

Spring 1973

LOST LADIES: THE ISOLATED HEROINE IN  
THE FICTION OF HAWTHORNE, JAMES,  
FITZGERALD, HEMINGWAY, AND  
FAULKNER

SHARON WELCH DEAN

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholars.unh.edu/dissertation>

---

**Recommended Citation**

DEAN, SHARON WELCH, "LOST LADIES: THE ISOLATED HEROINE IN THE FICTION OF HAWTHORNE, JAMES, FITZGERALD, HEMINGWAY, AND FAULKNER" (1973). *Doctoral Dissertations*. 1022.  
<https://scholars.unh.edu/dissertation/1022>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Scholarship at University of New Hampshire Scholars' Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Doctoral Dissertations by an authorized administrator of University of New Hampshire Scholars' Repository. For more information, please contact [nicole.hentz@unh.edu](mailto:nicole.hentz@unh.edu).

## INFORMATION TO USERS

This material was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again — beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.
5. PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.

**Xerox University Microfilms**  
300 North Zeeb Road  
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

73-25,782

DEAN, Sharon Welch, 1943-  
LOST LADIES: THE ISOLATED HEROINE IN THE  
FICTION OF HAWTHORNE, JAMES, FITZGERALD,  
HEMINGWAY, AND FAULKNER.

University of New Hampshire, Ph.D., 1973  
Language and Literature, modern

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan

© 1973

SHARON WELCH DEAN

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

THIS DISSERTATION HAS BEEN MICROFILMED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED.

LOST LADIES: THE ISOLATED HEROINE IN THE  
FICTION OF HAWTHORNE, JAMES, FITZGERALD,  
HEMINGWAY, AND FAULKNER

by

Sharon Dean

B.A., University of New Hampshire, 1965

M.A., University of New Hampshire, 1969

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to the University of New Hampshire  
In Partial Fulfillment of  
The Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy  
Graduate School  
Department of English  
June, 1973

This dissertation has been examined and approved.

*Philip L. Nicolett*

Dissertation director, Philip L. Nicolett, Prof. of English

*Carl Dawson*

Carl Dawson, Asso. Prof. of English

*Hugh M. Potter III*

Hugh M. Potter III, Asst. Prof. of English

*Charles E. Clark*

Charles E. Clark, Asso. Prof. of History

*Peter S. Fernald*

Peter S. Fernald, Asso. Prof. of Psychology

*May 7, 1973*

Date

### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am grateful to the University of New Hampshire for a dissertation grant-in-aid (1971) which enabled me to begin this study and to my doctoral committee for their helpful guidance. I wish especially to thank Dr. Philip Nicoloff who devoted many hours to reading and suggesting alterations in the manuscript and without whom this project might never have come into being.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT . . . . . v

I. INTRODUCTION: THE LOST LADY . . . . . 1

    1. If Women Had Other Objects . . . . . 1

    2. Critical Schools and Methods . . . . . 6

    3. A Note on the Texts . . . . . 10

II. ANGEL OR DEVIL? HAWTHORNE'S HESTER,  
ZENOBIA, AND MIRIAM . . . . . 11

III. PORTRAITS OF A LOST LADY: JAMES'S THE WINGS  
OF THE DOVE AND THE GOLDEN BOWL . . . . . 41

IV. GOLDEN GIRLS AND LOST WOMEN: THE HEROINES  
OF F. SCOTT FITZGERALD . . . . . 96

V. THE LOVELY CREATURE IN THE GREEN HAT: THE  
HEROINES OF ERNEST HEMINGWAY . . . . . 124

VI. WILLIAM FAULKNER AND THE "HEART'S DARLING" . 158

VII. YOU DON'T MARRY SEMIRAMIS . . . . . 186

FOOTNOTES . . . . . 202

BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . . 231

## ABSTRACT

The plight of the lost lady is captured in Hawthorne's The Marble Faun when Miriam Schaefer cries out that "when women have other objects in life, they are not apt to fall in love." In much of the best American fiction, women do not have other objects beyond the domestic. The source of the lost woman's dilemma, however, is that even the domestic role is denied her. Because she is a sexual threat or because love is impossible in a wasteland society, she is exiled by women who conform more than she, by men, and by the world as a whole. As a result of her exile, she seeks an impossible escape from isolation, most often via an illicit love relationship. When this fails, she accepts-- or even chooses--her isolation and in doing so practices some form of martyrdom as the only role left her.

Such a woman appears frequently in the works of Hawthorne, James, Fitzgerald, Hemingway, and Faulkner. She is represented specifically by Hawthorne's Hester Prynne (The Scarlet Letter, 1850), Zenobia (The Blithedale Romance, 1852), and Miriam Schaefer (The Marble Faun, 1859), by James's Kate Croy (The Wings of the Dove, 1902) and Charlotte Stant (The Golden Bowl, 1904), by Fitzgerald's



Gloria Gilbert (The Beautiful and Damned, 1922) and Nicole Diver (Tender Is the Night, 1933), by Hemingway's Lady Brett Ashley (The Sun Also Rises, 1926), Catherine Barkley (A Farewell to Arms, 1929), and Maria (For Whom the Bell Tolls, 1940), and by Faulkner's Caddy Compson (The Sound and the Fury, 1929), Laverne Shumann (Pylon, 1935), and Charlotte Rittenmeyer (The Wild Palms, 1939). The elements of sexuality, isolation, and sacrifice are the dominant characteristics of these women. They reveal not just the author's vision of womanhood but also his vision of life. For Hawthorne and James, the social order must survive and the woman who threatens to destroy this social order, most often by ignoring its laws against adultery, must atone for her sin. The Hawthorne and James lost woman, therefore, accepts isolation for society rather than continuing to seek isolation from society. On the other hand, Fitzgerald does not so clearly endorse the value of the social order; his heroine pays tribute to the isolated moments of love and practices her renunciation more for an individual than for society as a whole. Like Fitzgerald, Hemingway believes in the worth of the isolated moment, but like Hawthorne and James, he sees also that this isolation can destroy. Where the Hawthorne and James woman sacrifices for the social order which is valuable and the Fitzgerald woman sacrifices for the individual,

the Hemingway woman sacrifices for her lover because the social order is necessary if a male is to live productively. Finally, in Faulkner, the value of society is neither asserted nor denied; when Faulkner's lost woman renounces, she does so in order that someone else, most often a child, may at least have a chance for survival in society if he chooses this over isolation.

Hawthorne, James, Fitzgerald, Hemingway, and Faulkner all use the lost lady as a vehicle for exploring the conflict between isolation and society. She is an especially appropriate vehicle because of her limited feminine role. Where the man may live his life, the female must surrender hers. Where the man may find fulfillment outside of love, the female may not and, what is more, either loses the love that temporarily sustains her or never finds love at all. By forcing his lost lady into this kind of plight, the writer stresses the importance of maintaining male and female uniqueness. He finds inspiration from his heroine and yet keeps her always at an idealizing distance so that she cannot demand too much of him or plunge him into the inertia a perfect love relationship might engender. Most important, the heroine, by suffering and by sacrificing, attains the necessary depth needed for tragic stature.

The lost woman is remembered precisely because she is left with nothing but pain and because she selflessly endures this pain with humility and with dignity.

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION: THE LOST LADY

#### 1. If Women Had Other Objects

In Hawthorne's The Marble Faun, Miriam Schaefer captures the essence of the dilemma that faces a type of woman in American literature who may appropriately be called the lost lady. "It is," she says, "a mistaken idea, which men generally entertain, that nature has made women especially prone to throw their whole being into what is technically called love. We have, to say the least, no more necessity for it than [men]; only we have nothing else to do with our hearts. When women have other objects in life, they are not apt to fall in love"(659). Again and again in Hawthorne's fiction we find expressed an understanding for and a sympathy toward the woman's limited domestic sphere. Although Hawthorne would hardly minimize the importance of love, he sees that too often a woman may find legitimate love unavailable. Having no other object to vent her passion upon, she may then attempt to find fulfillment in illegitimate love, only to find that **this too is impossible**. Exiled from the larger sphere of a man's world, exiled from the hearth and, finally, from love itself, fiction's Miriam Schaefer are lost ladies whose plight has been examined and re-examined

by the best of America's nineteenth and twentieth century writers.

The lost lady may be characterized by more than the fact of her exile. The causes of her exile stem from an inborn sexuality which makes her unacceptable in or threatening to conventional society. Although each of the women we shall deal with suffers individual calamities, each also suffers simply because of her sex. Being female in the nineteenth century, Hawthorne's Miriam can be forced toward an incestuous marriage, and though she flees this, she can find no escape once a legitimate domestic place has been denied her. Being female in the twentieth century, Faulkner's Caddy Compson can pursue her sexuality outside marriage. Failing in her attempts to provide a home for her daughter, she feels she can support herself only by prostitution. And yet through all the misfortunes that this type of woman confronts, we find in her a sacrificial element that is as strong as the sexual. Just as her sexuality is the cause of her exile, this sacrificial element seems the result of exile. The only role left for the lost lady seems, finally, to be some form of isolation and martyrdom. When James's Charlotte Stant, for instance, gives up her lover, she gains nothing for herself, not even a sense that she is returning her lover to a marriage worth saving. Like Charlotte, the type of heroine we shall deal with most often progresses from an isolation forced upon her because of her sexuality or her sex through

an attempted escape from isolation through a love relationship to an isolation chosen for selfless reasons.

These elements of sexuality, isolation, and sacrifice are the dominant characteristics of the lost woman. Although this woman's plight is to some extent foreshadowed in much of America's sentimental literature, the basis of the sentimental heroine's dilemma is a kind of naïveté and girlishness foreign to the lost woman. The important thing about the lost woman is, after all, that she has integrity, that she is emotionally mature, courageous, and honest. Although Cooper deals more explicitly with the lost lady's integrity and maturity, his women are largely secondary concerns. Not until The Scarlet Letter do we find the first major American portrait of the lost lady. Such a portrait can only be tragic, for the social expectation of the nineteenth century, and to a lesser degree of the twentieth, is that women are supposed to be immature, especially in a sexual sense, submissive, dependent, and manipulative. The present study aims to examine the woman who defies such an expectation. Specifically, it examines Hawthorne's Hester (The Scarlet Letter, 1850), Zenobia (The Blithedale Romance, 1852), and Miriam (The Marble Faun, 1859), James's Kate Croy (The Wings of the Dove, 1902) and Charlotte Stant (The Golden Bowl, 1904), Fitzgerald's Gloria Gilbert (The Beautiful and Damned, 1922) and Nicole Diver (Tender Is the Night, 1933), Hemingway's Lady Brett Ashley (The Sun Also Rises, 1926)

and Catherine Barkley (A Farewell to Arms, 1929), and Faulkner's Caddy Compson (The Sound and the Fury, 1929), Laverne Shumann (Pylon, 1935), and Charlotte Rittenmeyer (The Wild Palms, 1939). Although the selection of authors and women has been largely a practical one, it seems a legitimate choice. These writers present at once the clearest and most troubling portraits of the lost woman and cover enough ground chronologically to show the evolution and the persistence of the type. In addition, the heroines chosen are both the best known of the type and the most representative of what is one of the crowning achievements of American literature. We remember and discuss them as much as we remember and discuss the novels in which they exist. We remember them precisely because their creators are themselves profoundly moved by these women. Although throughout the fiction of the five writers chosen for study, we shall find varying degrees of ambivalence, we shall never find a lack of sympathy. Although each of these authors fails to provide the lost woman with a viable alternative to isolation, he both understands and cares about her dilemma and admires the courage she shows in the face of her suffering.

The heroine I have called the lost lady was first popularized as a literary type by Leslie Fiedler in Love and Death in the American Novel. His term for the heroine is "dark lady." In the fiction of Hawthorne and James, this term is especially appropriate,

for here the lost woman is seen as a "dark lady" of experience in contrast to a light girl who is variously portrayed as shallow because she lives in a "cloistered virtue," or devastating because she pretends perfection and hides even from herself an imperfection which uses power to manipulate. This power is cloaked in the guise of morality. Because of the dark-light dichotomy, in my discussions of Hawthorne and James, Fiedler's "dark lady" designation has often seemed as appropriate as the "lost lady" designation. There is, in fact, some justification for calling all the lost heroines dark ladies because of their enigmatic and threatening qualities. The adjective, however, proves confusing because in the twentieth century the lost heroine is no longer a brunette, and actually represents, especially in Fitzgerald and Hemingway, a merging of the light-dark traditions. Regardless of what we wish to call the type of woman we shall deal with, the reader should understand that the emphasis of this study does not rest in a term used largely for convenience. Neither does it depend upon a narrow definition of a type. As Lillian Robinson has stated in her article "Dwelling in Decencies: Radical Criticism and the Feminist Perspective," we need to go beyond mere identification of a type in literature. "There are, indeed," Miss Robinson maintains, "parallel characteristics in the lives of fictional women. We should not make a mythic fetish of these, but consider



why they exist. To what extent do they coincide with the social reality of women's lives? Where they do not, did their authors wish this development upon them? To what end did they impose it? What are the effects of literary conventions dealing with women?"<sup>1</sup> Although this study does not follow Miss Robinson's outline, its primary aim goes beyond the "parallel characteristics" of the lost woman into an exploration of the vision of life which is presented through her. Examining this vision of life, we shall discover much about each author's conception of the ideal society and his sense that, because it is ideal, it is either impossible to reach or, being reached, impossible to keep. We shall discover, also, his conception of how a mature woman fits, or fails to fit, into both the real world and the ideal world. Finally, we shall discover what each author deems admirable human conduct in the face of life's difficulties, the degree to which such conduct is imposed upon his characters, and the reasons behind this imposition.

## 2. Critical Schools and Methods

In connection with Hawthorne and James two definite schools of criticism emerge, one which favors the light heroine and one which favors the dark or lost. The dispute over Hawthorne revolves largely around the question of whether he evades or endorses sexuality. Although most critics believe Priscilla, Hilda, and Phoebe represent Hawthorne's ideal, most also believe

Hawthorne at least sympathizes with Zenobia, Miriam, and, especially, Hester. Similarly, most of James's critics see Milly Theale as his ideal; however, a dispute exists over the nature of Maggie Verver. Though Charlotte Stant is seen by most critics in a more positive light than Kate Croy, both are all too often ignored entirely. In the twentieth century, Fitzgerald's Gloria Gilbert is generally believed to be totally shallow and selfish, and Nicole Diver, even when treated sympathetically, is seen as bearing the major blame for her husband's decline. Hemingway's Brett Ashley appears weak and selfish to all but a few critics who see in her some redeeming characteristics; his Catherine Barkley is seen to be treated unfairly by Frederic Henry or, more often, is seen to have a disastrous effect on him. Faulkner's heroines are for the most part ignored. Few critics deal with Pylon or The Wild Palms at all, and in most discussions of The Sound and the Fury, Caddy Compson is treated as a central concern of her brothers but a non-character herself.

One of the purposes of this study is to help resolve critical disputes over the nature of the lost lady and to bring her more into focus as an admirable woman. But because my major aim is not to criticize the critics, and because my thesis includes ample textual demonstrations, I have confined my discussion of relevant criticism primarily to footnotes. These notes enlarge the discussion and deal with what might otherwise seem

omissions. However, two major critical works dealing with what I have called the lost lady deserve mention here. Leslie Fiedler's Love and Death in the American Novel employs a psychological approach to give a general overview of the love and death themes in American literature as a whole. Concerning the heroines of American fiction, Fiedler believes that the male artist shies away from presenting "full-fledged, mature women, giving us instead monsters of virtue or bitchery, symbols of the rejection or fear of sexuality."<sup>2</sup> Most often, for Fiedler, the artist fails to deal with the mature woman because of his latent homosexual tendencies. But the close study we shall give the lost lady serves to at least temper Fiedler's arguments. We can assess whether a fear of women exists among American male writers or not only after a far more detailed discussion of the authors in question than Fiedler offers. And given the detailed discussion, the reasons for the American author's ambivalence--or fear--toward his lost woman can hardly be dismissed simply as stemming from heterosexual inadequacies.

The second major study of the heroine in American fiction, William Wasserstrom's Heiress of All the Ages, is a less extreme study than Fiedler's.<sup>3</sup> Where Fiedler employs a psychological approach, Wasserstrom employs a sociological one. Although Wasserstrom's book is useful in depicting the actual position of women in America, even more than Fiedler's book, it fails to present a

valid or convincing picture of what the artist has created. Both it and Love and Death in the American Novel misrepresent the heroine we have before us in the literary work. For this reason, although I have not ignored pertinent psychological or sociological evidence, I have largely subordinated these approaches in favor of an exploration of textual matters.

I have chosen to discuss the lost woman in the fiction of Hawthorne, James, Fitzgerald, Hemingway, and Faulkner via textual analysis for the further reason that such a method allows both author and heroine to remain unique as well as part of a tradition. While each individual author is examined in the context of what the other authors have done, I have been careful not to impose an artificial continuity of method or attitude upon these writers as a group. Each has his own individual statement to make over and above the areas of concern which link him to the other writers. So, in the Hawthorne chapter which follows, the theme of the fortunate fall seems a more appropriate center of focus than the related theme of renunciation. Later, in the Hemingway chapter, the theme of service, which again relates to the theme of renunciation, seems the appropriate center. In the James chapter much is made of the light heroine, for, given the complexity of James's method and the centrality of the light heroine, she too must be dealt with if her dark or lost counterpart

is to be properly understood. In the Fitzgerald chapter, the emphasis is placed on the loss of love. In the Faulkner, it is placed on the loss of the child; here the theme of motherhood comes to the fore. Thus each chapter stresses the author's uniqueness at the same time that it considers the similarity with which all treat the lost woman.

### 3. A Note on the Texts

The texts used have been selected for both their quality and their availability. Throughout, page references to these texts have been put in parentheses. Because the Centenary Edition (Ohio State University Press) of Hawthorne's works is not yet complete, I have for all the relevant Hawthorne fiction used the Random House Modern Library Giant (New York, 1937), edited by Norman Holmes Pearson. I have used the standard New York edition of James's novels, and for his tales, Leon Edel's edition of The Complete Tales of Henry James (Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott). The Scribner Library editions have been chosen for both the Fitzgerald and Hemingway texts. Because the 1956 Modern Library edition of The Sound and the Fury contains the 1946 Appendix but uses the earlier and more legitimate 1929 text, I have selected it. I have used the Liveright edition of Soldier's Pay (New York, 1954) and the Harrison-Smith and Robert Haas edition of Pylon (New York, 1935). Otherwise, the Faulkner texts are the Random House editions.

## CHAPTER II

ANGEL OR DEVIL:  
HAWTHORNE'S HESTER, ZENOBIA, AND MIRIAM

After hearing her husband read "Rappaccini's Daughter," Sophia Hawthorne asked if Beatrice Rappaccini were an angel or a devil. In one sense Sophia's question captures the ambiguity that all the heroines we shall study exhibit. Like Beatrice, they would "fain have been loved, not feared" (1064). If they cannot cry out with Beatrice's intensity at never having been loved at all, the love they find is only temporary, in Hawthorne because it attempts to isolate itself from the larger community. For Hawthorne, such isolated love threatens to destroy by allowing the lovers to pridefully place themselves above social law. So Beatrice, like others we shall look at, embraces her own destruction rather than continues to isolate her lover. Although she is a demon who threatens Giovanni with expulsion from the community, she is also an angel who, for a time, saves him from his own egotism and coldness and, at the last, saves him from death. The world, Hawthorne implies, needs the capacity for passionate love its Beatrices display, but if this passionate love exists outside the normal community, it needs also to destroy its Beatrices. In The Scarlet

Letter, The Blithedale Romance and The Marble Faun, he explores in detail the problems of women like Beatrice whose passion is never allowed to flower legitimately. The Scarlet Letter contains his most successful and moving portrait of a lost woman and The Blithedale Romance, his most vivid. But not until The Marble Faun does Hawthorne fully come to terms with the nature of the lost woman's sin and of her avenue to salvation.

Although the greatness of The Scarlet Letter rests in Hawthorne's portrait of Hester Prynne, the novel is used here primarily to outline the issues essential in our understanding of the lost lady. It is used to examine the apparent reasons for Hawthorne's feelings about Hester, not to recreate those feelings. In the novel, Hawthorne uses his authorial voice to state explicitly what he feels is the essence of the female dilemma. One of his clearest versions of the dilemma reflects his belief that society causes a woman to stray because it offers her no outlet for passion unless it be through marriage. And yet if society did offer women the kind of existence it offers a man, Hawthorne implies that the capacity for love essential in his conception of womanhood might be lost.

"Indeed," Hawthorne writes, "the same dark question often rose into [Hester's] mind,

with reference to the whole race of womanhood. Was existence worth accepting, even to the happiest among them? As concerned her own individual existence, she had long ago decided in the negative, and dismissed the point as settled. A tendency to speculation, though it may keep woman quiet, as it does man, yet makes her sad. She discerns, it may be, such a hopeless task before her! As a first step, the whole system of society is to be torn down, and built up anew. Then, the very nature of the opposite sex, or its long and hereditary habit, which has become like nature, is to be essentially modified, before woman can be allowed to assume what seems a fair and suitable position. Finally, all other difficulties being obviated, woman cannot take advantage of these preliminary reforms, until she herself shall have undergone a still mightier change; in which, perhaps, the ethereal essence, wherein she has her truest life, will be found to have evaporated(182).

The plight of Hester Prynne and the reasons for Hawthorne's sympathy toward her are thus made clear. Having the capacity to love but finding no man



to love, she succumbs to the dictate that a woman must, nevertheless, marry. Losing her husband but not her capacity for passion, she realizes the error of her marriage, and when passion finally is offered her, she embraces it despite its adulterous nature. But society judges against Hester; therefore, she attempts to deny her womanhood rather than be frustrated again in her search for fulfillment.

At the same time that Hawthorne portrays the frustrations Hester faces, he recognizes in The Scarlet Letter, as he shall recognize in his later novels, that society is not entirely to blame for her plight. Her adultery is sinful and must be repented of. Her attempt to crush her womanly tenderness "so deeply into her heart that it can never show itself more"(181) constitutes an even greater error. As a result of this attempt, she pridefully isolates herself apart from the community and uses the letter A as a way of "taking her out of the ordinary relations with humanity, and enclosing her in a sphere by herself"(116). She may perform some services for the community, but these services hardly make her acknowledge her partnership in it. Precisely because Hester fails totally to crush her passion, Hawthorne can redeem her from her error of isolation and be moved by the "ethereal essence" which continues to make her a woman.

Hester attempts to abandon her prideful isolation when she plans a reunion with her lover. This is not, however, Hawthorne's solution to her plight, for it does not reconcile her search for love with the dictates of the community. On the contrary, a reunion with Dimmesdale constitutes isolation from the community all have responsibilities toward. Hester and Dimmesdale cannot allow their sin against Chillingworth to separate them from the rest of the world because Hester cannot isolate herself from Pearl and Dimmesdale cannot isolate himself from his congregation. Their own sexual act can remain consecrated because it was an act of love and of union, but their breach of the rights of others cannot. Hester can reunite with Dimmesdale only when Pearl can stand with them, only when their connection is acknowledged to the world they both belong to.<sup>1</sup>

Only after the failure of their plan of escape does Hester learn the kind of repentance that can save her and learn that though she cannot escape isolation, she must not pridefully embrace it. Through the plan of escape, Hawthorne continues to indicate his feeling toward Hester that he set forth in our first vision of her emerging with "natural dignity and force of character"(115) from the prison door to stand as an image of "Divine Maternity"(117) and of human suffering on the scaffold of judgment. But through it, he also

indicates what he thinks human conduct should be. The plan of escape is a rekindling of the adulterous sin and, Hawthorne suggests, more than the adultery, is the real felix culpa of the novel. Chillingworth sees that, by committing adultery, Hester has plunged all into "dark necessity"(187), just as Eve's sin plunged the world forever into sin. The results of original sin are further sin; the result of the adultery as analogue for original sin is yet more sin.<sup>2</sup> Out of sin innocence cannot come. But out of sin some good can come. It is not, however, until the plan of escape that this good begins to be re-established in The Scarlet Letter, and in this sense the plan of escape represents the core of Hawthorne's thinking. Through the plan, Hester falls again, and tempts Dimmesdale to join her in her fall. Only after this fall can they both rise by acknowledging their original guilt in adultery. Rather than making Hester a sacrificial heroine, like so many of the women we shall look at, Hawthorne allows her to work her good and to accept at the end her loss accidentally rather than through an intentional renunciation. Still, Hester's motives, like the motives we shall explore in later heroines, keep Dimmesdale her prime consideration. She intends to sacrifice for him, but her real renunciation can come only when she releases Dimmesdale to his confession.

Just as she caused Dimmesdale to fall by tempting him to adultery, or more likely by allowing

herself to be tempted, Hester causes him to fall by accepting her plan of escape. But by her resolution to action, Hester becomes the necessary spur Dimmesdale needs to turn him away from his inactive dedication to concealed guilt. He now openly lies to Mistress Hibbens and to Chillingworth, so for the first time is being true by showing "freely to [at least some of] the world if not [his] worst, yet some trait whereby the worst may be inferred"(238). After the election sermon he acknowledges his sin in public. When he throws off all assistance from Hester and "confesses" the good comes about. But since Hawthorne equivocates about the nature of Dimmesdale's confession, Dimmesdale remains weak in character. He does not confess directly, and in later years some even doubt his confession.<sup>3</sup> Dimmesdale's rise is not, finally, out of weakness into courage. It is not as high as it should be, but Hester has at least worked some good for him, if not the good she had originally intended. In addition, she has aided Chillingworth who leaves money to Pearl<sup>4</sup> and, if nothing else, has lost his object of obsession. She has aided Pearl who sees her mother's suffering and changes from a wild, uncontrollable child into, presumably, a devoted mother. But the fall has been most fortunate for Hester herself. She can now repent of the adultery as well as of its consequences by returning to America

to do her penance. The scarlet letter is finally "transformed into something that . . . speak[s] a different purport"(184) because Hester has abandoned her prideful isolation and has acknowledged her sense of community by freely giving advice of the heart. The letter is no longer something to mock or condemn but is "something to be sorrowed over, and looked upon with awe, yet with reverence too"(240), something changed but, like sin, never eliminated, not even on her gravestone.

The epitaph on Hester's tombstone, "On a field, sable, the letter A, gules," suggests more than the darkness of illicit passion and the brightness that can come from darkness. It suggests as well the double level on which her conflict between isolation and the community exists. Isolated from homeland and husband, Hester seeks a way out of her solitude via an isolation of illicit love. Finding her love thwarted, she seeks refuge in further isolation with Pearl, and finding this to be no refuge, she seeks a second time the isolation of illicit love. This second attempt to act upon her love for Dimmesdale leaves no room for Pearl, and thus Hester is again thwarted. Out of her experience, she learns that one cannot isolate the self from the community as a whole, and if still solitary, she, nevertheless, accepts for herself a role as mother to a child who exists

in the world and as provider of advice and comfort to those in need. If her capacity for passion is no longer able to be realized, her capacity to serve, to care, to love that makes her in Hawthorne's eyes a woman, is now predominant. She progresses from an isolation that is unendurable to an isolation that she endures because it serves a purpose. Hester's change is typical of the progression we shall see in other lost heroines, especially those in the later Hawthorne and in James. Their isolation from others becomes an isolation for others. At the same time, it is unavoidable because of earlier error and thus suggests the price paid for sin as well as the fall turned fortunate.

Hawthorne's conception of the lost woman of experience is a major consideration again in The Blithedale Romance and now is intensified by the juxtaposition of a light, innocent heroine. The difference between the two is epitomized in Coverdale's descriptions of Priscilla's purses and Zenobia's hothouse flower. The "peculiar excellence [of the purses] , besides the great delicacy and beauty of manufacture, lay in the almost impossibility that any uninitiated person should discover the aperture; although to a practised touch, they would open as wide as charity or prodigality might wish"(459).

Priscilla's sexuality is hidden, not to be tampered with, and if anyone in the novel possesses the "practised touch," it is her manipulative, not her sexual, nature that reveals itself. Our first glimpse of Priscilla shows her in a high-necked gown, with icicles in her hair. She is like a "flower-shrub that had done its best to blossom in too scanty a light"(454). Zenobia, on the other hand, blossoms all too fully. She is like the exotic, open, rich flower that can "[endure] only for a day"(447). Zenobia dares to reveal her sexuality to the extent that she prompts from Coverdale a vision of her naked. "Behold! here is a woman!"(448), he says of her, and it is precisely this womanhood that causes her exile from a society that feels uncomfortable about her and that causes, finally, her vulnerability. In nineteenth-century society, suggests Hawthorne, the pale, inhibited Priscillas survive and, in their survival, contribute to the exile of their sexual sisters. Zenobia knows this at once, and recognizes that Priscilla will, "precisely at the stroke of midnight, . . . melt away at [her] feet in a pool of ice-cold water and give [her her] death with a pair of wet slippers!"(457).

Zenobia, again in contrast to Priscilla, is disturbing because of her intellectual qualities as much as her sexual ones. As with Hester, Hawthorne combines in Zenobia increasing intellectualism with the knowledge gleaned from a love affair, and as with

Hester, this intellectualism causes her to go astray. Unlike Hester's, Zenobia's creative intelligence does not express itself in needlework, but both heroines use their creativity as a gesture of defiance against their societies. In her writing and her lecturing, Zenobia challenges the nineteenth-century notion of woman's place. Although Hawthorne objects to a society that allows no greater outlet for women than the role of female reformer, he offers Zenobia no alternative role.<sup>5</sup> She becomes forced to couple these less than satisfying activities with an increasing awareness that despite her championing of women's rights, her own hopes are threatened by Priscilla who serves, ironically, as an example of why enlightenment is needed. Love leads her into misjudgment of Hollingsworth as a man worthy of her and into the knowledge of her threatened chances with him. In turn, her awareness of Priscilla as a threat leads to a misjudgment of how to strengthen her position. Hester's love and her intelligence convince her that she must escape with Dimmesdale; Zenobia's love and intelligence convince her that Priscilla may be exploited. Society, Hawthorne implies, represses both the sexual and the intellectual women, thus causing them to go astray and giving them an excuse for their error.

It is exactly this repression and its disastrous results that Zenobia sees as the moral of her story.



The moral, she says, is

that, in the battlefield of life, the downright stroke, that would fall only on a man's steel head-piece, is sure to light on a woman's heart, over which she wears no breast-plate, and whose wisdom it is, therefore to keep out of the conflict. Or, this: That the whole universe, her own sex and [the male sex,] and Providence, or Destiny, to boot, make common cause against the woman who swerves one hair's-breadth, out of the beaten track. Yes; and add (for I may as well own it, now) that, with that one hair's-breadth, she goes all astray and never sees the world in its true aspect afterwards(571).

Society forces a woman into her role as light or dark lady, and if she chooses the latter, by refusing to acquiesce to its dictates on a woman's place, it makes her position impossible. The woman who swerves out of her accepted role necessarily goes astray and, in Zenobia's view, never again can hope to find meaning in the world. She has blackened herself in the eyes of others and, what is worse, in her own eyes because the result of her rebellion has been to suppress, not enhance, her womanhood. If she has found an outlet for her passion, the outlet has proved fleeting and has eliminated all other avenues by which to express

a woman's capacity for love and service. Coverdale would wish to soften the part of Zenobia's moral which senses that the blackened woman can never find her way back to any kind of self-esteem, and Hawthorne would seem to agree, for Hester Prynne does return to a proper knowledge of the world. For Zenobia, however, there is no hope in life. Hollingsworth in his guilt has cast her off before she has had a chance to serve him. In doing so, he has compounded his guilt against Priscilla by denying his own responsibility in her exploitation. "He did well to cast me off," says Zenobia. "And yet had ~~he~~ ~~trusted~~ ~~me~~, and borne with me a little longer, I would have saved him all this trouble"(572). Now her only chance for service will come in death.

Zenobia's plight is complicated by the fact that she wants, along with emancipation, to be accepted as a woman whom a man might love and marry. Hawthorne makes this clear in the scene at Eliot's Pulpit. She scorns a woman's place only because she scorns the men who make that place unworthy. Zenobia does not contradict Hollingsworth's notion that "the heart of true womanhood knows where its own sphere is, and never seeks to stray beyond it"(511). Instead she has "deep cause to think [him] right" and knows that if "man be but manly and godlike, [then] woman is only too ready to become to him what [Hollingsworth] say [s]!"(512).

