

CANADIAN LITERARY CANONS IN ROMANIAN TRANSLATION(S)

Ana-Magdalena Petraru

**PhD, Postdoc Researcher POSDRU/159/1.5/S/140863, "Al. Ioan Cuza"
University of Iași**

Abstract: The purpose of this paper is to overview Canadian literary canons as consecrated by the Calgary Conference in 1978 and Lecker's seminal essays and account for the works on the lists that were translated into Romanian from the communist years to present day. Dealing with the reception of (English) Canadian literature in Romania, literary canons were naturally a key topic of interest because they allowed us to tackle the translations from canonical and non-canonical authors and the Romanian criticism on them. Last but not least, we will refer to these moments in Canadian literature as mentioned and debated on by our Romanian Canadianists (Bottez 2004, Petruț 2005).

Key words: Canadian literary canons, (Romanian) Canadianists, Canadian novels, Romanian translations, reception.

Introduction

Since early days, Canada reflects the struggle of a young country to gain independence from a mother country (Britain) and the neighbouring giant to the South (the United States); this can be also noticed at a literary level in the country's identity concerns and the need to establish a tradition. In the process, it moved from the first literary attempts of accounting for a colonial experience to become a real literature which is recognized all over the world. From the first most significant pieces of literary prose at the end of the end of the 18th century and at the beginning of the 19th century¹, Canadian literature moved into the twentieth century with distinguished Canadian prose that was later on translated into Romanian, as well: Lucy Maud Montgomery's *Anne of Green Gables* (1908), Stephen Leacock's *Literary Lapses* (1910) and *Sunshine Sketches of a Little Town* (1912) or Mazo de la Roche's *Jalna* (1927), to name only a few. In the Canadian criticism of the time, these new voices were considered to be "creative

¹ For more details, see our paper "Novelty, Bilingualism and Multiculturalism in Canadian Literature – Overlooking Romanian and International Perspectives", *Studies on Literature, Discourse and Multicultural Dialogue*, vol II, Literature, Arhipelag XXI Press, Tîrgu-Mureș, Mureș, 2014, pp. 277-283 (<http://www.upm.ro/ldmd/LDMD-02/Lit/Lit%2002%2035.pdf>).

and critical”, “dealing more and more with material they knew”, and “moving away from the local and parochial to the local and universal” so as “to be judged by other than domestic standards” (Staines, 1977: 9-10). Romanian Canadianists (*cf.* Bottez 2004: 48) consider writings such as Roche’s and Montgomery’s ones to be “successful novels or rather romances”, creations of the “Sunshine School” whose readers should turn the eyes from “a romanticized rendering of the past and present” to “a presentation of the actual conditions of Canadian life (on the prairies with its distinct patterns of life” as depicted by writers like Ortenso, Grove, Ross or Mitchell.

The first decades of the twentieth century also saw the emergence of Canadian cultural publications. It is one of these publications, namely *Canadian Forum* that recorded Douglas Bush’s sententious statement to the readers of 1922: “No one reads a Canadian novel unless by mistake” (quoted by Staines, 1977: 9), giving the reason that “Canadian fiction never comes to grips with life, but remains weak and timid, it has nothing to say (...). One can see no future for Canadian letters until learn to obey the fine injunction to ‘sin gladly.’ When we sin we do it in such a sneaking, hugger-mugger way, emoting moral platitudes until we are out of sight” (*ibidem*).

As Northrop Frye notes, Canadian literature since 1960 has become a real literature, and acquired international fame; the critic goes as far as arguing that there were Canadian authors who sold better across the ocean in Holland or Germany, than they did in Canada (1981: 30). Although writings of reputed novelists came out from the late 1920s on (Morley Callaghan’s short stories in 1928 and *They Shall Inherit the Earth*, one of the early novels that “reminds us of the density of Hemingway’s concise style” (Bottez, *idem*, p. 46), it is with Hugh MacLennan (and his *Barometer Rising* published in 1941) that a Canadian tradition started to take shape. The previous lack of tradition (or ghosts) was deplored both by international critics and Romanian ones, hence the struggle of the Canadian nation and letters for identity. MacLennan’s name is associated with the rise of a Canadian national consciousness as he found inspiration in drama of development of Canada which he used effectively as the framework for his fiction. In fictional terms, he was the first novelist to articulate a Canadian tradition by making his readers aware of themselves as Canadians; in his novels, MacLennan examined “the clashes and values” (between the colonial mentality and the new faith in a national destiny) (Bottez, *idem*, pp. 59-60). Moreover, for his *Barometer Rising*, he chose the first event in Canadian history which was on international news, as well: the tremendous explosion that

