RONALD HUEBERT

THE FIRST HUNDRED: A SHORT HISTORY OF A LONG LIFE

Ronald Huebert (1946-) earned a bachelor's degree from the University of Saskatchewan in 1967 and a master's degree and a doctorate from the University of Pittsburgh in 1969 and 1972. In 1974 he began teaching at Dalhousie University, where he remained for the rest of his career. His books include *John Ford: Baroque English Dramatist* (1977), *The Performance of Pleasure in English Renaissance Drama* (2003), and *Privacy in the Age of Shakespeare* (2016). He also served as Editor of *The Dalhousie Review* from 1996 to 2005, and he received a Lifetime Achievement Award from the Canadian Society for Renaissance Studies shortly before his retirement in 2017.

LET ME BEGIN with the obvious but necessary question: Why did *The Dalhousie Review* begin publication in 1921? One way of providing an answer would be circumstantial. Here it would be fair to notice that the journal received support from many faculty members at Dalhousie University and from Dalhousie's fourth President, Arthur Stanley MacKenzie, whose twenty years of service in that role were characterized by unprecedented growth in architectural development, academic ambition, and many other aspects of the university. Or it might be equally helpful to offer a cultural answer to this opening question. In a sense, the journal began publication because the time was ripe for it. A growing fraction of the population of this region had good reasons to be interested in the political, philosophical, and literary discourses of the university community, and it was access to these discussions that *The Dalhousie Review* promised its readers. Dalhousie was early but not alone in promoting this agenda. Within Canada *Queen's Quarterly* had been on the landscape since 1893, and the *University of Toronto Quarterly*

would begin publication in 1931. In the United States, a similarly broad-based mission was already underway at *The Yale Review*, and it would soon be adopted by newcomers, such as the *Virginia Quarterly Review*, which would be founded in 1925. The culture of the twenties was thus receptive to the creation of university journals with wide-ranging intellectual aspirations.

To propose these circumstantial and cultural answers to the question, however, is to understate the contribution of the journal's first Editor, Herbert L. Stewart, whose vision was a necessary precondition not only to the birth of *The Dalhousie Review* but to its development over the next 26 years. Born in Ireland and educated at Oxford, he came to Dalhousie in 1913 as Munro Professor and Head of the Department of Philosophy. He had a wide-ranging and constantly developing set of intellectual interests, to judge by the topics he chose to write about: Friedrich Nietzsche and modern German Idealism, Anatole France, Thomas Carlyle, the history of Protestantism, the Irish in Nova Scotia, Sir Winston Churchill, and many more. Such an eclectic set of interests would be an asset to any Editor of the kind of journal he was hoping to create, and the guidelines for his project are set out with some care in the "Salutation" he wrote to introduce the first issue, which lays claim to an intellectual territory between two extremes: that of the specialized academic journal, written in language that the "general reader" cannot penetrate, and that of the magazine designed to offer "mere literary entertainment," with no pretension to "serious thinking." Stewart promised to situate *The Dalhousie Review* between these extremes in order to engage a thoughtful readership: "What we have in mind is the need of that public, concerned about the things of the intellect and the spirit, which desires to be addressed on problems of general import and in a style that can be generally understood." Although interested in cultural production from anywhere in the world, he thought the "outlook" of the journal should be "primarily Canadian," with a further acknowledgement of its roots in the "Maritime Provinces." The authors who contributed to *The Dalhousie Review* in its first 26 years include well-known political figures (Sir Robert Borden, Sir Charles Tupper, and Robert Stanfield), distinguished scholars (Archibald MacMechan, R. MacGregor Dawson, Douglas Bush, Watson Kirkconnell, Harold Innis, Marshall McLuhan, and Hilda Neatby), and creative writers, especially poets (Duncan Campbell Scott, E. J. Pratt, Sir Charles G. D. Roberts, A. M. Klein, Eliza Ritchie, Helen Creighton, and Hugh MacLennan).

To judge by the names just listed, I would say that Stewart succeeded in his goal of supporting both national and provincial cultures, although women clearly figured less prominently than men.

