative reading experience. Montgomery uses the war to educate her readers, teaching us to see ourselves not as autonomous individuals, but as part of an organic global community. The glue that holds that community together is the shared wartime experiences of grief and loss that Montgomery makes available to the reader through her heartrending portrayal of Walter's death. Bereavement becomes a source of deepened sensitivity in this text; our empathy with Rilla's grief helps us to learn a language of suffering that Montgomery presents as our shared human inheritance. Ultimately, it is up to the reader to use that empathy in practical ways, translating the fictional into the real. Rilla's task of rebuilding Canada, of "keeping faith" with Walter, is finally passed on to the reader; the novel inspires us to live up to the wartime ideals of compassion, sacrifice, and commitment to others.

Rilla of Ingleside and *Sunshine Sketches* break all the rules of the modernist tradition that evolved so soon after their publication. They value small-town, domestic experience, they evoke an emotional response, and they nurture readers toward a mature, communal perspective. The repudiation of such sentimental techniques is a distorting lens through which these texts have been viewed. Ironically, however, it is to modernism that Leacock and Montgomery may owe their continued popularity. Hostility to the sentimental helped to widen the gap between "high" and mass culture, driving the sentimental impulse underground, to emerge only in the canonically invisible forms of the Harlequin romance, the soap opera, and the Walt Disney cartoon movie. Books that create a sentimental vision through memorable characterization and vivid writing have become rare indeed. As a result,

readers who seek inspiration and hope return again and again to Leacock and Montgomery, finding in their books a reading experience that is encouraging and companionable, an experience that is qualitatively different from that offered by more self-consciously sophisticated twentieth-century novels. In a literary world dominated by craftsmanship and experimentation, these sentimental and humorous texts are valued for the very characteristics that modernist criticism tried so hard to eradicate.

CELEBRATION AND CONTEMPT

THE IDEOLOGY OF SENTIMENT AND HUMOUR

With the publication of *Anne of Green Gables* in 1908, L. M. Montgomery leapt onto the literary scene. Two years later, *Literary Lapses* transformed Stephen Leacock from a crusty McGill economics professor into a beloved and well-known humorist. Both were past their first youth when they won fame and recognition; Leacock was over forty, and Montgomery was well into her thirties. Born and bred in a world of pie socials and soda jerks, at a time when three-quarters of Canada's population lived in country towns and farming communities, Leacock and Montgomery wrote their best-known works while that world rapidly slipped away.¹ As young people flocked to the cities, once-thriving villages became ghost towns. Mary Rubio and Elizabeth Waterston write in their introduction to Montgomery's journals that, "Having begun her life in a static and rather idyllic rural community, [Montgomery] watched the pace of people's lives quicken because of technological change and the spreading influence of urban centres. . . . she surely spoke for many in her generation when she wrote: 'Our old world is passed away forever--and I fear that those of us who have lived half our span therein will never feel wholly at home in the new' (June 1916)" (2: xvii). *Rilla of Ingleside* focuses attention on that "old world" in ways which are familiar to readers of *Sunshine Sketches*. The sentimentality in these texts celebrates the small town, with its associations of home and hearth, as a way of life which has passed away.

Modernism, by contrast, "derives almost entirely from the metropolitan centres--Paris, London, New York, and Chicago" (McCabe 16). In order to establish itself,

modernism had to usurp the rural tradition of popular literature that celebrated nature and small-town life. Branding regional literature as sentimental, modernists turned their attention to weightier, universal concerns--the universal, of course, being synonymous with the urban perspective. This rural-urban split carries with it a built-in gender bias that becomes clear if "to the regional [we] attach the connotation *home* and to the urban the connotation *world*" (Åhmansson 40). The small town thus becomes an extension of women's domestic sphere, defined by its opposition to the masculine world of the big city.

Where sentimental ideology celebrates the small town, the feminine domain, and the past, humour enters into the fray firmly on the modernists' side, mocking these values from an implicitly urban, male, progressive perspective. And yet in *Sunshine Sketches* and *Rilla of Ingleside*, sentimental and humorous ideologies coexist in the world view of male and female author alike. We laugh at the follies and hypocrisies of old-fashioned, hopelessly romantic, small-town characters, but when the narrator switches to the sentimental mode we find ourselves acknowledging the dignity and worth of these people and their values. The conjunction of humour and sentimentality creates an ideological tension that is not resolved within these texts; readers must ultimately move beyond these competing ideologies in order to understand how humour and sentimentality can work together.

Much of the laughter in *Sunshine Sketches* and *Rilla of Ingleside* is generated by the unique small-town perspective of the characters--a perspective that can only be appreciated if the reader brings to the text an understanding that the big city represents a norm from which these small-town characters comically deviate. The ideal reader of these texts is someone from a small town, gleefully able to recognize and appreciate its finer details, but with big-

city experience, much like the narrator of *Sunshine Sketches*, who identifies himself as a Mariposan, but who evidently knows how his home town must appear to anyone "fresh from New York" (15). The mockery of the small town thus takes two forms in *Sunshine Sketches*: in the satiric vein, Leacock exposes the greed and self-interest that masquerade as small-town philanthropy. Leacock's humorous ideology insists that the sentimental values of chivalry, charity, and fatherly love are simply hypocritical masks for actions which arise from covert, far less laudable motives. Such corrective satire is complemented by a more affectionate humour that also turns upon the gap between the way we see Mariposa, and the way Mariposans see themselves; this gentler humour takes the form of an innocuous running joke based on a mock-heroic juxtaposition of small and big.

Leacock's satire often exposes the vices and hypocrisies of Mariposa. Humour arises not from the vices themselves, but from the popular assumption that vice is virtue. In Mariposa, behaviour motivated by political partisanship or shrewd self-interest assumes the mask of sentimental virtue, and wins approbation from fellow Mariposans who are consoled by their own subterfuges. Mariposans are collectively inspired, for instance, by "one of the most moving scenes ever enacted in the Mariposa Court" (113). The scene in question is Judge Pepperleigh's decision to acquit his son Neil of the charge of assaulting Peter McGinnis. Judge Pepperleigh is famed as a father who dotes on his son; the narrator avers that the Judge never spoke a harsh word to Neil in his life. The result of this disciplinary technique is that Neil grows up to become a drunken lout, recognized by everyone but his father as a talentless bum. When Neil pummels Peter McGinnis, a Liberal organizer, Judge Pepperleigh is given an opportunity to indulge his two overruling passions: his love for his

son, and his hatred of Liberals and all their works. With barely repressed glee, Pepperleigh announces, "My boy, you are innocent. You smashed in Peter McGinnis's face, but you did it without criminal intent. You put a face on him, by Jehosaphat! that he won't lose for six months, but you did it without evil purpose or malign design" (113). This miscarriage of justice is a blatant abuse of judicial power, motivated by political partisanship. But it is celebrated by Mariposans as a moving demonstration of paternal affection. Through Judge Pepperleigh, Leacock suggests that fatherly love can be simply a mask for political manipulation and acts of deliberate injustice.

Leacock also ironically exposes the gap between a barkeeper's business interests and his philanthropic posturing in "The Hostelry of Mr. Smith" (13). A newcomer to the town, Mr. Smith manages to establish his hotel, despite the objections of temperance people, through a program of "wide and sagacious philanthropy" (26). Mr. Smith is living proof that charity comes home to roost, often within a few short hours. When a steam merry-go-round sets up beside the hotel, Mr. Smith spends ten dollars to pay for rides for the children: "That night the merry-go-round whirled madly till after midnight, freighted to capacity with Mariposa children, while up in Smith's Hotel, parents, friends and admirers, as the news spread, were standing four feet deep along the bar. They sold forty dollars' worth of lager alone that night" (26). Philanthropy is an investment that earns a 300% rate of return in one evening alone. Mr. Smith here, as always, is motivated solely by the bottom line. The humour arises from the fact that his greed is interpreted by Mariposans as a sentimental virtue; after the merry-go-round incident, the narrator comments that "Mr. Smith learned, if he had not already suspected it, the blessedness of giving" (26).

The technique of disguising ignoble motives under a mask of sentimental virtue is shared by Mariposans as a group. When the Mariposa Belle is sinking, for example, the men cry "Women and children first!" when they see how weak and unsteady the lifeboats appear as they are lowered into the water, arguing that "if it should turn out that the boat wouldn't even hold women and children, [what was the sense] of trying to jam a lot of heavy men into it?" (69). The sentimental code of chivalry is revealed here to be an empty form; it has been stripped of its original content of sincere self-sacrifice, and is now merely an attractive façade for cowardice and self-interest. The reader is expected to see through these transparent subterfuges; humour arises from the incongruity between petty vice and the empty forms of small-town virtue behind which it hides.

Such satiric humour has a clear moral content, intended to reveal the vice that lurks beneath virtuous masks. There is nonetheless a more innocuous form of humour in *Sunshine Sketches* which focuses on Mariposa's foolishness and absurdity, rather than its vice. Through a series of mock-heroic comparisons, Leacock plays once again upon the contrast between the way Mariposans view their town, and the way that such a town appears to a more sophisticated, big-city reader. When Josh Smith's liquor license is threatened, for instance, the narrator comments that "beside the decisions of the License Commissioners of Missinaba County, the opinions of the Lords of the Privy Council are mere trifles" (19). Such hyperbole is ostensibly meant to support the narrator's patriotic assertion that Mariposa is a hotbed of action and excitement. But if this tempest in a teapot is as exciting to Mariposans as the narrator claims, that only goes to prove what a sleepy little town Mariposa really is. This technique of reduction-by-inflation occurs throughout the sketches, as

Leacock emphasizes the cultural and moral littleness of the town by ironically insisting that Mariposa can outdo the grandeur of a European city. The Mariposa band is thus compared to the Buckingham palace guard (53), Josh Smith's defeat of incumbent Henry Bagshaw in the "Great Election" is linked to the defeat of Napoleon at Waterloo (163), and "the sound of 'O Can-a-da,' borne across the waters" of Lake Wissanotti is equated with "the intoning choirs of your European cathedrals" (66). Once again, Mariposans leave themselves open to ridicule through their transparent pretenses. Here, instead of showing vice masquerading as virtue, Leacock shows how the "small" masquerades as "big." Mariposans behave with the absurd naïveté of a little girl who struts about in her mother's make-up and high heels, pretending to be grown up. In attempting to achieve the status of the big European city, Mariposa reveals that it has internalized the same modern, urban values that condemn the small town as an unsophisticated backwater.

Readers are expected to bring to the text a cosmopolitan viewpoint that recognizes the gap between what Mariposa is--a sunny, sleepy, backward little town--and what it aspires to be. In the sentimental mode, however, Leacock nudges us out of our detached, urban perspective and allows us to join our vision with that of the citizens of Mariposa. In the process, he reveals that in its obsession with big-ness, Mariposa is in danger of forfeiting the rural, familial, and traditional virtues that give it an edge over its big-city neighbours. The very small-town virtues that serve as hypocritical masks in the humorous mode also act as sincere and redeeming features of this complex community. Judge Pepperleigh's paternal love, for example, has been humorously exposed as a mask for his game of political one-up-manship. In one of the most genuinely moving sentimental moments in the text, however,

we realize that his love for his son is very real, and we grieve with him when he comes home "with one hand pressed to his temple and in the other the cablegram that said that Neil had been killed in action in South Africa" (114). The Judge's dogged refusal to see his son's faults leads him into serious errors in parenting, but after Neil's death, his dedication to his son's memory is as laudable as it is pathetic. Looking at "Neil's picture, in uniform," standing beside General Kitchener (114), it is possible, for a brief moment, to see the boy through his father's eyes, as a young man who became a hero the only way he could, by dying far too soon fighting a distant war in a far-away land.

The sentimental virtue of charity is affirmed in a similar way during the sinking of the *Mariposa Belle*. Charity can be defined as a commitment to community of either time, money, or personal sacrifice. For Josh Smith, charity is a mask for greed and opportunism; he gives to his community in order to reap what he has sown, with interest, and in exactly the same coin. True charity does exist in Mariposa, however, though it is not where we might expect to find it. At first glance, the sinking of the *Mariposa Belle* is simply a crowded, farcical scene that pokes fun at the clumsiness of Mariposans. Rescue boats are launched when the steamer settles into the bed of the lake; as these leaky vessels sink one by one, the supposed rescuers are hauled up into the very ship they were trying to save, and are greeted with jubilant cheers. Amid all this hilarity, however, Leacock mentions that "After all, the bravery of the lifeboat man is the true bravery,--expended to save life, not to destroy it" (70). The sudden sincerity of his tone could easily be missed in the noise and bustle of the scene, but it is a signal for us to try looking at the event from a Mariposan point of view, to surrender our humorous detachment. With that change of focus, the chaos

and disorganization suddenly disappear. The sinking of the Mariposa Belle is an annual event, an exquisitely choreographed ritual in which the two halves of the community--those who went on the excursion and those who stayed behind--affirm their commitment to one another. Everyone is a rescuer, and everyone is rescued in a ritualized outpouring of community spirit.

Sentimental confirmation of the true grandeur of Mariposa also takes the form of a change of focus. Laughter at Leacock's mock-heroic comparisons occurs when the reader looks down at little Mariposa from the opulent armchairs of the Mausoleum Club, mentally comparing the town to a big-city standard. But when the narrator claims that the "foyer of the opera in Paris may be a fine sight, but I doubt if it can compare with the inside of Eliot's drug store in Mariposa" (137), we do not laugh. We do not call up a mental picture of the Eiffel Tower and the Arc de Triomphe for comparison; we are too busy gazing at the "blaze of lights," under which we see "boys and girls and old people too--all drinking sarsaparilla and chocolate sundaes and lemon sours and foaming drinks that you take out of long straws" (137). This is a scene of genuine gaiety--so genuine, in fact, that it charms Peter Pupkin out of his tragic pose of suicidal misery; he orders a bromo-seltzer instead of committing suicide, because one simply cannot go "up to the soda-water fountain and [ask] for five cents' worth of chloroform and soda" (138). Before long, Peter is restored completely to his senses, and is ready to head back to the Pepperleighs' armed with "three great bricks of Eliot's ice cream" (139).

In the sentimental mode, Leacock allows us to look through the eyes of Mariposans, to see the genuine virtues and attractions of the town and its inhabitants. That sentimental

vision is at odds with the point of view of humour, which sees only the vices and flaws that are hidden under sentimental masks. In *Rilla of Ingleside*, L. M. Montgomery also portrays characters whose pettiness and spite are hidden under a mask of superficial virtue. Irene Howard is a vain, malicious girl, whose condescending compliments Rilla initially takes at face value. There is nothing funny about Irene's true nature; she takes pleasure in torturing Rilla with gossip about Walter's reputation for cowardice, and when Walter finally enlists, Irene rushes to be the first to break the news to his agony-stricken sister. Although she once idolized Irene, Rilla eventually outgrows her old friend, and finds herself "seeing through Irene with a disconcerting clearness--discerning under all her superficial sweetness her pettiness, her vindictiveness, her insincerity, her essential cheapness" (113). The process is similar to what the reader goes through in *Sunshine Sketches*, but here there is nothing humorous about it. Rilla's ability to "see through" Irene brings painful disillusionment rather than ironic laughter.

For Leacock, everyone is a hypocrite, including the reader, whom Leacock constantly addresses with words that imply, "you know how it is." Hypocrisy is a fact of human nature, in Leacock's view, and it must be accepted and laughed at whenever possible. Not so for Montgomery. The Irene Howards of the world are always contrasted in her novels by "kindred spirits," or, as Miss Cornelia would put it, by members of "the race that knows Joseph." The members of this charmed inner circle are people who, with all their faults, are sincere and genuine, and therefore likeable. Norman Douglas is a bully and a pagan, but he is of the race that knows Joseph nonetheless, because he pretends to be nothing else. He shares many characteristics with Mr. Pryor, otherwise known as Whiskers-on-the-moon, who

is mercilessly portrayed as a bellowing despot. But, unlike Norman, Whiskers is an elder in the church; his self-righteous, hypocritical religiosity places him beyond the pale of the tribe of Joseph. Montgomery is more optimistic about human nature than Leacock--her novels suggest that it is possible to outgrow Mariposan artifice--but Leacock is the more forgiving of the two.

The satiric humour so characteristic of *Sunshine Sketches* is almost entirely absent from Montgomery's text. When she portrays hypocrisy and vice, it is usually without amusement. Montgomery picks up on the more innocuous variety of Leacockian humour, however; she makes the Ingleside housekeeper, Susan, a mouthpiece for the self-aggrandizing town sentiments that Leacock lampoons in *Sunshine Sketches*. Mariposans gallantly cloak their town disputes when the Prince of Wales visits, assuming that "later on, as king, he would, of course, *have* to know all about" the post-office fiasco and the "trouble over the town wharf" (156). Their naïve egotism and comic self-importance echo Susan's belief that "the Kaiser of Germany knows *and cares about* everything that happens in Glen St Mary" (Epperly 126). When a Victory Loan meeting produces few subscribers, Susan remarks wrathfully, "No doubt the Kaiser will feel quite downcast when he hears of this meeting!" (222). When Uncle Mark MacAllister's barn burns down, Susan concludes that "Germany is anxious to get square with him" for the speeches he gives at recruiting meetings (152). The town pacifist, Whiskers-on-the-moon, is a German spy in Susan's eyes, and, as Rilla explains, "Susan has an unshaken belief that the Kaiser's spies--presumably represented by Mr. Pryor--promptly inform him of every happening in our Glen" (222).

Montgomery adopts Leacock's technique of reduction-by-inflation in her portrayal of

life on the home front, displaying a good-natured awareness of the contrast between the littleness of the Canadian town, and the immensity of the worldwide conflict in which it has somehow become embroiled. This awareness is evident in Montgomery's humorous emphasis on various domestic correlatives to the action overseas. Whenever Germany strikes a blow to the Allies, the Ingleside family cat, Dr. Jekyll-and-Mr. Hyde, goes into a "Hyde" phase. Genevieve Wiggins points out that Susan is in typical form when she "yokes an unsuccessful batch of bread with the fall of Warsaw" (72). Similarly, the level of American involvement in the war can be measured by the amount of pot-banging required to prepare a meal; when Woodrow Wilson responds to the sinking of the *Lusitania* by "writing a note," the narrator sums up the situation by remarking that "President Wilson was rapidly becoming anathema in Susan's kitchen" (106). Even the war-baby that Rilla adopts, referred to as "Jims" by everyone else, is scrupulously addressed as "Little Kitchener" by Susan, after the war leader, Kitchener of Khartoum. The humour of these comparisons lies in the distance between our view and Susan's. Susan sees nothing incongruous in her comparisons, but the more sophisticated reader is able to perceive the ludicrous contrast between chubby little Jims and the powerful British general whose name he bears.

Susan provides comic relief during even the darkest days of the war as she fights the Germans in her kitchen, armed with a wooden spoon and pots of boiling soup. In the sentimental mode, however, Montgomery often confirms Susan's lovably absurd conviction that Glen St. Mary, P.E.I. is the hub of Allied resistance to German imperialism. When Jem, Rilla's eldest brother, writes home from the front, he reveals that Glen St. Mary is the source of his strength and motivation. "When I saw what had been done here," he writes,

"to homes and gardens and people--well, dad, I seemed to see a gang of Huns marching through Rainbow Valley and the Glen, and the garden at Ingleside" (97). He concludes his letter, saying, "We are fighting to make those dear old places where we had played as children, safe for other boys and girls" (98). Susan herself, when put to the test, is able to defend this point of view. When the townsmen show reluctance to subscribe to the Victory Loan, Susan gives them the tongue-lashing of their lives. In response, one of the men suggests, sarcastically, that Lloyd George must be greatly heartened by her support.

Outraged, Susan "just 'sailed in' as she puts it, and 'said her say'":

She said it was the likes of her, millions of her, that *did* stand behind Lloyd George, and *did* hearten him up. . . . Dear old Susan! She is a perfect dynamo of patriotism and loyalty and contempt for slackers of all kinds, and when she let it loose on that audience in her one grand outburst she electrified it. Susan always vows she is no suffragette, but she gave womanhood its due that night, and she literally made those men cringe. When she finished with them they were ready to eat out of her hand. She wound up by ordering them --yes, ordering them--to march up to the platform forthwith and subscribe for Victory Bonds. And after wild applause most of them did it. (223)

The tables have turned with a vengeance. In that very funny scene, Montgomery allows Susan, the representative of small-town domesticity, to deflate the male audience who had dared to laugh at her grandiose patriotic sentiments.

It is no coincidence that Susan's defence of the small town is also a celebration of womanhood. If the small town is the sentimental alternative to urban modernism, femininity

is even more clearly the "other" by which both humour and modernism define themselves. In *Sentimental Modernism*, Suzanne Clark points out that "The horror of the sentimental helped to define the good male poet as the prostitute once defined the good woman" (10). Her book focuses on the ambiguous position of women writers within such an anti-feminist modernist tradition. Books on women's humour often examine similar ambiguities because humour has long been perceived as a male preserve. Nancy Walker, for instance, feels a need to assert the bare existence of women's humour, and cites an oft-quoted study by Mahadev Apte to show that "The circumstances under which women's humor is permissible tend to be those in which women are in groups composed only of women--and thus are invisible to men" (85). Women's humour exists, Walker concludes with relief, but it is a well-kept secret, hidden from male ears. But such defensiveness attests of itself to the widespread association of humour with masculinity. Sentimentality, by contrast, is often associated with femininity and romantic love. As Clark observes, "From the point of view of literary modernism . . . women writers were entangled in sensibility, were romantic and sentimental by nature" (2). R. F. Brissenden confirms the link between sentiment and romance, remarking that "Love is the theme of every sentimental novel" (116). This triple association of sentimentality, romance, and femininity is set up as the negative term in a hierarchical binary of masculine humour and feminine romance.