almost destroyed Halifax on December 1917, when two foreign ammunition ships collided in the harbour. Romanian Canadianists (Bottez *idem*, p. 72) also plead the case of a Canadian modernism invoking the lack of international critical consensus in favour of its existence (R. Kroetsch, for instance, argues that Canadian literature passed directly from Victorian to postmodern literature, *ibidem*). Instances of modernist novels would be Sinclair Ross's *As for Me and My House* (1941) or Sheila Watson's *The Double Hook* (1959).

A remarkable record of the Canadian literary scene of the mid-1950s is *Writing in Canada*, the proceedings of the first major conference of Canadian writers and critics held in 1955 at Queen's University in Kingston. It is extremely relevant for topics such as the teaching of Canadian literature in home schools and universities, the difficulty of obtaining reliable texts, the absence of a substantial Canadian criticism, the relationship between writers, their publishers, and the public (Steele, 1982: 1). However, as shown below, the canonization of the Canadian novel has been done since the late 70s on with the Calgary Conference and the subsequent writings.

The Canonization of the Canadian Novel: the Calgary Conference

In Canada, the conference on the Canadian novel held at the University of Calgary in 1978 and its proceedings published in 1982 are the best illustration of the establishment of a Canadian literary canon. As the conference programme reads,

“The Conference on the Canadian Novel will provide a forum for discussions which have four main objectives: to provide a norm which can serve as a curriculum reference for teachers of Canadian literature at all levels; to suggest to publishers selection criteria and titles for future Canadian fiction series; to establish standards for future scholarly editions of Canadian novels; and to provide a guide for Canadians who are interested in the masterworks of their national literature. The final result will be the identification of those novels which have established themselves as Canadian classics.” (Steele, 1982: 22)

The most important result of this conference was the publication of a list of the 100 most important Canadian novels, intended as “a guide to those interested in the masterworks of our literary tradition” (*idem*, p. 158). This guide was the result of a ballot distributed to Canadian teachers and critics, who were invited to choose 1) the most ‘important’ one hundred

works of fiction (List A); 2) the most important ten novels (List B); and 3) the most important ten works of various genres (List C). The ballot was prepared by Malcolm Ross, with the assistance of McClelland and Stewart, publisher of the New Canadian Library. As Ross claims, the aim of the list of ten important books was to account for the difference between the general approval of a large number of novels, and a very careful, narrow selection. The critic hoped to find answers to concerns such as the existence of Canadian books that could be put with confidence on a course in contemporary fiction which would include writers like Saul Bellow or E. M. Forster; and what kind of authentic, rigid, severe standard could be applied to determine which novels would be suitable to such a context (*idem*, p. 138). The list of “the most important (not great, but important) one hundred works of fiction” (Moss, *apud* Steele, *ibidem*) was now put at everyone’s disposal. It consisted of realistic novels that followed a linear, conventional style and they were the central, defining texts of the new Canadian tradition. This was the tradition that centred on paradoxical questions of identity such as the ones earlier posed by Frye: “Who am I?” or “Where is here?” a tradition that valued works which affirmed the country and its people. Furthermore, there are fewer French-Canadian titles than English-Canadian ones on the lists. One of the conference participants, Henry Kreisel (1982: 141) argues that the reasons were the lack of translation, and the fact that many Departments of English did not teach novels in translation because Departments of French wanted to discuss them in their source language. The critic feels confident that important titles will be made available in both languages, in the following years with the support of the Canada Council. Among the one hundred chosen novels, we could mention: Alice Munro’s *Lives of Girls and Women*, Margaret Atwood’s *Surfacing*, *The Edible Woman* and *Lady Oracle*, Lucy Maud Montgomery’s *Anne of Green Gables*, Mazo de la Roche’s *Jalna*, Haliburton’s *The Clockmaker*, Richardson’s *Wacousta*, Mordecai Richler’s *St. Urbain’s Horseman*, Leonard Cohen’s *Beautiful Losers* and *The Favourite Game*, Marie-Claire Biais’s *A Season in the Life of Emmanuel*, De Gaspé’s *Canadians of Old*, Gabrielle Roy’s *The Tin Flute*, Hugh MacLennan’s *Two Solitudes*, *The Watch That Ends the Night*, and *Barometer Rising*, Morley Callaghan’s *The Loved and the Lost* and *They Shall Inherit the Earth*, Rudy Wiebe’s *The Temptations of Big Bear*, Anne Hébert’s *Kamouraska*, Louis Hémon’s *Marie Chapdelaine*, or Robert Kroetsch’s *The Studhorse Man* and *The Words of My Roaring*. In the proceedings, no clear explanation for the inclusion of such texts as the ones mentioned above and the exclusion of others is given.