However badly Zenobia may make gruel, she is not asking to be released from the making of it. What she wants in her ideal society is for a ~~woman's~~ world to be complementary to, not identical with, a man's. She wants to have more than the "one single event, which she must contrive to make the substance of her whole life"(473). However much she wants this event of marriage, not childbearing as Coverdale misconstrues her meaning to be, she knows that it is all too often not enough to fill one's life. Finding that she is failing in her aims with Hollingsworth and that she cannot have with him a love strong enough to "make the substance of her whole life," Zenobia becomes increasingly bitter. From championing women's rights, she comes to the view that "women have no rights . . . or, at all events, only little girls and grandmothers would have the force to exercise them"(522). Zenobia falls into error when she allows her increasing knowledge and bitterness to convince her that she can transcend the world's laws and violate the rights of the girl Priscilla. Only at the last does she learn that though nineteenth-century society offers her nothing, she cannot violate that society's laws and live.

However much Hawthorne understands the isolation that drives Zenobia to join Hollingsworth in his philanthropical scheme and to exploit Priscilla, he cannot completely exonerate her just as he cannot completely exonerate Hester. The trial scene gives

her the just penalty for her guilt. Notably it is the worst of her that is on trial here: she wears her artificial jeweled flower that shows her as hard and cruel rather than the hothouse flower that corresponds to Hester's crime of passion. But as in The Scarlet Letter, even as Hawthorne judges his heroine guilty, he sees her as less to blame than her male partner, who refuses to admit openly his own guilt.<sup>6</sup> As Zenobia presses for Hollingsworth's confession of his part in the exploitation of Priscilla, she asks him if he believes she had money from Old Moodie. When he answers yes, Hollingsworth implies that he knows also what has become of the money: because Zenobia has wronged Priscilla, Old Moodie has reclaimed his inheritance which now has gone--or at least will go at his death--to Priscilla. Thus Hollingsworth declares his love for Priscilla, and Zenobia denounces the philanthropist whose heart has been ruined in pursuit of his goal. Zenobia's guilt, like Hester's, pales beside her partner's. She has been sinful, but sinful as an "hereditary bonds slave must" be. She has been "false . . . but still a woman"(567), acting for love.

The cycle of error in The Blithedale Romance is not yet finished, for Hawthorne believes that one of the greatest effects of sin is that it isolates the sinner. Here, as in The Scarlet Letter, the isolation is so complete that it must lead to death

before it can lead to possible salvation. In The Scarlet Letter isolation leads to the plan of escape, thus to Dimmesdale's death, thus to Hester's salvation through repentance of the adultery. In The Blithedale Romance it is Zenobia who must die before Hollingsworth recognizes his guilt, and his recognition, like Dimmesdale's, seems ambiguous. He knows he is guilty of murder, but does he know he was guilty long before the murder, or before even the plot against Priscilla? His initial violation of Zenobia is to force her out of what little sense of community she has left into his isolated cause. At the opening of The Blithedale Romance, Zenobia is the woman who, in her mysterious relationship to Westervelt, has strayed "one hair's breadth out of the beaten track," but she has not yet gone "all astray." Despite her isolation, she still feels some sense of community. This is stressed by the warmth with which she greets those who come to Blithedale and with her willingness to accept even the encroaching Priscilla. It is a sense of community that goes against the Blithedale experiment itself which, says Coverdale, "as regarded society at large . . . . stood in a position of new hostility, rather than new brotherhood"(450). Zenobia tries to isolate herself in crime with another, but that this is impossible Hawthorne shows by having her rejected. Having no Pearl to unite her to the world, Zenobia sees suicide as her only solution. Suicide may be sinful, as is

Hester's plan of escape. Zenobia may even die unrepentant. However, only this fall allows Hollingsworth to become a man--~~an~~man broken by despair perhaps, but a man and not a heartless philanthropist.

A word remains to be said about the appropriateness of Zenobia's suicide.<sup>7</sup> Its general causes are made clear by Coverdale in a conversation with Westervelt: "Everything had failed her; prosperity in the world's sense, for her opulence was gone,--the heart's prosperity, in love. And there was a secret burden on her. . . . Young as she was, she had tried life fully, had no more to hope, and something, perhaps, to fear"(580). The despair which more immediately precipitates the suicide is vivid: Hollingsworth, his arm around Priscilla, is "no sooner departed,--utterly departed,--than [Zenobia] begins slowly to sink down. It was as if a great, invisible, irresistible weight were pressing her to the earth. Settling upon her knees, she leaned her forehead against the rock, and sobbed convulsively; dry sobs they seemed to be, such as have nothing to do with tears"(569). Though Zenobia is unaware of Coverdale's watching, it is in her nature to play the tragic scene. But that she is playing a role does not make her any the less sincere. It is in her nature to play Ophelia drowning. Coverdale thinks Zenobia chooses drowning because she believes it the most beautiful way to die. But she could as easily

have chosen it as the most ugly way and, therefore, as most befitting a "murder." Regardless of what the death posture may be, it is in the act of dying that Zenobia can play her last and isolated performance. Redeemed or not, she has helped to redeem her audience.

In both The Scarlet Letter and The Blithedale Romance, Hawthorne focuses on the error a woman falls into because she can find no legitimate outlet for her feelings or talents. Chained to a husband she does not love and whose existence she is not even sure of, Hester Prynne attempts to combat her isolation by acting upon a love which, because adulterous, must be condemned. Having found neither sustaining love in her past nor an outlet in the community for her intellect, Zenobia too defies that community's laws. Both choose wrongly and their means of combating isolation result only in greater isolation. Hester, however, can return to the community despite her failure to be fulfilled within it because she has had Pearl to love and because she sees for herself a role as counsellor. If this role is not personally fulfilling, it is at least purposeful, and as counsellor she can both accept her guilt and atone for it. Zenobia, on the other hand, has nothing left to tie her to the community, so she dies rather than accepts a further isolation that can do nothing for her or for anyone else. What Hawthorne has done to her, and to a lesser degree to

Hester, is plunge her into a dilemma of isolation, have her act wrongly, and as a result plunge her back into isolation. In doing so, he probes the frustrations of the mature woman in America while providing her with no alternative to this position.

In The Marble Faun, Hawthorne continues to probe the dilemmas a sexual woman faces living in a world that feels uneasy about her passionate nature. Here, even more than in The Blithedale Romance, he uses the strategy of contrasting his "dark" heroine with another woman whose sexuality poses no threat. Being born female, one has, it seems, only two choices: to be that which is represented by Kenyon's Cleopatra bust--"fierce, voluptuous, passionate, tender, wicked, terrible, and full of poisonous and rapturous enchantment"(662)-<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub> or that represented by his sculpted hand--so pure that it cannot receive a touch or reach out to give aid. Both avenues are extreme, and both, as Hawthorne presents the matter, will plunge a woman into sin. One who chooses, or is fated to, the dark extreme must necessarily be faced with isolation and despair, the breeding ground of sin. But Hilda's choice, which involves the isolation of a false perfection, is no less sinful. Believing in her own purity and God's protection, Hilda thinks she need only trust to good; she forgets that she must



also guard against evil which is not always discernible as a separate element from good. She dares to come to Rome only because she believes she can live high above the world in her cloistered dove-cote. Despite her efforts to exist on this non-earthly plane, Hilda does see evil, and when this occurs Hawthorne's harshness is strongest, for Hilda is more concerned with her own exposure to evil than with the evil itself. In addition, she would play the role of judge, a role which in Hawthorne belongs only to God. Do not play God, warns Hawthorne; on earth be merciful. Hilda, to some extent, learns this lesson. She does in time forgive Miriam and Donatello, and she does emerge from her isolation to marry Kenyon. She does not, however, admit her own involvement with the crime before the fact. Had Hilda possessed a fully mature woman's sympathy, Miriam could have confided in her as she could not confide in the unsympathetic Kenyon. Further, Hilda's happiness with Kenyon is obtained at the expense of Miriam and Donatello who, Hawthorne implies, confess partly in order to attain Hilda's release from the Convent of the Sacré Coeur. As much as Hawthorne tries to justify Hilda throughout the course of The Marble Faun, he still sees her as limited. She grows to be a positive heroine, to be sure, but her acceptance of humanity brings her a happiness that never asks a sacrifice. Hilda remains always the receiver in The Marble Faun; it is Miriam whom Hawthorne portrays as the more positive giver.<sup>8</sup>

As in The Scarlet Letter and The Blithedale Romance, Hawthorne in The Marble Faun combines a consideration of the question of sin with a consideration of the question of isolation. Since he shows a woman to be more isolated by society than a man, it is fitting that the question of sin in the three romances is primarily the question of a woman's sin. Miriam's guilt is, in fact, a result of her initial isolation. Her model does not negate her isolation but rather intensifies it by his unwanted presence, now and in her obscure past. In each of the romances, as in tales like "Young Goodman Brown," "The Minister's Black Veil," "Wakefield," "Rappaccini's Daughter," and "The Bosom Serpent," isolation breeds sin. Hester, isolated from Dimmesdale, develops her plan of escape; Zenobia, isolated from Hollingsworth, agrees to exploit Priscilla. Although we do not know what specifically thrust Miriam into her initial isolation, we know that because of this isolation she can have only a half intimacy with even her closest friends. Real community is not possible for her. Like those engulfed in the darkness of the catacombs, Miriam's "friends [must] vanish . . . one by one"(605). Had she gone against female modesty and eased her despair by revealing the meaning of her model, the murder might have been averted, but she would still be isolated. Had she told Kenyon her secret, he would not, at that time, have given her sympathy. Had she told

Donatello, she would not have grown and would not be the kind of man to bring her out of solitude. Had she told Hilda, Hilda would still have been forced to see evil and to deny the woman who forced her to this vision. We must give Miriam the credit that, even though she cannot avoid isolation, she can try to avoid the disaster this isolation is leading towards by deciding to tell Donatello all. But Donatello has not the patience to wait, and Miriam's isolation leads to the murder. Given the chance to unburden herself of the tormentor before she is given the chance to unburden herself of the secret, she chooses the former by her glance at Donatello.

Just as Hester's sin of adultery and Zenobia's sin of exploitation are not immediately fortunate, neither is this sin of murder. Sin leads to further sin for it leads to further isolation. Miriam wants to isolate herself with Donatello in some sphere that lies beyond the world's laws, and this is an error as great as Hilda's attempt at playing angel above the earth. Miriam thinks the world cannot now touch Donatello and her, but despite their brief ecstasy after they break the laws against murder, law does--and, indeed, should lest chaos ensue--come back to them. Man, suggests Hawthorne, cannot escape law anymore than he can escape evil.

The resultant isolation after the murder is intensified when Donatello renounces Miriam.

When Miriam tries to return to him he judges entirely wrong by refusing to hear her voice which is singing a German song in his retreat. Indeed, he does need to hear her voice and to return to the world. Immediately after the murder, Miriam was wrong to think she could isolate Donatello and herself away from the world; she is not now wrong to bring Donatello back to herself that they may work together for the good of others. But even as Miriam and Donatello are reunited they do not perform a concrete act of good until Donatello confesses. Only after this confession and Donatello's imprisonment, which may be seen as analogous to the deaths in The Scarlet Letter and The Blithedale Romance, does Miriam realize that repentance is necessary.<sup>9</sup> She now kneels under the "great central eye"(854) of God. Having thus repented, she blesses Hilda and Kenyon, not because Hilda is now guiltless, but because together Hilda and Kenyon represent the idea of community which, however imperfect, is preferable to selfish isolation. Miriam herself is still isolated, but the isolation is now of the different sort that Hester learns. It is endured for the sake of the larger community represented by Hilda and Kenyon. Hawthorne had said of Miriam that "very often . . . there is an insatiable instinct that demands friendship, love, and intimate communion, but is forced to pine in empty forms"(655). Although

Miriam may still have such an instinct, her fall has been fortunate in that she no longer has the emptiness. Her pining is not now in "empty forms" but is for the value of friendship. Her solitude, like Beatrice Cenci's, is not just for her own sake but for "both the world's sake and her own"(627).

Miriam's fall, along with its results, is worth considering in some detail because it represents the culmination of the theme of the fall in Hawthorne and is his analogue for the idea of renunciation or sacrifice. After the fall, Miriam renounces her chance for happiness with Donatello and thus contributes to Hilda's and Kenyon's happiness. More importantly, it contributes to the rise of Donatello himself. He is much like Hilda in his innocence, though his is of an earthly more than a heavenly type. Melvin Askew, in his article "Hawthorne, the Fall, and the Psychology of Maturity," sees why such innocence is unacceptable. The fall, he says, concerns the effect on earth, not in heaven. It thus becomes a metaphor for the human condition that must involve experience and knowledge if it is to involve maturity. Innocence is thus not guiltlessness but ignorance.<sup>10</sup> Hawthorne opens The Marble Faun with exactly this concept when he gives us an image of a child "clasping a dove to her bosom, but assaulted by a snake"(593). The choice for the child is between "Innocence or Evil"(593), not between good or evil. Good cannot be a choice

because good does not exist for man. Given only a choice between two extremes, it is better to choose Kenyon's moral that sin can educate than to choose Hilda's refusal to view sin. Hawthorne indicates this by saying at the outset that the Faun/Donatello has the possibility of being "educated through the medium of his emotions, so that the coarser animal portion of his nature might eventually be thrown into the background, though never wholly expelled"(595). Significantly, this animal nature, which one must consider analogous to sexuality, should not be annihilated. It merely should not play the most important part in life. Donatello does rise when he makes in knowledge the correct--though inevitably evil--choice between two extremes. His first fall, the murder, had been a sin of passion, but because it was based on shallow love it cannot truly educate him. As in The Scarlet Letter and The Blithedale Romance, this first sin represents the unavoidable sin of humanity which can result only in further sin. The result for Donatello is his selfish isolation and his loss of contact with nature signified in the story of the fountain nymph. Being wiser by this experience, Donatello does not lose touch with the owl of the story, but his wisdom is improperly used to justify his isolation. Such improper use of the knowledge resultant from sin must be overcome, and in this case it is overcome by another fall. Donatello must allow his emotions to

educate him further by following them and thus allowing himself a reunion with Miriam. But as with Hester's plan of escape and Zenobia's suicide, this reunion is in one sense sinful. We must assume that it involves illicit sexuality,<sup>11</sup> and it is this sexual element as well as the murder itself that Kenyon refers to when he says that Miriam's and Donatello's "bond is twined with such black threads that you must never look upon it as identical with the ties that unite other living souls"(776). But this reunion, despite its imperfection, is both necessary and fortunate. Only through it can Miriam and Donatello renew their contact with nature in the form of human nature and the community.

Miriam's fall is also necessary to bring Hilda out of her isolated pride into humanity. It teaches her that she cannot passively exist in her own protected sphere, but rather must actively war against evil. She may be right to believe in God's protection, but she must not negate her own responsibility by relying solely on God. Hilda needs to be exposed to an obvious evil, though not to succumb to it, in order to be saved from the evil of her coldness. Miriam, then, not Hilda, is the real savior in The Marble Faun. Though not a divine savior like Christ, like Christ she suffers on earth for the sake of humanity. She suffers primarily by giving up Donatello for Kenyon's

and Hilda's sakes, both of whom have failed her by their lack of sympathy. But she suffers also for Donatello. Even as she is his Eve, she is his Christ on earth. Donatello encroaches on Miriam almost as much as does the model. Repeatedly she warns him to beware of her, and repeatedly she begs him to commit no violence against the model. When Donatello murders, she willingly accepts her own responsibility in the crime rather than blames him for placing her in a situation where weakness could overpower her. Willingly Miriam renounces a life with Donatello and accepts the suffering of renewed isolation when Donatello has grown enough to confess his crime. Even as Miriam suffers for those who have wronged her, she can see passed her suffering to accept Hilda's vision of a moral ideal. She accepts this because she knows one must seek and advocate the ideal in spite of personal despair. She looks for the "dove-cote in the wargod's mansion"(677) rather than trying to deny their entanglement. When Miriam kneels finally to her God rather than to her model, she does so not only in repentance but in faith despite the evidence of the world.

In Hester, Zenobia, and Miriam, Hawthorne has created three women who are forced into isolation by a society that is embarrassed by them, who erroneously seek an escape from isolation by illicit sexual involvements, and who, finally, realize their sin and renounce what happiness they might have had for the



sake of law and for the community which has wronged them. However, despite such a duplication of narrative detail, each heroine lives in the memory as unique. As we wrestle with the complexities of Hawthorne's ideas, we must push aside the emotional qualities of his heroines, but we must not and cannot forget them. Hester transforms herself before our very eyes. She literally lets her hair down and becomes a woman who has suffered rather than a cold monument who has acquiesced to suffering. Out of her renewed agitation, she finds her peace and is transformed into a person who possesses humanity and humility. Zenobia's agitation in The Blithedale Romance is at once more sustained and less controlled. Even her powerful intellect, modeled after Margaret Fuller's, manifests itself in a physical way. Where Hester's passion turns inward so that we see her brooding on a woman's place in society, Zenobia's turns outward so that we see her denouncing a woman's place and so that we can never visualize her engaging in any kind of contemplation. The quietest her body appears before us in life is in the scene where she heaves tearless sobs. Even her death posture suggests struggle rather than repose and fittingly crowns all that we know of her life.

Where in Hester we see a woman who has transcended suffering, and in Zenobia a woman whom suffering destroys, in Miriam we see a woman whose entire life seems a tragedy. She is a woman with a past that is so scandalous

it must involve more than an illicit affair or a love disappointment. Like Zenobia, she is the continually agitated woman, yet like Hester, she is transformed finally into something quieter. Still, Miriam does not find Hester's peace. Although she finds she can perform some worthy act for another, she seems doomed to be forever homeless and out of place in the world. She is an appropriate end to Hawthorne's saga of the lost woman because she creates the greatest ~~sin~~ and performs, quite intentionally, the greatest sacrifice. Where Hester is the most tender of Hawthorne's women and Zenobia the most passionate, Miriam is the strongest.

But even as we acknowledge the differences between Hester, Zenobia, and Miriam, it is well to remind ourselves again of the root cause of suffering that ~~is~~ common to their lives. All are passionate women placed into a life situation that exiles them because of their passion. All are interesting to Hawthorne because of their predicament and because they can face their predicament only by coming to terms with the theme of isolation and society which is intrinsic to all his fiction. Even as Hester, Zenobia, and Miriam suffer because ~~they have no~~ outlet for their passion, it is precisely their passionate nature and the frustrations which arise from it that make them dramatically interesting to Hawthorne. In them, he offers us his three most

sharply defined and memorable women. Their fairer sisters, Priscilla and Hilda, are, by contrast, of little interest. It is not for them that Hawthorne wept. Only one of his male portraits seems to be of comparable interest--Miles Coverdale, the timid, aloof observer-narrator of The Blithedale Romance. It is the female who most moves him and whose position and frustrations as a female provides him with his deepest material. And given the two major types of females we find in his writing, it seems clear that Hawthorne preferred brunettes.

## CHAPTER III

PORTRAITS OF A LOST LADY:  
JAMES'S THE WINGS OF THE DOVE AND THE GOLDEN BOWL

In 1878, Henry James was asked to write a biography of Hawthorne for the English Men of Letters series. In it, he continually underlines his praise with a stress on Hawthorne's provincialism, charm, and simplicity, on his lightness, even in The Blithedale Romance, despite his duskiness.<sup>1</sup> Two points emerge throughout the biography, however, that reveal James's affinity to his American predecessor. The first of these, Hawthorne's sense of sin, James saw as intellectual rather than moral or theological. He believed it enabled Hawthorne to write about human depravity in, for instance, "Young Goodman Brown" rather than rendering him impotent because of the melancholy that conviction about sin would produce. James's second point stresses Hawthorne's preference for solitude over sociability. Hawthorne, says James, wrote best when he was emotionally at peace, when he confronted only himself or his intimates and could ignore the larger societies of a Brook Farm or a Custom House. But Hawthorne could still write about society at large. Even when he remained aloof, he knew the "deeper psychology" of men because he was steeped in the Puritan habit of probing the conscience.

In 1878 James was pledging celibacy as a way of maintaining the peace he needed as a writer, and his emphasis on Hawthorne's success in relative solitude is part of this pledge. Later, I believe, he saw that he could not so easily escape torment, and only then could he commit himself to portraying heroines similar to Hawthorne's Hester, Zenobia, and Miriam, who all dare to love and who all learn that love, private as it is, still must face the world lest it plunge the lovers into a sinful isolation based on pride. Where is the James heroine who loves and is loved in return? Significantly early, there is Nora of Watch and Ward, but her love is more a matter of duty. There is Fleda Vetch of The Spoils of Poynton, but the sincerity of Owen Gereth's love is questionable and Fleda's love is hardly passionate. And it is 1897 before James ventures this far into a love affair. In most of his major works, reciprocated and passionate love is not involved. In fact, James does not fully deal with this kind of love until his last three novels. And where is the James heroine who ignores society, even if, as in The Bostonians, society is represented by a rather narrow community of reformers? Daisy Miller ignores only a segment of society, and its disapproval, represented in Winterbourne, finally kills her. Catherine Sloper would ignore the society of Washington Square if Morris Townsend would love her--but he will not. James's heroines, unlike Hawthorne's, do not try to ignore society. But often

they manipulate it, and this too constitutes a search for isolation.<sup>2</sup> While they engage in social intercourse, they prefer to use society rather than to commit themselves to it.

By the time James writes The Wings of the Dove and The Golden Bowl, he has, I think, found a greater affinity to Hawthorne. Constance Woolson had written to James in 1883, asking him to give us a woman who is "distinctly loveable; perhaps, let some one love her very much; but at any rate, let her love very much, and let us see that she does; let us care for her, and even greatly. If you will only care for her yourself, as you describe her, the thing is done."<sup>3</sup> In 1902 and 1904, James does just that, and The Wings of the Dove and The Golden Bowl are, therefore, his most appropriate works in which to study the lost heroine. Although how "loveable" Kate Croy and Charlotte Stant are may be questionable, they certainly love as greatly as do their light counterparts, Milly Theale and Maggie Verver. And as much as Milly and Maggie, they act because of love. At the end of his career James has drawn closer to Hawthorne and written two novels that stress mutual, if not lasting, love,<sup>4</sup> and stress the value of commitment over the imperfection and impossibility of isolation.

James's portraits of the lost woman do not, however, constitute a shift in his concerns as much as they bring more into focus concerns that he has all along been dealing with. For instance, from the

beginning to the end of his career, James, unlike Hawthorne in any emphatic sense, sees that love always involves the issue of power. Leon Edel suggests this in his discussion of the "Vampire Theme" which he traces in origin to James's mother's subtle domination over his father, his father's dependence on the mother.<sup>5</sup> A typical example of the Vampire Theme is The Sacred Fount. In this short novel the narrator forms an explicit theory that in a close relationship one partner will gain strength at the other's expense. But the issue of power has more overtones in The Wings of the Dove and The Golden Bowl where James cannot view love without viewing what are to him symbols of power: money and sex.<sup>6</sup> Where Hawthorne sees love as essential in marriage, James sees money as essential. To Hawthorne's insight that a woman like Hester Prynne too often marries without love because society dictates she must marry, James adds the need of a woman to push for a marriage which will make her financially comfortable. The power of money usurps the power of love. And to Hawthorne's view of sex as an expression of unity even when the partners are forced to separate, James adds the dimension of sex itself as disuniting. In both The Wings of the Dove and The Golden Bowl it will be seen that money and sex undermine love. The dangers of isolation without love are no worse than the dangers of love itself.

James draws closer to Hawthorne's vision of women in The Wings of the Dove and The Golden Bowl, but because he has been building toward such a vision, many

of his other heroines recall Hawthorne's. Yet, in fundamental ways, they do not carry on Hawthorne's conception of the lost woman and do not forecast the twentieth-century outgrowth of this type. The difference lies in the use of innocence and sexuality. The lost woman exhibits innocence in the sense of ignorance rather than in the sense of guiltlessness. Hawthorne's Miriam and Hilda, for example, may both be guilty of different errors, but only Hilda tries to profess a cloistered innocence in the face of an evil world. Although the lost woman may, like Miriam, fail to see the full nature of evil, she never fails to acknowledge evil at all. Further, the lost woman always suggests overt sexuality. On the bases of innocence and sexuality a number of James's heroines, as close as they come to being lost ladies, are not finally clear examples of the type. Madame de Mauve, especially in the New York edition of the novel which bears her name, works evil in the guise of innocence and does so by remaining non-sexual; Claire de Cintré chooses, in The American, to enter a convent in order to avoid knowledge of her mother's evil and thus denies her own sexuality; the spinster Caroline Spencer of "Four Meetings" must go to Europe before losing her innocence; Daisy Miller goes to the Colosseum, one feels, not because she is innocent but because she defies society's definition of innocence, and yet she never has a chance to be sexual; Catherine Sloper's innocence in Washington Square allows her to be deceived by a fortune hunter and



her subsequent loss of innocence forces her to choose sexless spinsterhood over marriage without love; Pandora Day in the story "Pandora" prostitutes herself for social forms without heed to love; in The Bostonians, Verena Tarrent can be manipulated by Olive Chancellor and carried off by Basil Ransome precisely because she is innocent; Olive herself, if she does not pervert her sexual nature into outright lesbianism, nevertheless, drowns it in the feminist cause; Georgina Gressie of "Georgina's Reasons" marries for sexual license not love; Kate Theory of the same story loves Georgina's husband, but such love exacts from her only passive waiting; in The Spoils of Poynton, Fleda Vetch must sacrifice her sexuality to her concept of duty.

More than any of these Jamesian heroines, Isabel Archer comes, in The Portrait of a Lady, close to being a lost woman. A detailed analysis of her decision to return to Osmond lies out of the scope of this study; however, her motives I take to be largely sacrificial. Like the lost woman, Isabel chooses to face rather than to run from the errors of her life. She commits herself to a life of isolation for the sake of a larger community, represented in The Portrait of a Lady by the sacredness of a marriage vow and by the person of Pansy Osmond. But though one might argue that she returns to Osmond because of the love she once had for him, as later Fitzgerald's Gloria Gilbert will remain loyal to Anthony Patch for the sake of their faded love, hers is hardly

one of the great love affairs of American literature. In her most important choices she seems little motivated by love and largely motivated by principle. Further, her experience does not involve sexuality in the same sense that the lost woman's experience does. Isabel is sexual, but as James would put it, no key has unlocked her sexuality. Where the lost woman's morality lies in a dimension beyond her sexuality, Isabel's morality has little to do with the question of sexuality, and even if it did involve the sexual, her choice of Osmond would preclude any physical fulfillment.

Before proceeding to a discussion of The Wings of the Dove and The Golden Bowl, a word remains to be said about Christina Light as she appears in both Roderick Hudson and The Princess Cassimassima and about The Ambassadors' Madame de Vionnet. Christina Light, more than Isabel Archer, at first seems to be, but finally is not, a lost lady. She is sexual, to be sure, but whether her sexuality is ever acted upon we do not know. Even in The Princess Cassamassima, when she appears to be sexually involved with Paul Muniment, she loves only his connection with the anarchist cause. Like Hawthorne's women, Christina would renounce for the sake of an ideal: in Roderick Hudson, she wishes to give up her chance for a moneyed marriage rather than to prostitute herself by marrying without love; in The Princess Cassimassima, she wishes to die in place of Hyacinth Robinson for the sake of the social revolution. In neither case, however, is

she allowed to renounce and her attempts to forget herself for the sake of an ideal are thwarted. She is always thrown back upon herself. Thus her isolation cannot be endured because it is sustained neither in the name of love nor for the sake of the larger community.

On the other hand, in Madame de Vionnet James does exhibit the same kind of conception of the female as he exhibits in Kate Croy and Charlotte Stant, and it is significant that The Ambassadors is a product of his late period. Madame de Vionnet is experienced and sexual; she loves greatly even if she is not greatly loved; she acts toward Chad Newsome as she must, but in so acting she offers him his temporary salvation. If Chad finally forsakes her, she will face her isolation squarely and bravely, knowing she has made him a better person than he might otherwise have been. But The Ambassadors is Lambert Strether's story and Madame de Vionnet is, relative to him, a minor consideration. For this reason I have neglected her in favor of Kate Croy and Charlotte Stant.

In The Wings of the Dove and The Golden Bowl, James, like Hawthorne before him, portrays two heroines who on the surface represent opposing extremes. To Hawthorne's suggestion of the intermingling of good and evil that lies beneath these extremes, James adds the emphasis of a consciously dominant theme. Even in the early story "Osborne's Revenge"(1868), James had recognized that beneath a surface innocence lies the potential for

evil. The heroine of that story, an innocent American, may actually have caused the suicide of a jilted lover. Though the story ends with a refutation of her guilt, the text contains much that would indicate just the opposite. The hero of the story, seeking to gain revenge for his friend's suicide, is "puzzled by the idea that a woman could unite so much loveliness with so much treachery, so much light with so much darkness. He [is] as certain of the bright surface of her nature as of its cold and dark reverse, and he [is] utterly unable to discover a link of connection between the two"(v2,45). The theme becomes even stronger in the late James when he continually underlines it with his ambiguous and indirect style. The heart of the problem in The Wings of the Dove and The Golden Bowl lies in the question of James's preference for the light or the dark heroine--or for both or for neither. Though some critics have recognized the weaknesses of the light heroines, few have ventured the view that James himself may have intended the dark women to be the more admirable heroines of both novels and that the light-dark dichotomy in The Golden Bowl actually represents two types of evil.<sup>7</sup> Yet such an intent seems likely. Upon re-reading The Wings of the Dove, one's view of Milly Theale becomes increasingly negative; re-reading The Golden Bowl, one's conscious attempt to "side" with Maggie is completely undermined by her actions in the second book.

The problem of James's stance is most acute in The Wings of the Dove because his Notebooks and his Prefaces

both tell us that his initial conception of the novel revolved around the idea of a dovelike Milly Theale-- or Minny Temple if you wish.<sup>8</sup> But having begun the novel, James discovered more problems than even he had anticipated. Primarily, he found that he must build things up more "for [his] vessel of sensibility than by her,"<sup>9</sup> with the result that the center of focus shifts from Milly to Kate. James himself recognized that "one's plan, alas, is one thing and one's result another."<sup>10</sup> Criticism errs when it assumes that James, here, implies that he achieved the same result in The Wings of the Dove that he originally intended but achieved it by different means. It is as easy, and I think more correct, to assume that the result as well as the means differed from the original conception, though some of the original conception was indeed salvaged. Milly remains a major heroine in James's finished novel because Kate has made her important in much the same way that Hawthorne's Miriam ~~makes~~ Hilda important. In both cases, the light heroine matures and becomes worthy of our consideration only after she has been influenced by the dark. If Marius Bewley is correct in saying that James drew on Hilda for his portrait of Milly, both being sinless but unable to bear the "shock of another's evil,"<sup>11</sup> could he not also have drawn on Hilda for her negative qualities? Only when Milly is seen as less than saintly can a case be made for Kate as a heroine equal to and in some ways superior to her. Only then can Kate's motives and the

results of her actions be examined to show how her fate and her failure in knowledge undermine what she deems good intentions and thrust her into isolation. When these points are viewed carefully, it will become apparent that through Kate James reflects the overriding concerns we have seen reflected in Hawthorne's lost women. He idealizes Kate, especially in a literary sense, as much as he idealizes Milly. It is Kate, not Milly, who makes the supreme renunciation, and it is she who suffers and rises in the face of inevitable isolation.

In order to see that Milly grows by the end of The Wings of the Dove because of Kate's influence on her, we must assume that she is at first not entirely admirable. James in his Preface claims to deal with Milly via "some merciful indirection . . . as an unspotted princess is ever dealt with."<sup>12</sup> But the Preface is misleading. He neglects to tell us that he arrived at his method of distance only after he found that his direct treatment of her rendered her shallow and, in Kate's words, "too impossibly without sin"(I,226). For in the first five books of The Wings of the Dove James does treat Milly directly, and within this direct view, Milly appears a mixture of self-pity and egotism. Briefly, this may be illustrated in her refusal of Lord Mark's proposal. Though she is correct in seeing that her value to the man she marries is "precisely in the ravage of her disease"(II,149), she allows this insight to dwindle into self-pity, thinking how lovely it would be to die in Venice, claiming that Lord Mark would

"feel it better for [her] really to have it over"(II,152) when he has indicated nothing of the sort and would, in fact, have access to Milly's fortune whether he were her husband or her widower. Milly is only playing the dying princess role. Later with Densher she drops the role and forgets that her value is her disease. Having succumbed to self-pity and role-playing, Milly next shifts to egotism. When she says that she is "very badly ill"(II,155), she can use the illness to claim how "immense"(II,155) she is being by choosing to live. This is, however, a false egotism, for Milly believes she can live only if she is not "too much worried"(II,156). Once again, she dwindles into self-pity.