In *Sunshine Sketches of a Little Town* and *Rilla of Ingleside*, the humorous mode mocks feminine romantic values, while the sentimental mode affirms them. The representatives of romantic sentimentality in these texts are Zena Pepperleigh and Rilla Blythe, and there are plenty of opportunities to laugh at their illusions. The only female

character to be treated at any length in Leacock's text, Zena Pepperleigh is a two-dimensional caricature, defined by her dreamy devotion to romantic ideals. According to Robertson Davies, "Leacock never wrote of love except in a jocular and scoffing spirit" (25), apparently viewing love as "one of those amiable delusions to which clouded or inferior intellects are subject" (24). Reading Leacock's humorous treatment of Peter and Zena, one would be tempted to agree with him. The mock-heroic narrative stance is announced in the heading that begins Leacock's three-chapter exploration of romantic love: "The Extraordinary Entanglement of Mr. Pupkin" (109). The word "extra-ordinary" is obviously meant to be read phonetically; this small-town romance is remarkable for nothing if not for its ordinariness. Zena Pepperleigh is not "in the least exceptional or romantic, because all the girls in Mariposa" spend their afternoons reading novels and dreaming of "being borne away by an Algerian corsair over the blue waters of the Mediterranean," or being rescued by an armoured knight "from the embattled keep of a castle beside the Danube" (121-22).

Leacock enjoys pricking Zena's balloon and comically deflating her romantic dreams by contrasting them with prosaic reality. The prime candidate for the role of Zena's enchanted prince is Peter Pupkin, of the speedy bicycle and the daffodil blazer. Zena longs for a knightly rescuer; Peter, a veteran of the Mariposa Belle rescue squad, has already shown his true colours in that department. Similarly, when Zena dreams of her lover's return, "tall and soldierly and sunburned, after fighting for ten years in the Soudan for her sake" (121), Leacock interrupts the climactic moment. The lover has asked for a sign--"ten years in the Soudan entitles them to a sign"--and, just as Zena plucks a white rose from her hair, "she would hear her father's step on the piazza and make a grab for the *Pioneers of*

Tecumseh Township, and start reading it like mad" (122). The incongruity between these hard-working Canadian pioneers and the fabled knights and corsairs of Algerian fame is the source of Leacock's comic deflation of romance by reality.

If Zena's dreams are mocked, so is her courtship. Romantic canoe rides on Lake Wissanotti and chummy ice-cream dates are boiled down to a set of grotesque statistics: "Pupkin had paddled Zena sixty-two miles. . . . He had played tennis with her on sixteen afternoons. . . . More than that--he had been to tea at the judge's house fourteen times. . . . Still more than that, Pupkin had bought for Zena, reckoning it altogether, about two buckets of ice cream and perhaps half a bushel of chocolate" (126-27). At the height of their courtship, the staunchly Anglican Zena and Peter fly in the face of convention and attend "the Presbyterian Church 'for fun,' which, if you know Mariposa, you will realize to be a wild sort of escapade that ought to speak volumes" (127).

At every step, Leacock transforms Zena's romance into hilarious farce. The comic deflation of the romantic moment is a key element of Montgomery's humour as well. Rilla Blythe has much in common with her soul sister, Zena Pepperleigh. The love story in Montgomery's novel focuses on Rilla's relationship with Kenneth Ford, a romantic hero with many of the trappings of Zena's fantasies: he is charming and handsome, and "the glamour of a far-away city" sets him apart from the Glen St. Mary boys (29). When he leaves for the front, he vividly resembles Zena's "tall and soldierly" hero. He pays Rilla a last visit, taking the opportunity to gaze "at the delicate, girlish silhouette of her, her long lashes, her dented lip, her adorable chin. . . . He carried that picture of her in his heart to the horror of the battlefields of France" (134). This romantic moment is rudely interrupted, in true

Leacockian style, by the arrival of Susan, who digs in to "help Rilla out" by entertaining Kenneth with a history of his and Rilla's spankings (134). With evident relish, Susan recounts the time Kenneth was spanked by his mother on a visit to Ingleside, as well as the time she spanked him herself, rounding off her monologue with a merry recollection of the time Rilla was spanked by her father. Writhing in humiliation, "Rilla wondered viciously whether Susan meant to relate *all* the family spankings. But Susan had finished with the subject and branched off to another cheerful one"--the accidental death of little Tod MacAllister, who killed himself by "eating up a whole box of fruitatives" (136). Fruitatives and spankings make for a comic anti-climax that brings us back to reality even more firmly than does Zena's *Pioneers of Tecumseh Township*.

The juxtaposition of the romantic moment and the comic deflation of it typifies Ken and Rilla's relationship. At Rilla's first party, the evening begins as an idyllic country romance. The party is held at the Four Winds lighthouse, where couples dance beneath Chinese lanterns on a patio overlooking the Atlantic. Ken and Rilla dance, and then row "across the moonlit channel to the sand-shore" where they sit talking, accompanied by "the tiny little wavelets swishing on the sand, the cool and freakish wind of night crooning in the stiff grasses on the crest of the dunes, the music sounding faintly and sweetly over the channel" (31). Once again, humour is on hand to deflate this sentimental dream. Rilla misses her boat back home and is forced to walk around the harbour in her dancing shoes with the blunt and unromantic Mary Vance, who kindly offers to rub Rilla's blistered feet with goose-grease. "Goose-grease on your heels!" Rilla reflects in crestfallen disgust, "So this was what your first party and your first beau and your first romance ended in!" (39).

Unlike Leacock, Montgomery is willing to sustain romantic illusions for a few magical hours, but humour stands ready to mock sentimental fantasies the moment romance is fled.

The technique of humorous anti-climax, which deflates moonlit romance with the reality of goose-grease and blisters, also serves to link *Rilla of Ingleside* to *Sunshine Sketches*. In such humorous passages, Montgomery and Leacock seem, as Davies has suggested, to present love and femininity in a scoffing, or at least sceptical tone. In the sentimental mode, however, both Leacock and Montgomery validate women and their sentimental beliefs. The humorous focus on Zena's unrealistic fantasies implies that her love for Peter is insincere, or at best, deluded--that Peter is nothing more than a bit player in a drama that revolves squarely around Zena herself. Peter's suicidal depression seems to reveal a similar self-absorption; he is more preoccupied with envisioning grandiose headlines announcing his doom than he is with Zena. Even his recovery in Eliot's drugstore is motivated by a concern for appearances; his devotion to the appearance of tragic heroism is deflated by his equally self-conscious recognition that it would look very foolish indeed to order "five cents' worth of chloroform and soda" in the atmosphere of gaiety that pervades the very commonplace and undramatic soda fountain.

Peter's suicidal tendencies are not just the result of tragic posturing, however; they are also prompted by a sincere humility that goes beyond his reverence for the tragic code of romance. Peter is all too aware that he lacks the heroism Zena deserves: "When Zena would clasp her hands and talk rapturously about crusaders and soldiers and firemen and heroes generally, Pupkin knew just where he came in. Not in it, that was all" (127). Peter is ironically conscious of his affluent background, feeling ashamed of the ease with which he

has made his way thus far in the world. Zena, for her part, is willing to sacrifice her comfortable home to experience the romantic "enchantments" of living on a poor bank clerk's salary. Her declaration that "she would only marry a man who was poor and had his way to make and would hew down difficulties for her sake" (131) is what throws Peter into a tailspin in the first place. As usual, the humour arises from the gap between our vision and Peter's, but here we see that Zena's words are motivated by genuine thoughtfulness, while poor Peter is so panicked that he does not realize she is angling for a proposal.

Zena and Peter are sincere in their sentimental beliefs, despite their shared tendency for self-dramatization. Having overcome the humorous allegation that romantic love is merely a form of self-indulgence, Leacock sentimentally debunks humour's claim that it represents reality, and that love is only an illusion. Gerald Lynch claims that Zena Pepperleigh ultimately triumphs because she is able to "imbue Pupkin with the trappings of her romantic heroes" (106), fulfilling Leacock's own claim that "When a young man sees in his girl an angel, and a young girl sees in her lover a hero, perhaps they are seeing what is really there" (*HTW* 97). Leacock's words suggest that love has transformative power, that a sentimental vision may serve to lessen the gap between romance and reality. Accordingly, the most telling joke in these chapters is the ironic reversal of mock-enchament in which so dubious a prince as Peter Pupkin turns into a "merchant prince" (Cameron 126), who is willing to renounce the world for the sake of his charming mistress. Here, the real affirmation of romantic enchantment takes the form of a few quick phrases, buried in the midst of a sustained humorous passage. Leacock can be in full humorous swing, poking fun at Zena and her daydreams, when, suddenly and subtly, the tone changes: "I don't know

whether you know it, but you can rent an enchanted house in Mariposa for eight dollars a month, and some of the most completely enchanted are the cheapest" (122-23). Leacock's humour suggests that reality can be measured in dollars and cents, but there is a serious sentimental undertone here that reminds us of the very real enchantments of a first home filled with youth and love. Zena's willingness to marry a poor man attests to her belief that love can overcome the sordid realities of rent and grocery bills, and that sentimental faith can dignify the meanest existence.

This sentimental note is resumed at the end of the romantic plot, when Peter and Zena get married and move into "one of the enchanted houses on the hillside in the newer part of town" (150). The narrator begins in a mocking tone:

You may see Pupkin there at any time cutting enchanted grass on a little lawn in as gaudy a blazer as ever.

But if you step up to speak to him or walk with him into the enchanted house, pray modulate your voice a little--musical though it is--for there is said to be an enchanted baby on the premises whose sleep must not lightly be disturbed. (150-51)

Babies are incapable of vanity, hypocrisy, and absurdity--traits that provoke Leacock's satire. Peter and Zena's baby in fact represents the enchantment of the ordinary, and the glow of that enchantment casts its rays back through the story, giving a touching validity to Zena's sentimental celebration of love.

Where Leacock provides sentimental antidotes to his satiric deflation of domestic virtues, Montgomery, writing more openly in the sentimental mode, redeems romantic love

by countering humorous scepticism with a celebration of feminine values. Elizabeth Epperly identifies *Rilla of Ingleside* as Montgomery's "tribute to Canadian girlhood and womanhood" (129). The role of women in the war, as Montgomery depicts it, is both honourable and important. Rilla's prophetic brother Walter defines that role in his letters from the front, and also in his poem, "The Piper." Walter himself, it should be noted, is one of Montgomery's "feminized men," men who, like Matthew in *Anne of Green Gables*, are loved and respected because they cross gender boundaries and adopt the traditionally feminine qualities of tact, sensitivity, and a nurturing spirit. Sickened by the prospect of war, Walter cannot share the macho adventure-lust of his gallant brother Jem. Walter is a poet and a dreamer who was often teased in childhood for his bookish habits, and taunted for being a "girl" and a "sissy." Initially daunted by the blood and the ugliness of war, Walter hesitates to enlist, but when he finally goes to war he wins a Distinguished Conduct Medal for crawling out of the trenches to save a wounded comrade. Walter's feminine traits, as well as his manly heroism, qualify him to express Montgomery's sense of women's importance in the war.

After Walter is killed at the battle of Courcelette, Rilla receives his final letter, written only hours before he died. Walter asks Rilla to "tell your children of the *Idea* we fought and died for. . . . This will be part of *your* work, Rilla. And if you--all you girls back in the homeland--do it, then we who don't come back will know that you have not 'broken faith' with us" (192). Walter's words echo those of John McCrae in his poem, "In Flanders Fields." In *Rilla of Ingleside*, Walter's "The Piper," obviously modeled on McCrae's poem, becomes "the one great poem of the war," written by a "Canadian lad in the Flanders trenches" (167). McCrae has received harsh criticism for his admonition to

Take up our quarrel with the foe:
 To you from failing hands we throw
 The torch; be yours to hold it high.
 If ye break faith with us who die
 We shall not sleep, though poppies grow
 In Flanders fields.

McCrae's uncompromising spirit fed the popular battle cry of "No peace without victory," and may have torpedoed attempts at an early peace. As Owen Dudley Edwards points out, however, "Montgomery, if not McCrae, gave the later lines of 'In Flanders Fields' a purpose beyond war, the nobler end of consolidating war sacrifice into a lasting peace" (130).

Given the task of sustaining, protecting, and rebuilding her country, Rilla "keeps faith" by knitting socks, raising her war baby, and learning to cook. She joins the "legions of Hestias [who] guard the homeland and its symbols" (Epperly 129). For Montgomery, the Great War serves to widen the domestic sphere to embrace all of Canada. When Rilla takes a job at Carter Flagg's store, and Susan goes out into the fields to help bring in the harvest, their actions are a natural extension of their sentimental role as goddesses of the hearth.

It is significant, then, that in one key episode, Montgomery's celebration of femininity takes the form of a rebuke to those who laugh at romantic love. When Whiskers-on-the-moon forbids his daughter Miranda to marry her sweetheart before he leaves for the front, Rilla comes to the rescue and organizes a war-wedding to take place in Miranda's own home while her father is away. Caught up in the romance of the occasion, Rilla arranges for all the trimmings: a wedding cake baked by Susan, a gown, a ring, and even Anne's own

wedding veil. The results, however, are sadly disappointing; the romance of the occasion is marred by the fact that "Miranda, in spite of her dress and veil, was such a flat-faced, commonplace, uninteresting little bride" (159-60). To make matters worse, the groom cries throughout the ceremony, and Miranda's overfed dog, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, has a seizure: "He would begin with a series of choking, spasmodic sounds, continuing into a gruesome gurgle, and ending up with a strangled howl. Nobody could hear a word Mr. Meredith was saying, except now and then, when Sir Wilfrid stopped for breath" (160). Montgomery even puts this "masculine" comic denigration of romantic love into the mouth of a female character; Rilla plans to "write a perfectly killing account of it all to the boys" (161). Rilla's wartime role requires her to move easily from the language of romance to that of humour. Like many other forms of women's wartime service, Rilla's letter-writing allows her to transgress the borders of a traditionally male space, and to prove that women, as well as men, can speak two languages simultaneously.

Montgomery affirms Rilla's humour as a valuable aspect of her participation in the war effort, but she also qualifies its reduction of romantic values by making a sentimental turn towards realism. Miranda and Joe spend their brief honeymoon at the lighthouse at Four Winds, and then, on a cold Friday morning, the Blythes gather at the train station to see Joe off:

Joe took his pale little bride in his arms and she lifted her face to his. Rilla choked suddenly. It did not matter that Miranda was insignificant and commonplace and flat-featured. It did not matter that she was the daughter of Whiskers-on-the-moon. All that mattered was that rapt, sacrificial look in her

eyes--that ever-burning, sacred fire of devotion and loyalty and fine courage that she was mutely promising Joe she and thousands of other women would keep alive at home while their men held the western front. (162)

Montgomery's "sunshine sketch" of mutton dressed as lamb suddenly clouds over with the reality of a rural village drawn into a global war. As her husband goes off to face the Kaiser, meek little Miranda, transformed by sacrificial love, heads back to her father's house to face and overcome another form of tyranny.

In thus affirming the value of romantic love, Montgomery joins Leacock in a sentimental response to their own humorous cynicism. Despite many common threads in their treatment of small-town romance, Montgomery and Leacock have rarely been discussed together, possibly because one would not expect Leacock, the wry humorist, to have much in common with a woman who has been dismissed as "a dispenser of sentimental and idealistic escape fiction" (Wiggins vi).² The humour in Montgomery's novels has also often gone unnoticed, not only because she is a woman writer, but because she depicts a woman's world. Montgomery's Glen St. Mary is in truth a feminine inverse of Leacock's male-dominated Mariposa.

According to Leacock, "women are not humorous except by exception. There is no such person as Mrs. Pickwick" (*HH* 125). Following his own creed, Leacock is careful to portray only men in *Sunshine Sketches*. The sole exception is Zena Pepperleigh, who could hardly be considered one of Leacock's comic masterpieces; if we laugh at Zena, it is because we laugh at Peter even harder. By contrast, "Men rarely occupy strategic positions in Montgomery's novels--they are there as backdrops and the stories advance primarily

through the women's talking, networking and gossiping" (Rubio, "LMM" 39). It is not only the Great War that empties the stage of men in Glen St. Mary; Montgomery takes Mariposa and turns it literally inside out.

Sunshine Sketches of a Little Town opens with a tour of the town; we walk down Main Street and see the sights: "Smith's Hotel and the Continental and the Mariposa House, and the two banks" (14). Many of the sketches take place in outdoor locations: Indian Island and Lake Wissanotti, the piazza in front of the Pepperleighs' house, and the grounds of the "Beacon on the Hill." The interiors which are described are nearly all public places--the soda shop, the barber shop, Smith's Hotel and caff--and even then there is often the sense that we are looking in from the street, aware of the outer structure as well as the inside. The only private residences Leacock features are both semi-public: the encyclopedia-laden apartment above the bank, where Peter Pupkin hosts his poker games, and Dean Drone's rectory, site of the Infant Class and the Mother's Auxiliary.

Instead of leading us down Main Street, Glen St. Mary, Montgomery begins her novel in a domestic space: the Ingleside living room, where women sit and gossip over afternoon tea. Much of the novel takes place within Ingleside walls, in Rilla's bedroom or in Susan's kitchen. Outdoor scenes occur on the lawn or in the nearby Rainbow Valley. Characters only leave Ingleside and its environs for isolated, dramatic episodes at church, at the train station, or at Four Winds Light. We also visit three other homes over the course of the novel: the homes of Miranda Pryor, Irene Howard, and Mrs. Matilda Pitman. Montgomery's feminized small town is a world of private, domestic spaces--a world that is mute and invisible in Leacock's humour, because it is deemed to be essentially unfunny.

Rilla of Ingleside nonetheless proves that women can be funny, both as creators of humour and as comic characters. In fact, Montgomery portrays World War I as a situation in which men become dependent upon female humour; Rilla saves up funny anecdotes to relate to Jem, Walter, and Ken in her letters, and Walter admits to Rilla that "if it weren't for your letters--your dear, bright, merry, funny, comical, *believing* letters--I think I'd give up" (81). Affirmation of female humour fills the pages of this novel, and yet, so strong is the connection between humour and masculinity, that Montgomery's jokes nearly join Leacock's in disparaging the feminine values of the small town, romantic love, and the past.

Comic disparagement of the past most frequently takes the form of poking fun at old-fashioned characters who cannot keep up with the times. This progressive humour surfaces in *Sunshine Sketches* when Leacock satirizes one of the collective foibles of Mariposa: its inability to become the kind of sophisticated, modern city it so admires. With his infallible sense of what makes Mariposans tick, Josh Smith solves his License Board problems by making the town an offer it cannot refuse: he remodels his hotel along the lines of those he has seen in the big city. Here, however, sophisticated cafés and Rathskellers become the "caff" and the "Rats' Cooler." The success of the Rats' Cooler is a clear demonstration of Mariposans' sheeplike devotion to big-city trends. "Folks won't eat now in an ordinary dining-room with a high ceiling and windows," Mr. Smith explains. "You have to get 'em down underground in a room with no windows and lots of sawdust round and waiters that can't speak English" (23). Loath to be left behind the times, Mariposa eagerly pursues the sepulchral pleasures of this new, up-to-date dining experience, without understanding the ethnic significance of their surroundings. The punch line of the joke is

that the moment his liquor license is renewed, Mr. Smith promptly closes down the Rats' Cooler, "or rather Mr. Smith closed it for repairs, and there is every likelihood that it will hardly open for three years" (35). Unable to sustain its drive for modernity, Mariposa quickly settles back into its old groove; the caff stays open, to be sure, but it functions simply as a new forum for the same old food, prepared as usual in the hotel kitchen.

The next attempt to bring Mariposa up to date is equally ill-fated. Inspired by an urge to "kindle a Brighter Beacon" and "set up a greater Evidence" (79), Dean Drone endows Mariposa with a new church, the best money can buy, complete with stained-glass windows and imported tiles. The old "quaint little building in red and grey stone" (76) is levelled to the ground, and the mossy old cemetery is replaced with a brand new Necropolis. Mariposans invariably choose the most vulgar of modern fashions to imitate, and here they are once again unable to sustain their grandiose project. The church slides into debt, and Mariposa decides that, having got themselves into trouble in the first place by mimicking modern urban innovations, the only solution is to launch a "Whirlwind Campaign"--a new idea Henry Mullins picked up in the city. Mullins "does not understand the inner workings of a metropolitan fund-raiser but, Mariposan to the core, he is fascinated by the external features or trappings of a Whirlwind Campaign" (Lynch 93). Mariposa goes through all the motions, holding luncheons, forming committees, and writing letters, but since no one is willing to donate actual money, the campaign amasses a grand total of only one hundred dollars, donated by Mullins himself in a fit of shame.

Despite its earnest efforts, Mariposa remains hopelessly behind the times, and seems destined to stay that way. Humour arises from the town's progressive, but naïve attempts to

emulate modern, big-city fads. In *Rilla of Ingleside*, characters are satirized, not for their inability to move with the times, but for their conservative unwillingness to do so. The desire to hang on to the past reaches absurd proportions when Prime Minister Borden introduces Daylight Savings Time. Susan refuses to cooperate, arguing that "There was a Higher Power than the Union Government, to which Susan owed allegiance" (243). Setting up a peaceful resistance to those who "meddle with the arrangements of the Almighty" (243), Susan schedules all her personal activities according to "God's time": "She served the meals, under protest, by Borden's time, and she had to go to church by it, which was the crowning injury. But she said her prayers by her own clock, and fed the hens by it; so that there was always a furtive triumph in her eye" (243). Through the more progressive Dr. Blythe, Montgomery teases Susan for her reactionary response to such an easy innovation.

Whiskers-on-the-moon, in turn, becomes ridiculous through his narrow-minded resistance to change. Whiskers opposes the advent of the automobile, feeling that "the Government should be turned out of office for permitting them to run on the Island at all" (212). His refusal to accept this symbol of twentieth-century technology culminates in a street-battle, in which Whiskers, armed with a pitchfork, faces and vanquishes the motorized enemy. Susan describes the scene:

He made the car come to a halt, because there was not room to pass him on either side, and the agent could not actually run over him. Then he raised his pitchfork and shouted, "Get out of this with your devil-machine or I will run this pitchfork clean through you." . . . that poor agent had to back his car clean out to the Lowbridge road, nearly a mile, Whiskers following him every

step, shaking his pitchfork and bellowing insults. (212)

Foaming at the mouth and bellowing, Whiskers-on-the-moon makes a comically grotesque representative of the traditionalist point of view.