Interestingly enough, nine of the first ten novels on the list B selected at the Calgary conference were works that followed the mimetic conventions of representational realism which had dominated Canadian fiction for decades. George Woodcock notes that “it was characteristic of Canadian fiction when it began to emerge as something special and distinguishable that its practitioners tended to be formally unadventurous and even conservative and to concentrate to a degree long abandoned by novelists in culturally more settled countries on the content of their books – on what they had to say rather than on how they said it” (quoted by Lecker, 1995: 34). Therefore, it is precisely the early Canadian writers’ conservatism, their preference for content and ignorance of form that makes them “special and distinguishable”. The works are the following: Margaret Laurence’s *The Stone Angel*, Robertson Davies’s *Fifth Business*, Sinclair Ross’s *As For Me and My House*, Ernest Buckler’s *The Mountain and the Valley*, Gabrielle Roy’s *The Tin Flute*, Mordecai Richler’s *The Apprenticeship of Duddy Kravitz*, Sheila Watson’s *The Double Hook*, Hugh MacLennan’s *The Watch That Ends the Night*, W.O. Mitchell’s *Who Has Seen the Wind* and Margaret Laurence’s *The Diviners*.

The most important ten works of various genres (List C) chosen at the Calgary conference are: Carl F. Klinck’s *Literary History of Canada: Canadian Literature in English*, Northrop Frye’s *The Bush Garden: Essays on the Canadian Imagination*, E.J. Pratt’s *Collected Poems*, Stephen Leacock’s *Sunshine Sketches of a Little Town*, D.G Jones’s *Butterfly on Rock: A Study of Themes and Images in Canadian Literature*, Susanna Moodie’s *Roughing It in the Bush; or Forest Life in Canada*, Margaret Atwood’s *Survival: A Thematic Guide to Canadian Literature*, Margaret Laurence’s *The Stone Angel*, Sinclair Ross’s *As for Me and My House* and Earle Birney’s *Collected Poems*. As can be seen, there are several works that appear on more than one list (and M. Laurence’s *The Stone Angel* is probably the most illustrative example, followed by Sinclair Ross’s *As for Me and My House*), testifying to the works’ importance for the Canadian tradition explained above and the academic curriculum.

It can be said that the Calgary conference marks a canonical high point in the institutional creation of Canadian literature. As far as Canadian literary value after the Calgary conference goes, it cannot be argued that the canon was redefined or the critical value shifted. However, Romanian Canadianists (*cf.* M. Petruț, 2005: 72) argue that the conference was not able to generate a national canon because its participants did not have a common aesthetical background: the Western participants aimed at an aesthetics of form, language and narrative

structures, while central Canadians were governed by Victorian and modernist precepts that allowed an evaluation in terms of technique, theme and moral vision.