A word must be said about the nature of Milly's illness, for this most qualifies James's attitude toward her and directly bears on Kate's reasons for exploiting her. James seems of two minds. Initially he intended the illness to be physical, recording in his Notebooks that his heroine would be condemned to death by the "voice of the physician."<sup>13</sup> At no point, however, does Sir Luke Strett acknowledge that Milly has a physical illness. James was well acquainted with physicians who negated what he deemed physical illness, having had his own "obscure hurt" thus minimized.<sup>14</sup> But he was also steeped in knowledge of what we now call psychosomatic illness: he could not fail to recognize that he and William both had back problems which flared up when they met; he saw Alice's early invalidism as psychosomatic despite her

subsequent death by cancer. Finally, James was well-acquainted with the necessity of the will to live. His father may have died because he could not live without his wife; William, who suffered from angina pectoris, may have been cautioned by a doctor that he must be careful, that he must have the will to live;<sup>15</sup> Constance Woolson gave up her will to live and had, in fact, written a story, "Dorothy," about the slow death of a woman who does not want to live. In his own fiction, James often depicts the necessity of the will to live. Daisy Miller dies because she wants to; the mother in "Europe" refuses to die when she should. In the story "Longstaff's Marriage," Raymond Longstaff is dying of love for Diana Belfield until she wounds his pride by refusing a deathbed proposal. But having refused Longstaff, Diana falls in love with him, begins in accordance with the Vampire Theme to fail physically, and asks, as Longstaff had asked, for a deathbed marriage. He accepts, and Diana dies as the only honorable way to fulfill her marriage bargain. By refusing to name Milly's illness, James negates his initial intention of having the illness physical. It seems to me his final implication that Milly's illness, if not altogether psychosomatic, is at least nervous to the degree that the will to live could entirely eliminate the likelihood of her early death. Sir Luke Strett suggests exactly this. He tells Susan Stringham that Milly does not have what she thinks but that she may have something else. He advises Milly



only to choose to live, assuming that she can make such a choice. James cannot have missed the importance of the suggestion. It colors the novel so much that he would never have suggested a purely nervous disorder had he intended Milly to be condemned to a youthful death.

When James equivocates about the nature of Milly's illness, he weakens her relationship to Minny Temple whom he so obviously admired. He prized his cousin's desire to live and her refusal to cultivate the sickly pose. He had, after her death, been sent some letters which show Minny as courageous and fighting against her fate. By writing The Wings of the Dove he sought to "lay the ghost by wrapping it . . . in the beauty and dignity of art."<sup>16</sup> But he never says he achieves this, and in contrast to Minny, whose letters gave him first hand material on how to show a woman dying courageously, Milly's illness is made to seem unnecessary. Milly does not display the kind of courage Minny displayed, for she does not wish to live when to live is not easy. Because she cannot stand unhappiness and, like the hero of the story "A Most Extraordinary Case," finds it "better to die easy than to die hard" (VI, 320-330), she acts on the self-pity reflected in the scene of Lord Mark's proposal. She chooses to give herself death as she gives others life, a choice unnecessary if one remembers that she could offer Densher forgiveness and protection embodied in a portion of her money and still remain alive. Like Hawthorne's Zenobia she chooses not

to live with unhappiness, but unlike Zenobia she never gives such a life a chance. Like Zenobia her sensitivity kills her, but her sensitivity is hardly tasked.

What James has done, then, with Milly is salvage his original intention about her by resorting to indirection. But because he allows some question to remain as to the nature of her death, he does not elevate her at the expense of the positive character he found he was creating in Kate. It is well to remember also that James preferred Zenobia of all Hawthorne's heroines,<sup>17</sup> that in real life he admired women who were more Kate Croys than Milly Theales, and that even Minny Temple contains elements that ally her to Kate (see footnote 8). Leon Edel identifies a number of the strong Kate types in James's life. Elena Lowe, who became the mistress of the French artist Bellay, attracted him because, in James's own words, she was "beautiful, mysterious, melancholy, inscrutable." He admired Mrs. Charles Sumner, Mrs. Edward Boit, Mrs. Owen Wister, Alice Bartlett, and Lizzie Boot, all of whom were strong, hard, even cruel types. Constance Woolson, if somewhat oldmaidish, endured, until the delirium of an illness led her to suicide, the suffering and loneliness that Kate will endure and that Milly crumbles under.<sup>18</sup> Granted, this type of woman was threatening to James; however, she could not be so if his admiration for her were not great. Kate, as a similar type, constitutes, one feels, a Jamesian

ideal not because of what she does but because of the way she faces life.

Before we can arrive at an accurate vision of Kate, we must look briefly at what she does and does not do to Milly, for even at this simple level criticism often errs. To put it vulgarly, she exploits Milly for her money. But Kate Croy cannot be so simply relegated to the vulgar. Even after Milly's death, when she realizes the full extent of her involvement in that death, she tells Densher that she did . . . play fair"(II,385), and though this is certainly not enough to justify her, it at least tempers her guilt. If we look carefully at her actions throughout, we realize that this is James's judgment also. From the first Kate warns Milly to drop the "English gang"<sup>19</sup> because she is a "dove"(I,283). I take the term here to mean a dove in the sense of being easily destroyed. Later, given Milly's ability to forgive as she dies, Kate must see that the term, as she initially applied it, is inaccurate because too narrow. Although Milly is easily destroyed, she is also a dove in a larger sense. Kate worries that Milly will be destroyed because she worries about herself as a destroyer. Just as her return to Aunt Maud at the beginning of the novel is to gain time, so her initial use of Milly is to gain time. Densher is simply to be nice to Milly in order that he and Kate can meet without further kindling Aunt Maud's suspicions. But Kate's eyes are fully open to other possibilities from the first, and when Densher pursues

the idea Kate cannot turn back. Her fears that she may destroy Milly are advanced not because she has pushed but because Densher has. Contrary to many critics, I believe that James makes this clear in the interview between Kate and Densher on the evening in Venice when Milly, rather ostentatiously, entertains in her white dress. Instead of pushing Densher here, Kate actually tries to hold him back. She tries to explain how his being nice to Milly can gain them time. Time for what does not matter, for it is time itself Kate is concerned with. Densher cannot understand this nor understand that Kate, as she answers, is "taking a trouble for [him she] never dreamed [she would] take for any human creature"(II,223-224). Because he cannot understand, he names what Kate never would have named. Kate herself puts both the naming of a marriage plan and the acting against Milly on Densher: "If you want things named," she says, "you must name them," and Densher complies, saying, "Since she's to die I'm to marry her? . . . So that when her death has taken place I shall in the natural course have money?"(II,225). Thus it is Densher who chooses to exploit Milly to the point of a loveless marriage. Kate accepts his choice and because both act out of love and act freely she considers the choice "all right"(II,226). The terms of the "game," as James calls the plan of marriage,<sup>20</sup> are from this point on made solid. It will be played without coercion of Densher, and with warning to Milly who herself wants Densher's and Kate's relationship to be a "labyrinth"(I,188)

she can explore with "fun" as well as "anxiety"(I,189). It will be played in a belief that Milly will soon die anyway. Thus James can tell us that the game is played with "sincerity" and "compassionate imagination" which give Kate "a virtue, a conscience, a credibility . . . that were later to be precious to her"(II,140).

But for James to approve how this game is played is hardly to approve the game itself. Later Kate's "virtue," "conscience," and "credibility" are more severely tasked, for though the conduct of the game has been clear to her, the conditions have not. This failure in knowledge is the first step in bringing about her final isolation. What Kate does not recognize until too late is that Milly's illness is not physical in the sense that she will soon die regardless of Densher's conduct toward her. Shortly after Milly's visit to Sir Luke, Kate in fact states that Milly's knowledge of her relationship to Densher will not kill her. She says exactly the opposite of this later when Densher has furthered his advances to Milly; thus she seems to be gaining a sense that exploitation can hasten an already imminent death. Yet she never really admits to a belief that Milly's early death could be avoided. This alone can explain her reaction to Milly's having "turned her face to the wall." "That was what made her worse?"(II,321), she asks Densher. Since Kate is not surprised at Lord Mark's visit, the only alternative explanation for her surprise is her sudden awareness that exploitation alone could kill Milly.

Though Kate is not surprised at Lord Mark's visit, we must also remember that she is innocent of consciously precipitating it. Because there has been some debate about her role in the visit and because Densher's accusation of her is an important step in disintegrating their union, a justification of Kate's innocence seems here necessary. James makes Kate's sincerity clear when she hears of Lord Mark's visit: "Kate gave a quick glare. 'But he doesn't know it!'"(II,321). If the force of the exclamation point is not sufficient to convince us of James's intention, Kate's comment of "Poor Milly!"(II,321) can be added, especially when contrasted to Densher's initial reaction of concern with his own conscience over and above concern with Milly's dying. Nor has Kate any reason to lie here, for when Densher later accuses her she openly admits she would, even in knowledge, have refused Lord Mark. Having unknowingly gone to a point of no return against Milly, Kate, in short, would have dealt the death blow. From the time of Densher's announcement of Milly's condition Kate knows that she has been a murderess, so when Densher now accuses her of exactly this she feels no "resentment"(II,376). But she feels "pale dismay"(II,376), and this I take as James's indication that Kate has seen the first sure sign of Densher's renouncing her in favor of easing his conscience. For given the necessity, what would Kate have done that Densher has not actually done? Having been "decent"(II,380) to Lord Mark, she will not marry him to

save Milly,<sup>21</sup> just as Densher, having been decent to Milly, will not lie in order to marry and thus save her. Kate is willing to accept her guilt, but she cannot fail to read the signs in Densher's easy transfer of his guilt.

But more important than these facts are the motives behind and the results of Kate's actions, for these most clearly derive from James's presentation of the isolation theme. Kate's initial and most important motive is, of course, her love for Densher which is doomed by their want of funds. Isolated from her family in Aunt Maud's house, Kate, even at what James calls the "late to reconsider"(I,27) age of twenty-five, reconsiders her ideas about money. Under Aunt Maud's influence and with a full vision of how lack of funds has vulgarized her parents' and her sister's marriages, Kate determines to marry for love and with money or not to marry at all. Like the heroine of "A Landscape Painter," who reads the painter's diary and learns of his fortune before she consents to marry him, Kate stoops low in order to gain money. But unlike the heroine of that story, Kate may at least be credited with loving the man she engages herself to. When Kate and Densher hit upon the scheme to obtain Milly's money, Kate hopes to break out of isolation into love and into moneyed society, money in James being equated with escape from the vulgar, into at least the possibility of culture. But the scheme results only in further isolation when Densher crumbles

under what he considers Kate's unethical advances. Kate's words to Densher shortly before Milly's death--"She won't have loved you for nothing . . . And you won't have loved me"(II,333)--echo loudly through the final chapters of the novel and remind us that Densher, like Hawthorne's heroes, does not prove worthy of his mistress. For Densher easily gives Kate up, gives her up with even a feeling that he has lost little, that he has become a man haunted by a memory. In the closing lines of the novel, Kate gives him every chance to choose her. She asks him to swear he will not love Milly's memory: "I ~~want~~" your word of honour that you're not in love with her memory." Densher cannot swear--"Oh--her memory!"--so that Kate knows that Milly's "memory's your love. You want no other." She asks if they must be as they were, knowing they can rekindle their relationship only if they accept it as different; Densher says they must: "I'll marry you, mind you, in an hour." / "As we were?" / "As we were." / "But [Kate] turned to the door, and her headshake was now the end. "We shall never be again as we were!"(II,404-405). When Densher fails at each point, she "chooses" isolation so that he can live, in his own eyes, absolved, romantically haunted, and united with a memory.

The Jamesian concept that morality consists, in part, of loyalty to a spoken vow comes to the fore in Densher's ultimatum that Kate give up the money he knows their marriage has always depended on. The concept is not



a simple one, and it is crucial to an understanding of the isolation theme. To begin with, James felt that the sacredness of abiding by a promise could be carried to the point of absurdity. For example, in the tale "The Path of Duty" Ambrose Tester and his mistress Lady Vandelier renounce each other for the sake of Tester's engagement to a woman he does not love. After the marriage, Tester and Lady Vandelier spend their time gloating together over their sacrifice while the wife slowly fades. On the other hand, it seems to me that James endorsed Isabel Archer's return to Osmond and her marriage vows because it upholds the institution of marriage, recognizes Pansy's need, and fulfills Isabel's own need to choose freely. The most enigmatic presentation of the concept is, of course, in "The Spoils of Poynton" where Fleda Vetch would, at the last, accept Owen Gereth despite his engagement to another woman and where Owen's marriage is never depicted closely enough to see whether he loves his wife or not.<sup>22</sup> The crucial issue, I think, lies not in fulfilling one's duty to others but in doing this with also the self in mind. Ambrose Tester's engagement, for instance, is totally wrong because he wishes to marry only because his father wishes it. Tester retorts to the narrator of "The Path of Duty" that to marry without love, despite society's approval, makes a "pretty sight of [the marriage partners'] private lives" (vV,175). Although Tester is here rationalizing

his own desire to break his engagement, the point carries weight, especially, it will be seen, in terms of The Golden Bowl. It is not wrong to marry without love if the terms of the marriage are clear, it is not wrong to marry for the sake of another, it is not wrong to marry for money. James seems to me to indicate over and over again that what is wrong is to marry or keep a vow when one does not want to do so, provided of course that one's desire involves integrity and morality as applicable to the situation. A vow may not be made or broken for a whim. Neither should it be made without thought of one's own wishes or kept to the exclusion of all other considerations. Although one may renounce for the sake of another, one may not take on something only for the sake of another without risking a devastating situation. The tale "Georgina's Reasons" aptly illustrates the point. Both Georgina Gressie and Raymond Benton marry because they wish to; however, Georgina, who takes marriage lightly, incorrectly breaks her vows and commits bigamy. She has acted upon her own desire, but in doing so she has broken both a legal code and the moral code that should prohibit one from hurting another for selfish reasons only. Discovering the bigamy, Benton wishes to marry Kate Theory but will not go against a promise to Georgina and reveal her crime in order to obtain a divorce. In one sense, he is right in this decision. He refuses to hurt Georgina for selfish motives. Still, he does not renounce. Instead he asks for a pledge of

patience from Kate and the story closes on the futile note that Kate and Raymond still are waiting to marry. While following his duty to one person, Benton has exacted a pledge he cannot fulfill from another.

In The Wings of the Dove, Kate and Densher verbally and physically pledge themselves to one another, and Kate's refusal to marry Densher or anyone actually constitutes her loyalty to that pledge. To marry Lord Mark would break the pledge as Densher's marriage to a dying Milly--however wrong in other ways--would not. But Densher tells Kate that if he had made a pledge to Milly he would keep it even after her death and break his pledge to her. His morality here is as upside down as it is when he attends church because he has lied and said he was planning to attend it. Rightly Densher does not lie to Milly about his relationship to Kate. If, however, he had lied, he would have broken his vow to Kate in order to ease his conscience, and this could not transform his lie to a truth. Similarly when Densher does break his vow to Kate by refusing to marry her with Milly's money, his conscience is his main consideration. But to refuse the money cannot alter his guilt and should not ease his conscience. Although he is not wrong to consider his own wishes in addition to his duty to the vow, he typically places the refusal on Kate who has actually given him every chance to accept her. Kate, on the other hand, both keeps her vow to Densher and faces squarely her own guilt by accepting the money.

Earlier, she had said to Densher, "I engage myself to you for ever"(I,95), and this is exactly what she does by allowing him to have his easy conscience.

Money and duty both, then, work to isolate Kate from Densher. Her sexuality does the same. Just as she needs and, therefore, seeks money, she needs a sexual relationship with Densher and accepts him on this basis. From the beginning, however, Densher indicates he will fail Kate. He had avoided sexuality at first as a matter of "respect" which makes "love greater, not happiness less"(II,5). The point for him is the morality of premarital sex and for this reason he presses Kate to marry before they are both made "ill"(II,7) by their continence. But illness is hardly a persuasive argument for the celibate James, and even at this early juncture, Densher distorts sex into a means for power. In the second interview between Kate and Densher after Densher's return from America, he again pleads marriage. They are in Kate's boudoir, they embrace, and one feels that but another word from him would have convinced Kate that he is right. He does not say the word, and Kate, with Densher's usual help of verbalizing more clearly, reveals her plan to let Milly pursue him that they may gain time together. This said, the issue of "respect" seems no longer important to Densher, and he makes his first use of the illigimate power of sex, suggesting that Kate come to his rooms. By their third and fourth interviews Kate is ready to accept

Densher sexually, but in contrast to Densher, James does not portray her as using sex primarily to bargain. When he shows Densher remembering the sexual encounter, the terms of a business transaction--the "quantity of the article," the "solidity of the contract," the "service for which the price named by him had been magnificently paid"(II,237)--are uppermost. When he shows Kate acquiescing to the encounter, her need and her love are uppermost. Just before Densher voices his ultimatum, he wonders why Aunt Maud allows Kate and him to meet. Kate's response, "Does it strike you that we get, after all, so very much out of our meetings?"(II,187) indicates her first clear readiness for a sexual encounter. When Densher by the end of this third interview voices his ultimatum, he sees that "somewhere deep within, [Kate] felt his rebellion more sweet than bitter"(II,199). She takes "no refuge in showing herself shocked"(II,200), for she is ready to give herself regardless of Densher's way of asking her. Her actual acceptance of him in their fourth interview after his return from America, shows her as "rigid"(II,230) precisely because she is sensitive to his way of putting it, to his feeling of mastery. This rigidity I take as James's indication that Kate desires sexuality in the name of love, not power. If she did not want Densher she would hardly be weak enough to succumb to his bargain. Even Densher reads Kate partly right in this, seeing that "her readiness was the woman herself, and this other thing [rigidity] was a mask, a 'dodge'"(II,230). He is wrong

in this judgment only by seeing her rigidity as something calculated rather than her perfectly understandable reaction to his insensitivity. But because Kate loves Densher despite his insensitivity she can come to him with "at the last no blinking"(II,235), as only a woman who is ready to give herself sexually could come.

More is working to make Kate accept Densher sexually than his ultimatum and her need of him. It is not a coincidence that she accepts his proposal to come to his rooms after he has had but questioned her love for him, asking how she can "like" or "bear"(II,226) his relationship with Milly. Kate does not like it, yet she can endorse it and can bear it because Milly, in this scene dressed in the white of a virgin as well as of a dove, is not a sexual threat.<sup>23</sup> Milly must be too ill for a sexual encounter, James tells us in his Notebooks,<sup>24</sup> and since the question never comes up between Kate and Densher we must assume that Kate believes Milly is either too ill or too passive to be a sexual threat. But Kate can still feel jealousy towards Densher's increasing interest in Milly. By giving herself to Densher she can act out this jealousy, and she can hope to protect herself from the loss of Densher to a non-sexual Milly by sealing their spoken vow. Kate was in the past able to suppress her need of sexuality. With someone to compete with her for Densher's attention her need is increased. Sex becomes a matter of protection as well as a matter of love. Here is Kate's greatest

error, for the sexual encounter works to isolate rather than to unite precisely because it does involve the issues of power and protection. Immediately after the encounter Kate and Densher are separated, and their means of remaining faithful in this separation is to woo or be wooed by another. But while Kate is pretending interest in Lord Mark, Densher is playing his part with Milly too well.

Kate's conflict between her love for Densher and the need of money to marry him is further complicated by what she calls "all [her] virtue--a narrow little family feeling"(I,71). Given a choice between love and money, Kate would choose neither if the sacrifice of these would bind her to her family. To be sure, she goes to her father in order to gain time with Densher even if they must ultimately separate. With her father she will have freedom, with freedom she can see Densher privately so that when separation must come she will at least have memories to draw on. But Kate also offers to give Densher up in return for a home with her father. Her father's crime is the great thing in her life. Though she does not know its exact nature, she can neither escape it nor, being a woman, right it. Her hands thus tied, her concern is not what she can do for her father and her sister Miriam but is simply a concern for loyalty to her blood ties. To their "failure of fortune and of honour"(I,4) Kate will not add her own fear of their vulgar straits. Neither Lionel Croy

nor Miriam can understand this kind of loyalty. Lionel articulates for them both when he accuses Kate of having no "conscience," no "family sentiment"(I,17). Thus Kate is not allowed to renounce love for blood. She acquiesces to her family's desire that she gain them money by returning to Aunt Maud, hoping that she can somehow "do" for them without losing her own integrity by marrying without love.

The importance of what Kate sees as the "bond of blood"(I,32) is stressed again at the end of The Wings of the Dove. Lionel now seeks "refuge" and "safety"(II,360) in his daughters, and Kate has the opportunity to give him this. Refuge and safety are what a dove gives when it spreads its wings, and rightly or wrongly what gives such protection in the world of this novel is money. We must remember that James seems to have taken the title of his novel from two psalms: Psalm 55, "Oh that I had wings like a dove! for then I would fly away, and be at rest"; and Psalm 68 in which the "wings of the dove [are] covered with silver." Laurence Holland has discussed these as representative of Milly's conflict over the desire to escape life and the desire to live.<sup>25</sup> But James, I think, may well have attached an additional importance to the title as derived from Psalm 68. Whether the reference is deliberate or not, Kate now has the chance to have "wings of the dove covered with silver." In the course of the novel she has had really three choices: love, money, or family loyalty. Just as



her family will not allow the choice of loyalty, Densher will not allow the choice of love. He will not swear to not loving Milly's memory. He will not accept their relationship as different from what it had been. Thus the only choice left Kate is money and this I take it James intends us to believe she accepts. She "must choose," says Densher; "she stood in his own rooms doing it"(II,404). Kate now takes on the role of dove giving "refuge" and "safety" to her father in the only way he can find it. To fail to make a choice would do nothing for anyone except Kate herself who, like Densher, could ease her conscience. Instead, she rightly chooses to take the money. This is the least ideal of the three alternatives, but it is the only unselfish one available to Kate.

This is not to say that Kate rather than Milly is the dove of James's novel. But it does bring us back to a view of her as a positive heroine. Kate has made it possible for Milly to be a dove. She has exploited her, to be sure, and yet she has made Milly if not a better, at least a larger person. Her motive has not been simply exploitation. Rather she wants to "do" for Milly, to make her able to live while she can. She may have been wrong to meddle in the life of another, but this meddling is not intended to be detrimental, nor does it result in something detrimental, to Milly. In turn, Milly has made it possible for Kate to be a dove who can give "refuge" and "safety" to her father.

It would be better if Kate could offer money to her family without the loss of Densher. It would be still better if her dove-like quality could be manifested in some way besides the gift of money. But her father does not allow her such a "flight"(I,15) at the opening of the novel and the closest an impoverished Kate can come to the dovelike is in the beginning of her romance with Densher when they are "perched" "aloft"(I,53), united in mind and in love but impossibly isolated from the rest of society.

It is Milly herself who gives us what I take to be James's view of Kate when she sees that the role of "heroine . . . [is] the only character in which she wouldn't be wasted"(I,172). As heroine, Kate Croy is both sinful and redemptive. Where Milly's isolation is the "romantic isolation"(I,106) of being a rich orphan, Kate's is devastating. Isolated from family, from love and from moneyed society, Kate sins in the hope of permanently gaining one of these. Instead, she finds that sin isolated her even further. Her letters to and from Densher in America represent exactly this. Kept secret, they give their union a closeness and a deepness that publicity would negate, but kept secret they involve the deception of a larger community one cannot escape. Kate learns that she cannot exploit or deceive this community. When she is plunged into the deeper isolation of spinsterhood, she can thus acknowledge her ties to humanity by giving Densher his conscience and her family

their money. She has given them what they wish. Even if she knows that such values are wrong, she knows they are inevitable and she knows that she has given all she can.

Six years after publishing his tale of unspecified evil, The Turn of the Screw, James wrote his novel of unspecified evil, The Golden Bowl. The adultery between Charlotte and the Prince is not clearly the novel's center of evil and, as Jean Kimball has noted, James has been ambiguous about its actual occurrence.<sup>26</sup> His use of a ficelle only complicates matters, for Fanny Assingham is the reader's bane as much as his friend. She herself acknowledges that she has spoken some much that sooner or later she must hit upon a truth(I,384). Where such truth is James never tells us nor can he have expected us to trust a woman with a name like Fanny Assingham. Again and again he plays with tone to further enhance ambiguity. One can almost hear him dictating the final speech of the novel with several variations in tone. How each reader hears the Prince say to Maggie, "'See? I see nothing but you"(II,369), colors his entire reading of the novel.

It is my own opinion that James, however ambiguous, by the end of his story did have a clear line of plot and a clear notion of in whom the greatest evil lies in both The Turn of the Screw and The Golden Bowl. But he carefully offered alternatives to indicate that such exactness of

evil is superfluous and even harmful to the meaning of these works. Still, one's judgment of each work cannot help being influenced by what he deems James's first outline, the outline to which he added alternatives. What the initial outline of The Golden Bowl may have been to James--and he notably skirts much discussion of the novel in his Preface--may be largely unimportant, but within the different possibilities James finally offers, something of his notion about his characters, if not about the specifics of their actions, must be discerned. If he refuses us his opinion entirely, then he may well come under Wayne Booth's charge that total objectivity is meaninglessness. But Booth admires James and demonstrates that his point of view is present in his fiction.<sup>27</sup> Returning to a line like "I see nothing but you," we find that the words are crucial to an understanding of Maggie's character as less than saintly. They are received with "pity and dread," hardly the feelings of a triumphant wife whose husband is happy in love or who is ready to accept a passionate marriage. The terms are, in fact, mutually exclusive unless one sees that Prince Amerigo is suffering under the loss of Charlotte and is not ready to love meekly a sexless Maggie.

A discussion of The Golden Bowl may well open with an examination of the bowl symbol itself. A number of interpretations are possible, and it seems that each reader chooses his interpretation on the basis of his version of the plot.<sup>28</sup> But some points about the bowl seem essential.

Unbroken, the bowl represents in part the institution of marriage and the adultery which threatens that institution. We must remember here that James believed in marriage and in the sanctity of the marriage vow.<sup>29</sup> The bowl represents also these particular marriages and the four parties involved. On this level it contains four elements, the three pieces into which it breaks and the flaw itself. The flaw causes the bowl to be improperly whole, and finally causes the shape to break down completely. In this sense only Maggie can represent the flaw. She prevents the marriages from welding together on traditional husband and wife lines, she breaks what lines do exist, and she tries to reshape the marriages, first by aligning her father with Amerigo and herself with Charlotte, then when forced, by allowing the traditional husband and wife alignment. But the value of the bowl lies in both its "shape" and its "surface"(I,112). The "surface," the value of the institution of marriage, remains the same no matter what the "shape" of these individual marriages. Though the shape was always flawed, it did have a chance of value in the beginning. By the end of the novel, even as the marriages return to a traditional alignment, the bowl, as symbol of them, does not. We are left with the knowledge that the marriages can never regain their full value.

This does not negate the adultery as a flaw which threatens the marriages. What it does is place the flaw which destroys firmly on Maggie's shoulders.

James's point for using ambiguity remains. Abstractly, a flaw is a flaw and evil is evil no matter what their exact nature. But concretely, the results of evil may differ.<sup>30</sup> Whatever the abstract evil in The Turn of the Screw, the encroachment of the governess is the concrete evil which kills Miles. Only a sketch of Maggie's flaws need be mentioned here, but, as is the case with Milly Theale, such a sketch is necessary before one can fully understand James's attitude toward his lost heroine. In total, Maggie's flaws lead to the destruction of two human beings as well as to the rightful destruction of the adultery. Maggie would be, of course, largely justified in her actions were she simply a wronged wife. But this has no bearing whatsoever on her motives. She never knows with a certainty about the adultery, and yet she chooses to judge and sentence her husband and her friend without even a hearing. Critical arguments have revolved around James's sense of decorum here, of his stopping the adultery without the vulgarity of having the parties involved discuss it. This argument, however, breaks down because adultery is not the point. Although James may leave some readers in doubt about the actual commission of adultery, he makes it perfectly clear that Maggie acts, without knowledge, for the purposes of power. What has Maggie wanted to do with the bowl but display it as a symbol of her "knowledge"? She

cares little about the facts precisely because her belief in the adultery has actually given her the means to power.

If Maggie is the destroying flaw of The Golden Bowl, if Charlotte and the Prince are the equal pieces of the bowl itself, able to be thus split because they are equally guilty, Adam Verver must be represented by the stem, able also to be broken because of his own failure to weld the marriages together. With or without knowledge of the adultery, Adam Verver holds the main power of the novel because he controls the money and Charlotte and the Prince cannot forget this. Just before Adam proposes to Charlotte, he expresses to himself what he will use his power for: "The sharp point to which all his light conveyed was that the whole call of his future to him as a father would be in his so managing that Maggie would less and less appear to herself to have forsaken him"(I,207-208). Maggie does forsake Adam because she disappoints him when she begins to manipulate and to exert pressure on Charlotte and himself. The issue is not that Adam resents reminding his marriage, but that he must return with his wife to an America which he knows she despises. Add to this enforced return Adam's knowledge of the adultery, and further motives than those of concealing Maggie's failure from herself become apparent. He avoids the public scandal of divorce, especially as it would involve the

Principino, and he takes on a role of husband as well as father in the only way he can, by separating wife and daughter. Again James is ambiguous about the exact nature of events, but he leaves no doubt that Adam senses Maggie's failure. In the departure scene between father and daughter, Adam inquires about the Principino and Maggie replies that she has sent for him, that he will not "fail" Adam. Adam answers, "Oh, I don't want him to fail me!" (II, 361), and though no one is named who has failed Adam the italics imply that only the Principino is exempt. Even Adam has failed himself, but he has not failed Maggie, and he will not fail her by revealing that she has disappointed him.

The point James has made in the symbol of the golden bowl is that the flaw, the evil, lies in all four parties. Charlotte knows this; Maggie does not, and regardless of the nature of the evil, Charlotte's knowledge makes her the more admirable heroine. Again a comparison to The Turn of the Screw is apt. In that tale, Miles, explaining to the governess why he left his room at night, says simply, I wanted you to "think me--for a change--bad!" (vX, 80). Miles knows that to be bad is to be a boy, and to be a boy is to be human. Such evil he must strive for in the face of a governess who fails to recognize human imperfection in either herself or in him. Similarly, Charlotte will risk the flaws of her human self while



Maggie, martyr ~~that~~ she deems herself, will recognize only those flaws that justify her "noble" goal. In the second half of the novel James mercilessly probes Maggie's falsity and, to my mind, shows her as neurotic about her father and about sex, stupid in her notion of how to rebalance the marriages, and pitiable in her lack of self-awareness. These traits do not damn Maggie. But when she couples them with her desire for power, she condemns herself as much as do the governess in The Turn of the Screw and the narrator in "The Aspern Papers," the latter of whom James, in his Prefaces,<sup>31</sup> compares her to. Her self-condemnation is fascinating! but even as we can understand her this hardly should make us admire her.

In the critical debate over The Golden Bowl, Maggie has understandably been the greatest concern. Charlotte has been largely neglected, being written off as simply evil or pitiable, so that a full understanding of James's intent has been missed. It is Maggie herself who perceives the nature of Charlotte and of all the lost heroines: "she has been brave and bright . . . , she has been so in the face of things that might well have made it too difficult for many other girls"(I,180). To show this, James has again resorted to his method of indirection. Just as he has increasingly elevated Milly Theale by a "merciful indirection" in The Wings of the Dove, so he uses indirection to elevate Charlotte.

For she, not Maggie, is kept at a distance in the second half of The Golden Bowl where she is seen only twice. Though one could argue that indirection can denigrate as easily as elevate, all our direct views of Charlotte show that James intended the elevation and intended Charlotte to be closer to an earthly ideal than Maggie.