In several humorous passages, both Montgomery and Leacock adopt a modern, progressive stance, laughing at those who cannot or will not adapt to the pace of modern life. This no-nonsense attitude toward the past contrasts sharply with the nostalgia that characterizes the sentimental epilogues that both Leacock and Montgomery append to their humorous texts. The "Envoi" to *Sunshine Sketches*, subtitled "The Train to Mariposa," represents a dramatic shift in tone (181). Heretofore, Leacock has confined the sentimental to intermittent scenes that catch the reader off-guard with their sudden seriousness, interrupting what would otherwise be unbroken irony. In this final chapter, however, he drops his humorous mask to reveal openly the covert conservative who has only mocked his town for rushing to embrace a progressive cosmopolitanism. Those who have overlooked or dismissed the sentimental elements in the previous sketches wonder what to make of this stunning departure from what Dennis Duffy terms "the objective, tough-minded tone of the rest of the book" (13). Baffled, Jack Hodgins asks, "Has this, after all, been mere sentimental nostalgia? Have we been reading a defiant eulogy for a place and a time not intended for laughter at all?" (189).

"L'Envoi" is not quite as abrupt a change as Hodgins and Duffy imply; Leacock picks up a thread of nostalgic romance that appears very early in the text. He establishes the association between Mariposa and the past in the very first chapter, by claiming that the age of electricity never quite reaches Mariposa: "though it starts off as electricity from the

Ossawippi rapids, by the time it gets to Mariposa and filters into the little bulbs behind the frosty windows of the shops, it has turned into coal oil again, as yellow and bleared as ever" (17). As we approach Mariposa, the present drops away, along with its glittering technology, and we move into the soft, forgiving light of the past. The train to Mariposa also starts out as a shiny electric suburban express, but as we get farther away from the city, the cars are discarded "one by one, and in their place is the old familiar car with the stuff cushions in red plush (how gorgeous it once seemed!) and with a box stove set up in one end of it" (184). These are warm, comfortable images, but there is a chill in the air, a sense that we are in the company of ghosts. The unnamed Judge Pepperleigh and Dean Drone are passengers on the train, but it gradually becomes apparent that they are anachronisms, rigged out in period costume; the Judge is identified by his "two-dollar panama" and his "glaring spectacles," while the Dean is the "clerical gentleman with the wide black hat" (183). They are shimmering, transparent; if we glance away, they may disappear.

In this nostalgic and mystical mood, words that would have seemed jocular and ironic in any of the other sketches become sadly, sweetly serious. "How fast the train goes this autumn night!" the narrator exclaims. He invokes the names of the Empire State Express, the New Limited, and the "Maritime Express that holds the record of six hundred whirling miles from Paris to Marseilles." None can compare to "this mad career, this breakneck speed, this thundering roar of the Mariposa local driving hard to its home!" (185). We do not laugh at this juxtaposition of big and small. As we hurtle back through forty years of history, the speed of the Mariposa train is breathtaking indeed. Mariposa is a longed-for, unreachable goal in this chapter; the train pulls into the station, and the porters cry

"MARIPOSA! MARIPOSA!" but, as we gaze eagerly out the window, "the cry grows fainter and fainter in our ears and we are sitting here again in the leather chairs of the Mausoleum Club, talking of the little Town in the Sunshine that once we knew" (186). There is a sense of irreparable loss in this sketch; in the eleven previous chapters we have laughed at Mariposans, scoffed at their petty hypocrisies, and basked in the security of a world that seemed immune to change. Now that world is nothing but a ghostly memory.

The longing to return to Mariposa is not a form of self-imposed blindness. Leacock has mercilessly exposed the urban pretense and cosmopolitan materialism of Mariposa and its residents. Nostalgia does not seek to erase such faults; rather, it forgives them in an overwhelming wave of homesickness. As Montgomery observes, homesickness is a bond "not of the intellect, which sees and admits the flaw and drawback, but of the heart which cries, 'Yes, I see them but I love in spite of them'" (*Journals* 1: 335). Ann Douglas characterizes such nostalgia as politically passive and ultimately insincere. In her view, nostalgia "provides a way to protest a power to which one has already in part capitulated" (12), "allowing people to regret what they themselves have destroyed" (178). According to this interpretation, Leacock is already committed to the Mausoleum Club and all it stands for. His nostalgic celebration of Mariposa and the past is "calculated not to interfere" with his comfortable enjoyment of the deep leather chairs of the present (Douglas 12). If "L'Envoi" is a funeral oration for a lifestyle that has passed away, Douglas implies that it is a funeral designed to ensure that the past stays good and dead. Clara Thomas seems to concur when she claims that "L'Envoi" reveals *Sunshine Sketches* to be an "exercise of affectionate memory, of amused, ironic, worldly wisdom, mixed with a certain measure of

condescension" (99).

What these accounts overlook is the muted but very real sense of anguish and loneliness in this chapter. Leacock's nostalgia is neither a glorification of the past, nor an attempt to stabilize the present. Its message is not political, but personal. Leacock explores the tragedy of a generation that has lived to see its home melt away into the past, and who will never feel "quite comfortable or, in Leacock's understanding of the phrase, 'at home' in the twentieth century" (Lynch 9). His nostalgia is a careful, healing invocation of days gone by, designed to relieve the homesickness of the emotionally homeless.

Montgomery's own epilogue to *Rilla of Ingleside* also explores the basic tragedy of the passing of time. Her nostalgia, like Leacock's, is not based on an idealization of the past, nor does it prescribe any program for the future. Instead, it is an expression of grief for the terrible fact that young people grow old. *Rilla of Ingleside* is the last book in the series that began with *Anne of Green Gables*.³ Before she died in 1942, however, Montgomery put together a collection of stories, entitled *The Blythes Are Quoted*, which focuses on friends and neighbours of the Ingleside family. The stories were eventually arranged in chronological order and published under the title *The Road to Yesterday*.⁴ The book is held loosely together by passing references to the Blythes and their doings. The effect is occasionally unfortunate; the Blythes are nearly always peripheral to the story, but their names must be dragged in somehow, until the reader is ready to agree with Anthony Lennox, Penelope Craig, and Susette King, all of whom threaten terrible retribution to the next person who mentions the family. Nevertheless, readers who are familiar with *Rilla of Ingleside* pay close attention to the cryptic references that together form a kind of sequel to

Rilla's story. We discover that Rilla and Ken eventually marry and move to Toronto, that they keep a summer house on the Island, and that they have at least one son, named after Rilla's father, Gilbert.

Genevieve Wiggins has observed that "the overall impression" left by *The Road to Yesterday* "is that the author's optimistic approach to life has darkened" (155). Wiggins cites the presence of madness, bitterness, Gothic houses, and violence to explain her sense of the darkness in this text. None of these elements is new in Montgomery's work, however; the *Emily* series contains all these elements and more. Taken individually, the stories are actually quite sunny and optimistic: a lonely orphan boy finds a home, an old curmudgeon finds a wife, and numerous young people find true love. Nevertheless, the tone of the book is one of almost unbearable sadness.

The obtrusive references to the Blythe family operate for readers familiar with the other books as startling, and increasingly disturbing, signals of the passage of time. The book begins with a series of funny, jolly stories about little boys and girls, contemporaries of the Blythe children--Jem, Walter, Nan, and Di. Walter, who was "killed" when *Rilla* was published in 1920, is resurrected here as a child, playing in blissful ignorance of his fate. In "The Cheated Child," exactly half-way through the book, Rilla appears as a saucy little girl of four or five years of age (185). Two stories and 25 pages later, she is a young woman, sharing a pie with Kenneth at a barn dance in the golden summer before the war. From this point on, the passage of time accelerates, mimicking not only the quickening pace of modern life, but also the process of aging, during which the years slip by faster and faster. The next story takes place after the end of the war, as we realize when a character refers, quite

casually, to a certain Mrs. Jem Blythe; Faith Meredith has evidently returned from her V.A.D. work overseas to marry her childhood sweetheart. The next story jumps another ten years or so, to a summer when the Fords' cottage lies abandoned while they holiday in Europe. The rudest shock of all comes in the final story, when a character reflects that Dr. Blythe has "never been the same since his son was killed in the Great War. And now another war was going on and they said several of his grandsons were going--especially Gilbert Ford" (371). Nearly forty years have passed since the first page of this collection of stories. In the few hours it takes to read them, the reader grows old. Imaginatively, we belong to the days before the Great War, even to the days before Rilla and Walter were born, when a girl named Anne Shirley was accidentally sent to an old couple who wanted a boy. Now, the world has gone mad again, and we feel the intense exhaustion and discouragement that hastened Montgomery's death.

The sadness in these stories arises from our human inability to reconcile ourselves to the tragedy of time. It is monstrous that young, girlish Rilla, whose youth was sacrificed to war, should now be sending her son back to Europe to fight. It is horrifying that Anne, with the red hair and a temper to match, should now be a grandmother, her spirit extinguished by yet another war. The threat of World War II is matched, however, by the threat of the simple passing of time. As the book draws to a close, it becomes increasingly apparent that Glen St. Mary is deserted, populated only by ghosts. We visit Ken and Rilla's summer cottage, but they are not at home. In the title story, the note of sadness is struck when Susette King returns to the farm where she once played with the Blythes, only to find that it, too, is "temporarily deserted" (353). Only one former comrade remains, so he and Susette

spend their time reminiscing about old times in the silent, abandoned garden where the Blythe children used to play. Like "The Train to Mariposa," *The Road to Yesterday* evokes a lonely and aching longing for a home that is lost in the past.

Montgomery's nostalgia is in no way a statement about the relative merits of past and present. The past is loved and remembered because it is home to those who grew up in a world that passed away so suddenly, there was no time to say goodbye. Leacock and Montgomery celebrate that past, just as they celebrate romantic love and the small town. Two separate, opposed ideologies develop in these texts: humour is employed in the service of a progressive, urban, anti-romantic point of view, while sentimentality cherishes and celebrates domestic, rural, conservative values. These conflicting ideologies crackle with tension in *Rilla of Ingleside* and *Sunshine Sketches of a Little Town*, and they are never reconciled on the intellectual level. Nevertheless, the conjunction of humour and sentimentality makes for fascinating reading. Examining the emotional impact of humour and sentimentality may resolve the mystery of why and how these intellectually opposed forces make such effective partners in these funny, heartbreaking tales.

CAREFUL COOPERATION

THE EMOTIONAL IMPACT OF SENTIMENTAL HUMOUR

The ideological division between humour and sentimentality operates as a conflict between sentimental sympathy and ironic detachment. As Stuart Tave points out, traditional definitions of humour assume that "the various forms of the comic [depend] upon the rupture of sympathy" (205). Leacock and Montgomery's intellectual humour confirms Tave's observation. *Rilla of Ingleside* and *Sunshine Sketches* alternate between moments of pathos that bond us to the characters and their vision, and moments of humour in which our wider vision affords us the opportunity to laugh at characters' self-deception and naïveté. Thus, humour and sentimentality form a neat binary opposition as intellectually opposed points of view. The ideological conflict between urban, progressive humour and nostalgic rural sentimentality does not, however, correspond to any similar rift in the emotional impact of these elements. On an affective level, the relationship between humour and sentiment is one of cooperation, rather than opposition. Montgomery and Leacock use two basic techniques to resolve the ideological tension in their texts: first, each provides a parodic sub-plot that subtly affirms sentimental values in a burst of joyous laughter. Such parodies create a sympathetic humour that combines sentimental ideology with a humorous emotional response. The second method of collapsing the binary opposition between humour and sentimentality also has to do with emotion. Leacock and Montgomery alternate between laughter and tears in order to produce a carefully orchestrated emotional effect; Leacock uses laughter to control sentimental tears, while Montgomery's humour serves to intensify her pathos.

Humour typically arises in *Sunshine Sketches* and *Rilla of Ingleside* when human

weakness is exposed, while sentimental affirmation of humanity takes place in an atmosphere of seriousness and pathos. Leacock and Montgomery break this pattern, however, by affirming sentimental ideals in the form of a comic parody. Leacock's parody of *Romeo and Juliet* confirms the value of romantic love, while Montgomery's parody of nationalisms in the Great War confirms the value of the small town. The humour of these parodies is not contemptuous; instead of laughing at characters' foibles, we laugh in joyous sympathy with their triumphs. This sympathetic laughter is a release of pure energy, emerging from the sudden collapse of the tension that has held humour and sentimentality apart.

Leacock's parody in *Sunshine Sketches* focuses on "The Fore-ordained Attachment of Zena Pepperleigh and Peter Pupkin" (121). This small-town love story imitates and parodies the plots of sentimental romance. Zena Pepperleigh is an avid reader of sentimental novels, from which she has derived her ideas about the nature of love. Zena views "the ordinary marriages of ordinary people" with "nothing but a pitying disdain" (122). *Her* love story must involve a gallant and heroic prince (albeit disguised as a junior bank teller), it must overcome terrible obstacles, and above all, it must arise from a series of breathtaking coincidences. For, as the narrator explains, these characteristics are typical of "fore-ordained affairs and that's where they differ from ordinary love" (124).

The comic view of this love relationship shows it to be mundane and ordinary; Peter and Zena's sentimental fantasies are presented as evidence of their wilful self-deception, rather than their love for one another. When Zena and Peter express amazement at the series of sheer coincidences that brings them together, we laugh at what are evidently predictable and unremarkable events. Peter marvels at the extraordinary stroke of luck by which he first

catches sight of Zena while walking down Main Street, Mariposa: "If he hadn't happened to be going up the street and she to be coming down it, the thing wouldn't have happened. Afterwards they both admitted that it was one of the most peculiar coincidences they ever heard of" (119). Similarly, when Peter first speaks to his idol during the Whirlwind Campaign, he and Zena discover with wonderment that "their handwritings were so alike that you could hardly tell them apart, except that Pupkin's letters were round and Zena's letters were pointed and Pupkin wrote straight up and down and Zena wrote on a slant. Beyond that the writing was so alike that it was the strangest coincidence in the world" (124). These "inexplicable" coincidences convince Zena and Peter that their love is fore-ordained; but they convince the reader that these young lovers are blind to all the evidence, leaving their judgments of each other as doubtful as their judgments of their own handwriting.

Amid such scoffing laughter, Leacock begins to drop hints that there is more to this relationship than meets the eye. Instead of being simply a standard case of boy-meets-girl, Zena and Peter's relationship is actually a parodic version of *Romeo and Juliet*. Peter's resemblance to Romeo is established through his renunciation of his former flame, Miss Lawson. In Shakespeare's play, Romeo falls in love with Juliet at first sight, and realizes instantly that his love for Rosaline was simply a boyish fantasy. Pupkin, for his part, decides that the attraction he felt for Miss Lawson, which had motivated his "rescue" of the Mariposa Belle, could not have been love: "Indeed, when he began to think of it, it wasn't even attraction, it was merely respect" (116). This change in perception is comically undercut by the evidence he gives for his maturation: "And anyway, that was long before, six or seven months back, and Pupkin admitted that at the time he was a mere boy" (116).

The exaggerated degree of distance between the man and the boy is the clearest sign of Peter's self-deception.

At the same time, Pupkin's parodic likeness to Romeo suggests an unexpected sincerity in his love for Zena; when Peter catches a glimpse of Zena on the streets of Mariposa, he falls in love at first sight and "at once the whole world changed. The past was all blotted out. . . . And, for Pupkin, straight away the whole town was irradiated with sunshine" (119). As the birds sing and the rippled waters dance, Pupkin is truly transformed by love; the boy approaches the threshold of manhood. If Pupkin is still a bit of a booby, so was Romeo, and both give themselves over to love with an abandon that is both comic and touching.

Zena and Peter also resemble Shakespeare's "star-cross'd lovers" in the apparent opposition of at least one family to their union. Judge Pepperleigh is "hardly civil to Pupkin," although, "as a rule, all the bank clerks in Mariposa treated Judge Pepperleigh's premises as their own" (128). Furthermore, the judge makes it a habit to "sit and sneer at Pupkin after he had gone till Zena would throw down the *Pioneers of Tecumseh Township* in a temper and flounce off the piazza to her room" (128). Of course, the resistance of a parent to a child's marriage is not just the stuff of tragedy; romantic comedy depends just as often on the device of feigned opposition to cement the union.⁵ And so "The Fore-ordained Attachment" proves itself to be a parody of Shakespeare's tragedy by the comic twist it gives to the blocking figures. When Zena reveals her attachment to Peter by fleeing from her father's sneers, "the judge's manner would change instantly and he would relight his corn cob pipe and sit and positively beam with contentment" (128). As it turns out, Pupkin's

father, an enormously wealthy Maritime entrepreneur, is an old crony of the Judge.

Such a parodic fulfilment of Zena's romantic dreams surprises the reader, if not Zena herself. Zena looks at the world through rose-coloured glasses, but she perceives realities that are invisible to the sceptical reader. Peter is in fact a "merchant prince," and since the fathers share a sympathy of social class and position, the children's love is indeed "fore-ordained"--though by a power much closer and less mysterious than the stars. Of course, there is an element of contemptuous humour here; the sentimental formula of love-written-in-the-stars becomes absurd and ridiculous when the fore-ordainers, one of them clad in sealskin, puff smugly on corn cob pipes and gloat over their success. Nevertheless, Leacock has given the love story a "fairy-tale quality," creating "a synthesis of the magical and the mundane" (Lynch 110, 105). Instead of countering his humorous denigration of love with a sentimental phrase, Leacock ultimately clears his characters of the charge of self-deception in a very funny dénouement. In this episode of sentimental humour there is no "rupture of sympathy"; we laugh at the resolution of Peter and Zena's affair, not because we despise their dreams, but because, after all, we share them. Laughter is a release of joy and delight at the sudden and unexpected confirmation of the sentimental enchantments of love.

Montgomery also uses a parodic, and often excruciatingly funny, sub-plot to affirm a sentimental ideology and evoke sympathetic laughter. Her parody of the Great War acted out in little on the home front actually helps to validate Susan's sentimental insistence upon Glen St. Mary's importance to the war effort. World War I is re-fought in the homes of Glen St. Mary by symbolic representatives of the nations involved: Germany, Canada, and the United States. Germany is represented, of course, by Whiskers-on-the-moon. As the wartime

political climate heats up, Whiskers's pacifism is taken to indicate German sympathies, and though Mr. Pryor "vows he is no pro-German" (95), his assurance is not enough to convince Susan, who looks askance upon the "strange manoeuvres" he reportedly performs "with a lantern in his back yard" (96). Susan's suspicions are shared by the boys of Glen St. Mary, who respond to the sinking of the *Lusitania* by breaking all of Mr. Pryor's windows "in a fine frenzy of indignation over the Kaiser's doings" (105). If Whiskers-on-the-moon is a pseudo-Kaiser, Susan herself represents the unglamorous but formidable spirit of Canadian grit and determination: "Susan, standing on a load of grain, her grey hair whipping in the breeze and her skirt kilted up to her knees for safety and convenience--no overalls for Susan, if you please--was neither a beautiful nor a romantic figure; but the spirit that animated her gaunt arms was the self-same one that captured Vimy Ridge and held the German legions back from Verdun" (217). The parodic trio is completed by Mary Vance, who represents the United States. Initially opposed to the war, Mary prevents her beau, Miller Douglas, from enlisting. But, although her "zeal and patriotism had taken some time to kindle," Mary eventually does an about-face, and supports the war effort with energy and fire that burn "with a glow as steady and bright as any one's" (215). Her attitude echoes that of the Yankees, who, having at last declared war in 1917, "will go into it with a vim," Susan predicts, "since I understand that is their habit, when they do start" (204-05).

These comically symbolic figures enact farcical scenes that parody and anticipate the major events of the war. America's entry into the war, for example, is signalled by a chapter in which "Mary is Just in Time" to rescue baby Jims, who is dying of croup (194). Mary applies an old wives' remedy and cures Jims at the eleventh hour. When Rilla thanks

her for her help, Mary cheerfully replies, "Well, I think you ought to be [grateful], that's a fact" (202). Elizabeth Epperly points out that, "Since the tardy U.S. participation in the First World War follows so soon in the narrative upon the rescue of little Jims, one is almost tempted to see the bragging but undeniably efficient Mary as a soul twin for the American public" (120).

Epperly has also observed the symbolism of the scene that ensues when "Susan Has a Proposal of Marriage" (211). At various points in the text, Susan contemplates avenging Allied losses on the Kaiser's head by putting to good use the pots that sit simmering on her stove. Contemplating the wartime propaganda about the fate of Belgian babies, Susan remarks that "if I could have lifted that saucepan full of that boiling soup and thrown it at the Kaiser I would not have lived in vain" (74). Towards the end of the war, Susan gets a chance to act out her threats. Having lost a good housekeeper when his daughter married Joe Milgrave, Whiskers-on-the-moon appears in Susan's kitchen one afternoon and asks her to marry him. Susan's response to his proposal is witnessed by Anne when she arrives home from the village:

An extraordinary sight met her eyes. Round the end of the kitchen burst Mr. Pryor, running as stout, pompous Mr. Pryor had not run for years, with terror imprinted on every lineament--a terror quite justifiable, for behind him, like an avenging fate, came Susan, with a huge, smoking iron pot grasped in her hands, and an expression in her eye that boded ill to the object of her indignation, if she should overtake him. Pursuer and pursued tore across the lawn. Mr. Pryor reached the gate a few feet ahead of Susan, wrenched it

open, and fled down the road, without a glance at the transfixed lady of

Ingleside. (217)

In Epperly's words, "The routing of the German sympathizer on P.E.I." is "a comic miniature of the imminent German defeat" (126-27).⁶ Our laughter here is very much at Whiskers' expense, but it is also a laughter of relief and jubilation, based on our acceptance of Susan as "the staunch woman warrior spirit of Canada" (Epperly 125). This celebratory laughter combines elements of humour and sentimentality, affirming small-town womanhood in a joyous release of the emotions that have been held in check by the ideological tensions in the novel.