Other Canonical Views

Although in his seminal *The Western Canon* Bloom does not speak about Canadian canons, focusing only on the Western literary tradition and the works of twenty-six authors central to the Canon, in the appendixes to his study (divided into four chronological ages: Theocratic, Aristocratic, Democratic, and Chaotic), he lists works of canonical interest for the most important parts of the world (from the US, Great Britain, France and Germany to Scandinavia, the Czech Republic and Poland) as his version of the Canon. He also mentions several Canadian works under the section “The Chaotic Age: A Canonical Prophecy”, namely: Malcolm Lowry’s *Under the Volcano*, Robertson Davies’s *The Deptford Trilogy* and *The Rebel Angels*, Alice Munro’s *Something I’ve Been Meaning to Tell You*, Northrop Frye’s *Fables of Identity*, Anne Hébert’s *Selected Poems*, Jay Macpherson’s *Poems Twice Told*, Margaret Atwood’s *Surfacing*, and Daryl Hine’s *Selected Poems*. As can be seen, the operated selection ranges from critical works (N. Frye’s *Fables of Identity*) to novels (Malcolm Lowry’s *Under the Volcano* – considered both a British author and a Canadian one, included in most Canadian literary histories, but not in M. Petruț’s *Dictionary of Canadian Writers*; Robertson Davies’s *The Deptford Trilogy* and *The Rebel Angels*; Margaret Atwood’s *Surfacing*) and poetry. The author does not give any reasons for his selections, confessing that he is not as confident about the forth list as the other three:

“Cultural prophecy is always a mug's game. Not all of the works here can prove to be canonical; literary overpopulation is a hazard to many among them. But I have neither excluded nor included on the basis of cultural politics of any sort. What I have omitted seem to me fated to become period pieces: even their ‘multiculturalist’ supporters will turn against them in another two generations or so, in order to clear space for better writings” (1994: 548).

Lecker’s *Making It Real. The Canonization of English Canadian Literature* (1995) is one of the most recent critical attempts at defining a Canadian canon which comes as an account of the author’s experiences as a publisher and editor on his own involvement in Canadian canon-making. In his enterprise, Lecker is asking a series of common sense questions:

“Why had there been so little commentary on the nature of the Canadian literary institution itself? How did this institution display its past? Why did Canadian critics within the institution tend to write about some authors or texts and not others? What forces of inclusion and exclusion accounted for the choices made in our critical studies and literary histories? How were the selections appearing in anthologies of Canadian literature the product of these forces? How were students affected by this kind of canonical activity? What was it that made Canadian literature worthy of being defined as somehow different?” (1995: 4)

He argues that the formation of the English Canadian literary institution was driven by the desire to see literature as a force that confirmed one’s sense of community and place where literature becomes a medium for the connection between writing, culture and nation. According to Lecker, this assumption governed most Canadian criticism up to the 1980s since its beginnings in the 19th century. Therefore, canonical activity in Canada is seen as a reflection of the country’s search for identity in the belief that a country without a national literature is not a country at all. In the chapter “A Country without a Canon” he advances the hypothesis that, on the one hand, such a country may be free, plural, ahistorical and self-conscious of the material conditions that account for its contingent status. On the other hand, it may also be a country without moral conviction, without the means of recognizing difference, without standards against which education and political choices can be judged. Consequently, he argues that some recognition of canonical authority is ultimately crucial to the promotion of change and difference because there is nothing worth fighting against, if there is nothing entrenched. Lecker (*idem*, p. 16-17) also mentions one of the strongest forces behind the canonization of Canadian literature, i.e. McClelland and Stewart’s New Canadian Library series originally conceived by Malcolm Ross in the early 1950s. This is because by the end of the 50s, it had become the major printed vehicle through which Canadian literature reached high-schools and colleges where Canadian literature had started to be taught as an independent subject after WWII. Furthermore, as the demand for cultural self-recognition increased during the 1960s and 1970s (when Carl F. Klink’s *Literary History* also came out), more and more courses devoted to Canadian literature were introduced. Many of them relied upon the growing list of books selected by Ross, not to mention that a considerable number of teachers relied upon the critical introductions that accompanied each New Canadian Library volume to be provided

with critical access to the Canadian texts in question. This is how the canon became institutionalized.