Once again the lost heroine is used to mirror James's increasing awareness that isolation is as destructive for the majority of humanity as it may be constructive for the artist. As in The Wings of the Dove, the concept of isolation involves marriage, money, and sex, and Charlotte, like Kate, suffers under its full impact. In The Bostonians, James deals with the feminist movement of the nineteenth century, but not until The Wings of the Dove and The Golden Bowl does he deal sympathetically with the plight of a fully sexual woman in the nineteenth century. In this sense these are the novels that most resemble The Blithedale Romance. And in these, not in The Bostonians, the heroines want the fulfillment of love and marriage. that Zenobia seeks in Hollingsworth. But in The Wings of the Dove the question of fulfillment through love is largely an aside, for unable to marry, Kate Croy can remain loyal to her blood ties and thus retain some meaning in her life. Losing Densher, as Zenobia

loses Hollingsworth, she need not resort to suicide. Unlike both Zenobia and Kate, Charlotte attaches an importance to marriage so great that it can be sought without love. She does so because she is alone in the world, having no family, no Densher, no hope of a Hollingsworth to involve herself with. To try to capitalize on the feminist "spirit of the age"(I,58) is her only alternative to marriage, and James has shown in The Bostonians that in his judgment such a movement is sterile. Since one cannot, however, marry without money, given the chance to marry with money but without love, Charlotte, unlike Kate Croy, does so. This is her way, she tells Adam, of finding some semblance of a "home," an "existence," a "motive for one thing more than another--a motive outside of [herself]"(I,219). James does not condemn her, for she is fond of Adam Verver and she does want her marriage to succeed. She knows the risk she runs. Adam has made it clear from the beginning that he is marrying primarily for Maggie. That he says he has room for another "daughter," rather than using Charlotte's term of "another young woman"(I,222), indicates the depth of his concern for Maggie. He slips even further, saying his marriage is "her [Maggie's] idea" before he quickly amends his pronoun to "my idea"(I,223). The problem for Charlotte is not that Adam is ~~marrying for Maggie's~~ ~~more~~ than for her, but that Adam is not marrying for himself. Although it may be

right to consider Maggie when he marries, he must also marry for his own sake, to do what the Prince calls "the best for one's self one can--without injury to others"(I,58). To marry because one wants to marry even without love will not harm one's spouse if affection is there and the terms of the marriage are clear. But as in the tale "The Path of Duty," to marry for the sake of a third party only increases the risk that the marriage itself, which should in fact be a private affair involving two rather than three people, will prove distasteful. Charlotte is willing to take the risk because she believes, as she tells Adam, that he does "rather 'like'" (I,225) her and because she does like him. Just as Adam goes outside himself to Maggie, Charlotte goes outside herself to a consideration for the Prince. She will risk marriage "quite for ever"(I,237) only if the Prince is not afraid, and she will thus risk it because she wants to. Again, James drives home that what matters most in a marriage is not the motives for others but the motives for oneself.

Because Charlotte has not wanted to live isolated and only for herself, she has chosen marriage, and because she cannot ally herself to the community of the vulgar poor she marries for money. But both her marriage and her money fail her because they become issues of power. However, where money as power is the

dominant question in The Wings of the Dove, culminating even in murder, in The Golden Bowl sex is the dominant question, culminating in adultery. In The Golden Bowl sexuality does not initially involve power as much as it involves the fear of a commitment that cannot be sustained in the social world. Notably it is the Prince who fears a sexual commitment. The scenes where Charlotte returns from America on the eve of his marriage and where she comes to him in the rain are parallel expressions of this fear. In both cases the difference between male and female is made clear and in both cases, intentionally or not, James mirrors the plight of a woman who acknowledges her passionate nature. The Prince, we are led to believe, has known many women, yet only with Charlotte has he become afraid, has he even, we are also led to believe, avoided the sexual. What the Prince is afraid of is love rather than sex, for love will disrupt the equilibrium of his life.

In contrast to the Prince, James portrays Charlotte as unafraid. Yet on her return from America the Prince says one moment that Charlotte has "the habit, founded on experience, of not being afraid"(I,45), and the next that she is "afraid of herself" while he is "afraid only of her"(I,50-51). The contradiction is easily reconciled. Just as the Prince's habit of fearlessness toward women has been broken down by love, so Charlotte's fearlessness is broken when the Prince

becomes a consideration, allowed only temporarily, in her motives. Charlotte has returned to have one hour alone with the Prince. She knows that her one hour to remember cannot harm him and that it will give her something of memory in exchange for her loss.

"This is what I shall always have. . . . [.] that I was here with you where we are and as we are-- I just saying this. Giving myself, in other words, away--and perfectly willing to do it for nothing"(I,97). Like Kate's and Densher's letters to each other, the hour must remain secret in order that the world one must inevitably cope with cannot destroy that memory. But as with Kate and Densher, Charlotte and the Prince cannot escape this world. Charlotte is mistaken about her secret hour, but she is not lying. Nor is she feeling herself, which is exactly why she is fearful. She knows, I think, that she would accept the hour as sexual but that a sexual encounter at this point would destroy what peace and what hope for the growth of love withing marriage the Prince has.

Charlotte is afraid of herself and the Prince is afraid of her because of sexual love. Where Charlotte has nothing to lose and something perhaps to gain from a sexual encounter, the Prince has everything to lose. The sexual question aside, a woman has nothing to lose by loving in silence, for a woman's sphere is only to love or to marry. Such love, however, might

interfere with the man's larger sphere. James seems completely aware of this implication. In his essay on Constance Woolson (1887), he stresses the difference between the male and female realms, maintaining that in the category of love novels the male novelist considers issues besides love, the female novelist does not.<sup>32</sup> Within the novel itself he has Fanny Assingham tell us explicitly that the Prince has no larger sphere allowed him in his easy marriage: "he has nothing in life to do" (I, 278). The excess of time and of isolation causes him to think of Charlotte as a love object. Yet he is afraid of Charlotte on the day she comes to him in the rain as he was on the eve of his marriage. He has preferred what Charlotte calls the passive courage of "bearing one's self without relief" (I, 302) to her active courage which risks flaws, which risks ultimate separation in order to live all they can. The Prince has, in fact, been pushed into a woman's sphere where love is the only way to find fulfillment. It remains for him to find Charlotte's active courage in order to find meaning within this narrowness.

By speaking and acting upon the Prince's unspoken and unacted desires, Charlotte thus performs a service to herself and to him even as she betrays Adam and Maggie. She gives him herself rather than giving him a gift from the Bleensbury shop he could not accept. Her rationale is convincing: she is gaining

the freedom of the old time to go out in the rain, to do as she likes; she is thus making herself and the Prince happier and they in turn can better perform their duty of keeping their spouses happy; their spouses are the only ones they need think of, for Charlotte has no child to love and the Prince's child has been taken away from him by his wife and father-in-law.

Yet James, like Hawthorne, cannot let adultery rest so easily, however extenuating the circumstances or convincing the motives. Charlotte and the Prince have been united by their embrace on that rainy afternoon. When they are sent off to Matcham to perform the social duties of the Ververs, they are so in tune that they do not need words to communicate their intentions of consummation. I take Charlotte's comment at Matcham, "I've wanted everything" and the Prince's answer, "You shall have everything" (I, 363), as James's indication that not until the three hours in Gloucester does the consummation take place. But immediately, as in The Wings of the Dove, the sexual encounter becomes perverted by the issue of power; rather than uniting, the sexual isolates. Where Kate is the prime victim in The Wings of the Dove, both Charlotte and the Prince are victims in The Golden Bowl. For here the power is not inherent in the sexual act itself as it is in The Wings of the Dove, but is imposed upon it from the outside in the form of Maggie. Book I closes with an off-stage consummation;



Book II opens with its results. Maggie, we know, has enjoyed seeing the Prince with rivals(I,165). We know that she suspects Charlotte even now as more than a platonic rival. Suspecting the Prince of illicit passion, Maggie's passion is pervertedly aroused. But instead of using her own sexuality to win her husband back, she uses Charlotte's and the Prince's encounter to gain an upper hand.

Where in Hawthorne illicit sex is doomed, in James, whether discovered or undiscovered, it is perverted as well as doomed. But different as this perversion of sex is from Hawthorne's treatment, James is still very close to him in the concept that illicit sexuality seeks an impossible isolation of two beyond the larger community and its laws. For this reason neither James nor Hawthorne ever gives us a really private scene between intimates. The seemingly private scenes are only moments stolen in the midst of lurking society: behind Hester and Dimmesdale in the woods is Pearl; behind all of The Blithedale Romance is Coverdale; behind Donatello and Miriam murdering is Hilda; behind Kate and Densher in her boudoir is Aunt Maud, waiting downstairs; behind Charlotte and the Prince that rainy day is the butler they must deceive, or in the garden at Matcham is Lady Castledean, waiting for them to leave. The point is not that these stolen scenes lack intimacy but that society in some form is near enough to have to be contended with.

To equivocate about illicit sex is not, however, to praise Maggie over Charlotte. Within the context of the novel, it is Charlotte who finally dedicates herself to the larger community despite isolation. Although James felt that Hawthorne could not remain at Brook Farm because it involved too much community, he also understood Hawthorne's sense that Brook Farm was too separate from the rest of society.<sup>33</sup> What James wants, I think, even more than Hawthorne, is isolation for some purpose beyond the self--in his own case, for a commitment to art. Charlotte has failed to find isolation for herself and the Prince. Through this failure she gains the knowledge that one cannot ignore the community. She sees also that her motives for Adam and Maggie are not enough in that they encourage further isolation of father and daughter. By giving up the Prince without asking if he still loves her or if Maggie knows about them, she re-dedicates herself to the community embodied in the institution of marriage and the role this institution plays in social affairs. Searching for a gift for Maggie, Charlotte had said, "Mine is to be the offering of the peer--something, precisely, that no rich person could ever give her, and that, being herself too rich ever to buy it, she would therefore never have"(I,92). Significantly, Charlotte never finds a material gift for Maggie. Instead, she gives her back her husband.

She gives, I think, with the hope that Maggie will accept Amerigo without the struggle for power and with love. By this kind of acceptance Maggie could win Amerigo's love, which all her riches have never bought. Charlotte's is indeed the offering of the poor, of one who has willingly sacrificed love for the sake of upholding two marriages and for the hope of beginning her marriage over. We must remember here that Charlotte could easily reveal all, that she as much as Maggie holds a trump card by which she could fight for the Prince. Precisely because she is poor this card cannot be played; however, James does indicate, in the only two scenes in Book II in which Charlotte appears directly, that more than the question of money is involved. In the first scene Charlotte confronts Maggie who has just realized the extent of her power and who has taken the martyr stance of not revealing her knowledge. Maggie feels she is carrying a burden in her knowledge, but like the shawl she throws over her shoulders, her burden is light. She offers this burden to Charlotte and Charlotte refuses to take it, being so caged in by the close air that Maggie's light shawl is for her negligible. But Maggie's burden becomes her protection. She clutches her shawl to her as she clutches her "knowledge." Instead of confronting the adultery she clings to it as the protection that her new-found power offers. It is Charlotte, however, who allows the burden to be thus light. She

asks Maggie if she has "failed" (II,248) her, and indeed she has not and does not, for she has given Maggie exactly what she needs--the power to win her husband's love. What Charlotte is seeking to learn in this scene is not whether or not Maggie knows about the adultery, but what Maggie's new position is. Knowing about the adultery or not, Maggie, Charlotte knows, is rearranging the relationships of the four. So when Maggie tells Charlotte, "I accuse you of nothing," Charlotte can reply, "Ah, that's lucky"(II,250), because it allows her the freedom to win Adam Verver for herself even as Maggie can regain her Prince. Charlotte can Judas-kiss Maggie on this, acknowledging that she has betrayed her in the past but accepting, too, that Maggie, though obviously lying, is proceeding on a basis that seems best for the marriages. Later Maggie approaches Charlotte in the garden--using a pretext in contrast to Charlotte's earlier honest approach. Charlotte can here submit to Maggie's restructuring of the marriages and to her betrayal of lies because, as she says, "I want . . . to have him [Adam] at last a little to myself; I want, strange as it may seem to you . . . to keep the man I've married"(II,315).<sup>34</sup> "Strange as it may seem to you," for Charlotte knows that while Maggie has aided her with Adam, she has not recommitted herself to the Prince.

The marriages that have been reaffirmed in The Golden Bowl are thus both positive and negative. They uphold the standards of society and keep the parties from what James had earlier called in relation to Mrs. Rance, the "great alkali desert of Cheap Divorce"(I,133). But they do so in isolation. Maggie has isolated herself with her Prince and Charlotte has accepted the isolation of an America she hates. Here again we see the difference between Maggie and Charlotte. Maggie has chosen the sterility of society, of the entertainments she and the Prince will exist on. And she has chosen them at the expense of her husband. Charlotte has chosen isolation from the Prince and from Europe for her husband, for Amerigo, for Maggie, and for herself. To Adam, she has given a second chance as much as he has given her one; she has given him the means to escape a daughter who has failed him and to keep that daughter from knowledge of her own evil; and she has given him the hope that his grandson will grow up better in a sterile but not perverse marital situation, which is an important consideration when one remembers James's own bitter memories of his uprootedness during childhood. To Amerigo Charlotte also gives something he could not have if she refused to go with Adam. Charlotte knows that Maggie has failed Amerigo. Amerigo has indicated he will tell Charlotte of Maggie's "knowledge," and

he has every opportunity to do so while Maggie and her father discuss the Principine. This makes all the difference, for by wanting to tell Charlotte, the Prince indicates that Maggie's "knowledge" rather than his love for her has forced his separation from Charlotte. Though he will be forced to live within a sterile society and with a sterile Maggie, he has gained back his son, a result James stresses when he has Amerigo, offstage, put the Principine, who had before been taken over by Adam and Maggie, to bed. To herself Charlotte has given the hope of another chance with Adam. This is, however, a hope which Charlotte's narration on art indicates will fail. This narration also indicates that the good is effected not by the events Maggie has forced but by Charlotte who has chosen to accept the events. Adam may be forcing Charlotte to America with "a long silken halter leaped around her beautiful neck," a halter of money we assume because he holds it in "one of his pocketed hands"(II,287). But significantly "he didn't drag her." Rather, "she came"(II,287) because only by coming could she hope for some escape from isolation. The escape, we feel, will not finally be via Adam. She will remain isolated and from time to time we will hear from her "the shriek of a soul in pain"(II,292). But as the Prince and Maggie both see at the end, she will triumph in her isolation. If not better off herself;

"there is - - there always will be - - much of her left. Only . . . for others"(II,346).

Like Hawthorne's Hester, Zenobia, and Miriam, Kate and Charlotte have practiced the higher morality of doing for others. If, like them, they are forced to their actions, they yet perform them with an attitude that does not pretend false goodness, as Maggie's and, to a lesser degree, Milly's, attitudes do. Like Hawthorne's lost women, James's fall into error, and, like them, they salvage from their errors what they can. Kate exploits Milly and Charlotte commits adultery because lack of money has isolated them from the kind of society in which they could marry the men they love. Without money, they cannot marry at all, lest their love dwindle into what James sees as a vulgar and demeaning struggle against poverty. As in the cases of Hester, Zenobia, and Miriam, their attempts to escape isolation are doomed to fail because these attempts go against the laws of the community and, therefore, still involve isolation. Although love may exist outside the bounds of society, it may not be acted upon outside these bounds without penalty. In James, as in Hawthorne, the price is paid when the heroine recognizes her error and atones for it. Although Kate's error gains its impetus from Densher, she, nevertheless, pursues her goal with a kind of calculation that obscures the intensity of her feelings for the

man she loves. Although Charlotte's error gains its impetus from Maggie, she is willing to clutch at the straws Maggie provides her. When Kate discovers the full extent of her error, she again calculates her alternatives and, having been failed by Densher, gives up the man she cares so deeply about in order to give him his easy conscience, in order to perform her duty to her blood ties, and, most important, in order to accept her own guilt. When Charlotte discovers hers, she does not calculate her alternatives but lets herself be manipulated as long as her acquiescence upholds the institution of marriage and the family. Where Kate chooses her penalty of isolation, Charlotte accepts hers. Kate's seems a decision of the head, Charlotte's of the heart, but whether of head or heart both decisions require that these women renounce all they have had of happiness in the world.

It is clear that James, as much as Hawthorne, wishes us to admire his lost women. In the qualities that define their nature, they are not, in fact, so very different from Hawthorne's. They are passionate creatures at sea in a world which has offered no outlet, sexual or otherwise, for their passion. They are, as Maggie Verver says of Charlotte Stark, "brave and bright . . . in the face of things that may well have made it too difficult" (I, 180) for others, and we remember them for this as well as for their integrity and emerging selflessness. But James's lost women leave a different impact on us than Hawthorne's. Where



James wishes us to admire his women, Hawthorne wishes us to love his. Where we leave a Hawthorne novel feeling emotionally drained, we leave a James novel feeling intellectually exhausted. It seems to me primarily the difference in method that causes our varying reactions. Hawthorne tells us directly how he feels about the plight of his heroine. In The Scarlet Letter, for instance, he tells us that he believes Hester errs in her plan of escape and that she errs because she has thought too much about the status of women in society. He tells us further that Hester's error results from an unsolvable dilemma, for to change the status of women is fraught with danger lest the essence of womanhood be also transformed. James, on the other hand, never tells us where he stands. The closest we get to Hawthorne's method is in something like Charlotte's speech, at the beginning of The Golden Bowl (I,58), on the feminist "spirit of the age" being an inadequate substitute for love. But this is Charlotte speaking. As much as we may feel the speech, we recognize that emotion as Charlotte's, not James's, and we must turn to The Bostonians to get a full understanding of the author's feelings about the inadequacies of the feminist movement. As much as we feel the impact of Kate and Charlotte, our uppermost concern remains the subtleties of the Jamesian method. We must come to terms with these subtleties

before we can come to terms with the women themselves. Given the complexities of the Jamesian method, Kate and Charlotte can never be captured in a simple definition, but if we are in tune with James, they remain in our minds as strongly as Hester, Zenobia, and Miriam remain in our emotions.

## CHAPTER IV

GOLDEN GIRLS AND LOST WOMEN:  
THE HEROINES OF F. SCOTT FITZGERALD

With the advent of the Jazz Age, the lost heroine of American literature is no longer pictured as a dark extreme contrasted to a light extreme. But the heroine is less a new type than she is an outgrowth of the dark lady type, liberated now by all the generalizations that characterize the recklessness of the twenties: the restlessness left after World War I, Freud, prosperity, mobility, bootleg liquor. As such, she differs from her predecessors primarily in the emphasis on her new freedom, a freedom that is most often objectified in her sexual nature. The writers of the Jazz Age now allow a woman to leave the confines of marriage and to venture into what they depict as the wasteland of modern America. Confronting the isolation of this wasteland, their heroines can break the traditional codes of virtue in order to survive within it. The question is now not one of licit or illicit sexuality, for to Fitzgerald, Hemingway, and Faulkner sex is no longer emblematic of morality and illicit sexuality no longer threatens the social order. Women can at last give themselves up to their own desires because sex is their freedom, rather than their slavery. And yet, in them, sexuality does not dwindle into the promiscuous anymore than it does in their nineteenth-century sisters. The

true heroines of the twenties are not what Thomas Wolfe has characterized as doomed and lost martyrs whose faults lie in their own inability to say no in the face of the modern world. Rather, they face their disillusion by dreaming of an ideal and by maintaining a capacity to give themselves selflessly for what comes closest to that ideal. That their surface gifts are often sexual establishes them among the "liberated" of the twenties, but that their most meaningful gifts go beyond the sexual to the ideal establishes them as more admirable lost women.

An examination of what are among the most profound and complex portraits of women in the American fiction of the two decades following World War I supports these generalizations. Although all these women fit what appears to be the prescription of the lost lady, this is not to say that the writers here studied are consciously influenced by Hawthorne's and James's portraits of lost women. Rather they have independently come to similar conclusions about one type of woman in America, and they cannot view this woman without viewing her struggle with isolation and her victory, however small, over the circumstances that condemn her to a kind of existence that would destroy a weaker person.

The typical Fitzgerald heroine can be classified as an idealized dream girl or as a femme fatale who is, nevertheless, still a mere girl. Representative of the dream girl are Jonquil Cary in "The Sensible Thing," Judy

Jones in "Winter Dreams," Clara in This Side of Paradise. With the exception of Clara, they are innocents who are involved only in girlish flirtations and self-centered renunciations of deeper love. To Fitzgerald's heroes, they are goddesses on earth, symbols of an ideal perfection that can be retained only so long as it can be kept distant. So in This Side of Paradise, Clara seems to Amory Blaine a "daughter of light alone"(145), whom he identifies with his faith in God, but a daughter of light whom he knows would, if he came closer to her, become a "silly, flaxen Clara, with the gold gone out of her hair and platitudes falling insipidly from her changeling tongue"(141). Closely related to this dream heroine is the femme fatale, the Rosalind Connage or the Josephine. She may still be idealized by the men who love her, but the emphasis is more on her destructive powers than on her perfection. Otherwise, there is little difference between the two types. Both tend to avoid intense emotional attachments that might bring too much suffering. Both waste their emotions on girlish flirtations.<sup>1</sup> Neither possesses the courage or depth of Gloria Gilbert or Nicole Diver, Fitzgerald's two most profound portraits of lost women.<sup>2</sup> In The Beautiful and Damned, Gloria deserves attention as one of Fitzgerald's few heroines who has an existence beyond the dream vision of some male protagonist and as a heroine whom we judge finally to be a mature woman rather than an immature girl. She and Daisy Buchanan who, it will be seen, is not a lost heroine, illustrate Fitzgerald's kinship to and

difference from Hawthorne and James. It is Tender Is the Night's Nicole Diver, however, who deserves the bulk of our attention. Not only can she be seen as clearly fitting the lost woman type, but more importantly, she is Fitzgerald's fullest and most deeply-felt feminine portrait, who despite the depth of her suffering learns to face life with integrity and even with courage.

Although Fitzgerald's attitude often differs from Hawthorne's and James's, he, like them, cannot portray a mature female apart from the dilemmas of sexuality and isolation. His most obvious shift away from Hawthorne and James is in his treatment of the sexual. Through all of his writing one senses the conflict of a sexual moralist faced with the freer attitudes of the twenties, a decade in which someone like Rosemary Hoyt, being a "perfectly normal girl of twenty-two" would, so the legend goes, have had "a few shots at love"(211). In the early story "Sentiment--or the Use of Rouge;" Fitzgerald suggests that casual sex represents casual values and that to justify it in the name of selflessness--in this case, the selflessness of giving oneself to a person who might die during the war--is merely to rationalize. Gloria Gilbert is used to illustrate further this kind of disapproval of war-engendered liberalism. Where the twenties allows Hemingway to express Lady Brett Ashley's restlessness in what might be called promiscuity, Fitzgerald's personal attitude causes him to express the same kind of restlessness in Gloria's gumdrop eating, nailbiting, and bathtaking. The point for Fitzgerald

is not that sex must be licit but that sex must involve love. So Gloria refrains from adultery on the grounds of its lack of meaning without love rather than on the grounds of conventional morality.

But in the 1920s even conventional morality tends to endorse a double standard. Fitzgerald depicts this double standard in his fiction as much as he depicts the new standard of free love for male and female alike. So in The Beautiful and Damned Gloria refrains from adultery, Anthony does not. By the time of The Great Gatsby the double standard is explicit. Tom Buchanan can run around as much as he pleases and at the same time can condemn Jordan Baker's family for letting her "run around the country"(19). He can follow Daisy to Gatsby's parties and use her acquaintance with Gatsby to judge that women "run around too much these days. . . . They meet all kinds of crazy fish"(104). Where Hawthorne and James apply the same sexual standard to hero and heroine, Fitzgerald often allows only his men to act out the popularized Freudian attitude of sex as an animal function. This is especially apparent in Tom Buchanan's affair with the sensual but vulgar Myrtle Wilson, who is good enough for a mistress but not good enough to mention his wife's name. For Tom, Myrtle is just another trollope; for Myrtle, Tom is the man she loves. Such distorted Freudianism seems to me exactly what causes Fitzgerald's hesitation about sex, what suggests in him a condemnation of the double standard he depicts, and what allies him more closely to Hawthorne

and James than to Hemingway. Again it is in The Great Gatsby that the condemnation of casual sex is made most explicit. Nick Carraway marvels that Tom can turn prig enough to say that "nowadays people begin by sneering at family life and family institutions, and next they'll throw everything overboard and have intermarriage between black and white"(130). Through Nick, Fitzgerald condemns not Tom's statement but that part of Tom which makes just such a mockery of family life.

Although sex disturbs him, Hawthorne suggests that it is always pure if it involves love. On the other hand, James suggests that, even when it is pure, sex is perverted to power. Fitzgerald, it seems, wishes sex to be pure but finds that it is all too often perverted to the repulsive. Scenes that suggest sexual revulsion abound in Fitzgerald, and significantly they connect only to loveless sex. Twice in This Side of Paradise Amory Blaine faces a vision of the devil, once during a sordid night in New York and once when he surprises a friend with a girl. In The Beautiful and Damned Anthony is repelled by the night laughter of a unidentified female. For George Wilson in The Great Gatsby and for Dick Diver in Tender Is the Night loveless sex generates nausea. But, as in Hawthorne, in Fitzgerald sex can also unite. Though a woman may destroy the man who loves her, she brings to him the highest moments as well as the lowest.<sup>3</sup> This is indicated in Anthony Patch's parable of Chevalier O'Keefe, the man so susceptible to women that he decides to become



a monk, only to die when he falls from leaning too far over his monkish tower to contemplate what he sees as the beauty of earth, a peasant girl innocently fixing her garter. Sex may be ugly and it may destroy, but it may also indicate what little there is of beauty on earth.

Just as the sexual freedom of the 1920s seems responsible for Fitzgerald's emphasis on the vulgarity of sex, the wasteland attitude of this era seems responsible for his shift away from Hawthorne's and James's conception of isolation. In Fitzgerald, as much as in James and Hawthorne, society does intrude upon one's attempts at perfect isolation. In the early story "Babes in the Woods," Fitzgerald suggests this motif when he has three boys, representative of society, intrude on an about-to-be-accomplished and private kiss. For the mature, society's war and its requirement of money separate: Anthony and Gloria are separated by the war at the height of their marriage, and as their funds dwindle they are separated even further because they have found nothing to sustain them but money; because of the war and his lack of money, Gatsby cannot marry Daisy. But one sees in Fitzgerald what happens to the concept of isolation when society's forms are not reaffirmed as we have seen them reaffirmed in Hawthorne and James. For Fitzgerald, post-war society has been so perverted that only the moments which defy its forms have value.<sup>4</sup> In Tender Is the Night, for example, there is no return to a world that Fitzgerald endorses. Instead, much that he views as negative in society comes to the

fore by the end of the novel, especially in Mary North's and Lady Sibley-Biers' lesbian escapade. Mary tells Dick that, as representatives of the post-war world, she and Lady Sibley-Biers may be dull but "we're all there is!"(313). Precisely because of this we feel in Fitzgerald that isolation is not just consciously sought by his lovers but, for both the lovers and the author, is also to the last approved. No longer does the heroine see the mistake of seeking isolation and reaffirm society even as she worships the memory of her moments away from it. Instead she worships these moments away from the larger society not just as a memory but also as the only possibility of finding meaning within the twentieth century. Although money may be needed to buy her entrance into the social world, society, no matter how cultured, cannot buy an exit from the wasteland. For this reason, Gloria and Daisy show no concern for the social system. Gloria expresses her scorn by displaying a streak of "cheapness"(73) and by choosing friends who are not "first rate"(79); Daisy expresses hers by being bored at Gatsby's party. Since there is nothing good in society, neither need think of society's laws when contesting a will or running from an accident. And yet, society has been better to both Gloria and Daisy than it has been to Hawthorne's or James's heroines. They do not face a marriage without love or a suffocating spinsterhood. They do not face poverty unless by their own choice. Where the nineteenth century heroine, largely because of her unapproved passionate

nature, is forced by circumstances into isolation, Fitzgerald's heroines adopt the restless, isolated stance because of their vision of life. From a frivolous youth they progress to what Daisy calls the "sophisticated" and "cynical" view that "everything is terrible"(8). Because she, like Gatsby, does believe in the ideal green light, Daisy is being facetious here. But when she returns, even before the accident, to a cruel and vulgar Tom her facetiousness must surely be tempered. She learns that the green light is available only in an unrecapturable past. Where in the nineteenth century one senses from the beginning a personal doom, in the twentieth one senses an overwhelming "nada" where the circumstances of one's personal life can, in the final analysis, make little difference.

But in all the so-called wasteland writers this view that "everything is terrible" is as much a pose as a consistent belief, and Daisy's facetiousness carries weight no matter how intolerable life seems. Perhaps more than any of his major contemporaries, Fitzgerald does hold to an ideal conception of life, and he does make value judgments. Where Hawthorne and James endorse renunciation for the sake of what is good in the social world, Fitzgerald endorses renunciation for the sake of an ideal beauty which becomes synonymous with love. That his lost heroines renounce in part because they have little choice is beside the point, for within the limits of their choice they renounce because they wish to do

something for another human being. This is what constitutes the essential difference between Gloria and Daisy, and what prohibits Daisy from attaining the integrity of the other heroines we are dealing with.<sup>5</sup> Gloria does renounce, though her renunciation is more a matter of refusing to take something than a giving up of something. She could easily have deserted Anthony to marry someone with money, but she chooses not to. The fact that Anthony might inherit money has little to do with her choice. Rather she commits herself to the Anthony that was and to the love they had. Fitzgerald says of Gloria that "It puzzled her that she no longer knew just what she was preserving--a sentimental memory or some profound and fundamental concept of honor"(392). It is a little of both, certainly, and Fitzgerald makes this clear in two consecutive scenes. The first scene is in the house of General Lee, which Gloria sees as a disastrous tourist attraction that cannot make the past live; rather, the past can live only in the hearts of a few. Later, in her motel room Gloria clutches one of Anthony's shoes and cries for this past. Although she is being theatrical and sentimental here, she is also endorsing forever what she now has with Anthony but must lose. To cultivate the beautiful moment and when it fades to hold it in the heart forever constitutes Fitzgerald's concept of honor. Within the concept he sees sentimentality and, more importantly, sees inevitable damnation.

One might wish to argue that Daisy Buchanan also renounces her chances to escape her devastating marriage to Tom and that she thus endorses the love that they once had. But Daisy is placed in the dilemma of having loved two men, so that to renounce for one is to betray the other. Nor have her motives much to do with renunciation. We can credit her with the knowledge that marriage to Gatsby would become less than ideal, but we cannot credit her with choosing Tom out of the courage to renounce Gatsby before the dream fades or out of loyalty to the moments of happiness that Tom has thrown up to her. From first to last, Daisy is the coward who typically "lost her nerve"(145) when she might have avoided killing Myrtle Wilson by hitting another car. Instead of becoming ill in the face of disillusion, Daisy panics, and out of panic she increases the validity of Nick Carraway's judgment that the Buchanan's are "careless people" who "smashed up things and creatures and then retreated back into their money or their vast carelessness, or whatever it was that kept them together, and let other people clean up the mess they had made"(181). While Daisy possesses the aura of the lost heroine, she lacks the essential courage which we found in Hawthorne's Hester, Zenobia, and Miriam, and in James's Kate and Charlotte. Yet Fitzgerald, I think, wants us to believe that Daisy wishes she had the kind of courage that could make her renounce as well as merely survive. Nick Carraway does hear a car stop one night at the dead

Gatsby's doorstep. It seems to me that we can only take this as Fitzgerald's indication that Daisy feels compelled to pay final homage to the man she destroyed and to the dream they had and that, for all her lack of courage, she does have a conscience.

This kind of weakness in Daisy is not unusual in Fitzgerald's heroines. Nicole Diver is the major example of the weak woman, though she does, it will be seen, overcome her weakness. And it is this attitude that opens Fitzgerald to a charge of subjugating women, a charge that Hawthorne and James tend to avoid by portraying women who, whatever their faults, seem always stronger than the men around them. Like these writers, Fitzgerald senses that from the day they are born female, women are doomed to play an insignificant role. Why else does the mature Fitzgerald woman shun female companionship to seek male comradery? Why else do Fitzgerald's novels belong primarily to the hero? In This Side of Paradise Amory's mistress Eleanor curses the day she was born female and intelligent, "with the brains to do everything, yet tied to the sinking ship of future matrimony"(237). In The Beautiful and Damned Fitzgerald writes that the "biography of every woman begins with the first kiss that counts, and ends when her last child is laid in her arms"(63); he writes that love expresses Gloria more than Anthony; and he writes that Gloria can envision four kinds of husbands, with no mention of a choice to remain single. In The Great

Gatsby he paraphrases his own wife when Daisy hopes that her daughter will be "the best thing a girl can be in this world, a beautiful little fool"(17).<sup>6</sup> In Tender Is the Night he attributes Rosemary's work to the man's world: "economically [she is] a boy, not a girl"(40); he has Nicole see that for a woman even work is not enough, but she must have also "lots of minor accomplishments and pass them on to her children"(142); he has Nicole feel that when Dick goes away he leaves "her holding Nothing in her hands"(180). But although, like Hawthorne and James, Fitzgerald sees the plight of women condemned to a narrow sphere, he still creates a cult around his women. He wishes them primarily to be beautiful, not because intellect makes life difficult but because without beauty the concept of the ideal moment is tainted. In The Blithedale Romance, Hawthorne suggests through Coverdale that men only champion beautiful women; Fitzgerald suggests that this is as it should be. So in The Beautiful and Damned he introduces Gloria via her legs and her tan and he writes a parable about Beauty come down to earth to be worshipped and to change the vulgar situation where ugly women control men.