Ideologically defined, humour and sentimentality are like oil and water, but on an affective level they intermingle smoothly and effectively. In their parodies of love and war, Leacock and Montgomery evoke laughter as they affirm sentimental values. Scenes in which humour and sentimentality combine are the exception in these texts, however. For the most part, the sentimental mode begins at the point where humour ends. Montgomery, for instance, uses chapter titles to signal her emotional tone: "Doc Has a Misadventure" and "A Slice of Humble Pie" feature humorous incidents (75, 105), while "'And So, Goodnight'" and "'Until the Day Break'" are sad, sentimental chapters (188, 121). At first glance, this division might seem to imply that humour and sentimentality are unrelated in Montgomery's text. Nothing could be farther from the truth. Both Leacock and Montgomery shift back and forth between humour and pathos in a very careful, purposeful way. The emotional impact of humour is shaped by the use of the sentimental, just as the impact of sentiment depends on its relationship to the humorous scenes that surround it.

In *Rilla of Ingleside* and *Sunshine Sketches*, humour and sentimentality are carefully juxtaposed in order to control the reader's emotional response. Leacock and Montgomery combine similar ingredients with very different results, however; Leacock uses humour to restrain sentimental emotion, while Montgomery uses laughter to evoke sentimental tears. This difference parallels Hélène Cixous's distinction between a masculine and a feminine economy. In an essay entitled "Castration or Decapitation?", Cixous describes a masculine economy as a highly controlled social order based on the silencing of women's laughter. In ancient China, that masculine economy asserted itself militarily, by beheading women who dared to "fall about laughing" instead of being "governed by a rule that keeps time with two beats, three beats, four beats, with pipe and drum" (480). Mathematical, measured, and controlled, this masculine economy is based on carefully maintained, absolute equality--not, of course, equality of the sexes, but rather an equality that limits and controls human relationships by ensuring that nothing is given except what can be taken back in exactly equal proportions. As Cixous reminds us, "laws like 'a tooth for a tooth' . . . 'an eye for an eye'" exist only in "a system of absolute equivalence ... of no inequality, for inequality is always interpreted by the masculine as a difference of strength, and thus as a threat" (485). Nothing escapes the boundaries of such a system; in order for masculine equality to be preserved, everything must be priced and measured so that it can be rigidly controlled. Humour and sentimentality would need to be held in a careful balance in a masculine text in order to prevent an overflow of laughter and emotion that would explode the system from within.

Stephen Leacock signals his participation in such a masculine economy when he reveals the reasoning behind his juxtaposition of humour and sentimentality: "pathos keeps

humor from breaking into guffaws," he explains, "and humor keeps pathos from subsiding into sobs" (*HH* 212). Leacock uses humour and sentimentality to counteract one another, keeping his text within the straitened emotional boundaries of the masculine economy, which distrusts unmeasured outpourings of laughter and tears. Leacock's uneasy avoidance of vulgar "guffaws" links him to the eighteenth-century school of "amiable humorists" who, according to Stuart Tave, had a "suspicion of laughter" (43). This suspicion was based on the association of laughter with the bawdy, sexually debauched wit of the Restoration. Broad, sexual humour is the despised country cousin of high comedy, which, by contrast, is an intellectual exercise, characterized by restraint and emotional detachment (Abrams, *Glossary* 30). Leacock avoids the bawdy excesses of laughter by employing humour as "the literary vehicle of the middle way," straddling the dividing line between "caustic satire and sentimentality, softening satire with pathos" (Lynch 6). As Cixous herself puts it, "Rare are the men able to venture onto the brink where writing . . . [is] unencumbered by moderation" ("Sorties" 106).

If Leacock's distrust of laughter seems to indicate a desire for control, it also hints at a suspicion of the body, more clearly expressed in his revulsion against pathos that "subsides into sobs." These words add Leacock's voice to those of the legions of critics whose objections to sentimentality reveal a discomfort with any form of fluidity. Sentimentality, according to its opponents, "overflows" with emotion and "dissolves" into tears. In this vein, Leacock expresses his dislike of nineteenth-century sentimentality, charging that the Victorians "dissolved feeling into sentiment and sat in a flood of tears" (qtd. in Cameron 4). This very suspicion of fluidity obviates the need for any substantive analysis of what

sentimentality is and how it works; the image of an uncontrolled outpouring of bodily fluids is enough, within a masculine economy, to effectively end the discussion.

Cixous opposes an economy of control with a vision of another economy, one that would operate in an open, unmeasured space where women's words and their laughter can overflow. In "The Laugh of the Medusa," she describes the feminine psyche as "full of luminous torrents," and probes the "meaning of these waves, these floods" (335). Laughter is linked to the flow of menstrual blood; writing is the flow of mother's milk. The firm limits and sharp edges of the male body are evidently threatened when feminine writing unleashes floods of tears. Eventually, Cixous promises, "once the tears are shed, there will be endless laughter instead"--laughter that breaks free of masculine restraints ("Castration" 490). If laughter and tears coexist in a feminine text, they would not do so for the purpose of mutual surveillance, as in *Sunshine Sketches*. Instead, humour and sentimentality would work together to create a release of emotion that broke clear of the "middle way," scorning the golden mean of moderation in favour of the giddy freedom of emotional vulnerability.

Such a feminine economy is most clearly enacted in L. M. Montgomery's fiction. Montgomery's primary audience is made up of young women in their early teens who have not yet learned to protect themselves by restraining their emotions. In *Rilla of Ingleside*, the scarred and occasionally cynical Gertrude Oliver is unnerved by the wholehearted rapture with which fifteen-year-old Rilla contemplates her future, warning her to "Rap wood" (16). Gertrude's caution is more than justified by the subsequent trauma of World War I, but the novel nevertheless encourages a Rilla-like response, asking for our laughter and our tears to be poured out with "feminine" fluidity and generosity. Young readers comply unreservedly;

in many a copy of *Rilla of Ingleside* the pages after Walter's death are warped and yellowed by the mingled tears of many readings.

Leacock, by contrast, fends off the fluidity of the feminine economy by using humour to dry sentimental tears. Our tearful response to the death of Neil Pepperleigh in the Boer War, for instance, is immediately stifled by the narrator's reference to snooty Miss Spiffkins, "the biology teacher at the high school, who always says how sorry she is for Mrs. Pepperleigh" on account of the Judge's temper (113). "Hydrangeas,--canaries,--temper,--blazes!" the narrator splutters indignantly. "What does Miss Spiffkins know about it all?" (114). As we chuckle at the narrator's comic outrage, any stray tears can be hastily wiped away; *this* page will never be warped by unseemly feminine outpourings. Beverly Rasporich accordingly describes Leacock as a "controlled and literate author," a "restrained Upper Canadian man of letters" (80-81). Restraint is the keynote of the humour and sentimentality in *Sunshine Sketches*. Part of the book's success has undoubtedly arisen from the lightness of its touch; as soon as Leacock strikes a pathetic note, he backs away from it with haste, leading us back to the sunnier pastures of humour before the tears can start to flow. Leacock's ability to short-circuit the sentimental scene has won him critical praise; Donald Cameron remarks that *Sunshine Sketches* "might have fallen into the sentimentality that it skirts so closely at times: but its irony saves it" (135). Emotions are dealt out in carefully measured quantities in this text. When even laughter threatens to get out of hand, as it does during the Mariposa Belle mishap, Leacock breaks the mood with a sobering sentiment. When pathos threatens to extract sentimental tears, Leacock puts on the brakes with a quick, humorous aside.

Michael Bell has pointed out that "the combination of humour and sentiment," so common in English literature, "can be a technique of evasion--a use of comic diversions to avoid acknowledgment of feeling" (143). One of Leacock's evasive manoeuvres can be found in the story of Jefferson Thorpe's financial career. Jeff is the original wealthy barber; his interest in the stock market briefly makes him a rich man when he profits from his stubborn refusal to unload worthless stock. It takes Jeff ten pages to amass his fortune; the comedy of the chapter lies in watching him lose it in the six pages that remain. When Jeff's mining stock goes through the roof, he is bombarded with letters outlining promising investment opportunities. Readers are invited to recognize and laugh at Jeff's naïveté, as he puffs up with pride and gratification over the brochures sent to him from the Cuban Land Development Company, postmarked "from a post-office box in New York" (48). Recognizing his brains and business acumen, the Cubans invite Jeff to invest in an exclusive project designed especially for successful men like himself: "these Cubans, you know, have got a sort of Spanish warmth of heart that you don't see in business men in America, and that touches you. No, they asked no guarantee. Just send the money--whether by express order or by bank draft or cheque, they left that entirely to oneself, as a matter between Cuban gentlemen" (48).

The humour in this story rarely goes beyond a cynical smile. Laughter requires an element of the unexpected, but here the humour depends upon the story's predictability; Jeff may not know what is going to happen to all his money, but we do. When Jeff is not busy mistaking haciendas for "Hash-enders," and insurrectos for "resurrectos" (49), however, he shows a streak of compassion and altruism that challenges our ironic distance. Privately,

Jeff plans to help the poor with the money he makes from the Cuban venture, and wonders "how many blind people it would take to fill one of these blind homes and how a feller could get ahold of them" (51). Such episodes of absurd but lovable philanthropy prepare the way for the climax of the story, which occurs when Jeff realizes that he has been defrauded of his fortune: "Jeff went back to the shop so quiet--have you ever seen an animal that is stricken through, how quiet it seems to move? Well, that's how he walked" (52). This gut-wrenching moment of pathos is not prolonged; Leacock sends his arrow home, and then retreats to safer ground, scolding readers who are unable to blink away their sentimental tears: "Pathetic? tut tut! You don't know Mariposa" (52). With a stiff upper lip, Jeff takes up his old routine, cutting hair, raising chickens, and sending his daughter back to the Telephone Exchange. A similar discipline is demanded of the reader: we cannot allow our emotions to get the better of us; Jeff Thorpe cannot afford to be in our emotional debt; there can be no emotional imbalance that would reveal inherent differences in strength. At the end of "The Speculations of Jefferson Thorpe," no one owes anyone else anything (37).

The same holds true of the failure of Dean Drone's hopes at the end of "The Whirlwind Campaign in Mariposa" (89). The Dean has dedicated his life to the dubious dream of blessing Mariposa with a big new church. When that dream is threatened by the church's financial woes, the Dean puts his faith in the Whirlwind Campaign. Although the results of the campaign are supposed to be kept secret, the Dean catches sight of a Newspacket headline in the campaign's early, optimistic days, which reads, "A QUARTER OF A MILLION" (96). As a gentleman and a member of the clergy, Drone diplomatically averts his eyes, refusing to "read further because it would have spoilt the surprise" (96).

The Dean is surprised indeed when Henry Mullins calls at the rectory to break the news that the campaign has raised a mere hundred dollars. The church's financial ruin is bad enough, but Dean Drone is even more disturbed by Mullins' allegation that "the campaign had been ruined by a lot of confounded mugwumps" (99). The Dean had once overheard himself described as an "old mugwump" (84), and though he did not understand the term, the insult had rankled ever since. Drone seizes the opportunity to find out the true meaning of the word that has haunted him for so long, and discovers that "one mugwump would kill anything" (99). "After that," the narrator tells us, "the Dean hardly spoke at all" (99).

Lest such quiet pathos get the best of us, however, the narrator evens the score with scenes of the Dean writing notes of resignation in tones of preposterous self-pity: "It is now forty years since I came among you, a broken and melancholy boy, without life or hope, desiring only to devote to the service of this parish such few years as might remain of an existence blighted before it had truly begun--" (101). Having thus dismissed the course of his entire life, Dean Drone retreats into a circular syntax which makes his pathos into the verbal equivalent of a snake swallowing its own tail: "There are times, gentlemen, in the life of a parish, when it comes to an epoch which brings it to a moment when it reaches a point-- . . . --reaches a point where the circumstances of the moment make the epoch such as to focus the life of the parish in that time" (102). In the face of such farcical self-enclosure, it is difficult to feel that we owe the poor fellow anything, or that he might be indebted to us for any momentary feeling of fellowship in his misery.

The circularity of Dean Drone's thinking at the climax of his story is anticipated in a variety of ways throughout the course of the Whirlwind Campaign. Henry Mullins, who has

been reading letters of encouragement and solidarity from fellow businessmen, reads "one from himself, as head of the Exchange Bank, you understand, informing him that he had heard of his project and assuring him of his liveliest interest in what he proposed" (93). Such witless solipsism proves in the end to be the undoing of the Whirlwind Campaign, since "they never clearly understood which of them were the whirlwind and who were to be the campaign" (96): "You see, if practically everybody is on the committees, it is awfully hard to try to find men to canvass, and it is not allowable for the captains and the committee men to canvass one another, because their gifts are spontaneous. So the only thing that the different groups could do was to wait round in some likely place--say the bar parlour of Smith's Hotel--in the hope that somebody might come in who could be canvassed" (95). The real genius of the Whirlwind Campaign, from the point of view of a masculine economy, is that at the end of it, nobody will owe anybody anything. According to Cixous, the masculine economy "always turns the gift into a gift-that-takes. The gift brings in a return. Loss, at the end of a curved line, is turned into its opposite and comes back to him as profit" ("Sorties" 107). A gift in a masculine economy thus has the properties of a boomerang: it always returns to where it began. So, in the Whirlwind Campaign, the "spontaneous gifts" of the captains and committee men make a circuit that leads them right back to the givers' pockets. At a promotional luncheon, prominent members of the community each donate a cheque for a hundred dollars, conditional on the fund reaching a sum that begins at \$50,000, and rises by the end of the luncheon to \$200,000. At the close of the campaign, each of these "gifts" will return squarely to the giver.

Leacock laughs at the absurdity of the Whirlwind Campaign, and yet the circularity of

his humour, like the circularity of such charity, prevents the accumulation of any debt.

Sunshine Sketches is itself a curiously regimented text, characterized by an emotional stinginess that is quite typical of a masculine economy. In moments of sympathy and pathos, Leacock pays back his characters for the laughter we have enjoyed at their expense. If that laughter becomes too robust, our account will be overdrawn; on the other hand, if we cry too many tears over the misfortunes of a Jeff Thorpe or a Dean Drone, we find ourselves in a position of loss, having given more in sympathy than we owed. Leacock only breaks away from his pattern of emotional restraint in the "Envoi," where, for the first time, he allows his sentimental affection for Mariposa to reach our hearts without the protective restraint of humour. "L'Envoi" is Leacock's textual counterpart to Henry Mullins' last-minute decision to take the condition off his gift to the Whirlwind Campaign. Such final, belated gestures suggest that Leacock is aware of the ultimate inadequacy of the masculine economy. He is unable to create an alternative to the cycle of debt and repayment, but he is able to hint at the need for a better way.

Montgomery's alternative to this masculine order of debt and repayment is a feminine economy of love. Love cannot be measured, and so it "escap[es] the system of equivalence in all sorts of ways" (Cixous, "Castration" 485). Similarly, laughter and tears, when they are allowed to flow unchecked, break free from the masculine economy, for they depend upon a relaxation of the boundaries between self and other. Montgomery creates a fluid, feminine economy in *Rilla of Ingleside* by effecting a reciprocity between humour and sentimentality, or a fluid exchange between the two. As Hanna Schwarz-Eisler points out, Montgomery's sentimentality "allows uncontrolled emotional identification with the heroines"

(33). Where Leacock's text is characterized by deliberate restraint, *Rilla of Ingleside* uses this uncontrolled identification to create a heightened emotional response. Mary Rubio has observed that, in *Rilla*, Montgomery's "tricks for manipulating the reader's emotions are obvious to sophisticated readers, but they are undeniably effective" ("LMM" 41). Elizabeth Waterston adds that "people everywhere react physically" to Montgomery's novels: "They chuckle. . . . They gasp. . . . They cry" (KS 25). Montgomery's success in achieving this kind of self-forgetful reader-response depends in large part on her effective combination of humour and sentiment. In a novel as potentially dark as *Rilla of Ingleside*, humour acts as an antidote to depression. Because depression deadens the emotions, Montgomery is careful to avoid pushing pathos to the point where self-protective numbness kicks in.

The reciprocity between humour and sentimentality is most evident in the way Montgomery prepares for the emotional climax of the novel. When Walter is killed at the battle of Courcellette, his death should come as no surprise to the reader; Walter has been marked to die ever since he was introduced in *Rainbow Valley* as an idealistic young boy who loves chivalry, but hates to fight. Walter is an ideal martyr for Montgomery's heroic vision of the war. He has none of the bloodlust of his sturdy companions; when war breaks out he lies awake at night shuddering at the horror of a bayonet charge, fearing more to kill than to be killed. "I think of these things all the time," he confides to Rilla, "--and it doesn't seem to me that Jem and Jerry *ever* think of them. They laugh and talk about 'potting Huns'!" (47). Eventually able to overcome his torturing visions, Walter enlists and leaves for the front "in a white flame of sacrifice" (207). It is evident to the reader that he will not return.

Avoiding any element of manipulative surprise, Montgomery signals the approach of Walter's death by employing the psychic powers of Little Dog Monday. Jem's heroic mongrel has taken up residence at the local train station, waiting patiently for his companion to return. Although he really belongs to Jem, Monday is a great favourite with Walter as well. On the night of Walter's death, Rilla awakens to the sound of "a dog howling in a melancholy way down in the direction of the station" (187). "Whose dirge was he howling" the narrator wonders, "--to whose spirit was he sending that anguished greeting and farewell?" (187). With tears hovering just below the surface, the reader waits with Rilla for the tragic news that must inevitably follow such a chilling portent. But forewarned can also be forearmed; Montgomery does not sustain this note of tension and anxiety lest she push her readers into a stance of self-protective detachment. Instead, she lets in a brief ray of sunshine:

When five days had passed the Ingleside people began to feel that they might be cheerful again. Rilla dashed about the kitchen helping Susan with the breakfast and singing so sweetly and clearly that Cousin Sophia across the road heard her and croaked out to Mrs. Albert.

"'Sing before eating, cry before sleeping,' I've always heard."

But Rilla Blythe shed no tears before the nightfall. When her father, his face grey and drawn and old, came to her that afternoon and told her that Walter had been killed in action at Courcellette she crumpled up in a pitiful little heap of merciful unconsciousness in his arms. Nor did she waken to her pain for many hours. (188)

The lugubrious Cousin Sophia is a stock humorous character in this text. Her gloomy prediction, and Rilla's cheerful song lighten the mood just enough to allow us to let down our guard. The blow of Walter's death falls all the harder because, for a brief moment at least, it was forestalled.

Montgomery uses humour to facilitate the flow of tears in the larger structure of her novel as well. In the chapters leading up to Walter's death, Montgomery breaks a pattern that is otherwise as predictable as clockwork. In the fifth chapter of the novel, Jem and Jerry leave for training in Valcartier, and the war begins in earnest for the people of Glen St. Mary. From this point on, the dreary routine of war-worries and heartrending departures for the front is broken regularly, every four or five chapters, by farcical episodes of broad, physical comedy. In chapter nine, the Ingleside cat wedges his head into a salmon can and wreaks havoc in Susan's kitchen. Four chapters later, Rilla goes to apologize to the fashion-conscious Irene Howard, only to discover that she has put on mismatched shoes. As the novel draws to a close, Susan vanquishes the amorous Whiskers-on-the-moon with her pot of boiling dye; this episode is followed five chapters later by the final comic scene, in which Rilla takes shelter at a friend's vacant house, not realizing that she has actually broken into the home of a set of outraged strangers. This Goldilocks-style anecdote completes a rhythmic pattern that is virtually mathematical in its precision.

The only exception to this rhythm is the close conjunction of Miranda's absurd war-wedding with what is possibly the funniest chapter in the novel: "Norman Douglas Speaks Out in Meeting" (171). It is the spring of 1916 when Glen St. Mary gets up an ecumenical prayer meeting to support and encourage a departing battalion of young boys and old men,

whose desire to serve their country has overcome their physical unsuitability for war. Using a Leacockian device, Montgomery prepares the scene by remarking that this prayer meeting "was destined to fill an imperishable place" in the "oral annals of Glen St. Mary" (172). As the meeting gets underway, the Methodist minister asks the Presbyterian Whiskers-on-the-moon to lead in prayer: "Mr. Pryor bounded briskly to his feet, unctuously said, 'Let us pray' and forthwith prayed. . . . He prayed that the unholy war might cease--that the deluded armies being driven to slaughter on the western front might have their eyes opened to their iniquity and repent while yet there was time--that the poor young men present in khaki who had been hounded into a path of murder and militarism, should yet be rescued" (174). It is a measure of Montgomery's success in creating a sense of identification between her readers and her characters that, however much we may agree in the abstract with Mr. Pryor's words, here we instantly share the stunned outrage that fills the congregation.

Montgomery's funniest scenes are always narrated through the eyes of a spectator who, like the reader, is helpless to intervene in the situation. Here, the enforced passivity of the congregation echoes not only the helplessness of the reader, but also the helplessness of these same people to intervene in a much larger and more deadly situation: the war itself. It is with relief and satisfaction, therefore, that we watch Norman Douglas "suddenly [go] berserk" (174). As the scandalized congregation looks on, Norman takes "one mad spring over the front of the pew and [catches] the unfortunate Whiskers-on-the-moon by his coat-collar." With "his long red beard literally bristling with fury," Norman shakes Mr. Pryor "until his bones fairly rattled," hurling at him "a lurid assortment of abusive epithets" (175). Having exhausted his store of politer terms of abuse, including such gems as "putrid pup,"

"Hunnish scum," and "pestilential parasite," Norman pauses in mid-breath: "Everybody believed that the next thing he would say, church or no church, would be something that would have to be spelled with asterisks; but at that moment Norman encountered his wife's eye and he fell back with a thud on Holy Writ. 'You whited sepulchre!' he bellowed, with a final shake, and cast Whiskers-on-the-moon from him with a vigour which impelled that unhappy pacifist to the very verge of the choir entrance door" (175). The scene is constructed for maximum comic effect; Whiskers' pomposity, Norman's red-faced fury, and above all the outraged propriety of the frozen congregation make for comedy of the broadest sort. The deep, echoing belly-laughter evoked by the physical comedy of the scene is complemented by a more subtle form of humour; Norman's use of the phrase "whited sepulchre" draws attention to Whiskers' hypocrisy--his righteous pose conceals a basic cowardice that is all the more despicable compared to the courage and self-sacrifice of the "murderers" for whose iniquity Mr. Pryor begs forgiveness.