After Stewart retired in 1947, the Editorial Board intended to continue on the path he had laid out for the journal. In fact, the next two Editors—J. Burns Martin and Charles Frederick Fraser—had both served on his Editorial Board. Stewart had clearly set the standard that those who replaced him were trying to emulate, and he continued to influence the journal by serving on the Editorial Advisory Board and writing articles for publication.

The autumn 1953 issue had a new Editor, W. Graham Allen, and its preliminary pages carried an admiring obituary notice of Stewart, who had died in September of that year. The journal's masthead was followed by an invitation for "contributions in prose or verse" that could now include "original and imaginative short story fiction." This new departure for the journal may have been the brainchild of Allan Bevan, the Assistant Editor, whose long subsequent career in the Department of English would be marked by the promotion of new Canadian writing, especially fiction. The invitation was promptly rewarded, as the journal published a short story for the first time in the winter 1954 issue: "An Altar in the Fields" by Lawrence P. Spingarn. It wasn't a brilliant story, but it was a start, and over the next decade *The Dalhousie Review* published a short story (on rare occasions two) in most of its issues. The fiction writers were either not at all famous or not yet famous: their names were, among others, August Derleth, Isobel English, Alden Nowlan, Millar MacLure, and Rhoda Elizabeth Playfair. C. L. Bennet, who became the journal's fifth Editor in 1957, promptly removed the reference to fiction from his invitation to contributors, but this does not seem to have discouraged the writers just named, most of whom were published in Bennet's era.

In anticipation of the journal's fiftieth anniversary, Bennet gave a favourable and optimistic account of its current position in an editorial he wrote under the title "The Fiftieth Year of the *Review*." He began with a laudatory account of the path mapped out by Stewart, citing some of the same documents I have already drawn attention to, and added that the "lines laid down at the beginning have been those that the *Review* has attempted to follow ever since." Bennet admits that the world hasn't stood still for the last fifty years, so there have been some changes, but he thinks of them as minor adjustments. Under Bennet's supervision, the journal's original sub-

title, “A Canadian Journal of Literature and Opinion,” was abandoned, and two regular features, “Current Magazines” and “Topics of the Day,” were discontinued. These changes were meant to bring *The Dalhousie Review* into conformity with international standards (now that many subscriptions were being sold to libraries in American, European, and Commonwealth locations) and professional practises (now that a great deal of scholarly publishing was controlled by university presses).

It would be both tempting and unkind to propose a reading against the grain of this celebratory document. Why tempting? Because there are moments when explanation seems to be required but isn’t given. I quote a sentence quite near the conclusion: “Growing competition has drawn off some writing that might once have been the special preserve of the *Review*, and the academic rule of ‘publish or perish’ sometimes confronts an editor with papers that are better suited to the learned journals.” Was this a veiled reference to the supply of short fiction, no specimens of which had been published for more than two years, or to the brief articles, which supplied oddments of information rather than advancing an argument? Bennet seems to have been aware that the writing in *The Dalhousie Review* was becoming less distinctive and perhaps less attractive to the imagined readership of Dalhousie graduates, for whom it was first created. If he was uneasy about this trend, perhaps it was because he didn’t know whether he could or even should try to stop it. Why unkind, then? Because it doesn’t acknowledge that, for whatever reasons, Bennet was quickly running out of options. By the winter 1970-1971 issue he had been silently replaced without a word of recognition or farewell. 1971 was also the year he died.

Chronologically speaking, we are halfway home now. I should say here that from this point on I will be writing about people I knew or know, some of them quite well, and with whom I had collegial relations of various kinds. I will try to resist making *ad hominem* accusations in the pages that follow, though I promise not to be shy about calling a spade a spade. When the wrong course of action is proposed or adopted, in my view, I will find a way of saying so. And will I offer praise where praise is merited? Read on and find out if I do.