Fitzgerald's parable about Beauty is hardly a serious statement, but in effect he does champion the idea of giving a woman control over men only if she is beautiful. Such control involves emotional commitment rather than control over actions, and it does nothing to raise a woman from her subordinate role. As Fitzgerald says in Tender

Is the Night, these beautiful and controlling women are "happy to exist in a man's world--they [preserve] their individuality through men and not by opposition to them"(53). Gloria cannot become an actress because when she was young enough to succeed, she had to be a wife. When Tom Buchanan tells Daisy, "I'm going to take better care of you from now on"(134), he indicates that Daisy hasn't the capability of being anything but a protected wife. He is right, but he has helped to make her that way and has thus made himself, rather than Gatsby, the fitting husband for her. When Nicole Diver says, "I am a woman and my business is to hold things together"(82), the indication is that a woman's total commitment must be to family life alone. This kind of attitude in Fitzgerald is even clearer in a conversation between Dick Diver and the eczema lady. When the wretched woman explains that she suffers because she is "sharing the fate of the women of [her] time who challenged men to battle," Dick replies sarcastically that "You've suffered, but many women suffered before they mistook themselves for men"(184). All the liberation in the world, all the Jordan Baker athletes, do not counteract these evidences that Fitzgerald wanted a woman to remain within the confines of the household.

Yet Fitzgerald does not allow his women to dwindle into dowdy wives and mothers. In fact, childbirth is often a thing to avoid because if it does not destroy beauty, it suggests the aging process that will destroy



it. So Gloria becomes horrified at the thought of pregnancy and may, like Zelda, have had an abortion.<sup>7</sup> Daisy turns her one child into a household ornament, a manifestation of the cultivation of beauty more than the suggestion of aging, and Nicole Diver can "only pretend gently to love [her] misguided orphans"(180). However, one cannot remain beautiful by remaining childless. One cannot buy back youth or avoid what Gloria sees during her illness as the ugliness of people who are "rats," "apes," "monkeys," "lice"(394) merely because they are human. Gloria too becomes old and even unclean looking, and she has nothing to fall back upon in place of the beauty she had. Again we sense the Fitzgerald dilemma which he never solves: to cultivate beauty is to incur damnation. Even as early as This Side of Paradise, he struggles with the dilemma. Near the end of this novel Amory Blaine renounces sex, art, and religion, because beneath the beauty of these experiences lies evil. The renunciation is in name only, and Amory ends by invoking his goddess of beauty Rosalind Connage. The choice between cultivating beauty or cultivating detachment is suggested throughout Fitzgerald's fiction, but for all its dangers his sympathies always lie with beauty. The detached in his stories are those isolated from all society rather than isolated in a union with another that defies the rest of society. They are men like Anson Hunter of "The Rich Boy", who avoids a marriage to Paula Legendre

by drinking too much and ends up sustained in his loneliness only by liquor and by the worship of young girls he cares nothing about. Or they are like George Hannaford of "Magnetism" whose detachment causes the near suicide of someone else. Like Hawthorne and James, Fitzgerald condemns this kind of total isolation, but unlike them, he pits against this isolation the value of Jay Gatsby's dream of an isolated union with Daisy Fay. Fitzgerald sees the inadequacy of love. And if for him money suggests beauty, as to James it suggests culture, he sees also that money suggests vulgarity. He sees, as he says in The Great Gatsby, "what a grotesque thing a rose is"(162). But he can find nothing to add to love and money which will add meaning to life.<sup>8</sup> At the end of his career he learns that "in order to preserve something--an inner hush maybe, maybe not--[he] had to wean [himself] from the things [he] used to love," and that as a result one must live with man's natural state of unhappiness. But at the end of his life he still endorses his commitment to Zelda because of the life they had had together in the "eternal Carnival by the sea"<sup>9</sup> which is to him the twenties. He has now, however, a greater commitment to the permanence of art, and he has the sense that he has wasted too much of his life in pursuit of dreams. Shortly before his death he expresses his commitment and his loss in a letter to his daughter: "I wish now I'd never relaxed or looked back--but said at the end of The Great Gatsby:

'I've found my line--from now on this comes first. This is my immediate duty--without this I am nothing.'"<sup>10</sup>

With age he sought something to replace the objects he early sought and lost. But age killed him before he completed The Last Tycoon, and we never can know if he would have succeeded.

Tender Is the Night stands as Fitzgerald's most deeply-felt novel, and, therefore, as one of the most moving accounts of a heroine doomed within the outward glitter of the Jazz Age. Behind the fictional Nicole Diver, the reality of Zelda Fitzgerald lends an added significance. But though Nicole's inspiration may stem from Zelda, her story does not.<sup>11</sup> If Zelda's story may represent a certain reality about the twenties, it is well to remember that this is an age which in literature has been romanticized more than any other period in the history of America and that Fitzgerald is more than a little prone to such romanticizing. In the fictional version of the twenties, World War I is the cause of the age's glory and its tragedy. Its heroines often use the war and the loss of a lover in the war as an alibi for their restlessness. Daisy Buchanan's initial loss of Gatsby, for instance, falls into this category. In Tender Is the Night Nicole's sister, Baby Warren, explicitly uses this excuse. Because Baby Warren is older than Nicole, she is more aware of the suffering that the war imposed. But it is people like Nicole who, having no war to blame,

seem to suffer the most. It is they whom we most admire. Nicole destroys as a heroine; Baby Warren and Daisy Buchanan destroy more as non-heroines because they can give nothing of themselves. Baby tries to buy happiness for Nicole and Dick but her meddling helps to bring them destruction. In her world of buying, she is never able to transcend her own ego long enough to realize that her money compounds Dick's, and therefore Nicole's, unhappiness, or to realize that she cannot assuage or even imagine the extent of Nicole's suffering. More positively, Daisy would like to give herself to Gatsby, though it means giving up the "protection" that Tom offers. But she hasn't the courage even to say the word that would save his life. This kind of destructiveness in Daisy and Baby Warren is further illustrated in Fitzgerald's story "The Last of the Belles." Here the heroine construes a boyfriend's death to be emblematic of her own role as the destroyer woman. The boyfriend had threatened suicide and his coincidental death fosters such an attitude. What allies Daisy and Baby to this heroine is their consciousness of their destructiveness, which carries an aura of delight more than of despair. The more admirable Fitzgerald woman may be aware of her ability to destroy, but once she has matured she never exploits this ability. She goes beyond the girl heroine whom Fitzgerald once sarcastically described as someone "you had only to look at to know that her destructive period was going to begin any day now."<sup>12</sup>

Like Gloria Gilbert, Nicole Diver is one version of the dream-girl type who matures beyond this into a lost heroine. She becomes a sexual woman who unwillingly destroys men but who also redeems them. She possesses, if not a great deal of courage, enough to renounce for the sake of the man she loves. Like the lost ladies of Hawthorne and James, Nicole is a person who suffers; like them, she also causes others to suffer.<sup>13</sup> Though it is doubtful that she, as Kaethe Gregorovius claims to her husband, "only cherishes her illness as an instrument of power"(239), the illness does serve as such an instrument on Dick. Still, we cannot place the blame for Dick's destruction on Nicole any more than we can blame Hawthorne's and James's heroines for destroying their weak lovers or blame Gloria Gilbert for Anthony's dissipation. It is Dick's own weakness that allows Nicole's infirmity to encircle him and wrench him apart. Just as Hawthorne's Dimmesdale plays the minister to others but not to himself, Dick plays the doctor. To be sure, Nicole is a Jamesian Vampire who saps Dick's strength, but she stands as an innocent destroyer of a man who begins to shatter when his belief that there are "no wolves outside the cabin door"(117) proves false.

The intensity of the relationship between Dick and Nicole is based largely on sexuality. Through Nicole, Fitzgerald suggests Hawthorne's positive approach to at least licit sexuality and James's negative approach. Despite her love for Dick, we can never really forget

that Nicole has committed incest. She never fully acknowledges her complicity in guilt as Hawthorne's and James's women acknowledge their various guilts and, therefore, she appears more tainted than they. Because of her failure to deal directly with the incest, her wound can never completely heal. Thus she becomes the first heroine here studied whose guilt reasserts itself in a loveless affair. But though it is loveless, Nicole's affair with Tommy Barban is a necessary one in her struggle toward independence, for it constitutes a break from Dick, which she needs in order to feel "a sense of being cured"(289). Because she can make this break she acts upon a lesson Dick has taught her: "Either you think-- or else others have to think for you and take power from you, pervert and discipline your natural tastes, civilize and sterilize you"(290). In this sense, Nicole's break from Dick is "therapeutic"(291), a break taken because it is better to be a "sane crook than a mad puritan"(293). Even as she goes with Tommy, Nicole does not delude herself as to his position in her life. She did not want with him "any vague spiritual romance--she wanted an 'affair'; she wanted a change. She realized, thinking with Dick's thoughts, that from a superficial view it was a vulgar business to enter, without emotion, into an indulgence that menaced all of them. On the other hand, she blamed Dick for the immediate situation, and honestly thought that such an experiment might have

a therapeutic value"(291). Even though with Tommy "moment by moment all that Dick had taught her fell away"(298), because Dick has taught her to deal with her emotional weaknesses and because she no longer has any illusions, she survives her illicit encounter and feels "surer of herself"(299) afterwards. Because Dick has taught her, she rises above the "crook's eyes," above the Warren name, to recognize that her affair is primarily an emotional purgative where she feels more like a "decapitated animal"(294) than a woman in love. Her affair is one that takes place in the common world. It begins in the midst of prostitutes and sailors just as Dick's affair with Rosemary ripens against a background of lesbians at a party and brawls in the streets of Rome. Yet even these loveless affairs have a certain dignity beyond the sordid, for Dick and Nicole do care about their sex partners. If Fitzgerald cannot condone loveless sex, he, nevertheless, does not wish to depict the Divers as amoral. For this reason he deletes in his final version of Tender Is the Night an affair between Dick and McKibbens' governess/mistress in Innsbruck,<sup>14</sup> having Dick abide by his belief that such an affair would belittle all his years with Nicole "with something cheap and easy"(202). Always behind the Divers' affairs lies their ~~ideal~~ embodied in each other, an ideal which was briefly realized and which reflects Fitzgerald's vision of sex as unifying despite the intrusion of vulgarity. For Dick, Rosemary serves as a reminder that "Nicole

was his girl"(213); for Nicole, Tommy creates the "little old wish that she could tell Dick all about it"(311).

Despite Nicole's immersion in loveless sex, Fitzgerald is not ambivalent about her relationship to the man she loves. Nicole's and Dick's marriage signifies again Fitzgerald's theme of the ideal, though fleeting, love which lends meaning to life. The time Dick and Nicole spend on the Riviera in Book I is marked with Nicole's relapses and with the impending tragedy of Dick's involvement with Rosemary. It is also marked as the end of the high point in their love. But we are not allowed to forget that the high point did exist. Dick and Nicole reach a peak when their lives are so merged that they can sign their communications "Dicole"(103). Like Miriam and Donatello after the murder of the model or Amerigo and Charlotte at Matcham, they are merged to the extent of being "one and equal, not apposite and complementary; [Nicole] is Dick too"(190). Together they are the king and queen of the Riviera, the ideal glittering in the distance for the Rosemarys to worship. Because it is they who are the ideal, it is they who must withstand the constant intrusion of society's reality, signified by the new Americans who have invaded their beach. Through parties and through alcohol which make reality bearable, they try to hang on to their dream world and to capture moments of perfection for others as well as for themselves. The priest in Fitzgerald's story "Absolution" only imagines moments when "things go glimmering"(170); the Divers



actually find these moments of perfection. Unlike the priest who wants to embrace life but cannot, the Divers do embrace it. Dick and Nicole give a party on the Riviera, and against the background of the quiet sea they attain for a moment complete rule over an assembly of perfect warmth and affection. But this embrace is not an affirmation. It is only a way of avoiding for as long as possible what the priest realizes is "the heat and the sweat and the life"(171), the element of the vulgar temporarily hidden. This is not to absolve the Divers of vulgarity. One thinks of the opening of Tender Is the Night where Dick dons a lace bathing suit made by Nicole. But unlike their predecessors in the story "The Rough Crossing," we feel they are not simply deluded souls wallowing in the vomit of a drunk and seasick cruise. When in "The Rough Crossing" the heroine tells her husband "let's never get to know anyone else, but just stay together always--just we two"(270), we laugh because they have already shown themselves to be no different from those they condemn. Nor are Dick and Nicole like their predecessors in the story "One Trip Abroad." The protagonists of this story arrive at a fate similar to the Divers', but they do not fight their fate. Unlike the Divers, they are seen primarily as drifting and shallow people who easily let their love fade. Even in the fullness of Dick's dissipation and Nicole's loveless affair, we remember that the Divers could once give beauty to society, that even as they partook in its vulgar aspects they rose above vulgarity.

The ideal world of the Divers withstands for a time the vulgarity of the larger society embodied in the pseudo, ineffectual, and encroaching McKisco types. It survives the reality of Nicole's breakdowns and Dick's increasing reliance on alcohol. For a long time Dick and Nicole live on the edge of practical reality. They go one step beyond what is offered to or what is dared by most people. Dick cannot answer Nicole when she asks, "Why is it just Americans who dissipate?"(100). It is, however, this very quality of going beyond reality, of reaching for the ideal, that Fitzgerald sees as the answer to Nicole's question. Though Nicole faces the weakness of insanity, like the lost heroine she survives the intrusion upon her ideal of, in this case, negative society. Despite her mental weakness, her courage in survival equals that of the stronger heroines of Hawthorne and James. At the end of Tender Is the Night love has not been lost for Nicole and Dick. But it has become, in the Hemingway sense, too complicated. Were it not for Tommy, Nicole would try to rebuild what could only end in further disaster. She depends on Tommy as she will always depend on someone to tell her to "let well enough alone"(314). She has not learned independence, but she has learned endurance. Her endurance will now be in the restless life of the wasted intervals at the hairdressers, in the "prisons"(307) of normality foreshadowed at the beginning of the novel when she copies a recipe, then sews, on the beach. But because Nicole has learned that

the ideal cannot be kept, she will survive in reality, knowing that the moments when "things go glimmering" were worth the price of suffering. It is precisely because Nicole was defeated by reality once at the girls' school that she can now endure. Her fight against insanity has developed in her the capacity to withstand the far more crushing reality of Dick's destruction. When the excitement of her relationship with Tommy wanes, she will be able to go on, if not alone, at least not deluding herself that not being alone can stop loneliness. She has learned "at last the number on the dreadful door of fantasy, the threshold to the escape that was no escape; she [has learned] that the greatest sin now and in the future [is] to delude herself"(289). Above all, Nicole has learned that she is condemned to loneliness no matter how many Tommys can serve as her temporary protector. Despite Tommy, Nicole does not hope to assuage her loneliness in a myriad of men, for even with Dick this was impossible. By reaching the ideal embodied in her early love for Dick and by learning that the moments of perfect love are at best fleeting, she has learned to accept the realities of life, if not to reaffirm society. There can be a peace in Nicole's world similar to that in Hester Prynne's or Kate Croy's, a peace that comes with the acceptance of loneliness with or without society.

It is largely because of Dick that Nicole develops the strength to endure solitude. It is Dick who gives

her the impetus to make a break from him toward independence. He refuses to leave Nicole for Rosemary because he prefers her to this mere girl and because he believes that Nicole "mustn't suffer"(75). Yet Nicole gathers strength from Dick, and Dick, like a Jamesian hero, weakens with her growth. When he first meets Nicole, Dick predicts her recovery and his collapse: "Young woman, you'll be pulling your weight long after your friends are carried off screaming"(143). Even Nicole senses this. When she first becomes involved with Dick, she knows that he is trying to maintain a certain distance from her, but that he cannot. She knows "everything about [Dick and herself]"(154), everything about their destiny. Without speaking about Rosemary, she accepts Dick's need for the young and the vital. Without words, she understands at the party on the Golding's yacht that Dick needs her but cannot accept her. She recognizes not only Dick's signal for her to go to Tommy but also his reasons for giving the signal. She may know how to give, but to give is futile. Although she wishes to give to Dick, Dick, who has given all to Nicole and who is no longer needed, can only need and not accept. His indifference towards Nicole's encounter with Tommy Barban is merely the final pose of the healer, the final gift which he can give and which destroys his marriage but proves his love. Even as Nicole learns to pity Dick, she knows that it was he who willed that he lose control over her and she accepts his will. When she tells Dick to "Think

how you love me . . . I don't ask you to love me always like this, but I ask you to remember[,] somewhere inside me there'll always be the person I am tonight"(201), she has already accepted her inevitable loss. Like Gloria Gilbert, her gift is a matter of acceptance more than of renunciation. But it proves her love and this love is one of the small glimmers of hope in the wasteland fiction of the twenties.

Because Nicole Diver and Gloria Gilbert do express this glimmer of hope, one cannot view them only as negative bitches. To be sure, the heroines of Fitzgerald often are simply negative or immature and as such they differ greatly from the "larger" heroines of Hawthorne and James. Usually they seem more outgrowths of the light heroine--the shallow girl idealized by some man. What they possess of the lost woman is their destructiveness which stems simply from the fact that they are attractive to men. Nevertheless, it is the lost woman who sets the standards by which Daisy Buchanan falls short. And it is the lost woman who defines the positive aspects of Gloria Gilbert and Nicole Diver: their courage in love that saves as much as it damns, their willingness to sacrifice for the sake of this love, their refusal to be less than extraordinary. Though Fitzgerald lacks some of the sympathy that Hawthorne and James show toward the mature woman who is forced to live according to the dictates of the male world, he is, nevertheless, sympathetic toward his version of that woman. He gives to her his

vision of the dilemma between isolation and society and gives to her the strength to endure despite this vision. He once wrote in his Notebook that fifty years ago only women in literature were invested with "dignity under suffering," that the American male was shown primarily as "unresourceful" and "cowardly."<sup>15</sup> Though he often reverses this to make his women weak and unresourceful, he does not fall into the trap he criticizes by portraying no strong women. It is time to give Fitzgerald his due and to credit him with more than creating in literature and in life the destructive bitch or the insipid flapper.

## CHAPTER V

THE LOVELY CREATURE IN THE GREEN HAT:  
THE HEROINES OF ERNEST HEMINGWAY

It was, in romantic letters, a period that celebrated the lady who was lost, the lovely creature in the green hat who was "never let off anything." Her story was a familiar one: she was the ill-starred heroine of fate, a martyr to calamitous mischance, whose ruin had been brought through tragic circumstances which she could not control, and for which she was not responsible.

Thomas Wolfe  
You Can't Go Home Again

Although the Fitzgerald heroine more often invites Thomas Wolfe's caricature of "the lady who was lost," it is Hemingway's Lady Brett Ashley who, in The Sun Also Rises, evokes the image of the "lovely creature in the green hat." But if she is a woman with an excuse, she, more importantly, rises above the excuses made for her and, thus, becomes allied to the more positive and serious qualities of the women we have been looking at. She and Catherine Barkley of A Farewell to Arms represent Hemingway's two most profound portraits of the mature woman.

However, before we can discuss them as such women, a word must be said about the more typical Hemingway dream girl and the bitch. The dream girl is essentially the submissive woman who has no place in Hemingway's fiction beyond providing the abstract woman figure needed to make some thematic point. The full-fledged bitch is the woman who purposefully destroys and who knows nothing about love. These two types dominate Hemingway's stories, where a man-centered world does not allow room for the full development of a feminine portrait. Representative of the submissive female is the Indian girl Prudie, who is primarily only a name and whose dream-girl qualities are broken in "Ten Indians" only when she carries her submissiveness to other men. Or she is Nick's girl Marjorie in "The End of Something" and "The Three-Day Blow," who ideally lets Nick break off their relationship easily when love "isn't fun any more" (110). Representative of the full-fledged bitch is Margot Macomber, though to give Hemingway credit she becomes a bitch only after trying to make a successful marriage with a cowardly husband. Margot finally so needs to dominate the husband she despises that she kills him when he becomes a man she might have loved.

The third type of Hemingway heroine is his version of the lost woman,<sup>1</sup> and if she is seen less frequently in his fiction than the dream-girl or the bitch, she is, nevertheless, more memorable.



Had they been younger, Marie of To Have and To Have Not and Pilar of For Whom the Bell Tolls might have belonged to this type. But Marie has become so content with sex alone and Pilar has so accepted her earth-mother status that neither reveals a past which might establish her as a lost woman. Helen in "The Snows of Kilimanjaro" might also have belonged to the type: she loses a husband she loves, then seeks fulfillment in childrearing, reading, drinking, love affairs, and marriage only to find escape instead. But Helen is not seen directly and serves in the story primarily as an object for Harry to hate, though not to blame. Unlike these women, Catherine and Brett, and to a lesser degree Maria of For Whom the Bell Tolls, do represent the lost woman type. But just as James grows toward the vision of women we have been looking at, Hemingway grows away from this vision. It is with decreasing frequency that Brett, Catherine, and Maria illustrate the positive qualities we have seen in the Hawthorne, James, and Fitzgerald heroine. Still, because the role Hemingway envisions for women cannot avoid a confrontation with isolation, each of these heroines amplifies his version of the conflict between isolation and society. Each feels this conflict, and though she is largely condemned to isolation, she defies the forces that mold her in order to perform some good for the man she loves.

In the sense that the nineteenth-century light heroine is a girl idealized by some man, Maria is more an outgrowth of her than she is of the dark or lost lady. She is idealized for her simplicity which takes the place of the old idea of sexual purity, though Robert Jordan tempers his idealization with his knowledge that Maria's simplicity depends upon the peculiarity of the circumstances. Who Maria is, as distinct from Maria the symbol of "Madrid," of "comrades that have died," of "liberty and dignity and the rights of all men to work and not be hungry"(348), makes little difference beyond the fact that she is a good love-mate. In fact, the simplicity of Jordan's relationship with her depends upon her having no real past or future. She must be contained within the three days and nights of a fight close to death, a fight that exists for, but apart from, the larger society. Maria's past consists of a rape and the loss of her parents, and these are a matter of the present state of war and the common fate of girls in the midst of war. The rape is negated by love and the loss of parents is primarily an afterthought which serves to make Jordan proud of those he need never know. Similarly, Maria's future is only a dream which, even as a dream, becomes complicated by a visit to Gaylords where she does not belong.

Part of this canon of simplicity necessitates that Maria be a woman whose only role is that of

passive wife, the marriage vows in this case being unnecessary. She is a "rabbit"<sup>2</sup> in the same sense that Ibsen's Nora Helmer is a song-bird. Even in her sexual dimension, Maria is passive, for she exists only to please Robert Jordan. Where a mature woman must desire sex, Maria offers to give herself to Jordan even when intercourse would be painful. Where a mature woman will serve a man she loves, Maria carries service to the point of slavery. She becomes Jordan's property, ready to care for his sleeping bag, his socks, his pistol, his cigarettes, ready to let him be what Pilar calls her "Lord and Master" (209).<sup>170</sup> Where in the twentieth century a heroine often cuts her hair short to gain identity beyond the role of man's woman, Maria wishes to keep hers short so she may lose her identity in Jordan. Yet by the end of For Whom the Bell Tolls, Maria has become more than an immature and frightened girl whose love is both impulsive and shallow. She serves her man, to be sure, but in Hemingway service is an intrinsic part of love in the sense that love is a religious feeling. At this point in Hemingway's career service is the counterpart of renunciation. Although its suggestion of slavery bothers us, by the end of the novel we believe in its rightness, if not in its degree. At the last, it is Robert Jordan's turn to serve, to give Maria something to believe in after his death. Love, finally, is a two-way street, and if Maria expresses it by submission, this submission

teaches Jordan that love is strong enough and important enough to impinge upon the man's sphere of work. Having earlier kept Maria separate from his work, Jordan, by the end of For Whom the Bell Tolls, progresses to the realization that love is dominant over work and so can be felt even during the crisis of blowing a bridge.

What makes the concept of love as expressed through Maria different from its expression through the heroines we have thus far looked at is the lack of individuality in love. Maria, as we have seen, is more a symbol than a person. As such she represents universal love more than the love between two people, and becomes Hemingway's emblem for a society where no man is an island. It is generally felt that by the time of For Whom the Bell Tolls Hemingway has found something in society worth endorsing, some hope beyond the wasteland he depicted in The Sun Also Rises. But he is hardly clear in his endorsement. Although Jordan leaves Maria with the hope that he and his cause will live through her, he dies questioning his own belief in this hope. The future where the cause should, in fact, succeed in bringing about the brotherhood of man is to be propagated by two barren women.<sup>3</sup> Nor can Hemingway be said to reaffirm the society of civil war in Spain where both sides commit atrocities. If Maria is a symbol of all in life that may be loved, she is

nevertheless a symbol that exists away from past, present, and future society. Where Hawthorne and James believe that individual love must exist within a social context, where Fitzgerald reverses this to say that individual love can exist only apart from the social context, Hemingway confuses the two and says that individual love is a part of universal love but shows that it can exist only in isolation from the society necessary in a concept of the universal.<sup>4</sup> Because of this confusion, Maria is a failure on both an individual and a universal level and, unlike the lost lady, is a representative of human incompleteness.

Although Hemingway's vision of the isolation-society conflict in A Farewell To Arms differs from his vision in For Whom the Bell Tolls, in both the love relationship exists within such a conflict.<sup>5</sup> The world of A Farewell to Arms is one in which love is again a "religious feeling" (263), but here it is a totally personal love with no pretence toward a symbolism of universal brotherhood. Such love must remain perfect, and yet it cannot because life intrudes to destroy it. Once this love is destroyed, Frederic Henry must find something to replace it with, just as he replaced his religion, emblemized in the lost St. Anthony medal, with Catherine. Where Catherine gives away the medal and replaces it with love even before love is returned, Frederic loses both and replaces them with a kind of

empty endurance. But if we can take the narrative method as further evidence of what he has replaced love and religion with, then this replacement is, at least in part, the cultivation of memory through the retelling of the story.<sup>6</sup> If this is not an isolated pursuit in that Frederic shares his memories with his readers, it is, nevertheless, hardly an endorsement of life or society as he knows them.

Catherine Barkley, more than Henry, brings into focus the real extent of the isolation-society conflict, for as a woman she inevitably faces isolation. She, like Maria, is the perfect woman in the eyes of her lover, once Frederic has actually committed himself to loving her. Because she exists almost solely through Frederic's eyes, her perfection is never questioned. Where Hawthorne's Hilda tried to be a godlike creature, Catherine is one. Where Hilda erred by trying to compete with God, Catherine takes his place in a world where a religion of love for God and the brotherhood of man is made a mockery by the ravages of war. But Catherine is not so simple a dream vision as Maria or even Hilda. Instead, she is both the submissive woman and the strong independent woman who chooses to lose her independence for love; she is both sexless and sexual; she is able to renounce both freely and as a slave; she is both responsible and irresponsible in the face of isolation. This tension saves her from becoming another Maria

and causes Hemingway to present her as an admirable as well as a loved heroine. Yet the aspects of slavery and irresponsibility are largely what make Frederic Henry (and Hemingway) able to love Catherine. In contrast to the novels of Hawthorne, James, and Fitzgerald, where love exists despite the heroine's threat to man, it exists here because the threat is lessened. In such a way Hemingway makes his heroine contrived as Hawthorne, James, and even Fitzgerald do not. Where they present a woman as she might be, Hemingway presents Catherine as he wishes to imagine her. This presentation undermines our belief in her, but less so than is the case with Maria, because in Catherine Hemingway portrays a woman who gives up her independence for love rather than a woman who never possesses independence.

Despite her submergence in her lover, Catherine, far more than Maria, is a self-sufficient woman. This is most clearly evident in the scene where she tells Frederic that she is pregnant. Knowing that Frederic will feel trapped by fatherhood, Catherine conceals her pregnancy from him for three months and makes various attempts at abortion. Pressed by Frederic to the point that she is unable to conceal her condition any longer, she nevertheless proposes to make the arrangements for the birth of the child herself, a proposal which Frederic does not fight.<sup>7</sup> Yet this courage in Catherine is weakened because mixed with

her independence is a willingness to lose her identity-- certainly a necessary aspect of true independence-- in Frederic. "I've been a good girl until now"(138); "I've tried to be what you wanted"(139), says Catherine. Such an attitude is correct when love is viewed as a religious feeling. As the priest from the Abruzzi puts it, "When you love you wish to do things for. You wish to sacrifice for. You wish to serve"(72). This is part of the theme of renunciation so intrinsic to the lost woman. But even more than in For Whom the Bell Tolls, Hemingway plays service false. Although Catherine serves Frederic, Frederic does not serve Catherine. He believes he cannot serve her in life beyond giving her an anesthetic to dull life's pain. Had he believed in the concept of service he would at least have taken some share of the responsibility for Catherine's pregnancy and offered to arrange for the child's birth.

This kind of male dominance in Hemingway is evidenced further in Catherine's loss of sexual identity. Where Dick and Nicole Diver merge to become "Dicole," Catherine merges with Frederic to become Frederic. "There isn't any me," she admits, "I'm you"(115); "I want you so much I want to be you too"(299). This does not seem to me to be the kind of love Nicole or the nineteenth-century lost woman normally feels. After the murder of the model, for instance, Hawthorne's



Miriam and Donatello are united in sin and in love and exist, like Catherine and Frederic, outside of conventional society. But their union is always spoken of as a union of two into one, not one into another one: "the two hearts [were] together, till the horror and agony of each was combined into one emotion"; "one wretched and worthless life has been sacrificed to cement two other lives for evermore"(691). Similarly, James's Charlotte Stant and Prince Amerigo are united at Matcham in their one desire to go to Gloucester. Charlotte tells the Prince that "you always make me feel everything, just as you do,"(I,379), but then reveals their separateness as well by referring to the golden bowl towards which they felt differently. Nor does Catherine exhibit the same kind of sexuality as the typical lost heroine. Like Maria, she is not sexual from birth but is a "nice" girl turned on by love. The reason for this change I take to be the position of a sexual woman in the twentieth century. It is Fitzgerald who defines the difference between the two worlds when he notes that some women are "amorously inclined from birth" and undermines the significance of this by turning such women into "the girl who is a veteran of many petting parties."<sup>8</sup> The problem of being sexual from the time of birth rather than sexual from the time of love is evidenced, it will be seen, by Brett Ashley, who would hardly do as an idealized partner for Frederic.

Because Catherine is not sexual from birth she, even more than Maria, suggests what might be called the I-did-it-for-him syndrome, a rationale Fitzgerald explicitly condemns in his story "Sentiment . . . or the Use of Rouge." If Catherine cannot rid herself of a kind of slavish submission, she must at least rid herself of the idea of sex as only a duty. Hemingway seems to me quite aware of her need to become wholly sexual.<sup>9</sup> But once she has rid herself of the idea of sex as a duty, the importance Frederic puts on her sexuality curiously allies her to the plight of the nineteenth-century woman who is not allowed to be sexual. For Catherine's role is increasingly one of being a sexual object and it is as fixed a role as is that of housewife and mother. Sexuality condemns the nineteenth-century heroine because, as an object of society, she is not allowed to feel sexual; it condemns Catherine because, as an object of Frederic, she is not allowed to feel otherwise.<sup>10</sup>

Through the use of her dead fiancé, Hemingway establishes the progression in Catherine from an innocent who envisions sex as a duty more than as something desired into a totally sexual woman. The fiancé makes explicit Catherine's belief that sex is a duty. Being insignificant to her, sex is not, it follows, particularly desired. The question for her is how sex will affect her fiancé. For herself she

seems hardly to care one way or another. But when her fiancé dies, she feels she has been guilty of denying him something that is for a man necessary. Because she feels guilty she plays her crazy game of love. When Frederic dreams he takes her to a hotel room, he tries to make Catherine into a pickup and thus avoid personal involvement. But by having her, in his dream, pretend he is her dead lover, he also seems to understand that she must exorcize her guilt in her first sexual encounter. When he actually does make love to her, Catherine must relate this first sexual act to her previous denial to her fiancé by asking Frederic, "Now do you believe I love you?"(92). Once she has exorcized her previous guilt, much as Maria had to exorcize her rape, she can love Frederic in a more legitimate sexual sense. Instead of a proof of love, sex becomes an expression of love, what Rinaldi calls a "sacred subject"(169). In her sexuality, Catherine has now drawn closer to the lost woman, to Kate Croy, for example, who gives herself with at the last no flinching, as a woman who wishes to express, not prove, her love.