Together with Miranda's farcical war-wedding, this episode constitutes an unparalleled outburst of hilarity. For the space of a few chapters, tensions and war-worries are forgotten in an outpouring of laughter. Norman Douglas's outburst cannot be termed comic relief, for that would imply a kind of safety valve for excess emotion. Montgomery uses laughter, not to disperse emotion, but to keep it very close to the surface. When the pendulum shifts only a few pages later to the pathos of Walter's death, our tears pour out as readily as our laughter did. Common experience suggests that those who attempt to hold back their tears often succeed until something makes them laugh. Laughter has the power to break through the rigidity of repressed emotion, releasing a flood of healing tears.

Sentimental tears are frequently condemned for pouring out in quantities that exceed the requirements of the occasion that prompts them. Such criticism is inapplicable to a tragedy on the scale of World War I. No response could possibly be adequate, much less excessive, to the enormity of that occasion. Nevertheless, Walter's death is clearly sentimentalized. The sentimentality lies not in the quantity of emotion, but in the quality. Sentimental sorrows are always sweet; there is never a drop of bitterness to poison the cup. In such scenes there is always something to be glad about, something to admire. Montgomery carefully cleans the wound of Walter's death by showing that death can have meaning when it comes at the right time. Walter's final letter reveals that he anticipated and welcomed his fate. He writes that on the night before his final battle, he looked across No-man's-land and saw a vision of a "tall shadowy form, piping weirdly" (191). The story of the Pied Piper has long haunted Walter, and he explains to Rilla his interpretation of his vision: "Rilla, the Piper will pipe me 'west' tomorrow. I feel sure of this. And Rilla, I'm not afraid. When you hear the news, remember that. I've won my own freedom here--freedom from all fear. I shall never be afraid of anything again--not of death--nor of life, if, after all, I am to go on living. And life, I think, would be the harder of the two to face" (191). He closes with the words, "And so--goodnight. We go over the top at dawn" (192).

Walter's letter from the grave may be an unabashed bid for tears, but the tears Montgomery evokes are cleansing, healing tears that wash away anger and give strength to carry on. To the bitter, disillusioned modernists who came back from the war, such sentimental resignation was anathema. Montgomery makes it clear, however, that the country must be rebuilt by the psychologically whole, not by those twisted with anger and

bitterness. Inspired by Walter's words, Rilla takes the first step towards creating the new world he envisioned by making a gesture of selfless courage: she gives his letter to Una Meredith, whose hidden love for Walter is known only to Rilla and herself. Sentimental tears redeem Rilla from the crippling effects of bitterness and cynicism, enabling her to "keep faith" with the past and the future.

If laughter and tears work together to produce an outpouring of emotion at Walter's death, in the story of Little Dog Monday, laughter and tears unite. Dog Monday's story is sentimental because our emotional response to it is totally uncomplicated. Monday has no human flaws for us to overlook or excuse. He is wholly governed by loyalty, as only an animal can be, and though his psychic powers are extraordinary, his personality is not. Most of us have known good dogs capable of similar love and devotion, though they may display it in less spectacular ways. After Jem leaves for the front, Monday waits at the train station with "soft, wistful, puzzled eyes," resolving to meet each train "until the smoking, snorting monster, which had carried his hero off, carried him back" (58). In sentimental sympathy, we momentarily see the war through the confused, eager eyes of a dog. Uncontrolled identification leaves us feeling a little embarrassed, almost sheepish.

As the war wears on, however, our bond with Dog Monday increases, because other characters testify to the encouragement they take from Monday's faithfulness. Jem writes from the front that "on some of these dark cold nights in the trenches, it heartens and braces me up no end to think that thousands of miles away at the old Glen station there is a small spotted dog sharing my vigil" (98). When Jem is reported missing, Susan insists that he is alive, because Dog Monday, who howled all night when Walter died, slept as quietly as a

lamb the night of the trench raid when Jem disappeared. "No, Rilla dear, little Jem is *not* dead," Susan declares. "If he were, Dog Monday would have known, just as he knew before, and he would not be still waiting for the trains" (242). As absurd as Susan's logic may seem, the Ingleside family believe her, and "they all plucked up heart and courage to carry on, just because a faithful little dog at the Glen station was still watching with unbroken faith for his master to come home" (242).

The return of Jem Blythe is the emotional high-water mark of the novel. It balances out the grief of Walter's death, evoking tears and laughter simultaneously. Throughout most of the novel, humour and sentimentality have been interdependent but radically divided. At the end, however, Montgomery pulls together these two strands of emotional response in a scene of pure, overflowing happiness. A single passenger steps off the Glen train one spring afternoon, and the station agent is at a loss to identify him. As he tries to put a name to the bronzed, soldierly face, a "black-and-yellow streak shot past [him]. Dog Monday stiff? Dog Monday rheumatic? Dog Monday old? Never believe it. Dog Monday was a young pup, gone clean mad with rejuvenating joy" (273). Monday makes a spectacle of himself, barking and gambolling in a fit of ecstasy. As the station master looks on, he realizes "who the returned soldier was. Dog Monday's long vigil was ended. Jem Blythe had come home" (274). Once again, Montgomery uses a spectator figure to provide us with the angle of vision that allows for the greatest emotional impact. Looking through the station master's eyes, we see both Dog Monday's ecstasy and the laughing tears that Jem wipes away. Laughter here is not directed against anyone or anything--it is sentimental laughter, bubbling up out of pure joy, with the edge of satire washed completely away by a flood of tears.

It may be excessive indeed to feel that a war in which eight million men died turned out all right after all because a little yellow dog has been reunited with his master. But such emotional excess is the hallmark of feminine writing: "There is waste in what we say. We need that waste. To write is always to make allowances for superabundance and uselessness while slashing the exchange value that keeps the spoken word on its track" (Cixous, "Sorties" 110). Montgomery breaks away from the rigid control demonstrated by Leacock, justifying the personal emotion of relief that combines with humour to explode the checks and balances of the masculine economy.

Humour and sentimentality make effective partners in *Rilla of Ingleside* because our senses are trained to respond to changes in our environment. The cook in the kitchen cannot smell the roasting turkey, because its odours build too gradually to be perceived. Montgomery shifts from humour to sentimentality in order to cleanse the emotional palate; our response to the sentimental aspects of her text is more powerful because of their contrast to the humorous episodes that surround them. Leacock, by contrast, uses humour and sentimentality against each other in an attempt to keep emotion within lawful bounds. In both cases, the emotional impact of the text is determined by the interaction between humour and sentimentality. The careful cooperation between these ideologically opposed forces is symbolized by parodic sub-plots that collapse the binary opposition in a release of sentimental laughter. If the differences between Leacock and Montgomery can be evaluated in terms of masculine and feminine economies, Cixous herself would point out that such differences cannot be explained by mere anatomy. Leacock's masculine restraint is not simply the result of his maleness; it is an effective strategy for dealing with a certain kind of

audience, as his relative success among sophisticated academic readers attests. Montgomery, by contrast, has found a very different readership among mothers and daughters who are untouched by modernist hostility to the sentimental. Long invisible to the critical eye, *Rilla of Ingleside* continues to delight generations of readers with its stirring evocation of sentimental emotion. The emotional impact of these texts is thus not an end in itself, but rather a means of drawing the reader into the life of the text. The true significance of sentimental emotion can only be ascertained from an examination of how the text uses both sentiment and humour to change and transform the reader.

TALES OF TRANSFORMATION

REMAKING THE READER THROUGH SENTIMENTAL HUMOUR

In *The Alpine Path: The Story of My Career*, L. M. Montgomery admits that in the early days of her writing career the rejection slips she found most disheartening were those in which her work was "damned with faint praise" (75). That being the case, she likely would not have been gratified by Arthur L. Phelps's assessment of her fiction: "No critic would think of [Montgomery] as having made a serious contribution to literature," Phelps declares (85), generously adding, however, that, "coming at it freshly and with an attempt at open mindedness, to my surprise, I enjoyed [her novels]" (88). Phelps closes his article by urging us to try reading *Anne of Green Gables*, "Just for fun" (93). Distinctions between serious literature and mere pop culture often turn upon this issue of "fun." Books that entertain and reassure readers are considered less significant than those which "dislodge us from the security of cherished beliefs, shatter our complacencies, split open the congealed surfaces of things" (C. S. Ross 30). The binary opposition between high and low culture prevents us from acknowledging the transformative power of texts that do not correspond to this modernist model.

Stephen Leacock has been relegated less often than Montgomery to the critical ghetto of escapist fiction, but at least one critic has expressed concern that the sentimental nostalgia in *Sunshine Sketches* serves to let readers off the hook. Clara Thomas feels that, in the "Envoi," Leacock "trivialized real issues and then dismissed his whole conjuring as a nostalgic exercise" (101). As a result, Thomas claims, readers emerge unchanged from the reading experience; we remain "outside the frame, safely detached from involvement in and

responsibility for the action" (100). Thomas admits that she enjoys Leacock's humorous and accurate depiction of small-town life, but she fears that Leacock's reassuring sentiments prevent the text from having any lasting moral or intellectual impact.

This dismissal of sentimental literature as a merely pleasurable pastime is often expressed through the metaphor of food. Sheila Egoff's guide to Canadian children's literature warns parents away from sentimental fictions (Montgomery's included) that "concoct soothing syrups, sugar pills, or ice-cream sundaes--none of which is a diet for life" (261); Phelps uses a similar metaphor, contrasting Montgomery's "soft," old-fashioned novels with the "stronger meat" of modern fiction (90). Real literature has nutritional value, these critics would argue; it provides intellectual food to readers by subverting our comfortable assumptions. Popular literature, by contrast, affirms traditional values, and thus becomes the textual equivalent of cotton candy: formless, sticky-sweet, dissolving instantly upon consumption.

Montgomery and Leacock certainly do not attempt to "shatter," "dislodge," or "destabilize" their readers. That is not to say, however, that their texts have no transformative effect. *Rilla of Ingleside* and *Sunshine Sketches* belong to a morally committed sentimental tradition that seeks to change the world by changing readers' hearts. What is often mistaken for reassurance in these texts is actually encouragement; sentimentality celebrates not what we are but what we can become. Of course, it is no secret that sentimental texts are moralistic; Victorian sermonizing is one of the features readers today find unpalatable in many sentimental novels that once enjoyed a wide following. Montgomery herself is aware of the dangers of didacticism; she reflects in her journal upon

her childhood reading of *The Memoir of Anzonetta Peters*:

I shall never forget that book. It belonged to a type now vanished from the earth fortunately--but much in vogue at that time. It is the biography of a child who at five became 'converted', grew very ill soon afterwards, lived a marvellous patient and saintly life for several years, and died after great suffering at the age of twelve.

I must have read that book a score of times if I did once. I don't think it had a good effect on me. For one thing it discouraged me horribly--for Anzonetta was so hopelessly perfect that I felt it was no use to try to imitate her. (1: 376)

As Montgomery reveals, the pious preachments of many moralistic authors are not only useless, they can even be destructive, producing either rebellion or despair. If Leacock and Montgomery are effective sentimentalists, it is because they go beyond simply telling us how to behave; they engage us in performing the actions they describe, enabling us to grow spiritually and morally through the transformative experience of reading. As we face up to the realities of hypocrisy and vice in *Mariposa*, and of war and bereavement in *Rilla of Ingleside*, we find ourselves changed in our view of life. Yet, sentimental affirmation is something we have to earn in these texts; the happy ending is something the reader must create.

In *Sunshine Sketches of a Little Town*, moments of pathos or celebration are often deferred until after we have acknowledged and dealt with the less pleasant aspects of Mariposan life. Each sketch exposes vice and hypocrisy, but then closes with a more

poignant scene in which we identify with the joys and sorrows of the very characters we had mocked only moments before. The pervasive nostalgia of "L'Envoi" can thus occur only at the end of our tour of Mariposa, once we have recognized it for what it is, warts and all. Critics such as Clara Thomas assume that Leacock's sentimentality is a form of retreat from his own harsh satire; Leacock invites us, like ostriches, to stick our heads in the sand. *Sunshine Sketches* is never an exercise in wilful blindness, however; instead, it is an attempt to cure many forms of self-deception. The narrator tells us that Jeff Thorpe's barber shop "is one of those wooden structures--I don't know whether you know them--with a false front that sticks up above its real height and gives it an air at once rectangular and imposing." This optical illusion "is a form of architecture much used in Mariposa" (38). There is, however, more than one way to be deceived by a false front; we can be tricked into believing that the building itself is as large and impressive as its clapboard façade, or we can be distracted into overlooking the nobler qualities of the old-fashioned, dusty little barber shop that are hidden behind such grandiose architecture. Mariposans and readers alike are prone to both forms of blindness; by the end of *Sunshine Sketches*, however, the scales have fallen from our eyes.

Leacock's moral focus throughout these sketches is on the problem of self-deception. Hypocrisy is neither laudable nor attractive, but, unlike some other moral diseases, it is eminently curable. The very process of recognizing the problem often helps to eradicate it. Leacock's sketches portray a series of readers who build up a false and deluded self-image based on their ill-chosen reading material. The climax of these stories about reading occurs when life and art come into conflict, producing an often painful moment of self-recognition.

Jefferson Thorpe, for example, is a character who has fallen prey to a double blindness. He fancies himself a great financial wizard, on a level with Carnegie and Rockefeller. In a very literal sense, Thorpe is a reader of financial "escape" literature; after he makes his fortune, he spends his time poring over a "big packet of stuff from the Cuban Land Development Company, with coloured pictures of Cuba, and fields of bananas, and haciendas and insurrectos with machetes" (47). Since he is unable to translate the Spanish word "insurrectos," Jeff does not correctly interpret the words and pictures that fuel his dream of escaping his narrow and mundane Mariposa life. "You could see it all there in the pictures--tobacco plants and insurrectos--everything," we are told, but the implication is that we still do not have eyes to really see (48). As the narrator acknowledges, "I suppose a good many of us have felt just as Jeff did about our poor little earnings" (41).

Jeff's deluded fantasies would be harmless enough, however, were it not for the fact that they blind him to his own skills and abilities. Leacock makes it clear from the start that as a capitalist financier, Jeff makes a great barber. His barber shop is "a very Palace of Slumber" (39), for Jeff has perfected the art of the slow, leisurely shave. He is also a gifted conversationalist, possessing "a kind of divination" that allows him to fit his conversation to the man every time (40). As the narrator puts it, speaking for once in all sincerity, "It seemed to spoil one's idea of Jeff that copper and asbestos and banana lands should form the goal of his thought when, if he knew it, the little shop and the sunlight of Mariposa was so much better" (49). By the end of the sketch, Jeff has been painfully disillusioned about his prowess as a Wall Street speculator. The Cuban pamphlet had raised expectations of enormous profit, confirming Jeff's image of himself as a stock-market genius. That image is

brutally shattered when Jeff loses not only the money he made out of his mining speculations, but also the hard-earned cash of his friends and neighbours. Nevertheless, the sketch closes on a fitting note: we hear the hens clucking in the henhouse, and see the lights of the barber shop blazing until eleven each night--Jeff and his Woman have gone back to doing what they do best.

Dean Drone's story parallels Jeff's in many ways. The Dean's particular pride is in his classical education, which he feels raises him above the common lot. He spends his afternoons dozing under the plum trees and reading the Pastorals of Theocritus. "The light trash of modern romance might put a man to sleep in such a spot," the narrator acknowledges, "but with such food for reflection as Theocritus, a man may safely close his eyes and muse on what he reads without fear of dropping into slumber" (73-74). Even in translation, Theocritus remains an excellent cure for insomnia; the Dean, however, always reads in the original Greek. When asked to translate, we are told that Dean Drone "always refused. One couldn't translate it, he said. It lost so much in the translation that it was better not to try. It was far wiser not to attempt it" (74). The narrator takes us into his confidence, however, wryly confessing that "when Dean Drone said that he simply couldn't translate it, I believe he was perfectly sincere" (74). The Dean's reading is evidently chosen for its social cachet, rather than for any real enjoyment the Dean might find in mulling over words he cannot really understand. The sleep-inducing capacity of Theocritus is not without its uses, however. When his friend and rival Dr. Gallagher comes to visit, the Dean reads aloud a passage or two as a preemptive strike in their ongoing battle of intellectual one-upmanship. Greek history and literature are Drone's defence against Dr. Gallagher's repeated

attempts to educate his friends and neighbours about the history of their own country. Countering Champlain with Xenophon, arrow heads with Xerxes, and Indian skulls with Theocritus, Drone only barely manages to preserve his aristocratic, colonial ignorance of Canada and her history.

The Dean's social pretensions prevent him from understanding the true value of his own country. Like Jeff, Drone reads to escape Mariposa and thus escape self-knowledge. His obsession with classical learning prevents him from recognizing his own strengths as a minister: the Dean is sincere and compassionate; he never needed to build a Beacon or read Theocritus in order to serve God or his congregation. Like Jeff, the Dean undergoes a painful and humiliating experience that undermines his false self-image. After making several desperate attempts to write a letter of resignation, the Dean realizes that "he not only couldn't manage the parish but couldn't say so in proper English, and of the two the last was the bitterer discovery" (102). His inability to write his own language is crushing because it destroys his intellectual pretensions. The Dean is spared any further contemplation of his failures, however; he collapses in a stroke that ironically serves to highlight his best qualities. At the end of the sketch, Drone's idealism emerges as he lectures on the "great spaces of Lake Huron" to the "Infant Class, fresh from the infinity of spaces greater still" (108). The Dean's innocence seems infinitely preferable to the more sophisticated preaching of the new curate, Mr. Uttermost, who regales his parishioners each Sunday with a few of the "newer forms of doubt revealed by the higher criticism" (108). Among the infants and the plum blossoms, Drone finds his natural element; his own childishness is given full sway. The man who used to spend his time "making kites and toys and clockwork steamboats" for

children who were then forced to look on longingly as the Dean played with their toys, can now become a child again in earnest (75). Dean Drone's story ends, appropriately, on a pastoral note--but it is a very different ending from the one Drone would have imagined for himself.

Like Jeff Thorpe and Dean Drone, Mariposa as a whole is unwilling to recognize its weaknesses, and, as a result, is unable to understand its own strengths. Mariposa wilfully misreads its census figures, preferring to believe itself to be a big, cosmopolitan city, even though "the Canadian census puts the numbers every time at something round five thousand" (16). In Mariposa, there is a tacit assumption that such low numbers are "largely the outcome of malicious jealousy" (16). Mariposa's own jealousy of its big-city neighbours leads its citizens to find creative ways to gradually re-estimate the population until it rises as high as 10,000. At that point, however, "down swoops the federal census taker on his next round and the town has to begin all over again" (16). In its drive to become a bustling urban centre, Mariposa forgets that its small population is in fact its greatest strength. As the narrator puts it, in Mariposa people are "all so separate and so different--not a bit like the people in the cities" (46). Only in a town like Mariposa, where "Everybody is in everything" (55), is it really possible to know and be known. Hypocrisy can hide a multitude of sins--but then so can the anonymity of big-city life.

The satirist's exposure of Mariposa's vices and delusions functions nonetheless as a corrective measure, helping to clean the town up. Self-deception is a goblin that cannot stand the light of day; the very process of recognizing it also serves to eradicate it. The only major character who remains substantially unchanged at the end of *Sunshine Sketches* is

Josh Smith, who, not coincidentally, is also the only character whose hypocrisy is entirely a matter of deceiving others; there is no redeeming trace of self-deception to indicate in Smith an ability to be ashamed. When Smith gets the Conservative nomination, he orders his boys to "Take them signs '*American Drinks*' out of the bar. Put up noo ones with '*British Beer at all Hours*'" (165). Smith is no more of a turncoat than any of the other Mariposans who wear green on St. Patrick's Day, and then wave the Stars and Stripes on the fourth of July (55). But Smith's change of allegiance is more chilling because it is conscious and calculated, a tactical move rather than an outburst of sincere, though self-contradictory, enthusiasm. The illiterate Mr. Smith has no illusions about himself and is thus immune to change. Mariposans show a great deal of astuteness when they vote this man out of town, sending him to 'Ottaway,' where, presumably, he will fit right in.

By contrast, characters like Dean Drone and Jeff Thorpe demonstrate for us how *not* to read *Sunshine Sketches*; they read in order to avoid facing the realities of their lives. At first glance, Zena Pepperleigh seems to fall into the same category. Although the trashy "modern romances" that she favours are dismissed with contempt by the more snobbish Dean Drone, Zena appears to use her reading for much the same purpose; English peers and Hungarian refugees fill her imagination, completely crowding out the poor, humble *Pioneers of Tecumseh Township*. Dreaming of France and Spain and "the old grey towers of Hohenbranntwein" (122), Zena seems destined to suffer the same fate as Jeff Thorpe and Dean Drone: romantic fantasies threaten to blind her to the real love available right in Mariposa. Zena would not be the first heroine to be blinded by delusions of romance; her fictional contemporary, Anne Shirley, who is also an avid reader of romance novels, refuses

Gilbert's offer of marriage in Montgomery's *Anne of the Island* because good-humoured, comradely Gilbert is so unlike her dark, melancholy ideal.