It would be perfectly appropriate to think of the title and choric line of Bob Dylan’s famous song “The Times They Are A-Changin’” as the epigraph to this next segment of narration. Let me draw attention to just three avenues of change within university culture: (1) the onus of proof on the ques-

tion of authority, (2) the escalating demands for relevance, and (3) the sceptical deflation of principles once held to be universal. The academic world encountered by the fifty-year-old *Dalhousie Review* was thus not the same place it had occupied in its youth, and it was up to the next two Editors, Allan Bevan and Alan Kennedy, to devise a future for a journal rather proud of its stability in an environment that increasingly endorsed the need for and the value of change.

Bevan was not the sort of person you would imagine thriving under these circumstances. He was a very congenial man, already a long-serving member of the Department of English (which he joined in 1949) and an experienced supporter of the journal (he had served as Assistant Editor for almost a decade). He was also a self-deprecating ironist who never forgot that he grew up a farm boy in Saskatchewan. But he respected work of intellectual distinction, perhaps more than he cared to let on, and his editorial judgment was sound. Quite early in his term as Editor he was able to secure a contribution from Owen Barfield (an excerpt of which is featured in this issue), which showed its author's alert awareness of the radical instability of academic culture at the time. Bevan also published articles by Kerry McSweeney, Sandra Djwa, Evelyn J. Hintz, George Woodcock, and Linda Hutcheon, as well as poetry by Leona Gom, Don Domanski, and John Ditsky, among others. Fiction writers as widely known as Chinua Achebe and Nadine Gordimer also wrote discursive prose for publication in the journal while he was Editor. All of the foregoing sounds like a highly positive report, as indeed it is, but I think there was something missing. It's difficult to specify what this might be without resorting to cliché: the journal may have been getting along just fine, but did it have a mission? I doubt that Bevan was very worried about exactly the things that should have troubled him. If academic culture had become radically unstable, the pages of *The Dalhousie Review* (with few rare exceptions) were hardly aware of it.

Kennedy made a big splash when he began his term as Editor in 1980. Within the first two years he published articles by Flora MacDonald, Patricia Merivale, Margaret Atwood, Diana Brydon, Juliet McMaster, Stillman Drake, and Charles Taylor, as well as poems by Liliane Welch and Guy Vanderhaeghe, among others. But, as Editors go, Kennedy was a sprinter, not a long-distance runner. Having proven that he could do the job, he does not appear to have looked forward to years of repeating it. In the second half of his mandate he arranged for two issues to be handled by Guest Editors, as

Paul Smith put together a series of essays under the rubric "After Theory" for the summer 1984 issue and David Braybrooke and Thomas Vinci edited a selection of papers from a philosophy symposium under the title "Science vs. Reality: A Debate" for the fall 1984 issue. Although he continued as Editor for another year, Kennedy was already making other plans; he relinquished his editorial role in order to become Chair of the Department of English.

Alan Andrews became the eighth Editor, a position he would hold for just over a decade and for which he had many strong qualifications. He had an affectionate respect for the history of the journal, a belief in its mandate as something different from the agendas of learned journals in separate academic disciplines, an admiration for intellectual achievement of many different kinds, and a conviction that his own editorial work would require the help of collaborators. This last awareness motivated his appointment of J. Andrew Wainwright to the newly designated position of Fiction and Poetry Editor, an innovation that increased the visibility and improved the quality of the journal's creative writing. On Wainwright's advice Andrews published fiction by George Elliott Clarke, J. J. Steinfeld, Cyril Dabydeen, and Melissa Hardy, as well as poetry by Elizabeth Brewster, Ralph Gustafson, George Bowering, and Deirdre Dwyer. He also published articles by Peter Schwenger, Mustapha Marrouchi, Daniel Woolf, Edgar Z. Friedenberg, and Ann Medina, among others.