Canadian literary canons are the conservative products of the conservative institution that brought them to life, assesses Lecker (*idem*, p. 21). They reflect values such as:

“a preoccupation with history and historical placement; an interest in topicality, mimesis, verisimilitude, and documentary presentation; a bias in favour of the native over the cosmopolitan; a pressure toward formalism; a concern with traditional, over innovative forms; a pursuit of the created before the uncreated, the named before the unnamed; an expression of national self-consciousness; a valorisation of the cautious, democratic, moral imagination before the liberal, inventive one” (*ibidem*)

In another work, namely *Canadian Canons: Essays in Literary Value*, Lecker and his contributors (1991: 3) question the stability of the Canadian canon as far as its texts and authors are concerned. The aim is to undermine the discursive and ideological forces comprising the hierarchy of what is valued in an attempt to destabilize authority through the analysis of the intermingling structures that uphold the political, economic, social, and cultural institutions. This is because they are the ones that house the prevailing versions of literary history, tradition, form, and taste. Any analysis of canons must consider the status of these institutions and questions such as “Who rejects them? Who sees them crumbling? Who feels locked out? Who feels locked in and can't leave? Who loves their shape and size? Who is determined to remodel? Who holds their keys?” (*ibidem*) should be asked. Moreover, the study further reads that “national literary canons are deceptively fluid entities” (*idem*, p. 46). Arguments for this assertion are to be found in the different shapes assumed by apparently fixed canons at a particular moment in history, in response to new fashions and shifts in social value. Furthermore, the contours of a canon are considered to be subjective and “not governed by the inherent qualities of certain texts, but by the values attributed to them by those in power according to their current agendas and the particular configuration of national, aesthetic, and sexual politics that best serves their interests” (*ibidem*).

An important contribution to canonic value is Lawrence Matthews's essay in Lecker's *Canadian Canons* that discusses the list B of the Calgary conference and proposes an alternative one. His *Calgary, Canonization and Class: Deciphering List B* is also debated on

by Petruț (2005: 72-79). To the ten novels on the list B chosen at the Calgary conference, he proposes other ten less conservative novels, some of them also present on the A list of one hundred most important novels chosen in 1978: Leonard Cohen's *Beautiful Losers*, Rudy Wiebe's *The Temptations of Big Bear*, Robert Kroetsch's *The Studhorse Man*, Margaret Atwood's *Lady Oracle*, Hugh Hood's *White Figure, White Ground*, Matt Cohen's *The Disinherited*, Jack Hodgins's *The Invention of the World*, Michael Ondaatje's *Coming through Slaughter*, Mavis Gallant's *The Pegnitz Junction* and Norman Levine's *From a Seaside Town*. The author analyses the type of nationalism that derives from the novels in the original B list in their general intention of recording time and place according to mimetic conventions. He also questions the novels' usefulness (in the classroom) as this was the main intention that guided the general criterion for selection which operated for the one hundred most important fictional works on the A list and the derived B list. In his approach, Matthews makes reference to Richard Ohmann's essay, *The Shaping of a Canon: US Fiction, 1960-1975*, in an attempt to compare the American process of canonization to the Canadian one. He finds the former superior and more transparent than the latter since it occurs in two stages, the first involving book buyers, agents, editors, advertisers and reviewers whose work collectively constitutes of a selection process that leads to the identification of a small number of 'important' novels. The second stage consists in the separation of popular novels from those that attracted buyers and readers for a longer period and which were also received in newspapers and periodicals. These most successful and long lasting novels attract academic interest and become part of academic curricula and later, the canon. The Canadian canonization process is less intricate, according to Matthews since:

“the process by which a Canadian work achieves ‘pre-canonical status’ is very much simpler; (...) preliminary commercial success, need not occur at all (*As for Me and My House*), or if it does, there need not be a demonstrable connection between best-sellerdom and canonization (*The Mountain and the Valley*). Nor is (...) the singling out of the novel by an elite group of trend-setting journals, relevant. Virtually all of the action in Canada occurs at the very end of the process, the simultaneous embracing of a work by the classroom and the academic journal. So, in Canada, it is a relatively small group that makes the decisions about what books are fit for canonization: university teachers of English who specialize or dabble in Canadian literature” (1991: 155).

Moreover, the author establishes a pattern to evaluate the novels on the original B list with “no obvious common denominator in terms of subject or theme” (*idem*, p. 156) but which easily reveal themselves to the reader according to the realistic convention. Thus, the main issues in the novels (as Petruț, 2005: 76 also notes) are personal, clearly defined and easy to solve; in all the novels on the list the main character is struggling to find his/ her identity, his experience is personal and there is no serious examination of political and social issues. There are no postmodern or metafictional techniques as in most of the novels on Matthews’s alternative B list. The author’s conclusion is that the conservatism of these fictional works and their didactical character which justified their presence on the Canadian literature courses of the 1970s also prevailed in the choice of the appointed teachers and critics to include them on the B list.