Montgomery corrects her heroine nonetheless in a way which anticipates Leacock's treatment of Zena. Anne's roommate, Philippa, perceptively tells her that "You don't know love when you see it. You've tricked something out with your imagination that you think love, and you expect the real thing to look like that" (144). Zena avoids this fate because her imagination is flexible enough to allow her to perceive a "dim parallel between the passing of [Pupkin's] bicycle and the last ride of Tancred the Inconsolable along the banks of the Danube" (124). Instead of attempting to escape from Mariposa, Zena succeeds in transforming it through her own romantic enchantment. Her ability to turn Peter into an enchanted prince displays a creative power that other characters would do well to emulate. Jeff Thorpe could have saved himself a lot of grief if he had been able to see in his little barber shop an enterprise as successful in its own way as anything run by Carnegie or Rockefeller. Similarly, Dean Drone would have been a more effective minister had he recognized the qualities in the old red and grey stone church that made it more valuable to the community than any Brighter Beacon. Mariposa itself would be the better for learning to view its own attributes--Eliot's drug store, the Mariposa Belle, etc.--with the same appreciation it accords the Rats' Coolers and Whirlwind Campaigns of big-city life.

Through his fictional readers, Leacock suggests a view of reading that favours books which reconcile us to our communities. Zena's trashy romances are useful reading because they reconcile her to the life ahead of her: marriage, motherhood, and family. Sentimental fictions give Zena the ability to wrap this mundane destiny in a redemptive glow of

enchantment. In *Humor and Humanity*, Leacock openly admits what *Sunshine Sketches* only implies: that the purpose of humour is "to make a good world or reconcile us at least to one that might have been worse" (108). In *Sunshine Sketches*, these two seemingly contradictory impulses are fulfilled simultaneously. Over the course of the text, Leacock reconciles his sceptical, big-city readers with the small-town folks they left behind when they moved to the city and joined the Mausoleum Club. Readers are like the Prodigal Son; it is Leacock's job to bring us all back home. Such reconciliation involves a process of forgiveness and self-discovery. In learning to accept the world as it is, with all its imperfections, we actually make the world a better place, and ourselves better people.

But to arrive at this salutary conclusion, readers must first be distanced from their complacent illusions about themselves. "You" is the central form of address in *Sunshine Sketches* because we are all identified from the outset as potential Mariposans: "I don't know whether you know Mariposa. If not, it is of no consequence, for if you know Canada at all, you are probably well acquainted with a dozen towns just like it" (13). Leacock thus implicates us in his text where meaning emerges through a shifting series of relationships within the communicative triangle. Indeed, Mikhail Bakhtin's model of sociological poetics holds that literature, like any other form of communication, "*is the expression and product of the social interaction of three participants: the speaker (author), the listener (reader), and the topic (the who or what) of speech (the hero)*" (401). All three corners of this triangle are "essential constitutive factors of the work" (404).

Bakhtin characterizes the relationship between these three factors in terms of various "positionings." In the classical positioning, "the listener normally stands *side by side* with

the author as his ally" (407). Indeed, such is the case at the beginning of *Sunshine Sketches*; reader and narrator stand side by side, regarding the town which lies spread out before us, basking "in the sunlight, sloping up from the little lake that spreads out at the foot of the hillside on which the town is built" (13). Our physical position is significant here; in this passage we look down on Mariposa from a lofty hillside perch; in the sketches to come we will listen to the narrator's ironic asides and laugh at Mariposa from an equally lofty social position as sophisticated big-city visitors.

In many texts, readers are permitted to remain in this classical position, side by side with the author; in such texts, we enter the characters' world but we ourselves remain invisible, much like a lone tourist wandering unnoticed in the heart of a city. Our visit to Mariposa cannot take place in such safe anonymity, however; visitors stand out in such a sleepy little town. We come to *Sunshine Sketches* not only to see but to be seen: the narrator looks straight at us, addressing us in the second person, and he reveals that our subterfuges and hypocrisies are no more immune to his eagle eye than those of Mariposa. Gradually, the narrator's comments serve to strip us of any delusions of superiority we might have by positioning us alongside Mariposa; the listener is "calculated to be close to the hero ridiculed and not to the ridiculing author" (Bakhtin 407). An instance of this satiric positioning occurs when the narrator remarks that "it was when Jeff made money that they saw how gifted he was, and when he lost it--but still, there's no need to go into that. I believe it's something the same in other places too" (38). Similarly, when Mr. Smith's bartender casually boards the Mariposa Belle, the narrator points out that "if you know Mariposa you will understand that why he looks so nonchalant and empty-handed is because

he has two bottles of rye whiskey under his linen duster" (54). Even if we don't know Mariposa, the narrator reminds us that we are probably more than familiar with the process of smuggling liquor: "You know, I think, the peculiar walk of a man with two bottles of whiskey in the inside pockets of a linen coat" (54). Readers' hands are no cleaner than Mr. Smith's when it comes to drinking on the sly.

Readers are also expected to respond with rueful recognition to Mariposa's unwillingness to donate money to a dubious cause: "I suppose things are just the same elsewhere," the narrator claims, "--I mean the peculiar kind of discontent that crept into the Church of England congregation in Mariposa after the setting up of the Beacon" (82). Anyone who has flipped the channel during a PBS fund-raiser must admit to being no readier than the citizens of Mariposa to attend Dean Drone's Lenten Services of Sorrow.

Perhaps the most compelling remark of all, however, occurs after Dean Drone overhears a parishioner refer to him as a mugwump. The narrator reminds us that everyone is prone to denial and self-deception: "You know, perhaps, how a remark of that sort can stay and rankle, and make you wish you could hear it again to make sure of it, because perhaps you didn't hear it aright, and it was a mistake after all. Perhaps no one said it, anyway" (84-85). The Dean's inward fear that he is a mugwump becomes a symbol for the fears we all have about how we appear to others. As we laugh at Mariposa's ability to hide fear and shame under masks of sentimental virtue, we would do well to face up to our own buried memories of half-heard comments, acknowledging the flaws and failings that we, too, strive to hide from both ourselves and the world. Leacock moves us from our position beside him to a position shoulder to shoulder with Mariposans, curing us, in the process, of

the same blindness and self-deception that plagues the little town.

Having dealt with our blindness to our own vices and flaws, Leacock helps us to get over our blindness to what remains of value in this community. In *Sunshine Sketches*, Leacock recreates for the reader the experience of living in a small town. As "L'Envoi" makes clear, the big city is a place where it is possible to be alone and invisible; even Mariposans are hardly recognizable among the crowd on the train as it passes "through the suburbs and the golf district and the outlying parts of the city area" (183). Only when the electric suburban express metamorphoses into the "old familiar car with the stuff cushions in red plush" does the "dull reserve" of big-city life crumble away; people begin to talk and chat amongst themselves, calling each other "'Bill' and 'Sam' as if they were all one family" (184-86). A small town is a place where people are forced to interact, to acknowledge the community's role in each individual life. Such enforced contact is not an unqualified boon; during the Whirlwind Campaign, the narrator observes that "there is a sympathy and a brotherhood in these things when men work shoulder to shoulder"--so much so that "I have myself heard Judge Pepperleigh say that after the campaign he knew all of Pete Glover that he wanted to. There was a lot of that kind of complete satiety" (95-96). Human interaction is not always easy or pleasurable, but it is nonetheless the very stuff of life: people only grow and change as they learn to coexist with each other.

Leacock uses several key scenes to introduce changes in our positioning within the text. Stories that focus on individual characters often allow us to remain within the comfort of the classical positioning. During episodes that focus on the town as a whole, however, Leacock changes the rules: "the author *concludes an alliance*, as it were, *with his hero*

against the listener" (Bakhtin 407). At the beginning of the Mariposa Belle excursion, the narrator adopts an attitude of truly Mariposan enthusiasm: "Don't talk to me of the Italian lakes, or the Tyrol or the Swiss Alps. Take them away. Move them somewhere else. I don't want them" (53). His extravagant language seems to indicate that he is playing the fool, speaking with his tongue in cheek in order to evoke the reader's laughter. This impression is strengthened by the growing absurdity of such exclamations: "Don't tell me about the Carnival of Venice and the Delhi Durbar. Don't! I wouldn't look at them. I'd shut my eyes!" (53). These laughable statements are contextualized, however, by a serious, lyrical passage that reveals the true beauty of the Canadian wilderness: "Out on the lake the last thin threads of the mist are clearing away like flecks of cotton wool. The long call of the loon echoes over the lake. The air is cool and fresh. There is in it all the new life of the land of the silent pine and the moving waters" (53). Evidently, the narrator expects that readers will take for granted such wild, local beauty; he thus attempts to forestall any belittling comparisons the reader might make between Lake Wissanotti and the Swiss Alps or the Carnival of Venice. It is hardly flattering to realize that we, who are expected readily to recognize the rye whiskey behind the bartender's linen coat, are presumed to be immune to the beauty of this quiet morning scene.

The narrator plays the fool once more when the Mariposa Belle starts to sink. The narrator climbs aboard, exclaiming, "Safe yourself, if you like; as for me, let me once get back into Mariposa again, under the night shadow of the maple trees, and this shall be the last, last time I'll go on Lake Wissanotti" (68). His words remind us of our distance from Mariposa, our position as outsiders--we are safely on shore, while he stands on the deck,

shouting across the water. And yet our position of comfortable aloofness is undermined by a previous passage that validates the Mariposan point of view. The narrator describes the eerie darkness and silence that falls on the lake, "--far out, so that you can only just see the lights of the town away off to the south,--when the propeller comes to a stop . . . and there's a night wind beginning to run among the rushes" (68). He is perfectly accurate when he points out that "you'd have been scared, too, if you'd been there just before the steamer sank" (68). Our laughter at Mariposa's expense has a different quality when we suspect that, on some level at least, we are laughing alone. The narrator invites us to share the Mariposa Belle adventure, absurd though it may be, for, although the danger is not real, the community spirit it evokes is. By the end of the sketch, we may well feel a part of the town as the Mariposa Belle "steams safe and sound to the town wharf" (72). Against the brooding silence of the lake, "the lights and the crowd" do indeed seem the height of cheerfulness and bustle. When the narrator exclaims, "If only the federal census taker could count us now!" his enthusiasm is contagious (72); the word "us" includes the reader in the general jubilation; there are no self-conscious references here to our big-city scepticism.

In the sketches that follow, Leacock will return to the classical positioning; the narrator appears again at our side, ready with a stream of jokes and innuendos at Mariposa's expense. The reader is welcomed into the town only by fits and starts; we lurch forward toward identification with the town, but then we fall back again into mockery and ridicule. Leacock makes sure, however, that we do not remain in that comfortably superior position, reminding us that we, too, are subject to such weaknesses and failings. Finally, having forgiven both ourselves and the town, we are able to enter that community, discovering its

redeeming qualities.

The purpose of the whole exercise is most clearly revealed when the beacon on a hill catches fire. At home in the city, "a fire is only a spectacle, nothing more" (103). Spectators look on with idle interest, caring little for the stranger whose home is going up in flames. Such callousness is the inevitable result of big-city life, where everyone is isolated in a cold, impersonal crowd. The fire in Mariposa, on the other hand, reveals the true character of small-town life. When the blaze breaks out, the entire town is endangered; the common enemy is thus met with a common, cooperative effort: the men of the town fight the fire "from the midnight call of the bell till the slow coming of the day" (103-04). The scene is described in stirring, dramatic tones without a hint of irony:

They fought the fire, not to save the church, for that was doomed from the first outbreak of the flames, but to stop the spread of it and save the town. They fought it at the windows, and at the blazing doors, and through the yawning furnace of the open belfry; fought it, with the Mariposa engine thumping and panting in the street, itself aglow with fire like a servant demon fighting its own kind, with tall ladders reaching to the very roof, and with hose that poured their streams of tossing water foaming into the flames. (104)

The note of admiration here is genuine; Mariposan citizens have come together, each man risking personal injury for the benefit of the community. It is appropriate that the fire symbolizes both the best and the worst of Mariposa. The beacon on a hill kindles into a "testimony of flame" that attests to both the virtues and the vices of this small town: on the one hand, we have community spirit and bravery, and on the other we have community-

sanctioned arson and insurance fraud. As Leacock reveals, the process of interaction with others is always fraught with disillusionment--the close quarters of small-town life make vice and absurdity painfully evident. In fact, Mariposan hypocrisy is itself an inevitable side effect of the small-town experience; one need only wear masks in an environment where one can be recognized. Living in a community thus means learning to forgive--not overlook--the human failings that continually surface.

Leacock introduces readers into the realities of small town life in order to teach us what it means to be human. Modern urban life enables us to escape from our fellow creatures; we can surround ourselves with people who share our own interests and beliefs, and avoid coming to terms with the full range of human character and experience. The narrator stands by our side as we observe Mariposan frailties from a safely distant position, but then he turns the tables on us, revealing that we, too, are the butt of the joke, since we share all the qualities that make Mariposa laughable. Once we acknowledge our complicity in Mariposan vice and hypocrisy, the narrator encourages us to look still deeper to find the true value of human community. He aligns himself with the small-town perspective, gradually preparing us to take "The Train to Mariposa"--a journey that draws us back to the traditional values that are too easily forgotten in the individualistic game of "money-getting in the city" (186).

L. M. Montgomery also attempts to transform readers by requiring us to develop a communal perspective. According to Jane Tompkins, the most enduring popular fiction reaches its audience by offering "a blueprint for survival" (xvii). Her words shed light on Montgomery's novels, many of which have been treasured, not for abstract literary qualities,

but because they have literally changed readers' lives.⁷ Using loosely constructed, episodic plots, Montgomery's novels frequently focus on the transformation of a heroine as she adapts to her community while retaining a sense of self. Her Cinderella stories never rescue heroines to a leisured or lazy existence; instead they suggest that work of all kinds, whether domestic, creative, political, or social, has a positive, redemptive value. *Rilla of Ingleside* follows this tradition, focusing on Rilla's transformation from a vain, fun-loving "lily of the field" (16) into an integrated, useful member of her household and community.

We are first introduced to Rilla when Anne, who has never been accused of being overly critical of her children, acknowledges that her youngest daughter "has no serious ideals at all--her sole aspiration seems to be to have a good time" (7). Rilla is a typical adolescent girl, but she is likeable despite her frivolity and self-absorption. Like most girls her age, she passionately longs for romance and excitement, often feels neglected or misunderstood, and is "in a chronic state of secret indignation because nobody believed she was grown up" (11-12). Her first real party, the dance at the Four Winds lighthouse, is as enchanting to the reader as it is to Rilla, but it also serves to reveal the shallowness of Rilla's character. Her crush on Kenneth, for instance, though quite genuine, has an element of childish competitiveness. Rilla enjoys her knowledge that "every girl in sight envied her" as she and Kenneth dance under the lanterns by the sea (31). Similarly, when Jack Elliott announces England's declaration of war, Rilla's response reveals her self-absorption; she is shocked and disturbed at the idea of her brothers and playmates volunteering to fight, but her primary concern is for her ruined party. Much of the interest in the novel is generated from Rilla's growth and development as she gradually becomes aware of a world outside of

herself, and learns to accept and even welcome her responsibilities in that world. By the end of the novel, Anne's original attitude of concern for her daughter is replaced by pride and respect as she confesses to Gilbert that "Rilla has developed in a wonderful fashion these past four years. She used to be such an irresponsible young creature. She has changed into a capable, womanly girl and she is such a comfort to me" (258). This transformation is brought about through three major events: the adoption of Jims, Walter's death, and the war itself. The power of the story lies in the fact that we do not simply watch Rilla become a better, stronger, more mature young woman--our perspective shifts with hers.

Wolfgang Iser's theory of "the dialectical structure of reading" shows how "The need to decipher gives us the chance to formulate our own deciphering capacity--i.e., we bring to the fore an element of our being of which we are not directly conscious" (456). Because reading involves us in a continual process of anticipation and retrospection, of changing perspectives, it "entails the possibility that we may formulate ourselves and so discover what had previously seemed to elude our consciousness" (456). With every sentence we read we build up an "illusion," interpreting words and events in terms of what we expect to happen next. As we read on, however, those expectations are constantly altered, and we are forced to reevaluate what came before. As Iser puts it, "Every sentence contains a preview of the next and forms a kind of viewfinder for what is to come; and this in turn changes the 'preview' and so becomes a 'viewfinder' for what has been read" (439). The resulting interaction between text and reader forms what Iser calls the "virtual dimension" of the text. Each reader will form different expectations based upon his or her own disposition and personality. But the power of the reading experience lies in its ability to create a reality

"that will be *different* from [the reader's] own" (442). Reading uses this difference to challenge us; we are given an opportunity to grow and expand through a process "closely akin to the way in which we gather experience in life" (441).

Montgomery uses the process of illusion-building and illusion-breaking in *Rilla of Ingleside* to create a reading experience that mimics the experience of war itself. Indeed, for those on the home front, the war is experienced largely through the written word: characters read letters, telegrams, and newspaper headlines announcing all the major victories and defeats. Montgomery opens the novel with a scene in which Susan scans the "big, black headline on the front page of the *Enterprise*, stating that some Archduke Ferdinand or other had been assassinated at a place bearing the weird name of Sarajevo" (1-2). Young readers may well find this bit of news as bizarre and uninteresting as Susan does, skipping with her to the much more interesting section of the paper where tasty bits of local gossip are to be found. But young people are not the only ones who change over the course of the novel; Susan changes as well from a woman of narrow perspective, interested only in her own immediate house and community, to a well-read political commentator, aware of her position as a citizen of the world. As she puts it, "There was a time . . . when I did not care what happened outside of P.E. Island, and now a king cannot have a toothache in Russia or China but it worries me" (146).

Readers absorb this education as we read the newspaper over Susan's shoulder, sharing her ever-increasing interest. The next *Enterprise* headline reports that "Lord Kitchener says the war will last three years" (42)--information that is now immediately relevant to Jem and Jerry as they leave for the front. Susan and the Blythes pore over the

news reports, searching for clues to help them predict what will happen next; when the doctor reads a dispatch describing "A broken, a beaten, but not a demoralized, army," Anne responds, like so many other Canadians, by wearily anticipating that "It will be a long time now before the war is ended" (59). Readers, of course, are aware that Germany will be defeated after four years of war, but we, too, scan the text for clues as to how the war will affect the lives of characters in Glen St. Mary. In Miss Oliver's prophetic dream, the waves of war overwhelm the Glen, soaking her dress with blood. We know that the war will be won--but at what cost to this town and its people?

Montgomery recreates the rhythm of the war for her readers using her chapter structures to mimic the oscillations between hope and dread that characterize life on the home front. Between such dramatic events as Ken's farewell visit, Walter's death, or Susan's vanquishing of Whiskers-on-the-moon, Montgomery intersperses several chapters that deal with everyday life, bearing titles that express a sense of grim endurance: "Waiting" (221), "Dark and Bright" (89), and "The Weeks Wear By" (140). Such chapters nearly always begin with bad news and a sense of impending disaster. For example, a chapter entitled "In the Days of Langemarck" begins with the ominous news that there has been heavy fighting at Ypres in which "Our Canadian boys have done splendidly" (99). National pride is superseded here by a gnawing anxiety that surfaces every time the telephone rings or the newspaper arrives, for, as Rilla remarks in anguish, "The casualty lists are coming out in the papers every day--oh, there are so many of them. I can't bear to read them for fear I'd find Jem's name" (99). We read on with much the same fear, but in this chapter at least, gloomy forebodings lead not to tragedy but to a comic turn upwards. We share Rilla's relief when

we read Jem's letter from the front, indicating that he has "come through without a scratch" (103). We are even able to smile when this chapter ends, like so many others, with one of Susan's salty speeches. Contemplating Rilla's success with baby Jims, Susan remarks that "She really could not do better for that child than if she had raised a baker's dozen. . . . Little did I ever expect it of her on the day she landed here with that soup tureen" (104).

Susan's words hearken back to Rilla's decision to adopt Jims, which itself provides comic relief after the first of many British defeats. This fluctuation between fear and relief continues throughout the novel. The Ingleside family wait tensely as the Germans march toward Paris, for instance, but once again, crisis is averted when the "miracle of the Marne" intervenes. In another chapter, the *Lusitania* goes down with passengers and crew, but we are able to turn away from the attendant images of horror when Rilla makes her ill-fated visit to Irene Howard, wearing on one foot "a smart little steel-buckled shoe" and on the other "a stout and rather shabby boot" (109-10). A later chapter opens with bad news from the Eastern front; the Russian retreat coincides with a more personal calamity as Walter departs for France. Despite these menaces, however, we are still encouraged to muster a smile at Irene's superior attitude when she comments, "I often wish *I* could take things as lightly as Rilla Blythe" (128). Even the chapter of Kenneth's farewell visit begins on a dark note, with Dr. Blythe announcing the fall of Warsaw as he brings in the daily mail. The brightest comic moments in the text thus serve to offset the grim war news that so often begins each chapter.

Again and again, Montgomery creates a sense of impending doom, only to turn once more toward hope. Our fear of an upcoming catastrophe is perhaps strongest at the

beginning of a chapter entitled, "'They Shall Not Pass'" (163). On a "cold grey morning" in 1916, Gertrude Oliver creeps into Rilla's bedroom, shaken and frightened by a vivid, haunting nightmare that seems to foretell a "menacing thunder cloud" lurking on the horizon (163). "Something terrible is before us," Gertrude insists in desperate tones, "I *know*" (163). Her convictions are well-founded: "that day brought news of the opening of the Verdun offensive" (164). Days of tense waiting follow "as foot by foot the Germans crept nearer and nearer to the grim barrier of desperate France" (164). Instead of bringing tragedy to Ingleside, however, this chapter brings pride and jubilation: Walter wins a D.C. Medal, and then, on the heels of that honour, publishes "The Piper," the poem that would carry his "name to every corner of the globe" (167). Even the news of Robert Grant's death cannot break the upward tide; Gertrude grieves for her fiancé, but then "'joy came in the morning' as the Bible says" (169)--word comes that Mr. Grant was only wounded and is safe in hospital. Rilla is able to end the chapter on the customary note of courage and hope, asserting her faith that the "strange dream of Miss Oliver's foretold the victory of France" (171).