It might appear that *The Dalhousie Review* was conducting business as usual, but there were two systemic problems that Andrews, though keenly aware of, was never able to solve. The first of these, certainly not of his creation, was an embarrassing gap between the date printed on the cover of each issue and its actual date of publication. Eventually Andrews drew the inference that publishing four issues per volume was too demanding a pace under current conditions, and (beginning with volume 74) he reduced the number to three, a practise that has not been altered subsequently. The second systemic problem was that the tenth President of Dalhousie, Tom Traves, was no longer willing to serve as patron, and Andrews' final editorial in the winter 1996 issue reads like an obituary notice for the journal: "Unfortunately, more recently the central administration of the University decided that it would no longer nourish the *Review*, so that . . . it has proved necessary to bring its present existence to a close." After having presided over its burial, Andrews then alludes to its resurrection: "It is gratifying to

be able to report that the *Review* is to be revived in a new guise, under the auspices of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences at Dalhousie and with closer ties to the Department of English, under the editorship of Dr. Ronald Huebert. I wish him and it well."

As the foregoing narrative makes clear, or at least strongly implies, I was appointed Editor on the understanding that things would change. After moving to new offices and organizing a new Editorial Board, I published the spring 1996 issue, which opened with a "Salutation"—a title I borrowed from Stewart, who had used it to introduce the very first issue in 1921—that drew attention to some of the ways in which the journal had changed: a new cover design and a new typographical style signalled a break with the past, the appointment of new editorial and technical staff promised further changes in the years ahead, and new sources of revenue and administrative support enhanced the likelihood of future success. The explicit goal of all these changes, I pointed out, was "to reanimate the relationship between *The Dalhousie Review* and its readers."

The journal still had its problems, of course, as there was even now a gap between the purported and actual dates of publication. A far more interesting problem was how to strike the balance, as I perceived it, between discursive and creative writing. From its inception the journal had been primarily dedicated to the discussion of serious cultural issues, mostly in the form of articles, and to the review of important new books, especially but not exclusively books published in Canada. The occasional appearance of a poem in the early volumes strikes me almost as a diversion for the reader. But, as I have already implied, creative writing grew into a much more visible and more exciting portfolio in the later decades of the twentieth century. Soon after I became Editor, for instance, I noticed that submissions of poetry and fiction kept crossing my desk at a rate you might find either gratifying or alarming, or both, depending on your mood. On the other hand, articles arrived at a rate that was certainly not gratifying, and if alarming, then only by virtue of infrequency. Over the years I developed strategies to accommodate the plenitude of creative work and to augment the supply of discursive work, such as editing fiction and poetry issues, in which creative writing was the featured attraction, and organizing a number of issues on special topics, three of which were the work of Guest Editors who knew how to secure articles on topics that would have baffled me. For example, the summer 1997 "Africadian" issue was edited by George Elliott Clarke, the spring

1998 “Québec” issue was edited by Nelson Michaud, and the autumn 2002 “Eighteenth-Century Speculations” issue was edited by Trevor Ross. The issues on special topics edited by me include the autumn 1998 “Privacy” issue, the spring 2002 “Medieval Culture” issue, and the summer 2004 “Special Pleasure” issue. The six issues just identified resulted in the publication of 42 articles, an average of seven per issue, which was at least twice the number of discursive articles in a normal issue of *The Dalhousie Review* during my days as Editor.

The benefit of hindsight allows me to see the precarious balance between discursive and creative writing more clearly now than I did at the time. The writing of articles, during the period in question, was being professionalized. Within the university, endorsement by professional associations was treated with utmost respect. For a scholar of Romantic literature, for example, an article on Keats would count more heavily in decisions about promotion and tenure if it appeared in *Studies in Romanticism* (the official organ of the North American Society for the Study of Romanticism) than if it appeared in *Queen’s Quarterly*. Graduate students were also being mentored so as to reinforce exactly these professional values. As a result, serious academic articles were addressed no longer to the general reader but to a peer group of scholars qualified to evaluate professional research. And now that I’ve mentioned that great nineteenth-century invention—the general reader—it’s worth pointing out that by 1885 this serious bookworm was thought to be turning into a butterfly (or so I infer from a remark by M. G. Watkins in his review of Victor Hehn’s *The Wanderings of Plants and Animals from Their First Home*); a century later, it might have been nearing extinction—or, more likely, it was relying for its intellectual nourishment on one of the many alternatives to university-sponsored journals now becoming available: independent journalism (so-called), public broadcasting, and (later) internet resources. The details are open to dispute, but the overall trend remains: as it entered the twenty-first century, a journal such as *The Dalhousie Review* could no longer count on writers to create or readers to interpret serious academic articles on topics of general interest. The world was moving on.

