

PIERRE SAVARD — *Jules-Paul Tardivel, La France et Les États-Unis, 1851-1905*. Québec : Les Presses de l'Université Laval, 1967. xxxvii, 499 pp. Les Cahiers de L'Institut d'Histoire, numéro 8.

On first picking up M. Savard's book the reader may well be sceptical about the possibility of writing five hundred pages on the attitude of Jules-Paul Tardivel toward France and the United States. At the very least the reader may expect his interest to flag occasionally. After all, Tardivel's major interest to the historian recently has been his separatist opinions, and these Professor Savard has chosen not to deal with. It is therefore pleasant to be able to report that while I am not totally convinced that the author should not have treated the separatist question, he has nevertheless succeeded in writing a very significant book, and one which should consistently maintain the interest of scholars of Canadian intellectual history. It is, to be sure, very long and detailed; but that is only to say that it is exhaustive, that M. Savard has done his work thoroughly, and that no one should have to traverse this particular ground again.

What gives the book its interest and significance is that it is really a study of the major assumptions of nineteenth-century ultramontanism in Quebec. When Tardivel was writing of secularism in France or materialism in the United States, he was really reflecting his opinion of events in French Canada. Or perhaps it would be better to say that he was reflecting the fears which he entertained about what might happen to French Canadians if they changed. Consequently the book is extremely revealing of the characteristics of clerical nationalism in Quebec. It is true that Tardivel was an "extremist". But extremists are valuable specimens for study because they press to logical if sometimes irrational conclusions what the more moderate opinion of their camp really stands for. Thus, though Tardivel was hardly a typical "ultramontane", it would be difficult to think of a figure who expressed better, and more explicitly, the major assumptions of ultramontane nationalism in Quebec. Parenthetically, it might be said that it is in reading Tardivel that one begins to understand the Orange Lodge.

Tardivel was, as M. Savard insists, a French Canadian Louis Veillot. His sentiments and ideas were markedly similar to those of his French counterpart. Both were extreme reactionaries. Yet the really interesting fact is that Tardivel was a Veillot without a cause. It is true that he managed to build up a great many causes, but he did so only by exaggerating the liberalism of Mgr. Taschereau, or the importance of the Free Masons in Canada. That there was evidence that Quebec was changing in directions that Tardivel opposed is true; but to have believed that it was taking on the characteristics of revolutionary, materialistic, anti-clerical France was surely an indication of a total lack of judgment. In contemporary Quebec Tardivel would have worn a *beret blanc*, for Réal Caouette would have been too progressive for him.

(Or would he have followed Gilles Grégoire into an alliance with René Lévesque? Not if his attitude to Mercier is any evidence.)

But having said these things, it is still necessary to understand the mentality of a man like Tardivel, for his assumptions, if not his conclusions, are at the heart of nineteenth-century French Canadian nationalism. Indeed much of what he wrote found itself repeated by Bourassa, as well as by Canon Groulx. In short, while conservative nationalism may not have been a major force in the development of Quebec society, it was certainly a main current of Quebec's intellectual life. That is why Savard's book is of such importance.

Even when M. Savard appears to stray away from his central themes — and he occasionally does — he leaves the reader with a good deal of interesting information. A case in point is his discussion of certain views about Laurier that were held in conservative Catholic circles. Clearly not enough has been made of the fact that there were some ecclesiastics in Quebec who refused to believe that Laurier was a sincere Catholic. This is doubtless one of the reasons that made Bourassa so attractive to Church leaders. Of course there were other cogent reasons for Bourassa's success with the clergy, but the religious question is one that deserves more emphasis, and there is some evidence in this volume that is worth weighing. So too, M. Savard's treatment of the question of French Canadian emigration to the United States in the nineteenth century offers some new information and raises some new questions. No one has ever looked in a detailed fashion at the problem of annexationist sentiment in Quebec in the 1880's and '90's. The fact is that the rate of emigration to the United States made annexation a question well worth considering for French-Canadian intellectuals. The radicals who wrote in *Canada-Revue* were sympathetically inclined to annexation. Edmond de Nevers saw the reunion of the French-speaking people in North America as an ultimate destiny, and some who were on the right, like Père Edmond Hamon, were not unsympathetic to the idea of recapturing New England for the Catholic faith though the union of the French-speaking Catholics on both sides of the border. Tardivel was certainly not an annexationist but his separatism, his dream of the re-establishment of New France on the banks of the St. Lawrence, did involve a territorial settlement which was not bounded by the existing boundaries of Quebec. M. Savard's book both reveals a good deal on the subject of the great debate over emigration and suggests how badly a full-scale study of that subject is needed.

For all its merits, M. Savard's book would have been immensely more valuable had he attempted to say a good deal more about Tardivel's nationalism. His book makes it plain that those who have spoken of Tardivel only as a separatist and then dropped him have made a serious error. There was much more to Quebec's Louis Veillot than that. But his nationalism and separatism were nevertheless integral to his thought. Indeed much of what M. Savard says

about Tardivel's attitude to the United States and France is really the inverse of his nationalism. This would have been an even better book if it had fleshed out this important dimension fully.

Still, what is offered is well worth having. Put in a broader context it offers some support for Louis Hartz's concept of Quebec as a "feudal fragment" of Europe, and thus opens the way to a fresh look at the entire intellectual history of Quebec in the nineteenth century. This is a work which Professor Savard is well equipped to undertake. Until he does, Canadian scholars will remain indebted to him for what he has already offered: a first-rate study of a man rather accurately dubbed by the *Canada-Revue* as Jules-Paul Torquemada.

Ramsay COOK,  
Harvard University.

\* \* \*

JEAN-CHARLES FALARDEAU. — Notre Société et son Roman. Montréal, Éditions HMH, 1967. 234 p. (coll. Sciences de l'homme et humanisme).

Le titre de ce livre est déjà tout un programme : l'étude présuppose en effet une relation étroite entre le roman et la société. Comme écrit M. Falardeau, « la sociologie pose des questions qui entraînent à explorer et les mondes rêvés et le monde humain réel que ceux-ci auréolent et soutiennent » (p. 7). Cependant, devant les diverses tentatives des sociologues de pénétrer « les aspirations, les rêves et les raisons de vivre d'une collectivité » à travers la littérature, il faut examiner de plus près la relation entre l'œuvre littéraire et la société.

L'œuvre littéraire est devenue un objet sacralisé par la tradition littéraire et l'individualisme romantique. Fruit d'un effort individuel elle suppose, cependant, la communauté d'un langage et tout un système de complicité sociale. L'étude de Falardeau fait voir toutes les difficultés du métier de l'historien de la littérature : le passage de l'individuel au collectif, le rapport entre le monde rêvé individuel et le monde social. Depuis cent cinquante ans, la tradition littéraire traque les secrets du livre à un double niveau : de l'intérieur, par l'étude du texte lui-même, et de l'extérieur, par l'érudition biographique. Elle est ainsi amenée à présumer du social et du collectif à partir des témoignages de ce qui est individuel. Or, c'est ce rapport que l'on voudrait aujourd'hui inverser.

Bien entendu, on peut étudier ou même savourer l'œuvre littéraire coupée de toutes les attaches à l'écrivain et au contexte social. Néanmoins, l'œuvre littéraire est le fruit de l'activité humaine. Et depuis une cinquantaine d'années les psychologues, les linguistes et les sociologues scrutent l'homme, tant individuel que collectif, afin de mieux connaître les facteurs qui conditionnent son comportement. Sans aller jusqu'au déterminisme le plus complet, on commence à comprendre la périphérie de l'individualité de l'homme.