A Bird’s Eye View on Canonical Works in Romanian Translations

Since our doctoral thesis dealt with the reception of the English Canadian novel in Romania via translations and critical studies, we referred both to the original B list of 1978 and Matthews’s alternative one in making judgments on the English Canadian fiction as it entered the Romanian cultural and literary scene since the Inter-War years to the post-communist period, especially at the level of translated and non-translated authors whose works could contribute to a better understanding of Romanian readers of the Canadian literary scene². Regarding the communist years, we discussed both canonical and non-canonical novels (starting from the lists drawn at the Calgary Conference and in Lecker’s collection of essays).

² For more details see some our papers published on the topic: “Canada As Seen by Romanian Rewriters”, *Modern Canada: Prejudices, Stereotypes, Authenticity/ Le Canada Moderne: Préjugés, Stéréotypes, Authenticité*, Megatrend University, Beograd, Serbia, 2013, pp. 125-133 (http://www.sacs.org.rs/userfiles/MODERN_CANADA_web.pdf); “Canadian Imagery in Romanian Para(texts)”, *Language and Literature – European Landmarks of Identity*, nr. 12/2013, Editura Universității din Pitești, pp. 54-69, (http://www.upit.ro/uploads/facultatea_lit/ELI/Arhiva%20ELI/nr%2013,%202013_FINAL_25.04.2014.pdf); “High and Low Canadian Literary Products in Post-Communist Romania”, *Revue d’Etudes Canadiennes en Europe Centrale/ Central European Journal of Canadian Studies*, vol. 9 (2014). Masaryk University, Brno, pp. 95-110; “Canadian Literature in Romania. From the Inter-War Years to the Post-communist Period: the Case of Michael Ondaatje”, *Postcolonialism/ Postcommunism: Intersections and Overlaps*, Editura Universității din București, 2011, pp. 183-199 or “Did Canadian Literature (in Romania) Age and Become Wise?”, *Language, Culture and Change IV. Intergenerational, Interdisciplinary and Intercultural Bridges*, Editura Universității „Alexandru Ioan Cuza”, Iasi, 2012, pp. 114-129.

The first decades of the 20th century mark the true beginning of the reception (mainly via translations) of Canadian literature in Romania. In terms of literary genre, these are mainly translations from English Canadian prose, usually (fragments of) short stories and novels. Poems or critical studies devoted to Canadian poets are few. The favorite authors of the period were Stephen Leacock and Mazo de la Roche. The former was probably selected for his sharp sense of humour, the latter for the accessibility of her novels³. In fact, very few Canadian authors were tackled by the periodicals of those years whereas most of the important writers (Lucy Maud Montgomery, Thomas Chandler Haliburton or Susanna Moodie) were not mentioned at all.

The communist years witness both the translation of canonical works and non-canonical ones that suited the purposes of the totalitarian regime (e.g. Dyson Carter's progressive novels). Hugh MacLennan is the only English Canadian author translated during the communist period that is included on the B list of the Calgary Conference (with *The Watch That Ends the Night*, a novel which has not been translated into Romanian yet), whose contribution is a major step in the literary history of Canada and in the shaping of the Canadian literary canons (Petruț 2005: 73). His *Barometer Rising/ Barometru în urcare* was translated by Livia Deac in the early 70's by 'Univers' Publishing House. Another important canonical author translated into Romanian during this period is the French Canadian novelist Gabrielle Roy. Her *Bonheur d'occasion/ The Tin Flute* was rendered as *Fericire întâmplătoare* by Elvira Bogdan with a preface signed by Valer Cornea and published by *Editura pentru Literatură Universală/ The Publishing House for World Literature* in 1968.