If my tenure as Editor produced challenges, it also created opportunities, and I will end this account of my own experience by reporting two of these. Near the end of my first year as Editor, I published Robert M. Martin’s poem “God Explains What He Does Nowadays” in the autumn 1996

issue. It is a witty piece of writing; that is among the things I liked about it then, and it remains high on my list today. The poet has God admitting that he used to make "surprise visits" and send "Signs. A rainbow. A dove." That was long ago, and "now I've downsized." "The only thing I send down now is love," God says; and if that makes you happy, perhaps you might want to read the rest of Martin's poem. It's a very clever document, as even the fragments I've quoted will attest. But it's more than clever. It is also deeply informed by knowledge of what my tradition calls the Old Testament, by an awareness of what religion has meant to many generations of our (Eurocentric) ancestors, and (perhaps) by a whimsical regret at what has been lost with the disappearance of metaphysics from the contemporary world.

The very same issue featured an article by Anthony Stewart, "The Professional Sports Shell Game: A Black Canadian's Reflections on Twentieth-Century American Sports History," which demonstrates some of the ways in which the personal is political. Stewart argues that the dream of escaping the ghetto by means of success in professional sports is, for many young African-American males, a dangerous and debilitating illusion. Though he focuses on a particular problem, Stewart writes with the larger concerns of racial equity and identity very much in mind. He discusses at length what he calls "the quintessential paradox: African Americans appear to be damned if they do and damned if they don't, subjected to the heat of devaluation whether they stay where the larger society tells them to stay or attempt to push society's limits." It's a brave thing to emerge from this conundrum with hope, but Stewart manages to do so in his final paragraph, where he locates "the real sources of hope . . . just beyond the glitter of modern-day celebrity." Today more than ever, this is a hope we are called upon to share.

The two authors I've just mentioned were colleagues of mine at Dalhousie, and they have more in common than the mere happenstance of appearing in the same issue: though neither of them knew it at the time, they would become the next two Editors of *The Dalhousie Review*.

Martin joined the staff as Associate Editor in 1999, and he served as Editor for the four issues published while I was on sabbatical. By the time he began his full term as Editor in 2005, his track record suggested (rightly) that he would do a splendid job. He brought attributes to the position that enhanced the intellectual content of the journal and increased its visibility. Some of the strategies he used to ensure the quality of the journal's content were tried and true; for example, he edited a special issue on "Early

Modern Interiority" by publishing eleven articles that originated as oral presentations at a conference on this subject held in Halifax in 2004. His very considerable stature in the discipline of philosophy also helped him to recruit contributions from widely known philosophers, including Ronald de Sousa, Kai Nielsen, and Struan Jacobs, to name three examples. He also had a much better understanding of the digital world than did his predecessors, and he used this knowledge to the journal's advantage, as he began and promoted the detailed work of ensuring that electronic copies of all back issues would become accessible.

During Anthony Stewart's tenure as Editor, *The Dalhousie Review* changed considerably, sometimes in response to Stewart's premeditations, sometimes (I think he would agree) in response to circumstances not under his control. His first editorial, "On New Beginnings and Influences," outlined his priorities in detail. There would be fewer articles than heretofore, he predicted, and more creative writing. Book reviews would be longer, and a higher proportion of them would evaluate the productions of small Canadian presses. "While these changes are relatively minor," he wrote, "we see them as enhancing what *The Dalhousie Review* has done best for many years, publishing intelligent and thoughtful reviews, stories, poems, and articles for a discerning general readership." With this declaration in mind, we shouldn't be surprised to find that, in the first half of his five-year term, an issue edited by Stewart looked, felt, and read a lot like one edited by Martin, his predecessor and declared mentor. In the next issue, for example, he published three articles, including John Lepage's subtle and engaging recollection of his early life in rural Québec as mediated by William Henry Drummond; six short stories, including Cary Fagan's elegantly ironic "I'm Not Italian"; thirteen poems, among them Linda Frank's enigmatic and disturbing "After the Divorce"; and six reviews, three of them featuring books by small Canadian presses.