Montgomery returns to the theme of the false report in a chapter called "Black Sunday" (234). Never does defeat seem closer than on that "one day when all humanity seemed nailed to the cross" (234). For once all pretense of bravery is abandoned after Susan announces that "The British line is broken and the German shells are falling on Paris" (236). The extremity of the situation is evident: Susan burns the potatoes, Gertrude concedes defeat, and little Jims, perceiving their stricken faces and anguished cries, asks anxiously, "Is God dead? . . . Oh, Willa--oh, Willa, is God dead?" (236-37). As his big brown eyes well

up with tears, Susan and the Blythes pluck up heart and take a brace. By the end of the chapter, they learn to their relief that the hole in the line has been patched up, and the Germans are still a good seventy miles away from Versailles and the Louvre. Humour prevails at last, as Susan expresses her devout gratitude that "Cousin Sophia did not come in today. I really could not have endured *her* on top of all the rest" (239).

Montgomery repeatedly raises expectations of disaster, but then defuses our fears with humour and hope. This pattern foretells in every chapter of the novel the story of the war itself: long days of suffering and weariness will eventually culminate in victory. As we follow every heartbeat, every reverse and fluctuation, the war becomes a real experience for the reader. As Iser describes it, "We look forward, we look back, we decide, we change our decisions, we form expectations, we are shocked by their nonfulfillment, we question, we muse, we accept, we reject; this is the dynamic process of recreation" (449). We recreate the war as we read, gaining access to the very experience that helped Rilla and Susan to transcend their limitations. The war has taught Rilla to look beyond herself, to see her life in relation to the lives of thousands of men and women across Canada, Russia, Turkey, Italy, Belgium, and France. Equally importantly, it has given her opportunities for growth and self-sacrifice, as she raises young Jims by the book and handily "runs" the Junior Red Cross.

We are given a report card of Rilla's progress a few pages before Walter's death; on the second anniversary of the party at Four Winds, Rilla looks back with regret upon her youthful dreams of fun and frolic. But she also realizes the value of her years of hard work and deprivation:

I have a queer feeling of thankfulness for them--as if they had brought me something very precious, with all their pain. I wouldn't *want* to go back and be the girl I was two years ago, not even if I could. Not that I think I've made any wonderful progress--but I'm *not* quite the selfish, frivolous little doll I was then. I suppose I had a soul then, Miss Oliver--but I didn't know it. I know it now--and that is worth a great deal--worth all the suffering of the past two years. (185-86)

Rilla has learned the redemptive power of pain--it is a lesson she will need to sustain her through the ordeal that lies ahead.

On the microscopic level, Montgomery provides repeated reassurances that the Allies will ultimately be victorious. Although the war is threatening, the fear of utter defeat is never realized. Chapter after chapter, our expectations of impending defeat are "disappointed"--what happens is always better than what we would expect. The very repetition of this pattern can itself raise expectations--we hope against hope that Ingleside will be spared. Others may be killed over the long years of war, but Jem, Jerry, Walter, Carl--perhaps they will somehow make it through. The promise inherent in each averted disaster is finally broken, however. For the people at Ingleside, the worst does happen when Walter is killed at Courcelette. For once, the foreshadowed disaster actually comes to pass; Dog Monday's mournful howls do hail a passing ghost. Montgomery presents Walter's death, like the war itself, as a reading experience for those who grieve. The terse words Dr. Blythe uses to inform Rilla that "Walter had been killed in action at Courcelette" have the curt cadence of the telegram that undoubtedly brought the news (188).

Likewise, Rilla's process of mourning centres upon her reading of Walter's last letter, an experience the reader can share. In that letter, Walter urges Rilla to teach her children about "the *Idea* we fought and died for--teach them it must be *lived* for as well as died for" (192). That "*Idea*" is an ideal of self-sacrifice that Walter fulfils as he dies for his country. As his letter makes clear, his life is given willingly, in the hope that his sacrifice will inspire others to display a similar commitment to community, and to a life lived not for the self but for others. Walter does not merely set a good example, however; his death actually creates the conditions in which such a devoted, interdependent community might arise. Rilla's grief does not force her back into self-enclosure; instead it gives her the sensitivity and courage to understand Una's pain. Rilla's decision to give Una Walter's letter goes far beyond the call of duty--it is a spontaneous, heartfelt response to the very real need of "a woman stricken to the heart, who yet must not cry out or ask for sympathy" (193). Even when her agony is sharpest, Rilla's grief makes her strong, with a strength that emerges from her empathy for others. The moment of powerful, yet unspoken bonding between Rilla and Una is the last of several such moments in Montgomery's fiction.

Throughout the *Anne* series, Montgomery develops her belief that suffering is the common language of humanity. To experience bereavement in these books is to be initiated into the realm of the truly human. Matthew's death in *Anne of Green Gables* establishes the pattern, allowing Anne the opportunity for self-sacrifice: she gives up her university scholarship in order to allow Marilla to stay on at Green Gables. Anne's growth mirrors Marilla's own development; the two women comfort each other as they cry in the night, and for the first time, stern, repressed Marilla is able to express openly her love for Anne: "I

know I've been kind of strict and harsh with you maybe--but you mustn't think I didn't love you as well as Matthew did, for all that. I want to tell you now when I can. It's never been easy for me to say things out of my heart, but at times like this it's easier. I love you as dear as if you were my own flesh and blood and you've been my joy and comfort ever since you came to Green Gables" (296). Marilla's grief opens her heart and allows her to reach out to Anne in a whole new way.

This experience of growth through suffering is replayed in *Anne of the Island*. In that novel, it is the dying, rather than the bereaved, who undergo a transformation. Ruby Gillis is an old friend of Anne's from Avonlea school days, but in this text she is presented as a silly, shallow flirt whose conversation contains nothing but beaux and conquests. Anne and Diana keep up the acquaintance for old times' sake, but find the grown-up Ruby to be both absurd and irritating. As Anne explains, "you feel, when she is boasting of her beaux that she is doing it to rub it well into you that you haven't half so many" (35). Ruby is what Marilla might have become had the war not intervened. In this novel, Ruby is ultimately a figure of pathos; Anne returns home from college one summer to find her old chum "dying of galloping consumption" (80). She is thin to the point of transparency, but her cheeks are "hectically brilliant" as she keeps up a valiant, pathetic, and gruesome charade that nothing is amiss. Ruby flirts, laughs, and makes plans to teach at White Sands in the fall, but, as Mrs. Lynde so bluntly points out, "She'll be in her grave, poor girl, when White Sands school opens, that's what" (80).

The story of Ruby's illness is pervaded with a sense of shocked disbelief--for all her faults, it is still all *wrong* that gay, flirtatious Ruby should be dying at the age of twenty.

Matthew's death could be accepted as the natural end to a long and productive life--he even gets his wish to "drop in harness," dying of a heart attack as he would have chosen. Ruby's death is tragic in a way that Matthew's was not, but it, too, has meaning because it forces her for the first time to look beyond the moment. A few nights before her death, Ruby allows her mask to drop, and she and Anne have their first--and last--real, honest conversation. Ruby admits that she is terrified of dying. She believes that she will go to heaven, but shrinks from the thought, for, no matter how lovely it may be, "*it won't be what I've been used to*" (106). Anne can find few words of comfort to offer. Ruby's words are "sad, tragic--and *true!* Heaven could not be what Ruby had been used to. There had been nothing in her gay, frivolous life, her shallow ideals and aspirations, to fit her for that great change" (106). In her short life, Ruby has "laid up her treasures on earth only" (107). Montgomery reveals, however, that even for Ruby death itself can work a redeeming transformation: she dies with a smile on her face, as if death has accomplished "what life and love and great sorrow and deep womanhood joys might have done for Ruby" (110).

The injustice of Ruby's early death is eclipsed only by the death of baby Joyce in *Anne's House of Dreams*. Anne's first-born daughter lives only one day, and after her death, Anne refuses to be comforted by the idea that such tragedies are part of God's plan: "Why should she be born at all," she cries in anguish, "--why should anyone be born at all--if she's better off dead? I *don't* believe it is better for a child to die at birth than to live its life out--and love and be loved--and enjoy and suffer. . . . And how do you know it was God's will? Perhaps it was just a thwarting of His purpose by the Power of Evil" (117). The world Montgomery depicts is one where the unthinkable can happen--where death strikes young and

old alike. Anne cannot accept her daughter's death, cannot explain it--but as she grieves she learns the value of suffering. The plot of the novel revolves around Anne's troubled friendship with Leslie Moore, the woman who will one day become the mother of Kenneth Ford. Leslie has lived a life of unspeakable wretchedness, and the contrast between her misery and Anne's happiness is a barrier to their friendship. Not long after Little Joyce's death, however, in a chapter entitled "Barriers Swept Away" (121), Leslie confesses that she has envied and hated her friend: "Anne, I was grieved to the core of my heart when you lost your baby; and if I could have saved her for you by cutting off one of my hands I would have done it. But your sorrow has brought us closer together. Your perfect happiness isn't a barrier any longer" (125-26).

Sorrow works to draw people together in the *Anne* series; the friendship between Anne and Leslie is sealed by suffering, just as Rilla and Una are linked by their shared mourning for Walter. World War I makes the experience of bereavement a shared currency for an entire nation--indeed, for the whole Western world. Walter's poem becomes a symbol of the community of sorrow the war has created: "Mothers and sisters wept over it, young lads thrilled to it, the whole great heart of humanity caught it up as an epitome of all the pain and hope and pity and purpose of the mighty conflict" (167). Montgomery rewrites the war, giving it a psychological, rather than a political or historical, purpose; the self-sacrifice of men like Walter provides not only a moral imperative toward an ethic of commitment and service to community, but also a means of creating that community, drawing people together through a shared burden of suffering.⁸

Montgomery makes it clear that those who would protect themselves from pain also

isolate themselves from the rest of the world. To shrink from suffering is to risk becoming like Mrs. Reese, whose insensitive mutterings over "Pore, pore Walter" cause Susan to lash out, "He was *not* poor. He was richer than any of you. It is you who stay at home and will not let your sons go who are poor--poor and naked and mean and small" (189). With her self-righteous, empty platitudes, Mrs. Reese rides roughshod where angels fear to tread; she is clumsy and obtuse because she has no empathy, no ability to understand the family's pain. Montgomery's depiction of Walter's death allows readers to avoid becoming like Mrs. Reese; as we read we learn the universal language of sorrow; we begin to develop the empathy that leads to maturity.

Not coincidentally, it is empathy that leads Rilla to adopt baby Jims--the event that, more than any other, helps Rilla to mature. When she finds the baby squalling under the gimlet eye of Mrs. Conover, Rilla is struck to the heart at the "thought of the poor mother going down into the valley of the shadow alone, fretting about her baby" (63). She plunks the child in a soup tureen and, in a snap decision that has far-reaching consequences, decides to take him home. Caring for Jims disciplines Rilla, teaches her responsibility as she is forced to abandon her own interests in order to take care of another person's needs. Montgomery reveals, however, that Rilla's effectiveness as a foster mother depends not so much on her sense of duty, as upon her developing capacity for compassion. Rilla feels her first spark of love for the child when she comforts him in the night, in defiance of Morgan's admonition that such indulgence will spoil him. She initially resolves to let him cry himself to sleep, but then is tormented by visions of how she would feel if she were lying, unloved and forlorn, "in a basket in a big, black room, without one speck of light, and nobody within

miles of me, for all I could see or know" (93). As she cuddles Jims, the baby's sobs subside and, for the first time, he laughs, "--a real, gurgly, chuckly, delighted, delightful laugh" (94). Her moment of empathy for Jims produces a rush of affection that gradually turns her war service into a labour of love.

War worries, grief, and new responsibilities help Rilla to grow from a shallow, self-enclosed adolescent into a mature adult, committed to her family and community. Her story parallels the story of Canada, a nation that also saw the war as a coming of age. In a 1919 entry in her journal, Montgomery quotes from a letter she had written in 1910, in which she claimed that "Canada is only just finding herself. She has not yet fused her varying elements into a harmonious whole. Perhaps she will not do so until they are welded together by some great crisis of storm and stress . . . some kind of baptism by fire to purge away all our petty superficialities." With the benefit of hindsight, Montgomery adds, "When I wrote that I had no premonition of the Great War. But if I had known what was coming I could hardly have described it better" (2: 339-40). World War I was indeed a trial by fire. *Rilla of Ingleside* suggests that the universal bereavement wrought by the war can be a source of community: Canada can be "welded together" into a mutually supportive, interdependent unit, whose citizens are committed not only to one another, but also to the rest of the world.

The very process of illusion-building and illusion-breaking in this text is what draws readers toward this ideal. When we first read of Miss Oliver's dream, in which the Glen is swallowed up by a dark, churning tide, we share her hope that Ingleside will be spared. As the war wears on, however, Gertrude's initial attitude changes. On a cold winter night, Gertrude remarks that "I never go out these dark cold nights myself without thinking of the

men in the trenches." Her empathy extends beyond Ingleside and Glen St. Mary, as she worries about "not only *our* men but *everybody's* men" (95). Her initial expectations centre around home and hearth, but the war gradually broadens her vision. Walter's death breaks the illusion that the Ingleside boys "bear charmed lives" (185). Our initial question has been answered: Ingleside has paid its price for victory. But the novel does not end with Walter's death--we are led to ask deeper, more mature questions; our concern for the safety of loved ones deepens into a concern for the fate of Glen St. Mary and of Canada as a whole--what will be left when the tide of blood recedes?--an ashy waste land? or a world washed clean in sacrificial blood? Miss Oliver's final dream affirms the latter possibility: with the ebbing of the tide of war, Gertrude dreams that "the Glen lay before me, beautiful and green, with a rainbow spanning Rainbow Valley--a rainbow of such splendid colour that it dazzled me" (246). In 1920, it still remained to be seen whether Gertrude's prophetic vision of hope would be fulfilled. Seventy-five years later, we can still be inspired by Montgomery's vision of a community in which empathy and mutual sacrifice draw people together to form a strong, interdependent society.

But a mere two years before the Great War, Leacock's *Sunshine Sketches* anticipates this need to cleanse and to recreate the community of a callow nation. Leacock's satire attacks hypocrisy and self-deception in Mariposa because these traits threaten to obscure the very real virtues that Mariposa possesses as a functioning, interdependent community. He strips the little town of its masks, not just to reveal vice, but also to reveal the genuine qualities that lie hidden behind the false fronts that Mariposans love to wear. Masks can only isolate us from one another; Leacock portrays characters whose moments of greatest

dignity come when their masks are down, leaving them exposed and vulnerable. Readers are urged to share this vulnerability, to relinquish our own masks of ironic distance, and join the most foolish and absurd community of all: the human race.

Montgomery's tale of transformation uses different techniques to achieve the same goal. *Rilla of Ingleside* gives us a blueprint that allows us to outgrow our selfish containment, and mature along with Rilla into an acceptance of our responsibilities to family, community, and nation. Leacock and Montgomery both form part of a sentimental tradition that works to create a world in which "there will be no competition, no exploitation, no commands. Motivated by self-sacrificing love, and joined to one another by its cohesive power, people will perform their duties willingly and with pleasure: moral suasion will take the place of force" (Tompkins 142). Tompkins presents this sentimental utopia as a woman-centred society, based on the values women traditionally hold dear. Leacock's acceptance of such values confirms what Suzanne Clark has already suggested: that sentimentality is a feminist issue. A sentimental male writer, even when he has no feminist agenda (and Leacock, if anything, was an armchair misogynist), can wander into a celebration of feminine values in the process of creating a sentimental text. Recuperating the sentimental is thus an important project, not only because it allows us to rediscover women writers of the past, but also because it helps us to define a vision of the future. In a society that has become increasingly obsessed with individualism, progress, and material gain, Leacock and Montgomery offer a moral vision that is both inspiring and refreshing. Their sentimental humour creates a world to which we can turn, even today, for healing and hope.

CONCLUSION

According to Suzanne Clark, "The sentimental is . . . an 'unwarranted discourse'"

(1). One could say that Leacock and Montgomery explored the forbidden spaces of rural, domestic experience without a search warrant; their sentimental celebration of home and community was an illicit activity that was promptly quashed in the courts of modernist criticism. A sentimental discourse takes advantage of its marginal position, however, using it to explore alternatives to the hegemony of masculine values. Thus, the streak of nostalgic romance in *Sunshine Sketches* and *Rilla of Ingleside* provides an ideological alternative to the modern, urban ethos that idolizes progress at the expense of traditional, familial ties. Similarly, sentimental emotion has the power to break the rigid control of a masculine economy, initiating an alternative economy characterized by sympathy and openness. Both texts thus have a transformative effect; Leacock and Montgomery use sentiment and humour to nurture their readers, leading us toward a tolerant, mature vision that reconciles us to our human community and delivers us from individualistic self-enclosure.

Montgomery and Leacock both develop techniques that allow them to escape or defeat the competitive, self-protective, and ultimately isolating strategies of an urban, industrial culture. They create a fictional space that affirms the values of community and interconnectedness. Critical discourse, by contrast, is rarely able to break out of the cosmopolitan system. Criticism--even feminist criticism--is often very much bound up within a masculine model of individualistic, adversarial interaction. In fiction and poetry, women writers have sought out their literary foremothers, eschewing the self-interested "anxiety of

influence" theorized by Harold Bloom. As critics, however, women have fallen into the habit of rejecting their feminist precursors. Jane Marcus condemns the attacks by Elaine Showalter and Sandra Gilbert on their critical foremother, Virginia Woolf, arguing that their "Assumption of maternal authority and denial of their own 'mothers' merely mimics the patriarchal paradigm" (292-93).

Feminists are still searching for ways to mediate critical conflict without degenerating into a destructive war of words. University "communities" are necessarily competitive and individualistic; there is only room for so many scholars to be hired, promoted, and granted tenure. Economic realities have dictated that a Mariposan atmosphere of genial acceptance and mutual support be supplanted by antagonistic turf wars. In an informal conversation recorded in *Conflicts in Feminism*, Jane Gallop, Marianne Hirsch, and Nancy K. Miller regret that women within the academy have succumbed to this cutthroat atmosphere, building their careers by "trashing feminist work" (350). They discuss a coyly unnamed theorist (identified in the notes as Toril Moi) who has allegedly "summarized, erroneously, and dismissed, as naive, a range of complex and influential feminist theoretical work" (350). A curious domino effect emerges from these theoretical conflicts: Showalter and Gilbert object to Woolf's "trashing" of Charlotte Brontë; Moi, in turn, trashes Showalter for trashing Woolf; and Gallop, Hirsch, and Miller collectively trash Moi in defence of their feminist sisters. Has feminist theory devolved into mere bickering and infighting? Can it be anything else within the present model of discourse-power theory?

Good criticism is defined today very much the way Virginia Woolf defines bad literature in *A Room of One's Own*. According to Woolf, creative energy dissipates when

writers listen to the voices that urge them to abandon their vision and bow to external authority. She reveals that women have reason to be angry, but steadfastly maintains that anger is destructive to the creative text. The current climate of political correctness, fostered by feminism itself as much as by theorists of race and of sexual orientation, is fueled by anger, and thus is as threatening as the climate of adversarial criticism, is in fact another version of turf wars.

Sentimental values of cooperation and social bonding may yet provide an alternative to this "agonistic structure of argument" (Clark 197). Suzanne Clark suggests that over the centuries women have developed a sentimental rhetoric which convinces "not by direct argument but by indirection, by engaging its audience in a process of individual emotional response to images rather than a critical, thoughtful response" (198). Is there any room in the academy for such a sentimental criticism? The answer, ironically, may come from that attacked and protected foremother herself, Virginia Woolf. *A Room of One's Own* collapses the divisions between theoretical, critical, and literary writing. Casting her lecture as a narrative, Woolf eschews the rhetorical force of linear, masculine logic, weaving her ideas on Women and Fiction into an entertaining story, full of character and incident. The effect of this narrative strategy is to open up the text, making space for readers' own thoughts and perceptions.

Woolf uses her story-telling ability to present her ideas as merely the thoughts of a moment in a constantly evolving process of revision. Instead of simply proclaiming the incandescence of Shakespeare's mind, for instance, Woolf sandwiches in a reference to the research process, saying, "If ever a mind was incandescent, unimpeded, *I thought, turning*

again to the bookcase, it was Shakespeare's mind" (74, emphasis added). Her thoughts cannot be mistaken for conclusions; the very next book she takes from the shelf could potentially unsettle or reverse her judgment. This process of revision begins within the text and can continue outside of it. When the narrator, Mary Beton, describes an early draft of her lecture, she claims that her first sentence reads: "it is fatal for anyone who writes to think of their sex" (136). In the later draft that we now hold, however, this maxim is deferred until the final chapter; Mary's lecture begins instead with her description of herself, "sitting on the banks of a river . . . lost in thought" (5). Woolf refuses to draw stable conclusions, inviting readers instead to test her ideas against their own experience. Her discussion is full of logical leaps and breathless twists and turns; one moment she declares that women's writing is uniquely feminine (114); a chapter later she decides that the truly creative mind must be androgynous (136). Readers are free to follow up one or all of Woolf's ideas; we can attempt to reconcile the contradictions, or simply choose the insight we find most valuable--no single "right" response is privileged by the text.

If Woolf's words are convincing in *A Room of One's Own*, it is because they resonate with the reading experiences of her audience. Woolf does not attempt to establish absolute truths based on abstract reasoning. She establishes instead a model of criticism that is open and generous, paving the way for further discussion by inviting creative dissent, which can often be as fruitful as agreement. Such dissent need not involve "trashing" Woolf--after all, no one could disagree with Woolf more thoroughly than she disagrees with herself. The critical model implied by *A Room of One's Own* provides an alternative to the coercive, self-protective rhetoric that dominates too much critical discourse. Woolf's willingness to be

vulnerable suggests that she views her audience as an ally: she does not fear that our wit and perception will be used to discredit her (perhaps because she has already ascertained that there are no men concealed behind the red curtain of the Girton lecture hall!). "Sentimental" criticism requires both creativity and courage--but it has the potential to end turf wars and thus to transform not only the way we read, but also the way we write, the way we think, and the way we live.