But as Catherine becomes this kind of sexual woman, she also takes on the lost woman's characteristic of the destroyer. Jokingly she tells Frederic, "I want to ruin you"(305), and she very nearly does by softening him to the point that he wants to do nothing except love. However, it is not Catherine as much as

being "trapped biologically"(139) that softens Frederic. From the moment she learns of her pregnancy, Catherine knows that a child will complicate love too much. When her attempts at abortion fail, she must justify herself as a "simple girl"(154). Although she is not the whore she feels like in the hotel room, like the whore, she does not want her relationship to Frederic to become complicated. However, the relationship does become complicated, and the knowledge of Catherine's pregnancy fittingly precedes Frederic's nausea with jaundice, an effect of his incapacity in the face of this complication more than of his empathy with Catherine's condition. If this kind of stasis in the face of an increasingly complicated love is fitting, in Hemingway's view, for a woman, it is hardly enough for a man. For this reason Catherine must die. Dying, in fact, becomes her final service to Frederic, her real renunciation. Though one can hardly say that Catherine wills her death, we must credit her with knowing that such a renunciation must sooner or later come. From the time of her fiancé's death she has known that, though love may last, the love relationship may not.<sup>11</sup> She would have her child alone; she would even leave Frederic in favor of Fergy because sooner or later she knows she must leave him; she would have Frederic take a trip to be with men. That Catherine does not renounce in these other ways does not negate the seriousness of

her intent, for such a renunciation would not be necessary until the child is actually born, and Catherine never knows that the child's death eliminates the need for renunciation. So Catherine will seize what time is left her until by dying she performs her final service.<sup>12</sup>

It is not, of course, only a child that imposes a complication and the need for renunciation. But in A Farewell to Arms the objective reason for renunciation is this child. Similarly in Hawthorne and James, children require renunciation, though in the works of these authors the renunciation is practiced in order to seize rather than escape responsibility. Hester must give up her dream of escape with Dimmesdale if she is to fulfill her role as mother; Prince Amerigo must remain with his wife if he is to fulfill his role as father. In both cases, the child is a positive force, allying its parents to a necessary social order. Even the Diver children in Tender Is the Night increase Dick's sense of responsibility. Quite the opposite, Hemingway views childbirth as almost devastating in a love relationship and allows Catherine and Frederic to practice irresponsibility rather than renunciation for the sake of the child.<sup>13</sup> Frederic's and Catherine's unborn child becomes a symbol of a society which separates. They would go through the social form of marriage only when the actual presence of the child has already forced them out of their isolation of two.

In Fitzgerald a perfect moment away from society may involve the number of people at, for instance, the Divers' dinner party on the Riviera; even a child in Hemingway constitutes a third party breaking perfection. Catherine knows this or knows, at least, that Frederic feels this way. Instead of taking pride in her pregnancy, she turns her back so Frederic cannot see her growing womb. Despite Catherine's and Frederic's escape to Switzerland, their union against society becomes increasingly impossible. In Stresa, even when they were not together despite their being near each other, they were still together by virtue of being "alone against the others"(249). Later in Switzerland, the closer the birth comes the more Catherine retreats into herself and Frederic into the larger world.

This inward movement of Catherine and outward movement of Frederic indicates a further complication of the isolation-society theme. It points up again what the authors we are concerned with see as the difference between a man's and a woman's world and shows Catherine as being of a piece with the lost woman who even if she affirms society never finds a place within it. Hemingway stresses the difference between his vision of male and female needs in the scene at the racetrack(131-132). Catherine wishes to get away from the others: "'Do you like this?' Catherine asked./ 'Yes. I guess I do.'/ 'It's all right I suppose. . . . But, darling,

I can't stand to see so many people." Frederic complies, "We can stay out here and watch the race from the fence," even enjoys his escape, "It's grand here." But he is happy to return to the crooked races and its crowd: "After we had been alone awhile we were glad to see the others again. We had a good time." For Catherine, on the other hand, Frederic is enough. Though, Frederic tells us, she too is happy to return to the crowd at the racetrack, it is she who first feels the need to escape it. It is also she who most delights in the escape, "I feel so much cleaner;" "Don't you like it better when we're alone?"; "I felt very lonely when [all the people] were there." And it is she who suggests returning because Frederic wishes to return, "Don't let me spoil your fun, darling. I'll go back whenever you want."

The man needs people beyond his love, or he needs his work. After his isolated hospital-love with Catherine, Frederic returns to his work in the war. After his interlude during the Swiss winter, he returns to society by watching people while he sits in a café and by boxing. Conversely, Catherine's work as a nurse does not sustain her, so she is almost crazy until she meets Frederic. Indeed her work as a nurse is primarily a vehicle for her relationship with him. She works hard at night duty only in order to be near him. Catherine knows there is no place for a woman in society, and so she chooses the isolation of love

despite its temporiness. When Frederic flees the war she accepts a longer term of love than she had hoped for, but she knows that within this longer term Frederic needs more than love. So she asks whether he wishes to leave her for a time to "be with men and ski"(297), and when he says no she proposes that he grow a beard in order to have something to do outside of loving her. She knows, in short, what the lost woman knows--that as a woman she lives a narrower existence than a man. But in Hemingway this is not her plight. It is both the way things are and the way things should be.

Frederic's beard becomes Hemingway's symbol for the increasing difference between the inward movement of Catherine and the outward movement of Frederic. The only difference of opinion they have in the novel is about the beard. Catherine wants Frederic to keep it, for it represents the time they had together away from society. Frederic wants to shave it in order to enter more comfortably into fellowship with other men when he boxes. So Frederic's beard tells us that though love has not begun to fade, the idyllic time of an isolation of two is over. For Hemingway, unlike Hawthorne, James, or Fitzgerald, cannot envision a place for love within or outside of a social setting. He forces his hero to return to society while still celebrating those isolated moments in whatever may represent the good place. Frederic needs society as much as he needs an escape from it and in neither place



can he, like Dick Diver for instance, find both love and productivity.<sup>14</sup> Catherine cannot have society, nor can she have Frederic alone. So she chooses an isolation of one where dying she tells Frederic not to touch her. That she amends her plea and allows his touch indicates again her willingness to serve her love and to accept an isolation of two in place of her only other choice, total isolation with no longer even a child in her womb.<sup>15</sup> Within society Frederic too is, of course, the isolated man, but the difference for the man and the woman is that even a wasteland society offers avenues other than the domestic by which a man can survive despite his isolation.

Hemingway underlines the idea that for a man there is more than just love in what has been called the "original" conclusion to A Farewell to Arms.<sup>16</sup> Here he stresses that life goes on despite the loss of love and has Frederic forget to remember in the morning that Catherine is dead, just as Nick Adams in the story "Ten Indians" forgets to remember that Prudie has betrayed him. The ending as it now stands does not negate this idea which the novel has been leading to in all its references to Frederic's life outside his love. It does, however, heighten the importance of Frederic's love for Catherine. It gives to it a genuineness that throughout the novel often seems lacking. The love affair is a real love affair,

something that Frederic may survive without but will not forget, something that enlarges Frederic and allows Catherine to practice service.

If intense love, like that which Catherine feels toward Frederic, seems necessary in a definition of the lost woman, what then of Brett Ashley, whose love for Jake Barnes may be questioned? James's Isabel Archer, it will be remembered, was excluded from this type partly on the grounds that she does not love greatly. In The Sun Also Rises, however, love--or the impossibility of love--is of central importance. Given the circumstances of her world, Brett loves as greatly as she can. She is not Isabel Archer who seems quite unwilling to entertain the possibility of love until her brief and justifiably dismissed temptation with Casper Goodwood.

Like the Fitzgerald heroine, Brett lives in a world that has been ravaged by war, and, subsequently, by the prosperity of peace. She has been wounded by both these worlds. Although her wound may have begun as a product of a love lost not in the heroism of war but in the senseless wartime hazard of dysentery, it is sustained by the glitter that covers the post-war years. Where the Hemingway woman may often find fulfillment in love, the only satisfying role Hemingway offers her, Brett lives in a world where love itself,

in the guise of Jake Barnes, has grown impotent. Since she cannot find fulfillment, she seeks diversion through emancipation. Indeed, emancipation is her first escape. Hawthorne's Zenobia and James's Charlotte Stant both know that emancipation is not the simple answer to a woman's dilemma, for both know that emancipation, whatever form it takes, is no substitute for love. Zenobia can only write "poor little stories and tracts that never half did justice to her intellect"(464), because regardless of her emancipation there is no "fitter avenue"(464) within which she may develop. Even if there were a larger place for a woman in the world, one feels that Zenobia would prefer the love of Hollingsworth. For Charlotte, the emancipation movement, what Prince Amerigo calls the "spirit of the age"(I,58), makes her position as a single woman "very favorable"(I,57), yet she chooses to try for even a loveless marriage as preferable to mere "existence" in a half-liberation that serves no one but herself(I,57), and failing in this, chooses the lover she has always wanted. Brett's constant nervousness within her emancipated role indicates that she too knows emancipation is a futile replacement for love. But she will practice emancipation anyway because she has no alternative.

In Hemingway, as we have seen, if love can fulfill even temporarily, it must involve sexuality. This is especially true in The Sun Also Rises where

the impossibility of sexual love with Jake is heightened by Brett's natural sexuality. Unlike Maria and Catherine, who become sexual after they love, Brett seems sexual from birth. "It's the way I'm made"(55), she tells Jake, and she is made so much this way that love without sex is "hell on earth"(27). She may pretend that sex "isn't all you know," but by the very nature of love in Hemingway, Jake and Brett both know that "it always gets to be"(26). Failing to find the fulfilling love Catherine and Maria find, Brett seeks fulfillment by combining several kinds of love. Though most of her relationships involve sexuality, she cannot simply be dismissed as promiscuous. Hemingway understates her promiscuity by giving us none of the overt sexual scenes he uses in A Farewell to Arms and For Whom the Bell Tolls.<sup>17</sup> Where the value of Catherine and Maria lies, for Hemingway, in their ability to combine love and sexuality, Brett's worth must lie elsewhere. Because in her world love is unavailable, sex can be nothing more than an opiate like drink. But Hemingway establishes Brett's worth in part by the way she uses her opiates. Brett is not only what Jake calls a "good drunk"(148), she is also a good whore. All her men must pass some test before they qualify to sleep with her: the briefly-seen Negro drummer, whom we assume Brett has slept with, must be a good drummer; Ashley must be a man who is aware of nada, though this awareness disintegrates

into a despair that is purely destructive; Count Mippipoppolous must have his arrow wounds in order to become what Brett calls "one of us"(32), that is, one of those who knows about nada. In the time context of The Sun Also Rises the most important men in Brett's life are, of course, Mike Campbell, Robert Cohn, Romero, and Jake. Each represents to Brett a different kind of love and each passes her entrance exam.

Brett uses Mike as her drinking companion, and since he, like Brett, is both awful and nice, he is a fitting partner. Though their relationship does involve sex, the atmosphere of alcoholic escapes is far more dominant. They drink, and only when they can drink no more do they go to bed, safe in their mutual acceptance of a loveless partnership. Both can have other affairs, but both become dissatisfied with this arrangement. Mike becomes cruel, no longer passing Brett's standards, and Brett turns to Romero to end her dissatisfaction. Still, Brett will return to Mike when, with Cohn and Romero out of the picture, he has hopefully become less cruel. Though she realizes that she "can't even marry"(242) Mike, that there can be no union in a world where we must stand alone to face or escape the bulls, she will presumably go through the marriage ceremony that will unite in name only. Because the marriage vows are so casual, she can speak them without surrendering to the role of loveless domesticity that the lost woman seems always to be

fighting against.

Like Mike, Robert Cohn passes Brett's standards, then causes his own dismissal from them. He passes because, as Bill Gorton says, he too is both "nice" and "awful"(101). Although Brett, of course, needs Cohn in order to escape Paris, she also needs to practice what we saw in Catherine Barkley as the distortion of renunciation into a false I-did-it-for-him martyrdom. She leaves Paris with Cohn because she "rather thought it would be good for him"(83). Given Brett's willingness to renounce in order not to hurt Romero, it seems valid to assume she would refuse to hurt Cohn. But Brett has erred in her judgment and Cohn becomes a swine, she a Circe. Perhaps this error is an indication that Brett, at age thirty-four, is beginning to slip. Shortly after her affair with Cohn she does slip to the point of breaking down on the way to Pamplona. Regardless, it is Brett's error that becomes her salvation, for it is the swinish Cohn who serves as her conscience. Because she has lost her self-respect with Cohn, she can learn from him whom she presumed to teach that it is necessary to gain back her respect with the integrity of true emotion. This integrity she gains with Romero, who passes her ~~standards~~ because he is the epitome of manhood with his tanned face and triangle scar, his cigar and his green trousers that seem fitted by a shoehorn. If Brett cannot react to him with love, she

can at least react with real emotion. Romero is a bedfellow of passion rather than of pure distraction. Brett can give, rather than just try to give, as much as she takes from the encounter. She has been a non-passionate, nontaster of life. With Romero she becomes, for a time, an aficionado, reacting with passion to the bullfighter instead of the bullfight. Though she is a bitch to collect him, it is both right and necessary that she have him. Through him she gains a small amount of the integrity of the lost woman and some understanding of the concept of service.

Because of his wound Jake cannot be Brett's sex partner, but by virtue of that wound he gains entrance into her world. Given the sterility of love, one may wonder why Brett and Jake even try to love. Part of the reason, we know via Jake, is Brett's desire to have what she cannot have. If she cannot have Jake, he cannot fail her and leave her without even the "pretty" thought that things might be different. Jake becomes her good place, her refuge from the noise of her world. She needs him as a priest-confessor in place of the religion she lacks but fears. As such, Jake becomes as much an escape as the sex, drink, and gayety that wear Brett down. But like Frederic Henry's and Catherine's escape to Switzerland, it is an escape which can help to sustain her when she is forced back into society. More than in the other Hemingway novels,

in The Sun Also Rises the hero and heroine do not believe that society should be reaffirmed. As in A Farewell to Arms, the emphasis rests on how to live within society, but here there is no chance for a temporary alliance of two against the others.<sup>18</sup> What hope exists in The Sun Also Rises, exists for a future generation, which has nothing to do with a love like Catherine's and Frederic's. Such a hope is even odder in the non-productive lives of Jake and Brett than is Robert Jordan's hope that he will live after death in a barren Maria. As in For Whom the Bell Tolls, it is a hope that exists in name only, in the title of the novel rather than in its content.

Largely because of the emphasis on her promiscuity, Brett does not suggest the kind of idealization that we saw in the Fitzgerald heroine and in Catherine and Maria. She is a gypsy pagan, an image to dance around, a bacchanalian queen seated on a wine cask, not a goddess on earth. The men who worship her know how "awful" she is as much as they consider her "nice." They worship not an ideal perfection but an ideal nonperfection. Even Robert Cohn must finally accept the reality Brett thrusts upon him, and even Romero must finally accept a boyish Brett instead of a long-haired woman.<sup>19</sup> But if the most obvious fact of Brett's reality is her sexuality, it is not the most important. Although Romero does not approve this aspect of Brett, he accepts her regardless of it. It is Jake, however, who



establishes Brett as going beyond the whore to the lost woman. Jake cannot, after all, love Brett for sexual reasons. And Jake does love Brett. At San Sebastian he may be cleansed of her as a destroyer who makes him cry, but he will stick by her always because he loves that something in her worth sticking by. What the something is seems to me exactly those qualities which establish her as a lost woman: her knowledge of the isolated role she plays yet her ability to survive despite it; her refusal to play the phoney with those, who, like Jake and Romero, really matter; and her willingness to serve these when service is called for. Brett, finally, is no Margot Macomber. Where Margot grows directly out of a person like James's Georgina Gressie of "Georgina's Reasons," Brett combines Kate Croy or Charlotte Stant with Georgina. Georgina uses social laws, particularly the marriage law, for sexual license and never learns to stop hurting others for purely selfish reasons; Brett defies social law. She would avoid hurting others if she had the foresight she did not have with Robert Cohn but did have with Romero. The essential difference between Brett and Georgina or Margot is that she is worthy of the admiration we feel toward the lost woman as much as she provokes our contempt and pity.

Hawthorne's and James's lost heroines survive the narrow worlds they can never really fit into by being independent women who refuse to be made domestic

objects and who refuse, also, to give up their womanhood. Fitzgerald's Nicole Diver survives by defining herself in terms of a man, by becoming a man's woman, yet by finding her independence too. Catherine and Maria survive by being totally a man's woman, though Catherine, we have seen, would assert her independence if necessary. Like the other Hemingway heroines, Brett lacks independence. Despite her journeys around the continent, she can go nowhere alone. Mike tries to take care of her; Jake does take care of her by being her rescuer; both indicate that Brett needs taking care of. But Brett is unlike Catherine and Maria, and unlike the other women we have studied thus far, primarily because she tries to be a man instead of trying to find a satisfying woman's role.<sup>20</sup> Thus she makes a fetish about a man's hat, about her boyish hair, about free love and drinking. Unable to find the sustaining love the other heroines find, it is to her credit that she chooses to be man-ish rather than to be the worst kind of a man's woman that Hemingway depicts on the train to Pamplona. This woman, whom Jake and Bill meet with her husband on the train, is the type who "understands" her husband's debauchery on a fishing trip. Her comments to Jake and Bill reveal just the opposite: "That's the way men are. . . . I voted against prohibition to please him [the husband], and because I like a little beer in the house, and then he talks that way.

It's a wonder they ever find anyone to marry them"(86). What she does not understand is that she condones the worst kind of man, who thinks occasional and rather mild debauchery will make him manly and who is oblivious to the nature of the good place where he fishes. If we get angry at Catherine and Maria, at least they bow to a love that is religious and not profane. If we get angry at Brett's refusal to be a woman, at least she refuses to be the lady-on-the-train type.

But try as she will, Brett cannot be a man, nor should she be. Hemingway will not allow her the sustaining aspects of manhood, the fishing trips or the clean well-lighted places or even the work that is as important to a man as love. Again we see the plight of a woman who, even when she cannot love, is only allowed to become worthy by her relation to a man. Where Jake's dignity comes in part from his writing, Dimmesdale's from his ministry, Merton Densher's from his journalism, Dick Diver's from his psychiatry, the women in these novels find dignity primarily in terms of the sacrifice they make for a man. So Brett carries the sacrificial theme through. From having to do something, she progresses to wanting to do something.<sup>21</sup> From her false sacrifice with Cohn, she progresses to a true sacrifice with Romero. Though her relationship with Romero is doomed from the start, her release of him is real enough to cause

her to call on Jake for aid. Brett may not be fake in her emotion toward Romero, but she knows that this emotion is vulnerable to time and to Romero's youth. He wants finally to marry her, but only, she feels, if he can dominate her and make her "more womanly"(242). But Brett knows she cannot be more womanly and that her barrenness will eventually affect Romero. By breaking off her affair while it is still good, she saves herself from domination by the kind of husband Romero promises to be and also saves herself from disillusion about an affair which, sooner or later, is doomed to fade. She could, however, have easily reaped the benefits of her affair until her disillusion set in and thus have ruined Romero. Because it is Romero's disillusion more than her own that she is most concerned about, she chooses to deny her own interest at its height in order to save what she values in him. She has practiced discipline and temperance, and her later undisciplined and untemperate celebration of her actions cannot take away the rightness of what she has done.

Because he allows her a chance for genuine sacrifice as well as genuine emotion, Romero becomes the instrument of Brett's salvation just as Cohn was the gadfly to salvation. Brett's religion is an even-handed one where "we pay for all the things we do"(26). To the suffering such payment involves, Romero helps

Brett to add the dimension of purposeful atonement for the "hell [she has] put chaps through"(26). She cannot pray for Romero, so she acts for him by leaving him. By action she regains her integrity and finds "what we have instead of God"(245). This may not sustain her forever and she may, like Zenobia, at the last break down. For Brett is not a Catherine Barkley who faces death courageously and without thought of herself. She is not a Nicole Diver or Hester Prynne or Charlotte Stant who through suffering have learned survival. Her fear and suffering are rarely faced and often escaped via drink and sex. But in her renouncing of Romero she faces squarely what she has before only escaped.<sup>22</sup> Because she acts with courage in the midst of all the things she fears, she becomes, for the moment at least, equatable with her predecessors.

From Brett Ashley to Maria, Hemingway presents the theme of renunciation, which for him is more a matter of service. But increasingly service becomes slavery rather than renunciation and the heroines become mindless toys for men to play with.<sup>23</sup> If Hemingway could rally from his failing art in order to write The Old Man and the Sea, he could not rally in his depiction of a heroine.<sup>24</sup> Catherine renounces all but her sexual womanhood in order to serve a selfish Frederic Henry; Maria exists so much as a servant to Robert Jordon that she seems never to

have had a larger dimension that could invoke renunciation; the closest we get to a heroine in Islands in the Stream is a nostalgic portrayal of an ex-wife who returns to sleep with her husband and to regret the past which cannot be recaptured. The rest of the women in Islands in the Stream are treated even more briefly than the ex-wife and, in part, satirically. The best of Hemingway's writing here involves the hero and his male children and the hero facing death at sea. Renunciation turned slavery culminates in Renata of Across the River and Into the Trees, the last fully treated heroine in a Hemingway novel. Renata, as she might have appeared in an earlier Hemingway novel or in a novel by Hawthorne or James, would have the courage to love a dying old man, to refuse to break down under her suffering, to give up her girlish pleasure for a love she knows is doomed to failure, to survive in a loveless marriage when love has died. She would, in short, be a lost heroine even more than Catherine or Brett. But as Hemingway presents her, Renata is repetitive and fawning and fails to exist outside of her declarations of love to Cantwell. In her, the element of dignity so intrinsic to the lost woman is totally absent.<sup>25</sup> She represents the ultimate in the one-sided ideal of service, Cantwell giving her love but giving up nothing for her, not even his last duck-hunting trip. Robert

Jordan at least tries to serve Maria by giving her an idea to hold onto after his death. Although this idea of survival of the two in the one who lives appears in Across the River and Into the Trees, it is buried beneath the overwhelming love rhetoric, the I love you very truly, the I want you Daughters, the my last and only true loves, of that novel. Frederic, too, wishes to serve Catherine when, in A Farewell to Arms, it is too late. But only in The Sun Also Rises is service convincingly a dual obligation: Brett renounces Romero, and Jake drops the slavery of pimping for Brett by renouncing his peace at San Sebastian in order to rescue her. Though each renounces for a different person and a different reason, neither renounces as a slave. Just as Catherine replaces her relatively easy slavery toward Frederic with renunciation through death, Brett replaces service as an aside to indulgence with her renunciation of Romero.

Because both Catherine and Brett give up what is for them very difficult to give up, because they give up something they cannot replace, they qualify as lost women. Because they renounce, they, like the lost woman, choose to embrace an isolation which provides them nothing but which serves another. Like the Fitzgerald heroine, their concern is with a single human being more than with society's values. Their martyrdom, however, is provoked because the individual

they renounce for needs society whether it is valuable or not, and thus more than the Fitzgerald heroine they reflect Hawthorne's and James's concern with the need for a larger community. But Catherine clearly does not need a social milieu in addition to her isolated love so that, dying, she releases Frederic to the kind of world that only a man in Hemingway finds necessary. Even Brett needs her social world only when a sustaining love relationship fails her. Her world is hardly one which Hemingway sees as valuable and can hardly be seen as more than an escape from the isolation which lies beneath it. The Hemingway woman, like his dream girl, becomes a creature whose only needs revolve around love. Where in Hawthorne and James, society, as well as love, exists for both men and women, in Hemingway it exists and should exist only for a man. Within such a world, a woman who cannot find or cannot keep love seems doubly lost.



## CHAPTER VI

## WILLIAM FAULKNER AND THE "HEART'S DARLING"

In the works of Faulkner we have come full circle in the American writer's concern for the plight of the lost woman. Faulkner's vision of her lies closer to Hawthorne's than to his contemporaries; and no two authors whom we have dealt with seem closer in their feelings toward her than they.<sup>1</sup> As we read The Scarlet Letter, we feel that Hawthorne did indeed weep over Hester Prynne. And as we read The Sound and the Fury, we judge that Caddy Compson was to Faulkner "the beautiful one," his "heart's darling."<sup>2</sup> But where Hawthorne created in all his major novels a heroine toward whom he could show a sympathy close to that he felt toward Hester, Faulkner shies away from a recreation of his Caddy Compson type. If his women are not the strong, elderly, often perverse Addie Bundren types, they are the mindless Lena Grove peasants, who have no sense of the lost woman's dilemma or they are the socially conscious Narcissa Benbows, who have no sense of the lost woman's rebellion. Even Temple Drake who, by the time of Requiem for a Nun, accepts her sexuality and her guilt, is not essentially like the heroines we

have been studying. She and her early prototype, Cecily Saunders of Soldier's Pay, seem, with their shallowness and their frigidity, in fact closer to the nineteenth century light heroine than to the dark.<sup>3</sup> Although Temple may lose this frigidity, her sexuality is perverted from an expression of human love into a love for evil, and it is fulfilled only in slavery to the men who use her. Her renunciation of pride in order to acknowledge her guilt is a selfish act performed for her own preservation. Neither she nor Cecily ever gain the courage to act for another human being.

Despite its lack of affinity to the lost woman type, Requiem for a Nun illustrates a concern that Hawthorne and James stress in the love relationship and that Hemingway and Fitzgerald worry over. The meaning of Requiem for a Nun which Temple accepts via her confession is that children "shall be intact, unanguished, untorn, unterrified"(211). Man, says Faulkner, must be responsible to those children whom Fitzgerald tends to ignore and whom Hemingway refuses life.<sup>4</sup> When we come to Faulkner's relatively few versions of the lost woman, we think again of Hester Prynne, who accepts and is even saved by her responsibility for Pearl, and we think of Charlotte Stant who renounces her lover in part that his child may be unanguished, untorn, unterrified. But in Hawthorne

and James children are still a minor consideration. As in Fitzgerald and Hemingway, the intense love relationship often leaves little room for a child: so Pearl is born only after her parents are separated and the Principino is born of a loveless marriage, not of an adulterous love. In Faulkner, the child becomes a more central consideration, and this seems fitting. Where Fitzgerald and Hemingway depict a world in which, however unsuccessfully, love can often fight the twentieth-century wasteland, Faulkner senses that this wasteland has left no room for sexual love and that a woman must, like Brett Ashley, find a substitute. This substitute is the child. Faulkner's Laverne Shumann of Pylon, Caddy Compson of The Sound and the Fury, and Eula Varner of the Snopes trilogy<sup>5</sup>, renounce for a child rather than a lover they never find. The substitute of child for lover is, however, hardly simple, and Charlotte Rittenmeyer of The Wild Palms, Faulkner's one lost woman in love, faces an unsolvable dilemma. Foreshadowed by Pylon and The Sound and the Fury, The Wild Palms marks the culmination of a vision that senses the incompatibility between love and the child, or love and society, and that finds it must give up the one for the other.

Faulkner has said that in Pylon he was depicting a world which left no place in its culture or economy for the phenomenon of the barnstorming circuit and that this circuit was "frenetic and in a way almost immoral."<sup>6</sup>

We must stress the "almost" in his latter statement more than the "immoral," for Pylon is largely a criticism of a traditional society that blindly condemns the rootless and adulterous relationship of Roger and Laverne Shumann and Jack Holmes. The point Faulkner makes is not that this new culture is ideal but that it contains a kind of morality which has mistakenly been condemned as immoral.<sup>7</sup> Jiggs, the mechanic, taunts Laverne's child about whether his father is Roger or Jack, yet he has himself deserted his own wife and children. A cab-driver and a group of reporters represent the casual observers in Roger's hometown and at the airbase, and these are quick to believe, even revel in, the gossip. Roger's father is, likewise, quick to believe that Laverne earns money by prostitution and hides it in her child's toy airplane. His condemnation of Laverne, not Roger or Jack, indicates that society judges primarily the woman who allows men to share her, not the men who do the sharing. This and society's voyeuristic desire to participate in the adultery is indicated especially by the nameless reporter who narrates the novel and who is, in some respects, its main character. The fact that despite her taint Laverne remains attractive and seems not a whore is a crux for the reporter. He wishes to bed with her. Like Hemingway's Robert Cohn, he is disturbed by her to the point of being

unable to function. But unlike Cohn who refuses to accept Brett's promiscuity, he continually perverts Laverne's sexuality, dwelling on whether or not she can tell the difference between her two men and on whether or not she accommodates both at the same time. The problem for him, as for the others, is the same as in the story "Centaur in Brass" where a Faulkner character states it explicitly: "The idea of their being on amicable terms outraged us more than the idea of the adultery itself. It seemed foreign, decadent, perverted: we could have accepted, if not condoned, the adultery had they only been natural and logical enemies"(151).

Conventional adultery where the men involved fight for a woman versus unconventional adultery where the men involved remain friends is treated often by Faulkner, who found the idea of "two men trying to get in bed with the same woman"<sup>8</sup> the best, in terms of what people like to read, conflict to write about. "Centaur in Brass," "Artist at Home," "All the Dead Pilots," "Mistral," "Dr. Martino," and "Honor" all deal to some degree with the relationship between male and male, as well as between male and female, in a love triangle. The story "Honor" is the most closely related to Pylon and serves to underline the criticism of conventional moral judgments that Faulkner implies in the novel. In "Honor," a narrator becomes involved

with another man's wife. When the husband discovers the affair, the narrator believes the honorable solution is to fight to the death in a flying stunt. The husband, it seems, might have accepted a menage of three, but, given the narrator's belief in enmity, he offers divorce instead. When the chance to have the woman for himself thus occurs, the narrator seems not to want her after all. He would accept death, but he cannot accept love. He pursues his code of enmity in the name of an honor that leaves no room for love. Even the woman, who finally rejects this code of honor, seeks only to escape her financially difficult domestic situation.

That the conventionally condemned triangle in Pylon seems far more honorable than the triangle in "Honor" can be justified on several counts. The justification comes largely through Laverne who is as central a character in Pylon as the reporter, so much so that Faulkner readily accepted a student hypothesis that Laverne might be considered the pylon about which all men gravitate.<sup>9</sup> Like James, Faulkner elevates his heroine by using a "merciful indirection"; for Faulkner, the ideal woman must be understated, not described.<sup>10</sup> Although he shows us little of Laverne directly, throughout the novel we know that she endures despite the odds against her. She has been orphaned, seduced by her brother-in-law, possibly

raped. Because she is not a mindless peasant type she tries to escape her lot and joins the isolated barnstorming culture. Yet Laverne is trying less to escape into isolation than she is trying to escape out of it. If she does not find with Roger and Jack an intense love relationship, she nevertheless finds a place where she can exercise both her individuality and her sense of responsibility toward others. The sex act becomes for her not a withdrawal from others into an isolation of two but a commitment to others, a symbol of loyalty.

We never see Laverne's motives for choosing two men rather than one. This is part of the technique of merciful indirection. We do, however, see that once her choice is made, she remains loyal to it and sacrifices for it. At one point Laverne says that what she would like is "just a house, a room; a cabin will do, a coalshed where [she] can know that next Monday and the Monday after that and the Monday after that . . ." (165). She wants the domesticity and security that we see immediately after this at Matt Ord's house, where Roger is trying to get a plane to fly in order that his family may win money enough to stay together. We hear Ord's wife setting a table and singing to a child. Laverne will never be allowed this. Indeed, she gives up this way of life as one that is incompatible with the temperaments of

Roger and Jack. She is not wifely, yet she provides them with a kind of home; she is not motherly, yet she is a good and a loving mother.

Laverne can provide a home without the security of a settled house. But society being what it is, a certain amount of money is necessary to survival. In Faulkner, as in James, money is a central issue in the novels we are concerned with, though Faulkner hardly requires the quantity of money that James does.<sup>11</sup> Money becomes a problem in Pylon primarily because Laverne is pregnant again. Though the father of this child is Jack, which gives lie to the reporter's speculation about the nature of Laverne's sex relationships, it is Roger who sacrifices his life in an attempt to earn enough money to support two children. When Roger's attempt fails, Laverne is forced to abandon her son rather than to run the risk of watching two children starve. Significantly, Laverne's renunciation of her son is the only scene in which we get a sustained and direct view of her. Faulkner leaves no doubt here that she abandons her child precisely because she is a good mother. We have already seen her fulfilling her role as mother: she marries that her child may have a name; she watches over that child's health; she refuses to let him be sheltered from the nature of his parentage which will confront him sooner or later; she has shown him love so that he does not want to leave her.<sup>12</sup>



Faulkner is not here concerned with the rightness or wrongness in her choice. Rather, he is concerned that the need for money to survive in the modern world forces a choice. Laverne could leave the life in which she has found a kind of love and responsibility and choose to earn money herself to support two children. But "where would she get a hundred and seventy-five dollars, anyway?"(313) asks Roger's father when he finds the money the reporter has left in the child's airplane. The implication is that the only avenue open to Laverne is prostitution. Given the alternatives of prostitution or starvation, she abandons the child she loves without regard to her own loss.