The spring 2010 "Groundtruthing" issue introduced a major design change, as the cover was unrelieved glossy white with severe black lettering to spell out the title of the journal and a synopsis of its contents. There was a new look inside the covers too, as the names and titles were now printed in capitals. Stewart mentioned these design changes in his editorial for the summer 2010 issue: "All this has been done in the interest of updating the look of our magazine in concert with our new online presence." The look may have changed, Stewart implied, but the mission had not. He also al-

luded to the first Editor's much-cited manifesto and situated his own practise directly in its wake by expressing his hope that these changes will signal "a return to the space between the specialized and the popular." He then reaffirmed his earlier outline of priorities, but added this qualification: "We have started to favour essays that address subjects that might be of interest to a more general readership" rather than "the sort of subjects one is more likely to see in more specialized, discipline-specific journals." This was a laudable intention but, for reasons explained earlier, no longer an available practise for *The Dalhousie Review*. The issue from which I am quoting identified only two of the items listed in its table of contents as essays. In the next issue, there was only one item so identified, and in the issue after that there were none.

Stewart left Dalhousie in 2012 to take up a position at Bucknell University, and the double issue he put together for the spring/summer of that year was his last. In his final editorial he took legitimate pride in having opened up a great deal more space for the publication of creative writing. In this respect alone he certainly played his part in refashioning *The Dalhousie Review* as the journal we know today.

The two Editors who have guided the journal through most of the ninth decade of its long life are Carrie Dawson and Anthony Enns. Both of them, on accepting responsibility for *The Dalhousie Review*, were able to appreciate its new mandate with great clarity and to run with it. Dawson became Editor in 2012, and she was the first woman to serve in this position. Although this is a surprising fact about her role, partly because of the conspicuous contributions of women to the life of the journal over many years, it is not something she chose to mention in her various public opportunities to do so, which is one reason why I mention it here. And I would say further that Dawson was not afraid of allowing gender to play a part in her editorial practise. She begins her editorial for the spring 2015 issue, for example, by lamenting the inadequacy of the sex education provided in her home and describing some of what she learned in the schoolyard. After addressing this question from a greater distance, she comes home again in her final paragraph, where she worries about her "studiously world-weary but perpetually mortified pre-teens" who, she resolves, will not be deprived in the way she was. So she talks to them about her own pre-teen experience, "gather[s] them around the dinner table, and read[s] aloud Rebecca Päpucaru's hilarious poem 'If I Had Your Cock,' which is contained in this issue." Even before

you've had a chance to read the poem, I think you'll agree that the foregoing is a scene in which gender and editing are working in collaboration.

Quite early in her term as Editor, she also allowed the journal's cover to become a much livelier place. Thanks to the artistry of Anthony Taaffe, a circulation of attractive drawings began to appear on the previously white cover, along with a band of colour to enhance the new effect. And there was plenty happening inside as well. In 2013 she initiated an annual short story contest for contributors of fiction; a year later Gavin Tomson became the first winner of this award with "Sometimes Their Parts Fall Off." She was clearly doing exactly what needed to be done to promote *The Dalhousie Review* as a journal devoted largely to creative writing. "And it's working," she announced with obvious pleasure in her last editorial in the spring 2016 issue. This joyful claim was followed by a considerable list of achievements by authors recently published in *The Dalhousie Review*. Editing the journal was a relatively short labour for Carrie Dawson, but there are many reasons to believe it was a labour of love.