NOTES

1. Canada census figures show that in 1881, when Leacock and Montgomery were both children living on farms in Ontario and P.E.I., only 15 % of the country's population was located in towns and cities of over 5000 people (*Census of Canada 1880-81*, 406). The rural/urban split for that year reveals that 74 % of Canadians lived in what were designated rural areas (Urquhart 14). By 1911, both Montgomery and Leacock were living for at least part of the year in Ontario, where, for the first time, the urban population surpassed the rural (*Fifth Census of Canada* 530).
2. One of the few critics who has commented on the connections between Montgomery and Leacock is Elizabeth Waterston, who points out that Montgomery's style is "tempered by wit that has the tang of Stephen Leacock's *Sunshine Sketches of a Little Town*" (KS 17). Montgomery's gentle satire of the "provincial nature" of her heroines is equated with the "mock-heroic but loving tone" with which Leacock depicts his Ontario town (KS 74). Waterston may also have *Rilla of Ingleside* in mind when she compares "the humorous and nostalgic train ride described in the opening and closing chapters of Stephen Leacock's *Sunshine Sketches of a Little Town*" with the "amazing number of Canadian war novels [which] contain scenes set in a railway station or a troop train, scenes of separation or of sad return" (Survey 96).
3. *Rilla* is chronologically the last book in the "Anne" series, but Montgomery later wrote two more novels that go back to the days before the war; *Anne of Windy Poplars* (1936) takes place during Anne and Gilbert's engagement, while Gilbert is in medical school, and *Anne of Ingleside* (1939) tells of the days when the Blythe children were still very young.
4. The otherwise chronological arrangement is broken by one misplaced story. Among the many tales which focus on friends of the Blythe children (who are usually aged eight or younger), is "Fancy's Fool," which features a young man named Stephen Barry, evidently in his twenties, whose "adventurous . . . blue, eagle eyes" prompt Montgomery to remark that "In the future he and Jem Blythe were to share a German prison" (90). It is possible that Stephen went to war as a man of thirty-five, but it is more likely that this story takes place much later than the turn-of-the-century stories that surround it.
5. Crafty parents, who conspire to marry off their children by feigning opposition to the match, are prominently featured in many romantic comedies, including the long-running musical, *The Fantasticks*, and Montgomery's own "The Pot and the Kettle," one of the stories in *The Road to Yesterday*.
6. The simplicity of this miniaturization of the war has led to valid and pervasive concerns that *Rilla of Ingleside* uses its sentimental warmth to glorify war. Certainly, Montgomery does not question the wartime propaganda that depicted Germany as the militaristic aggressor

and England as an innocent victim. Her characterization of Whiskers-on-the-moon as a German sympathizer and domestic despot, because he dares to question wartime rhetoric, helps her to portray the conflict as a basic struggle between good and evil. Montgomery answered such charges in her journal, claiming, "I wrote *Rilla* not to 'glorify war' but to glorify the courage and patriotism and self-sacrifice it evoked" (3: 387). Montgomery's distinction is an uneasy one; as Vietnam veterans know to their cost, opposition to war all too often becomes opposition to those who fight it, while support for the "boys at the front" is often synonymous with support for the war itself. Montgomery's heartfelt admiration for those who fought the war, both at home and abroad, seems to demand that she affirm the war as well. If nothing else, Montgomery makes it clear that someone like Walter, who hates the war but cannot stand by and let others fight it for him, should not be considered morally inferior to the "Hell, no, we won't go" pacifist draft-dodgers of the 'sixties.

For modern readers, even schoolgirls who read the novel at an age when they are learning a very different version of the war in history classes, *Rilla of Ingleside* must be read with a double eye. We may cringe at Rilla's rhetoric when she assures young men that they could not "die better than fighting for the ashes of their fathers and the temples of their gods" (93), but we must also understand the terrible need of Rilla and her family to comprehend and justify the nightmare they were living. *Rilla* may not tell the historical truth about the war, but it does reveal a psychological truth about those who lived through it. From our comfortable peacetime vantage point, it would be arrogant to condemn an ideology that sprang from the helplessness and grief that such families endured. Montgomery's novel demonstrates not only her characters' need to justify the suffering of war, but also the mental gymnastics required to do so. Walter echoes the propaganda that turned the Great War into a war against war, enlisting in order to "make it impossible for such things to happen again while the world lasts" (119). By depicting the war as a battle of valiant womanhood (Rilla and Susan) versus patriarchal tyranny (Whiskers-on-the-moon), Montgomery emphasizes her other basic point: that war can only be justified by the actions of those who survive it; it is Rilla's responsibility to remodel Canada on matriarchal lines in order to create a world in which war will be impossible. The historical irony, of course, is that Rilla's children, the "golden harvest" from the "'red rain' of Langemarck and Verdun" (192), will have to go back and fight the war over again only twenty years later.

If Montgomery never wavers from her patriotic and wholehearted support of the war effort, at least one of her major literary allusions casts a dark shadow over the war. Owen Dudley Edwards explores the implications of Montgomery's use of Browning's "The Pied Piper of Hamelin": "An older generation of rulers, perhaps in Britain, have refused to meet their obligations because of their own corruption and self-indulgence. A war machine has obliterated enemies; uncontrolled, it demands its price, failing which it lures away the youth of Canada on completely false grounds, transporting them to a remote land" (135). Edwards concludes that there is "a terrible ambiguity to the central image of the Piper. . . . on one level, Walter is a boy following the Canadian wartime ideal of blood-sacrifice. But on another level, he is a boy lured to his death by a lying Piper" (135-6).

7. Mary Rubio's essay, "Subverting the Trite," explores the impact of Montgomery's *Emily* series on generations of young women who have been inspired by Emily's often tortuous but

eventually successful struggle to make a place for herself within her family and community without abandoning her dream of becoming a writer. As Rubio points out, authors like Alice Munro and Jane Urquhart have followed Montgomery's blueprint, and now acknowledge "the way in which Montgomery's 'Emily' provided a model of female authorship for them" (9).

Jean Little also remembers Montgomery's books because they inspired her and gave her hope. The book that affected her life most profoundly was *Jane of Lantern Hill*, in which Jane, like Emily, achieves personal success by becoming part of an integrated community. Although Jane starts out as a shy, awkward, painfully self-conscious "fork-dropper," by the end of the book she has become a happy, self-confident child, finding social and creative fulfilment in such domestic activities as baking biscuits, splitting kindling for the fire, and making batches of wild strawberry jam. Little admits that she "lingered over and loved Jane's times of personal triumph" (80). The impact of Montgomery's novel can indeed be measured by Little's use of this "blueprint" in her own fiction; her novel, *From Anna*, retells Jane's story. Like Jane before her, Anna wins respect from both herself and others by achieving competence in a creative, domestic field. Anna's woven basket becomes a symbol of her ability to overcome her internalized reputation for clumsiness and incompetence.

Rubio suggests that Montgomery's blueprints for survival can inspire not only individuals, but also nations. Montgomery's *The Blue Castle* is another tale of transformation in which the heroine, Valancy, escapes the tyranny of her conventional family to find happiness in nursing a "fallen woman" through her last days of life. The novel is enormously popular in Poland, where it has been made into a musical. Rubio describes the electric atmosphere of a 1984 performance:

On stage, Valancy seemed to symbolize the Polish nation as she sang hopelessly of her 'blue castle' where she could have freedom from the overbearing, restrictive, destructive clan which policed her actions and thoughts. . . . I shall never forget the atmosphere in the Cracow theatre when Valancy freed herself from the clan, became self-determining, and sang of her freedom: it was as if--for the moment, at least--the people in the audience dared hope that they, too, might eventually achieve what Valancy had achieved--freedom from oppression. ("Subverting the Trite" 34)

The qualities that enable Valancy to cast off her shackles--courage, determination, and commitment to others--are the very principles of solidarity that strengthened Polish resistance to oppression. Montgomery's blueprint for survival can be both personal and political.

8. In her later books, Montgomery abandons the theme of redemptive suffering that plays such an important role in many of the *Anne* books. The *Emily* series, begun immediately after *Rilla of Ingleside*, focuses instead on the threat that anger and bitterness will warp a generation. The series is set in the early days of the century; the war seems very far away from the New Moon world of candles, horse-drawn buggies, and hand-churned butter. But Emily's two closest friends both struggle through troubled and stormy relationships with parents who have been unable to cope with experiences of death and bereavement. Ilse Burnley is a wild, uncontrollable young creature who is neglected both physically and emotionally by a hostile, misogynist father who has been embittered by his wife's desertion of him when Ilse was just a baby. Beatrice Burnley had left one evening to accompany her

handsome young cousin to his ship, and she had never returned. The ship was lost at sea, and Dr. Burnley never forgave or forgot. It is only through Emily's agency that the truth comes out: pretty, laughing Beatrice had not gone out to sea with her cousin, but had fallen into an open well as she hurried home to her husband and child. Dr. Burnley is forced to realize that he has spent twelve years hating womankind for an accident no one could have foreseen or prevented.

Emily's other close friend, Teddy Kent, is not neglected by an angry, death-warped father; instead, he is smothered by his jealous, possessive mother, whose love leads her to poison his cats, drive away his friends, and thwart his artistic talent for fear that she will lose him. Mrs. Kent's mania, like Dr. Burnley's, is based on her inability to recover from the death of a spouse. Hers is a horribly ordinary tale: she and her husband had quarrelled, she had spoken harsh, angry words, and he had died before she could apologize. Her morbid guilt, like Dr. Burnley's misplaced anger, turns the natural process of grieving into a prolonged, unhealthy, and destructive ordeal--an ordeal that only ends when Emily finds an old letter indicating that Teddy's father had forgiven Mrs. Kent before he died.

Through these two characters, Montgomery explores the dark side of *Rilla's* utopian narrative; bereavement can be a source of community and strength, but it can also become a legacy of isolation and anger. Sandra Gilbert claims that male misogyny and female self-blame were characteristic responses to the aftermath of the Great War. *Rilla* was published in 1920; *Emily's Quest* came out in 1927. Could it be that in the intervening years, Montgomery observed the damaging effects of the war upon the "Lost Generation"? If so, the *Emily* series returns us to the blueprint *Rilla* offers. For even Dr. Burnley and Mrs. Kent are healed when they are able to reinterpret the past in terms that allow them to forgive both themselves and the world. *Rilla of Ingleside* offers a view of the Great War that makes way for such forgiveness, allowing for a new idealism, cleansed of anger and bitterness, that alone can make a sacrifice like Walter's worthwhile.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

WORKS CITED

I. Primary Sources

Jones, Tom and Harvey Schmidt. *The Fantasticks*. 1960. Thirtieth Anniversary Edition. New York: Applause Theatre Book Publishers, 1990.

Leacock, Stephen. *Essays and Literary Studies*. Toronto: S. B. Gundy, 1916.

---. *How To Write*. London: The Bodley Head, 1944.

---. *Humor and Humanity: An Introduction to the Study of Humor*. New York: Holt, 1938.

---. *Literary Lapses*. 1910. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1991.

---. *Sunshine Sketches of a Little Town*. 1912. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1991.

Little, Jean. *From Anna*. New York: Harper & Row, 1972.

McCrae, John. "In Flanders Fields." *Up the Line to Death: The War Poets 1914-1918*. Ed. Brian Gardner. 2nd ed. London: Methuen, 1976. 49.

Montgomery, L. M. *The Alpine Path: The Story of My Career*. 1917. Fitzhenry & Whiteside, 1990.

---. *Anne of Green Gables*. 1908. Toronto: McClelland-Bantam, 1981.

---. *Anne's House of Dreams*. 1917. Toronto: McClelland-Bantam, 1981.

---. *Anne of Ingleside*. 1939. Toronto: McClelland-Bantam, 1981.

---. *Anne of the Island*. 1915. Toronto: McClelland-Bantam, 1981.

---. *Anne of Windy Poplars*. 1936. Toronto: McClelland-Bantam, 1981.

---. *Emily Climbs*. 1925. Toronto: McClelland-Bantam, 1983.

---. *Emily of New Moon*. 1923. Toronto: McClelland-Bantam, 1983.

- . *Emily's Quest*. 1927. Toronto: McClelland-Bantam, 1983.
- . *Jane of Lantern Hill*. 1937. Toronto: McClelland-Bantam, 1988.
- . *Rainbow Valley*. 1919. Toronto: McClelland-Bantam, 1987.
- . *Rilla of Ingleside*. 1920. Toronto: McClelland-Bantam, 1987.
- . *The Road to Yesterday*. 1974. Toronto: McClelland-Bantam, 1993.
- . *The Selected Journals of L. M. Montgomery*. Ed. Mary Rubio and Elizabeth Waterston. 3 vols. to date. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1985-.
- Shakespeare, William. *The Tragedy of Romeo and Juliet*. *The Riverside Shakespeare*. Ed. G. Blakemore Evans. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1974. 1055-99.

II. Secondary Sources

- Abrams, M. H. *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. 6th ed. Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace, 1993.
- Abrams, M. H., et al., eds. *The Norton Anthology of English Literature*. 5th ed. Vol 1. New York: Norton, 1986. 2 vols.
- Åhmansson, Gabriella. *A Life and Its Mirrors: A Feminist Reading of L. M. Montgomery's Fiction*. Volume I. Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, Studia Anglistica Upsaliensia 74. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 1991.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail/ V. N. Volosinov. "Discourse in Life and Discourse in Art (Concerning Sociological Poetics)." Trans. I. R. Titunik. *Contemporary Literary Criticism: Literary and Cultural Studies*. Ed. Robert Con Davis and Ronald Schleifer. 2nd ed. New York: Longman, 1989. 392-410.
- Baym, Nina. *Women's Fiction: A Guide to Novels by and about Women in America 1820-70*. 2nd ed. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1993.
- Bell, Michael. *The Sentiment of Reality: Truth of Feeling in the European Novel*. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1983.
- Brissenden, R. F. *Virtue in Distress: Studies in the Novel of Sentiment from Richardson to Sade*. London: Macmillan, 1974.
- Cameron, Donald. *Faces of Leacock: An Appreciation*. Toronto: Ryerson, 1967.

Census of Canada 1880-81. Vol. 1. Ottawa: Maclean, Roger & Company, 1882. 4 vols.

Cixous, Hélène. "Castration or Decapitation?" Trans. Annette Kuhn. *Contemporary Literary Criticism: Literary and Cultural Studies*. Ed. Robert Con Davis and Ronald Schleifer. 2nd ed. New York: Longman, 1989. 479-91.

---. "The Laugh of the Medusa." Trans. Keith Cohen and Paula Cohen. *Feminisms: An Anthology of Literary Theory and Criticism*. Ed. Robyn R. Warhol and Diane Price Herndl. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1991. 334-49.

---. "Sorties: Out and Out: Attacks/Ways Out/Forays." Trans. Betsy Wing. *The Feminist Reader: Essays in Gender and the Politics of Literary Criticism*. Ed. Catherine Belsey and Jane Moore. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Blackwell, 1989. 101-16.

Clark, Suzanne. *Sentimental Modernism: Women Writers and the Revolution of the Word*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1991.

Davies, Robertson. *Stephen Leacock*. Canadian Writers 7. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1970.

Douglas, Ann. *The Feminization of American Culture*. New York: Avon, 1977.

Duffy, Dennis. "To Carry the Work of William James a Step Further: The Play of Truth in *Fifth Business*." *Essays on Canadian Writing* 36 (Spring 1988): 1-21.

Edwards, Owen Dudley. "L. M. Montgomery's *Rilla of Ingleside*: Intention, Inclusion, Implosion." *Harvesting Thistles: The Textual Garden of L. M. Montgomery*. Ed. Mary Henley Rubio. Guelph, Ontario: Canadian Children's Press, 1994. 126-36.

Egoff, Sheila. *The Republic of Childhood: A Critical Guide to Canadian Children's Literature in English*. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1967.

Ellis, Frank H. *Sentimental Comedy: Theory and Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Epperly, Elizabeth Rollins. *The Fragrance of Sweet-Grass: L. M. Montgomery's Heroines and the Pursuit of Romance*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1992.

Fifth Census of Canada 1911: Areas and Population by Provinces Districts and Subdistricts. Vol. 1. Ottawa: C. H. Parmelee, 1912. 5 vols.

Gallop, Jane, Marianne Hirsch, and Nancy K. Miller. "Criticizing Feminist Criticism." *Conflicts in Feminism*. Ed. Marianne Hirsch and Evelyn Fox Keller. New York: Routledge, 1990. 349-69.

- Gerson, Carole. "Anthologies and the Canon of Early Canadian Women Writers." *Re(Dis)covering Our Foremothers: Nineteenth-Century Canadian Women Writers*. Ed. Lorraine McMullen. Reappraisals: Canadian Writers 15. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 1990. 55-76.
- Gilbert, Sandra M. "Soldier's Heart: Literary Men, Literary Women, and the Great War." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 8.3 (Spring 1983): 422-50.
- Hodgins, Jack. Afterword. *Sunshine Sketches of a Little Town*. By Stephen Leacock. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1991. 187-91.
- Iser, Wolfgang. "The Reading Process: A Phenomological Approach." Trans. with David Henry Wilson. *Contemporary Critical Theory*. Ed. Dan Latimer. San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1989. 434-56.
- Kornfeld, Eve and Susan Jackson. "The Female *Bildungsroman* in Nineteenth-Century America: Parameters of a Vision." *Such a Simple Little Tale: Critical Responses to L. M. Montgomery's Anne of Green Gables*. Ed. Mavis Reimer. Metuchen, New Jersey: The Children's Literature Association and the Scarecrow Press, 1992. 139-52.
- Little, Jean. "But What About Jane?" *L. M. Montgomery: An Assessment*. Ed. John Robert Sorfleet. Guelph, Ontario: Canadian Children's Press, 1976. 71-81.
- Lynch, Gerald. *Stephen Leacock: Humour and Humanity*. Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1988.
- Marcus, Jane. "Daughters of Anger/Material Girls: Con/Textualizing Feminist Criticism." *Last Laughs: Perspectives on Women and Comedy*. Ed. Regina Barreca. New York: Gordon & Breach, 1988. 281-308.
- McCabe, Kevin. Introduction. *The Poetry of Lucy Maud Montgomery*. By L. M. Montgomery. Ed. John Ferns and Kevin McCabe. Markham, Ontario: Fitzhenry & Whiteside, 1987. 2-19.
- Phelps, Arthur L. *Canadian Writers*. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1951.
- Rasporich, Beverly. "Stephen Leacock, Humorist: American by Association." *Stephen Leacock: A Reappraisal*. Ed. David Staines. Reappraisals: Canadian Writers 12. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 1986. 69-82.
- Ross, Catherine Sheldrick. "Readers Reading L. M. Montgomery." *Harvesting Thistles: The Textual Garden of L. M. Montgomery*. Ed. Mary Henley Rubio. Guelph, Ontario: Canadian Children's Press, 1994. 23-35.

- Ross, Malcolm. "The Achievement of Stephen Leacock." *Stephen Leacock: A Reappraisal*. Ed. David Staines. Reappraisals: Canadian Writers 12. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 1986. 125-27.
- Rubio, Mary. "Lucy Maud Montgomery." *Profiles in Canadian Literature* 7. Ed. Jeffrey M. Heath. Toronto: Dundurn Press, 1991. 37-45.
- . "Subverting the Trite: L. M. Montgomery's 'Room of Her Own.'" *Canadian Children's Literature* 65 (1992): 6-39.
- Rubio, Mary and Elizabeth Waterston. Introduction. *The Selected Journals of L. M. Montgomery*. By L. M. Montgomery. Vol 2. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1987. ix-xx.
- Schwarz-Eisler, Hanna. *L. M. Montgomery: A Popular Canadian Writer for Children*. Pfaffenweiler: Centaurus-Verlagsgesellschaft, 1991.
- Tave, Stuart M. *The Amiable Humorist: A Study in the Comic Theory and Criticism of the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1960.
- Thomas, Clara. "The Roads Back: *Sunshine Sketches of a Little Town* and George Elliott's *The Kissing Man*." *Stephen Leacock: A Reappraisal*. Ed. David Staines. Reappraisals: Canadian Writers 12. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 1986. 97-105.
- Tompkins, Jane. *Sensational Designs: The Cultural Work of American Fiction 1790-1860*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1985.
- Urquhart, M. C. and K. A. H. Buckley, eds. *Historical Statistics of Canada*. Toronto: Macmillan, 1965.
- Vanderhaeghe, Guy. "Leacock and Understanding Canada." *Stephen Leacock: A Reappraisal*. Ed. David Staines. Reappraisals: Canadian Literature 12. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 1986. 17-21.
- Walker, Nancy A. *A Very Serious Thing: Women's Humor and American Culture*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1988.
- Waterston, Elizabeth. *Kindling Spirit: L. M. Montgomery's Anne of Green Gables*. Canadian Fiction Studies 19. Toronto: ECW Press, 1993.
- . *Survey: A Short History of Canadian Literature*. Toronto: Methuen, 1973.

- Wiggins, Genevieve. *L. M. Montgomery*. New York: Twayne Publishers, 1992.
- Winks, Robin W., et al. *A History of Civilization*. 7th ed. Vol 2. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1988. 2 vols.
- Woolf, Virginia. *A Room of One's Own*. 1929. *A Room of One's Own/Three Guineas*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992. 1-149.

WORKS CONSULTED

- Barreca, Regina, ed. *New Perspectives on Women and Comedy*. Philadelphia: Gordon & Breach, 1992.
- Carlson, Richard S. *The Benign Humorists*. Archon Books, 1975.
- Collins, R. G., ed. *Nineteenth Century Literary Humor*. Mosaic New Views. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press, 1976.
- Corrigan, Robert W., ed. *Comedy: Meaning and Form*. San Francisco: Chandler, 1965.
- Fussell, Paul. *The Great War and Modern Memory*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1975.
- Kaplan, Fred. *Sacred Tears: Sentimentality in Victorian Literature*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987.
- Moi, Toril. *Sexual/Textual Politics: Feminist Literary Theory*. London: Routledge, 1988.
- Porter, Helen. "The Fair World of L. M. Montgomery." *Journal of Canadian Fiction* 2.4 (1973): 102-04.