Many important canonical novels by Canadian authors that were not translated during the communist years or after 1989 are: Margaret Laurence's *The Stone Angel* and *The Diviners*, Robertson Davies's *Fifth Business*, Sinclair Ross's *As for Me and My House*, Ernest Buckler's *The Mountain and the Valley*, Mordecai Richler's *The Apprenticeship of Duddy Kravitz*, Sheila Watson's *The Double Hook*, Hugh MacLennan's *The Watch That Ends the Night*, W. O. Mitchell's *Who Has Seen the Wind*, Rudy Wiebe's *The Temptation of Big Bear*, Robert Kroetsch's *The Studhorse Man*, Hugh Hood's *White Figure, White Ground*, M. Cohen's *The*

³ See our papers published on the topic: "Popular Canadian Fiction from Pre-Communist to Post-Communist Romania: The Case of Mazo de la Roche", *Contemporary Canadian Literature in English: European Perspectives*, Editura Universității Alexandru Ioan Cuza, Iași, 2012, pp. 24-37 or "Canadian Humour Unveiled: Stephen Leacock in (Pre)Communist Romania", *Philologica Jassyensia*, anul XI, nr. 1 (21), 2015, pp. 207-221 (http://www.philologica-jassyensia.ro/upload/XI_1_PETRARU.pdf).

Disinherited, Jack Hodgins’s *The Invention of the World*, Michael Ondaatje’s *Coming through Slaughter*, Mavis Gallant’s *The Pegnitz Junction* or Norman Levine’s *From a Seaside Town*. These are most of the authors on the B lists, either drawn up at the Calgary Conference in 1978 or by Lawrence Matthews in Lecker’s *Canadian Canons*, both quoted by Margareta Petruț in *Romanul canadian postbelic între tradiție și postmodernism/ The Post-War Canadian Novel Between Tradition and Postmodernism* (2005: 73-74). However, some of these authors had other works translated into Romanian and published during the communist years: Sinclair Ross and Mordecai Richler were included in *MacNair cel Orb/ Blind MacNair*, the anthology of short stories which came out in 1970 and Margaret Atwood’s *The Edible Woman* that was translated in 1989 as *O femeie obișnuită* by Margareta Petruț and reedited in 2008 as *Femeia comestibilă*.

The post-communist years mark the most intense period for the translation and reception of Canadian literature in Romania and is characterized by massive translations from Canadian postmodernism (Margaret Atwood, Leonard Cohen, Michael Ondaatje), but also of popular fiction. Several publishing houses published part of Margaret Atwood’s work in prose and no less than seven of her novels came out in the series “Leda Masters” at ‘Corint’ Publishing House which owns the copyright in Atwood’s works. Michael Ondaatje is the second most translated Canadian postmodernist author (five novels), followed by Leonard Cohen (his two novels and *The Book of Longing*).

Table 1. English Canadian postmodern authors in post-communist Romania

No	Year	Author(s)	Title and translation	Translator(s)	Preface	Place	Publishing house
1.	1995	Margaret Atwood	<i>The Handmaid’s Tale</i> (1995)	Monica Bottez	-	București	‘Univers’ g House
2.	1997	Michael Ondaatje	<i>The English Patient</i> (1997)	Monica Wolfe-	-	București	‘Univers’ g House
3.	2000	Margaret Atwood	<i>The Robber Bride</i> (2000)	Gabriela	-	București	‘Rao’ Publishing
4.	2002	Michael Ondaatje	<i>Anil’s Ghost</i> (2002)	Liviu Bleoaca	Maria-Sabina	Iași	‘Polirom’ g House
5.	2003	Leonard Cohen	<i>Beautiful Losers</i> (2003)	Liviu Bleoaca	Mircea	Iași	‘Polirom’ g House
6.	2003	Leonard Cohen	<i>The Favourite Game</i> (2003)	Vlad A. Arghir	Mircea	Iași	‘Polirom’ g House