It would be doubly presumptuous of me to pass judgment on the work of Anthony Enns, who began serving as Editor of *The Dalhousie Review* in 2016, as his term has not yet expired, and who knows what he may achieve before it does? Secondly, he has the prerogative of editing whatever I write, so even if I were to tell the truth . . . But a few things may already be said about Enns' ability to design initiatives that build on and enrich the traditions he has inherited. Let's begin with some telling examples. No sooner had he become Editor than he helped to set up an internship program under which selected graduate students in English would be able to work for the journal, assisting regular staff in designated editorial and promotional tasks. It's a win/win situation: the journal benefits from the work being done, and the students gain experience that may interest them and their potential employers. Working together with representatives of the Halifax Central Library, he also initiated the Dalhousie Review Public Reading Series. This is an excellent opportunity for community outreach and a chance to shine for some of the local authors published in the journal. Shashi Bhat, formerly a local author, has certainly earned her chance to shine. Her short story "Mute," first published in the autumn 2017 issue, went on to capture the Journey Prize for short fiction in 2018. Enns deserves credit for selecting and publishing the story and for making the nomination that would lead to this outcome. The author, of course, still gets credit for writing the story

in the first place. The publication of interviews with emerging authors in recent issues is a further signal of the journal's continuing commitment to creative writing.

With Enns as Editor the cover design has also become somewhat busier and louder than before. Perhaps this has come about in response to his penchant for creating themed issues. The summer 2017 issue, for example, was designated the "War Issue" because it opened with a substantial section of writing (poetry, fiction, and non-fiction) about military conflict and its social consequences, and the drawing on the cover appropriately featured a field of poppies in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of World War I. The autumn 2017 issue also featured a special section titled "Domestic Disturbances," and the cover drawing, though quite abstract, appears to me to be of a badly mangled house. There is still ample space in each of these issues for stories, poems, and reviews that do not fit the theme; in other words, this Editor likes to develop an idea but won't impose a straitjacket. But now I am perilously close to making just the sort of judgments I ruled out earlier as presumptuous. An issue on the topic of "Biophilia" is in preparation as I write, and its appearance may require that today's judgments be modified.

A real history, I should have warned you earlier, has no conclusion. It arrives at the present, or something very close to the present, and then it stops. It can of course present evidence that things happened in a particular way, and perhaps for particular reasons. It can notice ironies that accompany this or that unexpected turn of events. All of these qualities are observable, I think, in the history you've just read. I have been claiming, for example, that *The Dalhousie Review* developed in certain ways because it was given a very strong mandate by its first Editor, who was able to carry out his intentions in person for 26 years and who exercised remarkable influence over the intentions of others long after that. What I'm identifying here is a species of foundationalism that characterized the thinking of many of the journal's Editors, at least when they were thinking historically. At these moments, they went back to the journal's founding documents, especially the first Editor's "Salutation." They asked themselves whether their own practise was measuring up to the original template, and they invariably answered yes (or some version of yes) even when they knew that it was quite a stretch to say so. Even when they were doing things prohibited by that original template, in other words, they still claimed to be following it.

But my review of the published record would suggest something quite different. The remarkable thing about *The Dalhousie Review* over the last 100 years has been not its unchanging fidelity to a fixed paradigm but rather its resilience, which has allowed it to adapt to changing circumstances with its mandate altered and its energy renewed. What stands out for me is not the putative stability that successive Editors were looking for (or thought they were looking for) but the resourcefulness that repeatedly brought about changes in the journal's submissions policy, its target audience, its physical appearance, and its image and style. The resilience I am trying to describe is what allowed the cautious guardian of academic discourse of a hundred years ago to become the playful sponsor of creative energies that we know and love today.

Still, let's not assume that this is the end of the adventure. We may celebrate the work of the journal's recent Editors; indeed, we may be delighted by the new orientation they have discovered for an old publication. But perhaps we can resist the presentism of seeing our moment as the end of the story. That is the sense in which a real history has no conclusion. History, including the history of *The Dalhousie Review*, will continue (relentlessly, inexorably, you name it) even after our celebration has ended. If we are lucky, it will record not only endings but new beginnings, which we cannot yet imagine.