If Laverne is, as she believes, a "bad"(307) person, she is still a moral person in the sense that she acts responsibly for others. This morality of responsibility is seen again in the conventionally "bad" Caddy Compson of The Sound and the Fury. If, however, morality is measured by social appearance, then Caddy, like Laverne, is immoral. When Mr. Compson tells Quentin that "your Mother is thinking of morality whether it be sin or not has not occurred to her"(126), he is criticizing exactly the kind of social judgments practiced in Pylon. Taking the Compson world into consideration here, we must see that despite her "badness" or "immorality," Caddy is not

sinful. For the Compsons have abandoned God without whom sin is a lost concept. What Caddy has been taught about God consists of Mrs. Compson's bitterness toward Benjy who is a judgment of her for stooping to marry a Compson. "When is the Lawd's own time?" Caddy asks Dilsey; "It's Sunday," Quentin answers(29). But we cannot expect that Sunday for the Compson children is the Lawd's own time anymore than it is on that Easter, 1928 when, of all the Compsons, only Benjy celebrates the resurrection. Caddy can never love a God she has been taught nothing about. She, like Laverne, cannot be judged in the Christian context of sin or the social context of morality. Both must instead be judged by their capacity for human love and responsibility.<sup>13</sup>

Caddy may be the controlling figure of destruction in The Sound and the Fury. She does become the town tramp and she does forsake those she loves. But she is still Faulkner's "heart's darling." In answer to a question on why he did not devote a section of The Sound and the Fury to Caddy, Faulkner answered that she was "too beautiful and too moving to reduce her to telling what was going on."<sup>14</sup> If we take Faulkner at his word, expressed again and again, that The Sound and the Fury is a story about Caddy,<sup>15</sup> we see not only that she affects those around her, but that those around her reveal Caddy as Faulkner wishes

us to see her. Through those she loves--Benjy, Quentin, her father, (Miss) Quentin, Dilsey--we see her at her best despite or because of the distortion with which these characters sometimes view her. Through those she does not love--Jason, her mother, her men--we see her as she, like so many of the women we have looked at, appears to most of the world: hard, cold, sluttish, and evil. Whether she is thus viewed favorably or unfavorably, each major character of The Sound and the Fury establishes Caddy's relationship to the lost heroine: she is the isolated woman who accepts her personal isolation within society instead of trying to escape it via an attempted union with another person away from society; she is the woman who gives up all that is meaningful to her out of regard for others, not herself.

Beyond some childish name-calling, Caddy is never intentionally mean to anyone. She is, of course, outraged at Jason, but she never exposes his crime and she is genuinely sorry that her divorce costs him a job. Her basic kindness is pointed out closely on the evening of a fight over some paper dolls. Mrs. Compson makes her take away Benjy's cushion. She argues about this but she obeys. When Benjy begins to cry, Caddy puts the cushion behind her mother's head, perhaps more in

kindness for Benjy who is now on Mrs. Compson's lap than for her mother. She then tells her mother, again possibly for Benjy's calm, to "go upstairs and lay down so you can be sick"(78). Although Caddy is not being intentionally kind to her mother, neither is she being sarcastically and bitterly unkind as Jason would be if these had been his words. Caddy tells her mother to "Hush"(78) almost as she would tell Benjy the same thing and, indeed, that word may be spoken in this scene more for Benjy's benefit than for Mrs. Compson's. In her concern for Benjy and in her general lack of malice, Caddy can show a tolerance for Mrs. Compson that neither Jason nor Mr. Compson are capable of. Kindness, however, does not stop Jason and Mrs. Compson and, because of his weakness in the face of the others, Mr. Compson from isolating Caddy from their home.

Through Benjy we see Caddy at her most tender, her most motherly. She is his protectress when he is a child called Maury. When he is older but still unable to care for himself, she is his teacher, telling him about "Santy Claus" and Christmas. She is his entertainer, innocently letting him carry a letter to Mrs. Patterson, cutting up dolls for him by the firelight, running to meet him as he waits for her by the gate. To Caddy, Benjy is not a burden. He is not Mrs. Compson's "poor baby"(8) or a cross to bear. For him she will try always to smell like trees.

She will wash off her perfume and a young man's kiss and will wash away Dalton Ames by bathing in the branch. To her brother Quentin, Caddy is not only the mother and the protectress, the comforter and the companion, she is also the imagined lover and the fellow suicide. Although Quentin's view of Caddy is distorted by his interwoven love and hate for her, we can still see between them an almost mystical kinship, one as strong as the kinship we have so often seen between heroine and lover. But despite her love for both Quentin and Benjy, Caddy cannot accept Quentin's proposal to create a private family in a separate hell. She is not Hawthorne's Miriam who, in The Marble Faun, wishes to isolate herself and Donatello into a world of sin. Instead, she knows from the first what the heroines we have been studying seem always to learn, that isolation into a heaven or hell separate from the rest of society, even if desirable, is impossible.

Just as Caddy rejects Quentin's proposal that she escape with Benjy and himself into isolation, she rejects her single chance for sexual love. It is, in part, her love of her brothers that makes it impossible for Caddy to find sexual love. Only Dalton Ames could have provided her with this kind of love, but because of Quentin and Benjy she dismisses him. However, though she refuses sex with a person she cares for, she cannot deny her sexuality altogether.<sup>16</sup>

Though her virginity means no more than a "hangnail"(412), Caddy's first sexual encounter is a strong enough physical sensation that she dies within it. Because she accepts her sexuality, she destroys those she loves, but in the sense that her sexuality indicates her acceptance of change that cannot be ignored, she refuses to be a partner in illusion that, be it sooner or later, will break for all.

Because Caddy knows she cannot deny her sexuality in order to protect Quentin and Benjy, her renunciation of Dalton Ames is not performed only for them. Although Dalton presents the possibility of sexual love, neither he nor Caddy actually are in love. Although Caddy's blood pounds at the sound of his name, she can only answer "I dont know"(195) when Quentin asks her if she loves Dalton. In Faulkner, as in the other authors we have studied, love is not something a heroine wonders about. If she loves, she loves totally and immediately.<sup>17</sup> Still, the passion Caddy feels toward Dalton is meaningful. It is a passion she would like to keep and Dalton is a person far more worthy of Caddy than her later husband Herbert. He may tell Quentin she is a "bitch"(113), but he calls her one only in the sense that he lumps all women together as bitches. Toward a more personal Caddy he expresses continued concern. Caddy might have wished to marry Dalton, though until her pregnancy,

thoughts of marriage would seem only a momentary weakness in her. At any rate, she, perhaps to justify her loss of virginity, believes she can marry him. After his fight with Quentin, she thinks of getting Dalton back, presumably by telling him she is pregnant, which she is not.<sup>18</sup> "yes I can tell him I can make him believe anytime I can make him"(202). When she chooses not to try to marry Dalton, Caddy avoids a loveless marriage. When she discovers her pregnancy, Dalton has long been out of the picture, and she chooses to marry a person she cares nothing about, a person who is already so crass that a loveless marriage cannot harm him.

Caddy gives up Quentin and Benjy, whom she loves, and Dalton, whom she regards, because she can give always without thought to herself. By sacrificing her Brothers in favor of sex rather than the possibility of sexual love with Dalton, Caddy also sacrifices herself. That only she puts flowers on Quentin's grave, that she must stand alone and separate at her own father's funeral, poignantly display the utter homelessness which has become the fate of the one Compson who made that family's household a home. However, Caddy's greatest renunciation, like Laverne Shumann's, involves her child. Though she abandons her daughter to the sterility of a Compson household, as Laverne abandons her son to an aging couple who

can love him only if he is their grandson, this is fundamentally a selfless act. Caddy may wish to be a mother, but she knows that motherhood is an answer to nothing and that the protection it affords a child is relinquished at the moment of birth. The motherless child who so loved to play mother is denied real motherhood to the point that her name cannot even be spoken in front of her daughter. As the final motherless child, Quentin appropriately finishes the Compson decline.

Despite (Miss) Quentin's deterioration, we are wrong if we assume that Caddy makes a mistake in leaving her with the Compsons. Although the somewhat superficial nature of her reasons for leaving Quentin seem a weakness in the novel, we should have no doubt that Faulkner intends we believe in these reasons. By abandoning her daughter, Caddy presumes that she is giving her the only chance she can have, and if this proves to be no chance at all, it is society that has forced such a choice and not Caddy herself. For Caddy, divorced by a husband who could give her money if not love, can support a daughter no more than Laverne can support her son. Like Laverne, Caddy believes that her only viable way of making money is some form of prostitution. Even when she marries a second time, a loveless marriage seems no better a background than Caddy had as a Compson,



and Caddy is by now, in the eyes of the world, a tainted woman. We must remember also that Caddy believes, until her father dies, that she may come back to her family and her daughter. Unable to do this, she is the best mother she can be to Quentin: she visits her secretly, she writes to her, she sends her money. With her brother Quentin and her father dead, Caddy can still hope that her daughter may be influenced by Benjy and Dilsey. But Benjy is now a slobbering man rather than a lovable child, and Dilsey is an old woman who cannot break through the hard shell Jason has forced Quentin to build around herself. It is Dilsey, however, who indicates that Quentin, though lost, is not worse off away from the Compsons than with them. She is "all right"(352), Dilsey tells Mrs. Compson when Quentin is discovered missing. When Luster wishes to tell where she is, Dilsey admonishes him to "jes keep hit. . . . Soon es Quentin need any of yo egvice, I'll let you know"(372). Dilsey knows that Quentin, by her escape, has seized the only chance for survival open to her.

Though some hope is left for Quentin at the end of The Sound and the Fury, we envision for her a fate more like that of Temple Drake than of Caddy whose final doom is a monument to her selflessness. We know at least that Quentin does not return to her mother in order to find any kind of salvation. For Caddy has not saved the only person left to her. Her

cycle of betrayal has been completed so that she "hasn't anything anymore worth being saved for nothing worth being lost that she can lose"(420). Caddy has moved further and further away from the Southern past of the Compsons until she ends up in a foreign land. Her goal is to break all family roots. That she poses against the richness of a German resort with a decorated staff-general is a tribute not to her defeat, but to her triumph, for she has sacrificed all that she loves in the acceptance of a fate that cannot destroy her.<sup>19</sup> She has accepted her own isolation without trying to escape the society around her and so will survive, as ageless at fifty as she was at thirty.

The conflict between isolation and society that Laverne and Caddy face becomes even more important in The Wild Palms. Unlike Laverne and Caddy, Charlotte Rittenmeyer forsakes her children not because she feels it is best for them but because it is best for her. Yet the motives behind her choice, guided by a sexual love not seen in either Pylon or The Sound and the Fury, are no less admirable. Because The Wild Palms does, however, involve sexual love, Charlotte appears more like the other lost women we have looked at, particularly Hemingway's version of that heroine in A Farewell to Arms.<sup>20</sup> Given the closeness of the names Charlotte and Harry to Catherine and Henry, given an idyllic

interlude away from a society that makes love difficult if not impossible, given an unwanted pregnancy and the death of the heroine because of pregnancy, one inevitably thinks of A Farewell to Arms. However, although as lost women Charlotte and Catherine are much alike, it will be seen that Faulkner's view of isolated love lies closer to Hawthorne's than to Hemingway's.

In The Wild Palms the conflict between love and society is expressed largely through the question of whether or not a love relationship leaves room for a child. Because the child is an intrusive third party it prohibits the kind of isolated love that all the authors we have studied deal with. Thus Charlotte cannot act upon her love for Harry unless she abandons the children of her marriage. Although her suffering over these children is dealt with indirectly, it must not be minimized. Instead, the intensity of "Wild Palms" as a whole is given distance by the "Old Man" story.<sup>21</sup> Though her children are "not particularly remarkable"(42), we know that Charlotte regrets their loss and that she renounces them only because love exacts this sacrifice from her: "I have already thought of them," she tells Harry. "So now I dont need to think of them any more because I know I cant change that answer"(48). Immediately after Charlotte convinces Harry to perform an abortion on her, in part because children "hurt too much"(217), we again learn indirectly

how much she suffers. Harry imagines a scene which is taking place between Charlotte and her husband and children. We see the children hurting her. The older one suffers her kiss and the younger follows the other's beckoning so that Charlotte releases them both because "they want to go"(22) rather than to visit with her. And if these unremarkable children hurt, how much more might a child born of love cause Charlotte to suffer. Yet Charlotte does not seek an abortion merely because a child hurts. She feels, as she had with her other children, the incompatibility between parenthood and sexual love. She wished to believe "that when people loved, hard, really loved each other, they didn't have children, the seed got burned up in the love, the passion"(205). When she finds she is pregnant and can no longer even pretend to believe this she feels that "it's not us now . . . I want it to be us again"(210).

Charlotte, however, is not a selfish heroine, so her abandonment of her children and her abortion have yet another motive behind them. When she abandons her children she chooses for Harry as much as for herself. She saves him from becoming a sterile hypocrite like the doctor who has him arrested and to whom Faulkner intends a comparison. When she abandons them, the children had doubtless already begun to grow away from a dependency upon their mother.

Again when she chooses the abortion, she chooses for Harry and herself, but this time the unborn child is also a strong consideration. She renounces it out of the same motive that Laverne Shumann renounces Jack and Caddy Compson renounces (Miss) Quentin, a motive she may also have had for eliminating the idea of taking her two daughters with her and Harry: "I can starve and you can starve but not it"(205). Once more Faulkner has returned to the concept that society's requirement of money destroys active motherhood and love or relegates these to the perverse or the tedious. Charlotte cries twice in The Wild Palms, and both times it is in despair over money. The first time she cries because lack of money makes it impossible to escape with Harry; the second, because money for a child can be earned only through a job as a WPA school-crossing guard that will turn Harry into a robot who, if any passion is left him, "can rape little girls in parks on Saturday afternoons"(220). Where in James money was emblematic of the escape from vulgarity and the possibility of culture, in Faulkner it is emblematic of all that is bad in society. As in James, Faulkner's lovers cannot live without money, but neither can they live with it, for money, or the struggle to earn money, traps them into a world where there is no place or time for love. Harry and Charlotte can escape together only when they gain

money by breaking society's laws. Harry steals money from a wallet he has found. When this begins to dwindle and society, discovering he is a wife-stealer, will not allow him to replace it by working as an intern, he and Charlotte escape further into an idyllic isolation in Wisconsin. But they cannot live in either their escape from Charlotte's marriage or in their total escape from society. Their money--or its equivalent, food--will run out. So they return to Chicago and work for their money according to society's laws, Harry as a true confessions writer, Charlotte as a shopgirl.

Both the time with too little money and the time with too much nearly destroy the love relationship in The Wild Palms because Harry, like Frederic Henry, is dishonest in his belief in love.<sup>22</sup> Where Frederic's dishonesty is represented by his willingness to let Catherine bear all the responsibility for her pregnancy, Harry's is represented by his failure to return the money he found in the wallet. His theft represents dishonesty as much as it represents rebellion, and stands in marked contrast to Charlotte's open and honest rebellion against society's marriage laws. The time of idyllic retreat is Charlotte's heaven. She is productive within it and enjoys it without fearing its end or losing sight of the suffering which she has paid for it. Charlotte's hell is the time in Chicago when money is plentiful but Harry and she

are rarely together. She survives this because she has not lost sight of the moments which such suffering has bought. Harry, however, is almost defeated by lack of money and by respectability because he, like Frederic Henry, finds isolated love non-productive, even boring, and allows socially acceptable love to fade into inertia. Just as Frederic lacks Catherine's ability to keep love alive in easy, as well as in difficult, situations, Harry lacks Charlotte's ability to do the same. She had warned him about this:

They say love dies between two people.  
That's wrong. It doesn't die. It  
just leaves you, goes away, if you are  
not good enough, worthy enough. It  
doesn't die; you're the one that dies.  
It's like the ocean: if you're no good,  
if you begin to make a bad smell in it,  
it just spews you up somewhere to die.(813).

As much as Frederic begins to make a bad smell when he allows love to strip him of energy, Harry does the same.

But Harry recalls Hawthorne's Arthur Dimmesdale as much as he recalls Frederic Henry. Nearly defeated by money and by respectability, Harry has not yet learned a second lesson Charlotte wishes to teach him about love. For her "love no more exists just at one spot and in one moment and in one body out of

all the earth and all time and all the teeming  
breathed, than sunlight does"(43). So he tries to  
capture love in space and time by escaping with  
Charlotte to Utah. Now Harry threatens the love  
relationship a third time by his feelings of guilt  
which in part cause him to bungle Charlotte's abortion.<sup>23</sup>  
The contrast between Charlotte and Harry is so mirrored  
in the contrast between Hester Prynne and Dimmesdale,  
especially regarding the escape plot of The Scarlet  
Letter, that one wonders if Faulkner had Hawthorne  
in mind here. Where Harry and Dimmesdale desire  
escape into love but haven't the courage to fulfill  
their escape, Hester and Charlotte reach a point  
where, right or wrong, they will pursue love. The  
conflict in The Scarlet Letter and The Wild Palms  
seems essentially the same: is a love that ignores  
its obligations to a larger community sinful or not?  
Both authors indicate that they believe ties to  
the human community are necessary. Hawthorne, however,  
never lets us forget that Hester is correct in be-  
lieving that her adultery with Dimmesdale had a  
"consecration of its own"(200). This consecration  
is what Charlotte recognizes in her love for Harry  
and what she teaches him to recognize even as he accepts  
his guilt.

If Charlotte has in some ways destroyed Harry  
via his guilt, as Hester in some ways destroys Dimmesdale,  
she has also given him the chance to continue to live



by accepting love. Faulkner, it seems to me, intends us to see that Charlotte provides Harry with the choice of escaping his guilt feelings and living in a "comfortable safe peaceful purgatory"(83) by forgetting her, of living with guilt and love by remembering her, or of escaping both and dying. Because of her ability to love during both the idyllic and non-idyllic times, she teaches Harry the courage to make his choice. That Charlotte has provided Harry with such a choice we learn through the actions of her husband after her death. With Harry's dedication to guilt her main concern, Charlotte has exacted a promise from her husband to offer Harry escape from prison or to offer him poison. She does not want Harry to die. She had, in fact, wanted him to avoid arrest by abandoning her at her deathbed. But neither does she want him to pervert their love with guilt. Only through Harry can their love continue, but Charlotte knows that guilt may destroy both Harry and the memory of love. By offering escape, she offers the choice to remember or not; by offering poison she offers the choice to die if the remembering, which in the prison cell cannot be avoided, becomes unbearable. In the past Harry could talk about suicide with his friend McCord. Now he can irrevocably refuse forgetfulness and pay tribute to love which Charlotte knew all along cannot be destroyed unless the lovers themselves

become unworthy. Harry makes his choice, knowing that "if I become not then all of remembering will cease to be.--Yes, . . . between grief and nothing I will take grief"(324). Not despair or guilt but grief because he has let his loved one die. By accepting grief Harry has learned Charlotte's lesson that love "doesn't die. It just leaves you, goes away, if you are not good enough." He has made her offer of escape from guilt unnecessary, for now, via memory, he will not let their love die. If he atones for his guilt, he more importantly remembers his love.

Harry's belief that love can be kept alive indicates a closer affinity to Hawthorne and James than to Fitzgerald and Hemingway.<sup>24</sup> Fitzgerald and Hemingway, we have seen, suggest that love is fleeting largely because society intrudes upon it. Hawthorne and James, however, suggest that love survives even if society destroys a love relationship. Although Faulkner, seems to me to reflect in the three works we have considered a recognition of the negative aspects of the twentieth-century wasteland, he seems also to believe that society not only does intrude upon love but must. One of Faulkner's major concerns is individual responsibility toward the human community.<sup>25</sup> It is this kind of responsibility that we have seen Hawthorne's and James's women perform by renouncing their

lovers. This is not the kind of responsibility that Fitzgerald's and Hemingway's heroines practice. Still, they renounce as selflessly in obeisance to the value of isolated love rather than to the need for love to exist within the social order. Similarly Laverne, Caddy, and Charlotte act from selfless motives and give up what is of value to them. Laverne and Caddy seem closer to the nineteenth-century heroines in that they give up their children, as the nineteenth-century heroine gave up her lover, in recognition that the social order demands it. Though the social order may now be wrong, it is nevertheless inescapable. By giving up their children they give them a chance to find a place in the community not available to themselves. Nor does Faulkner believe twentieth century society all bad. Ironically, it is Charlotte who denies a society which has been kinder to her than to Caddy or Laverne. She values her marriage vows and will not break them in back alleys for pleasure alone. She values her children and later her friendship with McCord. She leaves all these, however, for the greater value of sexual love. Though sexual love can survive within society, in The Wild Palms represented by the first Chicago interlude, it must discard society when the time comes, here when Harry is fired. For lovers in the twentieth century, says Faulkner, must neglect everything, even the human

community in pursuit of their love. In this sense The Wild Palms is in conflict with Faulkner's belief in responsibility toward the community. Olga Vickery, however, resolves the dilemma and in doing so suggests the common ground between the five authors we have been considering. "As an assertion of human values in a dead society," says Miss Vickery, Charlotte's and Harry's "conduct is admirable; as a way of life it is ultimately self-defeating." Even though doomed, Miss Vickery goes on, their revolt is necessary to restore the balance between the individual and society; even though society always triumphs, its triumph is only temporary, for individuals always rebel.<sup>26</sup> It is exactly this kind of revolt that causes all the women we have looked at to be lost heroines who can find no place within society but without whom society would itself be lost.

## CHAPTER VII

## YOU DON'T MARRY SEMIRAMIS

All of the writers we have studied have exhibited an extraordinary ability to portray the feminine point of view convincingly and sympathetically. Their lost women live in one's memory long after the specific details of the novels have faded. Hawthorne and James have written entire novels about a woman. If Faulkner often skirts the close view of a woman's mind, he, nevertheless, has been able to give her an existence central to his novel so that she becomes more than a prop used for the development of a male protagonist. As much as Caddy Compson, for instance, is used to tell us something about her brothers, she still remains the most important character in The Sound and the Fury. The sustained close view of the woman is lacking in Hemingway and Fitzgerald so that their novels are as much about the hero as about the heroine. This is perhaps because in the twentieth century the art of conversation has dwindled into the art of seduction, and how a woman thinks has become less important to a man than how a woman feels. Still, like Faulkner, Hemingway and Fitzgerald have been able to create women who have existences of

their own. Though the sympathy toward the female dilemma is lacking in the later Hemingway, he, too, has triumphed in his ability to portray the lost woman type. Brett Ashley, in fact, is perhaps the most convincing, because the least idealized, heroine of all those we have looked at.

Hawthorne, James, Fitzgerald, Hemingway, and Faulkner all have gone further than merely portraying a woman toward whom they show sympathy and understanding. In different ways, each has used his heroine as a vehicle to explore the conflict between isolation and the community and has seen that she is a proper vehicle for such a concern because of her position as a woman. For Hawthorne, if the community imposes isolation upon a woman, the woman herself is no less sinful when she welcomes it because of selfish pride instead of enduring it for the sake of another. Whether isolation involves one person, as is largely the case with Hester Prynne, or two people, as is the case with Miriam and Donatello, or a group of people, as is the case with the experiment at Blithedale, it cannot and should not be retained at the expense of the social order. So in every Hawthorne novel, the value of the social order is reasserted. If the heroine remains herself isolated, she remains so for the social order, not in defiance of it. Hester returns to America to acknowledge that her adultery was a sin. At last she accepts the community's

judgment and serves that community by giving advice of the heart so that others shall not stray. Zenobia commits suicide with the result that Hollingsworth can acknowledge his guilt and his folly in dedicating himself to an idea that exploits in the name of philanthropy. When Miriam gives up Donatello and accepts a greater isolation than she has ever had to endure, she does so in the name of law without which society would crumble.

Like Hawthorne, James stresses in both The Wings of the Dove and The Golden Bowl that though the community isolates, the community must survive. His characters are misguided not because they engage in illicit love, but because illicit love violates an institution of marriage symbolic of the order necessary to the survival of society. For this reason, and to assert the sanctity of parenthood, Charlotte Stant allows Maggie Verver to recapture, if not her husband's love, at least his fidelity. For this reason, Kate Croy would marry Merton Densher only if they kept the money Milly Theale left them. Rather than a reward, the money becomes, for Kate, an admission of guilt against the moral law that says man must not exploit his fellow man.

Kate Croy refuses Merton Densher for the further reason that she loves him, and loving him, she allows him to clear his conscience and live rather

than dissipate under the knowledge of his guilt. It is this kind of sacrifice in the name of an individual more than in the name of society that comes to the fore in the twentieth century. Although the strength of the community to intrude upon isolation is no less strong, the value of such intrusion is tempered. In Fitzgerald's work, we never find the value of the social order being reasserted. He endorses instead those moments away from a larger world which may destroy the perfect isolation of two even if it cannot destroy the memory of these moments. In Hemingway we see a similar attempt to escape the social order, but in contrast to Fitzgerald, if the value of the social order is not reasserted, the community itself is at least re-embraced. The Hemingway heroine, therefore, tends to give up her man because she believes he needs the community of men. Brett Ashley leaves Romero so that he may continue to exist in the world of men, and by her death Catherine Barkley releases Frederic Henry to this world. The Fitzgerald heroine, on the other hand, gives up--or remains with--her man because she believes only the moments away from the community have value and because she does not wish to destroy the memory of these moments. Gloria Gilbert remains isolated from social acceptance in order to stay with a dissipated Anthony Patch and pay tribute to the past they shared. Nicole Diver



embraces a social acceptance which isolates her from Dick in order to keep the memory of her moments with him from being lost in what promises to be a disastrous future. In Faulkner, too, the heroine knows that society must be contended with, and she accepts personal isolation so that another individual-- often now a child--can live in society, whether its value is reasserted or not. Caddy Compson and Laverne Shumann both sacrifice their desired roles of motherhood that their children may have at least a chance within society. And while Charlotte Rittenmeyer refuses to let society destroy her love, she does not force her lover to try to live only within or without it.

Each of the heroines we have looked at is isolated by a society that either cannot accept her sexuality or cannot provide her with a role beyond that of wife and mother. With two exceptions, each for a time attempts to find value in isolation by allying herself to another human being and creating for the two of them a separate world. Only Caddy Compson and Charlotte Rittenmeyer believe from the first that isolation into a separate heaven, or a separate hell, is impossible, and even Charlotte accepts the moments of isolation that she values but knows cannot last. The other heroines all must learn about the futility of creating an isolation of two. When they learn this, they in some way renounce for the sake of the

community or the individual. In The Mansion, Faulkner's V.K. Ratliff captures this ability to renounce that makes Helen/Eula Varner and all the lost women we have looked at what they are. They have, he says, not "jest the inexhaustible capacity for passion, but of power: the power not jest to draw and enchant and consume, but the power and capacity to give away and reward"(139-140). He later qualifies this, saying that Helen can "give nothing away that was ever [hers] : all [she] can do is share it and reward its fidelity and maybe even, for a moment, soothe and assuage its grief"(140). The qualification, however, does not negate the selflessness that we have seen as triumphant in the lost heroine. Instead it suggests that even if she is selfish, she more importantly can forget herself in the idea of another for whom--not to whom--she gives up something of herself.

This idea of renunciation, be it an unplanned result of a fortunate fall as with Hester Prynne or the more purposeful sacrifice of someone like Charlotte Stant, constitutes both the triumph and the failure of the novelists we have studied. The portrayal of renunciation is triumphant to the degree that it convinces us of its reality and of the heroine's stature. In every case studied, we trust, on a fictional level, the author's judgment. But, we might

ask, to what degree do we believe a woman of the type presented capable of renunciation? It is exactly this failure in belief about the ideal nature of women that triggers the critical disputes raging about the lost heroine. From the realistic point of view Brett Ashley seems the most convincing of the heroines, Caddy Compson, the least. Brett's renunciation of Romero, great as it is for her, is tinged with her own feelings of pride in how heroically she has acted. On the other hand, Faulkner asks us to believe that Caddy does not use her daughter or her rejection by the Compsons as a rationalization when she embraces the life of a prostitute-mistress. She acts, we are to believe, for others, and rather than living as she wishes, she lives as she must in order to survive. The male writer can convince us of the selflessness of his lost woman perhaps because he is male. He portrays her closely because he knows her well, and yet he never endows her with a strain of whorishness that a female writer might be more apt to see, particularly in the promiscuous types like Brett and Caddy.

Because of this tendency to idealize his lost heroine, the American author seems, at times, to have created a type of woman whose response to life is unrealistic or even perverse. At the very least, she responds to life as these authors believe it should be rather than as it is. She responds to it

with the expectation that a place beyond the domestic or the sexual does exist for a woman, that she can find fulfillment in such a place and still experience a satisfying and socially acceptable love relationship. Yet in seeking some form of ideal in life, she all too often chooses to find this ideal with a man who is unworthy of her. Again and again we encounter a woman who has finally been so frustrated by life that she is willing to settle for a happiness with a moral coward like Arthur Dimmesdale or Merton Densher, with a man like Dick Diver who cannot reconcile his roles as healer and lover, with a self-centered lover like Frederic Henry, or with a man like Harry Wilbourne who learns to love only when his mistress is dead. Choosing such a lover, it is inevitable that this heroine be frustrated again.

The authors we have looked at create in their lost heroines women whose response to life they admire because it is a passionate response. At the same time they never allow them an outlet for a response that might, finally, create a world that eliminates the frustration which is the necessary spur to such a response. Thus we see on the part of each of these authors a constant equivocation toward the lost woman which comes out most clearly in the denial of a sustained love relationship for her. From Hester Prynne, who loses the man she loves, to Caddy Compson, who has

never found love, all the women we have looked at end up as solitaries. If, however, these writers deny their heroines a sustained love relationship because of fear, the reasons would seem hardly so pathological as someone like Leslie Fiedler suggests. An underlying fear would seem to me to stem less from misgivings about women as sexual beings than from misgivings about women as sexual aggressors. For sexual aggressiveness has long been considered a man's prerogative, and the sexually aggressive woman like Brett Ashley seeks to usurp this role. To a lesser degree intellectual dominance is also a male privilege, and the woman like Charlotte Stant who controls a situation via intellect and instinct both, while her lover sits passively with "nothing in life to do"(I,278), is seen as threatening to become male. Though the nineteenth-century woman is less overtly sexual, she is more intellectual than the twentieth-century woman, and thus as threatening. Be different from a man, be better than he, these authors seem to say. But as they say this, they fail to find a place for a woman in society outside the sphere of love. By finding no other role for her, and in the end taking even this role away, these authors can sympathize with her plight and make her more noble for the way in which she survives. Realistically, they present what has long been true, that a woman's existence is defined, if she is lucky, in terms of

the man she marries but does not love or the man she fails to marry. Artistically, this provides the perfect situation out of which to create women who can sacrifice the one thing offered to them.

It is not only to maintain the difference between male and female that these authors portray their heroines as thwarted in love. They also believe--or, granted, fear--that enduring love is at best impossible and at worst undesirable. The type of love we have been dealing with is love at a peak of passion. By definition this seems to be a closed form of love, as though it strives for a climax that can be sustained forever. It is Fitzgerald who sees most clearly that man hasn't the strength to continue such passion indefinitely. But alone among the writers we have dealt with, Fitzgerald fails to suggest that this is as it should be. When love takes up all his time Anthony Patch fails to be productive, and even Dick Diver, who can both love and produce at the same time, begins to fall apart when his own aging is added to the strain. It is Hemingway and Faulkner who seem to see most clearly that love destroys itself by the very fact of its nonproductivity. It is Hawthorne whose work pays the highest tribute to the value of passionate love, the value of Hester's and Dimmesdale's moments together in the forest or Miriam's and Donatello's

union after their murder. And it is Hawthorne whose professed love for Sophia pays tribute to the value of a quieter kind of love that sustains but does not isolate, that domesticates but does not destroy.