7.	2004	Michael Ondaatje	<i>In the Skin of a Lion</i> (<i>unui leu</i>)	Ana-Maria	-	Iași	'Polirom' g House
8.	2006	Margaret Atwood	<i>The Handmaid's Tale</i> (<i>ea cameristei</i>)	Monica Bottez	Monica	București	'Leda' Publishing
9.	2006	Leonard Cohen	<i>Book of Longing</i> (<i>leanului</i>)	Șerban Foartă na Chevereșan	Mircea	Iași	'Polirom' g House
10.	2007	Margaret Atwood	<i>The Blind Assassin</i> (<i>orb</i>)	Lidia Grădinaru	Florin Irimia	București	'Leda' Publishing
11.	2007	Margaret Atwood	<i>Cat's Eye</i> (<i>Ochi de</i>	Virgil Stanciu	Florin Irimia	București	'Leda' Publishing
12.	2007	Margaret Atwood	<i>Negotiating with the</i> <i>Writer on Writing</i> (<i>cea cu moartea: un</i> <i>espre scriitură</i>)	Gianina Chirazi	-	București	'Tritonic' g House
13.	2008	Margaret Atwood	<i>The Edible Woman</i> (<i>comestibilă</i>)	Margareta	-	București	'Leda' Publishing
14.	2008	Margaret Atwood	<i>Oryx and Crake</i> (<i>Crake</i>)	Florin Irimia	Florin Irimia	București	'Leda' Publishing
15.	2008	Margaret Atwood	<i>The Penelopiad</i> (<i>ada</i>)	Gabriela	-	București	'Leda' Publishing
16.	2008	Michael Ondaatje	<i>Divisadero</i>	Mihaela	-	București	'Univers' g House
17.	2009	Margaret Atwood	<i>Femeia-oracol</i> (<i>Lady</i>	Gabriela	Florin Irimia	București	'Leda' Publishing
18.	2011	Michael Ondaatje	<i>Masa pisicii</i> (<i>The</i> <i>le</i>)	Radu Pavel	-	Iași	'Polirom' g House
19.	2013	Margaret Atwood	<i>Mireasa hoțomană</i> (<i>The Robber Bride</i>)	Gabriela	-	București	'Leda' Publishing
20.	2013	Margaret Atwood	<i>Alias Grace</i>	Nicoleta și nia	-	București	'Leda' Publishing

Alice Munro's short stories were also published in Romanian as *Prea multă fericire* (translated by Ioana Opaț, 2011/2013); *Dragă viață* (translated by Justina Bandol, 2014) and *Fugara* (translated by Mihnea Gafița, 2014) at Litera Publishing House. After she won the Nobel Prize for literature in 2013, she was naturally advertised as such to the Romanian readers via the book covers.

Conclusion

To conclude, only three out of twenty canonical novels on the lists discussed in our paper were translated into Romanian. Works of the previously mentioned authors, other than the ones included in the canon, came out in the post-communist years (e.g. many of Margaret Atwood's, Michael Ondaatje's and Leonard Cohen's novels). A translation was carried out

during the communist period, i.e. Gabrielle Roy's *Bonheur d'occasion/ The Tin Flute* (translated by Elvira Bogdan as *Fericire întâmplătoare* in 1968). The other two were carried out after the fall of the communist regime: Leonard Cohen's *Beautiful Losers* was translated as *Frumoșii învinși* by Liviu Bleoaca, prefaced by Mircea Mihăieș and published by 'Polirom' Publishing House in 2003 and Margaret Atwood's *Lady Oracle/ Femeia-oracol* translated by Gabriela Nedelea and published by Leda Publishing House in 2009.

Bibliography

1. Bloom, Harold (1994) *The Western Canon: the Books and School of the Ages*, New York/ San Diego/ London: Harcourt Brace & Company.
2. Bottez, Monica (2004) *Infinite Horizons: Canadian Fiction in English*, preface by Rodica Mihăilă, București: Editura Universității București.
3. Frye, Northrop (1981) *Divisions on a Ground: Essays on Canadian Culture*, Toronto: House of Anansi Press.
4. Lecker, Robert (1995) *Making It Real. The Canonization of English Canadian Literature*, Toronto: House of Anansi Press.
5. Lecker, Robert (ed.) (1991) *Canadian Canons: Essays in Literary Value*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
6. Petruț, Margareta (2005) *Romanul canadian postbelic între tradiție și postmodernism*, foreword by Virgil Stanciu, Cluj-Napoca: Argonaut.
7. Staines, David (1977) *The Canadian Imagination*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
8. Steele, Charles, R. (ed.) (1982) *Taking Stock. The Calgary Conference on the Canadian Novel*, Ontario: ECW Press.

Acknowledgements: This work was supported by the strategic grant POSDRU/159/1.5/S/140863, Project ID 140863 (2014), co-financed by the European Social Fund within the Sectorial Operational Program Human Resources Development 2007 – 2013.