It seems especially fitting that the artist reflects the problem of nonproductivity in an intense love relationship, and it seems fitting that he carry the dilemma further to the threat that domesticated love may allow productivity via the child but not via art. Domesticated love, he believes, may give to the artist a damning happiness. The American artist tries to ease his doubts about domestic and passionate love by portraying, most often, the kind of passionate love that he can keep in control by keeping always out of reach. Faulkner has his artist Mr. Gordon of Mosquitoes act upon this principle by endorsing the poet who locks his heroine in a book and by opting for his own armless and legless sculpture of a woman instead of the girl Patricia. One of the most obvious ways the writers we have looked at achieve distance is by making passionate love somehow unAmerican. Until we come to Faulkner, all the lost women are in some way foreign, whether they are like Hester Prynne clearly British or like Charlotte Stant an expatriate American or like Nicole Diver only suggestive of the foreign.<sup>1</sup> The more negative heroines--the Hildas and Maggie Ververs and Baby Warrens--are American. Faulkner does not explicitly repeat this tradition, but even

Laverne and Caddy and Charlotte make themselves foreign by rebelling against the American, especially the Southern, myth of womanhood.<sup>2</sup> More obviously, the American artist keeps passionate love at a distance by killing the love relationship. Thus he mirrors a belief in the need for its death at the same time that he enhances its value by keeping it always just out of reach.

Finally, the American artist kills the love relationship for his lost woman because the art of fiction demands it. The artist cannot take away the suffering and the self-imposed isolation of these heroines without taking away their stature from which his novel gains much of its depth. Like idyllic love, the ideal situation in a novel generates inertia. Hester Prynne married to Arthur Dimmesdale makes the theme of The Scarlet Letter read that adultery is not sin and that guilt does not demand suffering; Kate Croy married to a penniless Merton Densher makes The Wings of the Dove read that refusing the money that is the result of murder negates that murder; Nicole Diver married but estranged from her husband makes Tender Is the Night read that dissipation can triumph over even the memory of love; Brett Ashley, mistress of Romero, makes The Sun Also Rises read that the wasteland has destroyed even small vestiges of honor; Charlotte Rittenmeyer and Harry Wilbourne



as parents make The Wild Palms read that children may be made the pawns of love. Instead, the lost heroine chooses to suffer and to practice responsibility by caring enough about another person to give up something of her life.

In order to maintain the uniqueness of male and female, in order to find inspiration without a loss of artistic strength, and in order to give depth to the fictional world, it seems appropriate that the love relationship of the heroines we have looked at is either lost or never exists at all. However, in part because of the necessity of destroying the love relationship, Hawthorne, James, Fitzgerald, Hemingway, and Faulkner equivocate in their own commitment to the heroines they endorse. They are like Faulkner's Gavin Stevens who several times in the Snopes trilogy expresses the sentiment that men do not marry Semiramis or Helen but only commit murder or suicide for her. These authors can feel strongly enough toward their heroines to have their heroes commit suicide or murder, but, most often, their heroes cannot marry them; that is, the author cannot find for his heroine a role within the community. The problem is defined in the words of James's Christina Light who, in Roderick Hudson, attempts to do for another by renouncing Rowland Mallet for the sake of his peace. "Nothing, nothing, nothing," she says, "has come of it. I have passed the dreariest

month of my life"(310). The point here, of course, is that Christina, acting on Roderick Hudson's advice, has done exactly the opposite of what Mallet needs. Later in the novel and again in The Princess Cassamassima, she attempts similar sacrifices with similar results: she refuses Prince Cassamassima in marriage and thus renounces his money only to be forced in the end to degrade herself by marrying this man she does not love; she wishes to die in place of Hyacinth Robinson for the revolutionary cause, but is not allowed to. Christina Light appropriately makes this comment about the futility of her attempts at renunciation, but the point can, to a degree, apply to all the heroines we have looked at. Unlike Christina's, their renunciations are purposeful. They do come to something--to the growth of an individual or to his peace of mind, to the salvation of the memory of love, to the re-establishment of a necessary social order or the chance for an individual to exist within this social order. However, although they come to something for others, for the lost woman herself they come to "nothing, nothing, nothing." Although the lost woman may know the satisfaction of having done the great thing, she is not the type of woman who will live in smug self-congratulation. Her material reward is as nonexistent as Christina's and, if she lives, she will live only the dreary life.

Thus, by creating an ideal of selflessness in their women, Hawthorne, James, Fitzgerald, Hemingway, and Faulkner all conspire to cheat these women of life. Their women may be better than men, but they cannot be happy. In every case the women we have studied seem worse off than the men. Where Zenobia, for example, must die because she has nothing left to live for, Hollingsworth lives with his Priscilla as well as with his guilt, and will die with a sense of repentance rather than a sense of futility; where Charlotte Verver is exiled to loneliness in an America she hates, Prince Amerigo regains his child; where Gloria Gilbert suffers in her marriage to Anthony Patch, he becomes immune to suffering; where Brett Ashley regains her nervousness along with her integrity, Romero and Jake both regain their peace; where Charlotte Rittenmeyer loses love by dying, Harry gains it by remembering. The women we have looked at are made to be Christ-like martyrs whose reward must lie in heaven rather than on earth. Where the man may live his life, the woman must surrender hers. But in a Christian context the woman, despite her martyrdom, is still sinful largely because she is illicitly sexual. Thus her reward cannot lie in heaven, and, indeed, these authors hardly suggest a belief in such heavenly reward. Since her reward does not in any material sense lie on earth, where then is it? Only, it seems, in the

mind of the author who destroys his heroine's chance to live but thanks her for the ability to give which he wills upon her. This may be the greatest failure on the part of each one of these authors, and yet we tend not to condemn him for it. Although he bemoans the fact that the mature woman has no place in society, the only place he can create for her, even in his fiction, is an isolated martyrdom. If this comes to "nothing" for the heroine herself, it causes her, nevertheless, to achieve a memorable literary stature. We shall never forget Zenobia, her hair covering her face, sobbing without regard to Coverdale's watching, or Charlotte Stant lecturing on art, her voice sounding like the shriek of a soul in pain, or Nicole Diver impulsively wanting to aid her defeated husband, or Catherine Barkley permitting Frederic Henry the touch that she, in her death throes, does not desire, or Caddy Compson, solitary, visiting her father's grave. In all these scenes we see the woman with nothing left but pain, and in all we see that she endures this pain with humility and with dignity.

## FOOTNOTES

## I. INTRODUCTION: THE LOST LADY

<sup>1</sup>Lillian S. Robinson, "Dwelling in Decencies: Radical Criticism and the Feminist Perspective," College English, 32 (1971), 884.

<sup>2</sup>Leslie Fiedler, Love and Death in the American Novel, rev.ed. (New York: Stein and Day, 1966), p.24.

<sup>3</sup>William Wasserstrom, Heiress of All the Ages: Sex and Sentiment in The Genteel Tradition(Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1959).

III  
II. ANGEL OR DEVIL? HAWTHORNE'S HESTER, ZENOBIA, AND MIRIAM

<sup>1</sup>R.W.B. Lewis (The American Adam: Innocence, Tragedy and Tradition in the Nineteenth Century, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1955) recognizes that Hawthorne's real heroes and heroines--Hester, Clifford and Hepzibah, Donatello and Miriam--recognize the need for community and ultimately return to it.

<sup>2</sup>Gloria Chasson Erlich ("Deadly Innocence: Hawthorne's Dark Women," New England Quarterly, 41, 1968, 163-179) sees exactly this point when she says that both "Hester and her oppressors are preordained to failure by the still active efforts of prior guilt"(166), the adultery being equated with original sin. Though Miss Erlich is quite right on the resultant impossibility of innocence, she errs, I think, by seeing that Hawthorne's "answer to the beautiful and dangerous woman . . . is the Virgin, the image of motherhood without the stain of sex"(174). The women Hawthorne prefers would seem to her to be Priscilla and Hilda as well as Hester with her alter ego Pearl. But Miss Erlich fails to recognize that though Priscilla and Hilda may keep the virginal image, Priscilla does not become a mother and Hilda is never shown to us as becoming a mother.

<sup>3</sup>This would argue against Ernest Sandeen ("The Scarlet Letter as Love Story," Publications of the Modern Language Association, 77, 1962, 425-435) who believes Dimmesdale does acknowledge his love for Hester in public. It also adds credence to Neal Houston's ("Hester Prynne as Eternal Feminine," Discourse, 11, 1966, 238) contention that Hawthorne suggests Dimmesdale's guilt is greater. He cites as evidence Dimmesdale's anger when Hester reveals Chillingworth's identity, "his desire to utter blasphemies to the townsmen," the townsmen's understanding of how sorely Hester must have been tempted to fall, and Governor Bellingham's comment that the responsibility of Hester's soul lies with Dimmesdale..

<sup>4</sup>Roy Male (Hawthorne's Tragic Vision, New York: W.W. Norton, 1957, pp.94-97) sees further reasons for Chillingworth leaving money to Pearl; Pearl symbolizes truth and grace and, therefore, the death of Chillingworth, guilt, necessarily leaves her a legacy. Money is an appropriate legacy in that it indicates Pearl's movement to the human where it is the keynote.

<sup>5</sup>Philip Rahv ("The Dark Lady of Salem," Partisan Review, 8, 1941, 362-368) and Edward Wagenknecht (Nathaniel Hawthorne: Man and Writer, New York: Oxford University Press, 1961, p.142) both believe that Zenobia oversteps her bounds; for Rahv, Hawthorne must destroy her as a symbol of the emancipated woman; for Wagenknecht, Hawthorne treats her unsympathetically because she unsexes herself by trying to be emancipated. More accurate, I think, are Judith Montgomery ("The American Galatea," College English, 32, 1971, 890-899) who sees that Hawthorne is concerned with what it means to be a Zenobia in a society that prefers Priscillas and Nina Baym ("The Blithedale Romance: A Radical Reading," Journal of English and Germanic Philology, 67, 1968, 545-569) who believes Hawthorne saw Zenobia's feminist role as unworthy of her, but as the "best she can do in a society that offers women no worthy roles at all"(554).

<sup>6</sup>Barry A. Marks ("The Origin of Original Sin in Hawthorne's Fiction," Nineteenth Century Fiction, 14, 1960, 359-362) makes an excellent point when he says that Hawthorne's fiction "raises and refuses to answer the question of ultimate guilt for specific actions"(362). He does this in order to show that it is not "for men to judge one another. It is

rather for them to accept life's mysterious paradoxes, to acknowledge the sin which is the common lot of all, to love God and their fellows" (362). I would agree with Marks and say that Hollingsworth and Zenobia are both in error for judging one another. But to refrain from judging ultimate guilt is not to eliminate Hawthorne's judgment of degrees of error.

<sup>7</sup> Julian Smith ("Why Does Zenobia Kill Herself?" English Language Notes, 6, 1968, 37-39) believes Zenobia commits suicide because she is pregnant. Though he marshalls some impressive critical evidence, it would seem to me that Zenobia cannot be pregnant. The father of the child would have to be Hollingsworth, for Hawthorne has not made Zenobia into a trollope who would be pregnant by one man while loving another. Yet Hollingsworth seems an unlikely partner, for he is tormented later by only one murder, not two. One could argue that Zenobia was pregnant and Hollingsworth did not know it. But Zenobia would hardly have given Hollingsworth up with such a trump card unplayed.

<sup>8</sup> Peter D. Zivkovic ("The Evil of the Isolated Intellect: Hilda in The Marble Faun," The Personalist, 43, 1962, 202-215) discusses the problem of Hawthorne's seeming endorsement of Hilda and concludes that Hawthorne indeed approved her but that he did not understand her or he would have seen that her quest for perfection, though admirable, isolates her from humanity. It seems to me that it is precisely because Hawthorne does see this that he must equivocate about Hilda. Zivkovic also believes that Hilda remains innocent because only conscious evil is really evil. Again I would argue that Hawthorne says exactly the opposite, for each of his lost heroines must finally repent of an initial evil that they at first justify. To fail to repent because they fail to gain the knowledge that they must repent is not to make them, or Hilda, innocent.

<sup>9</sup> John C. Guilds ("Miriam of The Marble Faun," Cairo Studies in English, 1960, 67) believes that Miriam does not learn repentance but instead reduces "a fundamental truth--sin followed by penance, repentance, and faith in God's mercy can ennoble--to a simple statement that sin itself ennoble."

<sup>10</sup> Melvin W. Askew, "Hawthorne, the Fall, and the Psychology of Maturity," American Literature, 34 (1962), 335-343.

<sup>11</sup>Frederick Crews (The Sins of the Fathers: Hawthorne's Psychological Themes, New York: Oxford University Press, 1966, pp.217-221) discusses Miriam's sexuality in relation to the murder. Murder, he sees as representative of the coupling between Miriam and Donatello. Thus Hilda's witnessing of the murder becomes a vicarious sexual initiation.

### III. PORTRAITS OF A LOST LADY: JAMES'S THE WINGS OF THE DOVE AND THE GOLDEN BOWL

<sup>1</sup>Tony Tanner's introduction to the Macmillan edition of Hawthorne (1967) contains an excellent discussion of James's concern for his English audience, of the circumstances of the biography, and of James's changing opinion about Hawthorne. Peter Buitenhuis in his article "Henry James on Hawthorne" (New England Quarterly, 32, 1959, 207-225) also treats the topic.

<sup>2</sup>Annette K. Baxter ("Independence vs. Isolation: Hawthorne and James on the Problem of the Artist," Nineteenth Century Fiction, 10, 1955, 225-231) rightly contends that James lacked Hawthorne's fear of a dehumanizing isolation. But when she defines James's isolation as one that uses society I think she fails to recognize his growing awareness that a dedication to art is necessarily a dedication to more than an isolation from or a manipulation of society. Similarly, J.A. Ward ("Social Disintegration in The Wings of the Dove, Criticism, 2, 1960, 190-203) seems correct in saying that James saw society as disintegrating to the point that one can find meaning only in the isolated self, but he fails to go the necessary step further to see that James advocated a dedication to that very society once individual meaning has been found. Alwyn Berland ("Henry James and the Grand Renunciation," Kansas Magazine, 4, 1958, 82-90) hits the point more accurately when he says that James believed people must act as though an ideal civilization exists, whether it does or not.

<sup>3</sup>Leon Edel, Henry James (New York: J.P. Lippincott, 1962), III, p.89.

<sup>4</sup>Edmund Wilson ("The Ambiguity of Henry James" in The Question of Henry James: A Collection of Critical Essays, ed. F.W. Dupee, New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1945, p.38) senses in James a decreasing ability to



deal with scenes of emotion. However, it is worthwhile to note that though the emotion is indirect, it increasingly involves passionate love.

<sup>5</sup>Edel, Henry James, I, pp.49-55.

<sup>6</sup>Sex in the novels of Henry James has been widely discussed, but primarily in terms of James's technique. Robert Falk ("Henry James and the 'Age of Innocence,' Nineteenth Century Fiction, 7, 1952, 171-188) sees that he uses ambiguity and indirection as a way around the taboos of the nineteenth century, and Frank Colby ("In Darkest James" in Dupee, The Question of Henry James, 20-27) sees that this ambiguity in fact masks a sexual content that would otherwise have been censored. Edmond Volpe ("James's Theory of Sex in Fiction, Nineteenth Century Fiction, 13, 1958, 30-47) adds what I judge a deeper insight, saying that James's indirection rests on the belief that the motive rather than the facts of sexuality are of prime importance. James states this theory himself in his essays on Hawthorne, Maupassant (Partial Portraits, London: Macmillan, 1905, pp.243-287), Sereio (Notes on Novelists, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1914, pp.245-293), and D'Annunzio (Notes on Novelists, pp.294-313) and in a 1911 letter to H.G. Wells (The Letters of Henry James, ed. Percy Lubbock, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1920, II, p.189). Two doctoral dissertations have also been written on the subject, Thomas Bontley ("The Aesthetics of Discretion: Sexuality in the Fiction of Henry James," Diss. Stanford University, 1966) contends that James's theory of sex in fiction has its origins in the English novel of domestic phety and that it has nothing to do with a psychological incapacity to treat sex directly. In his discussions of The Wings of the Dove and The Golden Bowl, he concludes that rather than avoiding or condemning sex, James endorses the need for both physical and spiritual love. Courtney Johnson ("The Problem of Sex in the Writings of Henry James, Diss. University of Michigan 1966) sees three viewpoints in James's concept of sex: that the effects of love are more important than sex; that sexual experience isolated from the whole of life is anathema; that the solution to sexual problems is inseparable from the solution to moral, aesthetic, and spiritual problems.

<sup>7</sup>Three critical positions dominate the discussions of The Wings of the Dove and The Golden Bowl, though often the positions overlap. These and a selection of critics who hold to them are listed below.

- (I) Those who venerate Milly and Maggie, if not to sainthood, at least to the point of triumphing over Kate and Charlotte, who are either denegated or largely ignored:

Quentin Anderson, "Henry James and the New Jerusalem," The Kenyon Review, 8, (1962), 515-566 and The American Henry James (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1957).

Millicent Bell, "The Dream of Being Possessed and Possessing: Henry James's The Wings of the Dove," Massachusetts Review, 10 (1969), 97-114.

Leo Bersani, "The Jamesian Lie," Partisan Review, 36 (1969), 53-79.

Francis Fergusson, "The Golden Bowl Revisited," The Sewanee Review, 63 (1955), 13-28.

Caroline Gordon, "Mr. Verver, Our National Hero," The Sewanee Review, 63 (1955), 29-47.

Jean Kimball, "The Abyss and The Wings of the Dove: The Image as a Revelation," Nineteenth Century Fiction, 10, (1956), 281-300.

Stephen Koch, "Transcendence in The Wings of the Dove," Modern Fiction Studies, 12, No. 1 (1966), 93-102.

Dorothea Krook, The Ordeal of Consciousness (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1962). In many ways Miss Krook is more moderate but her emphasis is on Kate's diabolical scheme and Milly's triumph despite her pride that keeps her from sainthood.

Brian Lee, "Henry James's 'Divine Consensus': The Ambassadors, The Wings of the Dove, and The Golden Bowl, Renaissance and Modern Studies (Nottingham), 6 (1962), 5-24.

Elizabeth Owen, "'The Given Appearance' of Charlotte Verver," Essays in Criticism, 13 (1963), 364-374.

Mary Sprague Schwertman, "Henry James's Portraits of Ladies," Diss. University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill 1969. In Ms. Schwertman's discussion of Maggie, Maggie's faults are mentioned but the emphasis is on her development into a "true heroine." Though Charlotte is not condemned, she is ignored.

Stephen Spender, "The Golden Bowl" in Dupee, The Question of Henry James, pp.236-245.

J.A. Ward, "Social Disintegration in The Wings of the Dove, Criticism, 2 (1960), 190-203.

- (II) Those who pity or show understanding toward Kate and Charlotte: in the case of The Wings of the Dove, critics who hold this view still see Milly as triumphant and thus she remains their main concern; in the case of The Golden Bowl, they see Maggie as closer to a satan than a saint, and to prove her a satan is their prime goal:

R.P. Blackmur, "Introduction" to The Golden Bowl (New York: Dell-Lourel, 1963). Mr. Blackmur has evidently changed his mind, or at least his emphasis, from his essay "The Loose and Baggy Monsters of Henry James" (Accent, 11, 1951, 129-146).

Joseph T. Firebaugh, "The Ververs," Essays in Criticism, 4 (1954), 400-410.

D.W. Jefferson, Henry James (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd-Writers and Critics Series, 1960). This study is highly sympathetic toward Kate and contends that she and Denner must be viewed in a positive light more than in terms of their scheme.

Margaret Trieschmann, "The Golden Bowl: An Analysis of the Sources of Evil in Human Relationships," Iowa English Yearbook, 12 (1967), 61-67. This is one of the few studies that sees the Prince as still in love with Charlotte at the end of The Golden Bowl.

- (III) The moderate position which sees good and evil in both types of heroines but which still too often neglects Kate and Charlotte in favor of Milly and Maggie:

Oscar Cargill, The Novels of Henry James (New York: Macmillan, 1961). Mr. Cargill sees both The Wings of the Dove and The Golden Bowl in terms of the limited heroine.

Laurence B. Holland, The Expense of Vision: Essays on the Craft of Henry James (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1964).

Ora Segal, The Lucid Reflector: The Observer in Henry James's Fiction (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1969).

Stephen Spender, The Destructive Element (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1936). Mr. Spender contends that the wickedness in The Wings of the Dove is in the situation, not in the characters; however, he does suggest a preference for Milly over the "inspired devil" (172) Kate.

Elizabeth Stevenson, The Crooked Corridor: A Study of Henry James (New York: Macmillan, 1961).

J.A. Ward, "Evil in The Golden Bowl," Western Humanities Review, 14 (1960), 47-59.

Walter Wright, "Maggie Verver: Neither Saint nor Witch," Nineteenth Century Fiction, 12 (1957), 59-71. Mr. Wright includes a similar list of the critical stances on The Golden Bowl.

A notable exception to the failure to adequately treat Charlotte Stant is seen in Jean Kimball's "Henry James's Last Portrait of a Lady: Charlotte Stant in The Golden Bowl (American Literature, 28, 1957, 449-468). She takes her cue from Ferner Nuhn's (The Wind Blew from the East, Port Washington, New York: Kennikat Press, 1940) moderate view of Charlotte and Maggie and presents an excellent case for seeing Charlotte as the real heroine of The Golden Bowl by comparing her to Minny Temple, Milly Theale, and Isabel Archer. Miss Kimball goes as far as suggesting, without being adamant, that the adultery between Charlotte and Prince Amerigo may not even take place. Though I cannot hold to this extreme a view myself, I believe Miss Kimball is not far wrong in her suggestion: Maggie, after all, never knows whether the adultery takes place or not, yet she uses her "knowledge" of it for the gain of power. Picking up from Ms. Kimball but going I think too far, John Clair (The Ironic Dimension in the Fiction of Henry James, Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 1965) suggests that Charlotte and the Prince pretend an affair in order to force Maggie away from her father, and that Charlotte, unknown to the Prince, sends the Bloomsbury shopkeeper to Maggie after she has purchased the golden bowl for too high a price. The value of all these studies lies in the critics' willingness to view Charlotte justly if not, particularly in the case of Mr. Nuhn, with complete sympathy; the danger lies in their allowing James's ambiguity to lead them into pure hypothesis. A more general and less dangerous approach is suggested by Sallie Sears (The Negative Imagination: Form and Perspective in the Novels of Henry James, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1963) who sees that Madame de Vionnet,

Kate Croy, and Charlotte Verver all are central images of desire and bear the full burden of responsibility for the temptation they represent. Their rivals, Mrs. Newsome, Milly, and Maggie, are pale yet dangerous shadows beside them; in their bravery, beauty, and magnificent sexuality the former group of women dominate their respective worlds in spite of their "immorality," and for this very fact pay a price. In the end each of them is expelled from the collective social organism like some noxious foreign body that by mistake gained entrance. . . . Each of their lovers, having sown his wild oats, returns to the fold, the home, or society he had left for the sake of the woman, who now becomes some sort of moral outlaw or scapegoat. Yet even in spite of this they dominate in the possibilities they have represented for energy and passion, and in the strength of their suffering, which is greater than that of their "pale lady" counterparts, since it is the suffering of someone who has loved and been loved in return (208-209).

<sup>8</sup>James undoubtedly had Minny Temple in mind when he wrote The Wings of the Dove; however, one must be careful not to overstate her influence. Leon Edel (Henry James, I, pp.228-238), for instance, quotes James as writing that Minny possessed a sense for others to act out "of their force or their weakness . . . at no matter what cost to herself" and that Minny "was absolutely afraid of nothing she might come to by living with enough sincerity and enough wonder." He also sees James as equating Minny with his "Vampire Theme," growing weaker as he grew stronger after his "obscure hurt." Edel's concern here is James's love for Minny, but he is also a critic who equates Minny with Milly. Yet these points, it seems to me, can also apply to Kate Croy who forces Densher to act and loses him, who is far less afraid than Milly, and whose control over Densher grows weaker as his grows stronger.

<sup>9</sup>Henry James, The Art of the Novel: Critical Prefaces, ed. Richard P. Blackmur (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1934), p.293.

<sup>10</sup>Prefaces, p.296.

<sup>11</sup>Bewley (The Complex Fate, London: Chatto and Windus, 1952, p.46), I think, interprets both Milly and Hilda incorrectly when he judges them "angels pure and simple." I would also take issue with his contention that James admired Hilda: in Hawthorne (153-154), James says he admires the idea of Hilda as a character, not Hilda herself.

<sup>12</sup>Prefaces, p.306. Laurence Holland ("The Wings of the Dove, ELH: A Journal of English Literary History, 26, 1959, 549-574) believes that James's indirection pays tribute to Milly but also betrays her by not doing justice to her suffering and her glory and that it thus mirrors the content of the novel in which Milly "is betrayed by the very actions that enshrine her" (569). Christof Wegelin ("Henry James's The Wings of the Dove as an International Novel," Jahrbuch für Amerikastudien, 3, 1958, 151-160) believes that the indirection expresses the impossibility of rendering Milly's final encounter with Densher and her death in words. Both, I think, miss James's point that perfection is impossible on earth and, therefore, must remain abstract.

<sup>13</sup>The Notebooks of Henry James, ed. F.O. Matthiessen and Kenneth B. Murdock (New York: Oxford University Press, 1947), p.169.

<sup>14</sup>See Edel, Henry James, I, pp.172-183 for a discussion of James's injury and it's subsequent distortion by critics.

<sup>15</sup>James receives advice from Sir James Mackenzie, a doctor, on how to live despite the physical problem of angina pectoris. Though this occurs after The Wings of the Dove, William had earlier been treated for a heart ailment by Dr. Begly Thorne, a possible model for Sir Luke Strett. Harold L. Rypins, M.D., "Henry James in Harley Street," American Literature, 24 (1953), 481-492.

<sup>16</sup>Henry James, Notes of a Son and Brother (London: Macmillan, 1914), p.479.

<sup>17</sup>Hawthorne, p.128.

<sup>18</sup>Edel, Henry James, II, pp.106-122.

<sup>19</sup>The term is Howells' ("Mr. Henry James's Later Work" in Dupee, The Question of Henry James, pp.6-19).

<sup>20</sup>Notebooks, p.172; Prefaces, p.303.

<sup>21</sup>James had initially intended Kate to marry Lord Mark, but he had also seen that "her merit, her virtue" is that she will not marry a man she does not love (Notebooks, p.173). Kate's refusal of Lord Mark once and her avowal that she would refuse him again even if it meant Milly's life indicate the increasing importance James put on her "merit" and "virtue."

<sup>22</sup>Stephen Reid ("Moral Passion in The Portrait of a Lady and The Spoils of Poynton," Modern Fiction Studies, 12, No.1, (1966, 24-43) discusses the concept of duty to a vow in The Portrait of a Lady and The Spoils of Poynton. I believe, however, that he goes too far by seeing behind James's belief as expressed in Isabel Archer and Fleda Vetch rationalization for "fear of loss of love" or "fear of sexual assault"(36).

<sup>23</sup>Millicent Bell ("The Dream of Being Possessed and Possessing") argues that Kate has no sexual jealousy and is, therefore, perverse, perhaps even latently lesbian. Quite to the contrary, Kate accepts Densher's ultimatum because she does feel sexual jealousy, but still allows him to pursue Milly because she believes in Milly's sexlessness; the difference is between feeling and belief.

<sup>24</sup>Notebooks, p.170.

<sup>25</sup>Holland, "The Wings of the Dove," 557.

<sup>26</sup>See footnote 7

<sup>27</sup>Wayne C. Booth, The Rhetoric of Fiction (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1961). F.R. Leavis (The Great Tradition: George Eliot, Henry James, Joseph Conrad, New York: G.W. Stewart, 1948) most represents the opposing view that in the late works James's ambiguities are not made clear where necessary so that they reek more of inattention than ambiguity.

<sup>28</sup>For alternative interpretations of the golden bowl symbol see Kimball, "James's Last Portrait of a Lady," 466, Lotus Snow, "A Story of Cabinets, and Chairs and Tables: Images of Morality in The Spoils of Poynton and The Golden Bowl," ELH: A Journal of English Literary History, 30 (1963), 432, and Joel Porte, The Romance in America: Studies in Cooper, Poe, Hawthorne, Melville, and James (Middletown, Connecticut: Wesleyan University Press, 1969). Since so many interpretations can apply here Dorothea Krook (The Ordeal of Consciousness, pp. 390-413) seems in part correct when she judges the symbol artificial and unsuccessful. Though the ambiguity does serve a purpose James has, I think, sacrificed a great deal of the novel's naturalness for the symbol.

<sup>29</sup>Though I am in strong disagreement with Naomi Lebowitz (The Imagination of Loving: Henry James's Legacy to the Novel, Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1965, p. 95) and Quentin Anderson ("Henry James and the New Jerusalem," 536), who view Maggie as the saving force in The Golden Bowl, both arrive at their views through an accurate judgment of James's stand on marriage. Anderson sees him as in agreement with his father who felt "marriage" differed from "concubinage" by having a social character out of which a higher society could evolve. Similarly, Ms. Lebowitz sees that James believed love must live in the social world, not as a secret affair.

<sup>30</sup>Frederick Crews (The Tragedy of Manners: Moral Drama in the Later Novels of Henry James, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1957) seems to me to suggest a similar point when he maintains that in James there are degrees of innocence and guilt and that we are wrong to absolve Kate, for instance, because we understand her background. In The Golden Bowl, he rightly sees that all are guilty and that James's judgment is difficult to find. Charlotte, for instance, he believes has no less than five roles: "wayward mankind whose sins will be unburdened by Christ"; Judas, kissing Maggie; the devil shrieking in pain; the false religious attitude of an eye for an eye; Eve banished from an Eden into ugliness (108-109). Further, he is correct in seeing that the issue of power, which is neither wholly bad nor wholly good, involves all four parties and that the main power rests in Adam Verver. But I think Crews does not go far enough in his otherwise excellent treatment of The Golden Bowl. James's ambiguity should not free us from believing in degrees of innocence and guilt. Despite the intermingling of good and evil, in The



Golden Bowl as much as in James's other works, the effects of the good and evil do establish these degrees. If we cannot agree on the exact effects or judge omnipotently, we should at least argue that for each reader degrees of guilt and innocence do exist.

<sup>31</sup>Prefaces, p.329. James here discusses Maggie and the narrator of "The Aspern Papers" in terms of technique, but for him technique involved subject.

<sup>32</sup>Partial Portraits, "Miss Woolson," pp.177-192.

<sup>33</sup>Hawthorne, p.93.

<sup>34</sup>Discussing Charlotte's behavior the night of the card game, Jean Kimball ("Henry James's Last Portrait of a Lady," 463) amasses evidence that Charlotte cannot be termed a liar; throughout the novel she has been credited with "nobleness," "sincerity," "a generous rigour of conscience," "explicit honesty," and "true directness."

#### IV. GOLDEN GIRLS AND LOST WOMEN: THE HEROINES OF F. SCOTT FITZGERALD

<sup>1</sup>See Constance Drake, "Josephine and Emotional Bankruptcy (Fitzgerald/Hemingway Annual, 1969, 5-13) for a discussion of the pattern of wasted emotions in the Josephine stories.

<sup>2</sup>In his edition of Fitzgerald's early fiction, John Kuehl (The Apprenticeship Fiction of F. Scott Fitzgerald, New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1965) discusses the femme fatale as narcissistic girl who causes man to make a fool of himself. Though these girls do relate to Gloria, Daisy, and Nicole, they seem to me too immature to attain the status of lost lady and are, by their very immaturity, more closely allied to the light heroines of the nineteenth century. Where Gloria, Daisy, and Nicole may have been girls like this, they become much more than this. Sergio Perosa (The Art of F. Scott Fitzgerald, trans. Charles Matz and the author, Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1965, p.21) makes a similar distinction in his discussion of Eleanor, not Rosalind, as the heroine in This Side of Paradise. For Perosa, "If

Clara had been the daughter of light, Eleanor is at the same time the archetypal dark woman (born and educated in France; one is reminded of Isabella [sic], . . . in Melville's Pierre), who is the symbol in so much American literature of the complexity of experience and of the profane eros . . ."

<sup>3</sup>Lionel Trilling (The Liberal Imagination: Essays on Literature and Society, New York: Viking Press, 1951, p.246) defines this dichotomy between destruction and perfection when he sees that the Fitzgerald hero "can conceive and realize a love that is beyond his own prudence or beyond his powers of dominance or of self-protection, so that he is destroyed by the very thing that gives him his spiritual status and stature."

<sup>4</sup>James E. Miller, Jr. (F. Scott Fitzgerald: His Art and His Technique, New York: New York University Press, 1964, p.145) suggests the failure of society in Tender Is the Night when he traces the novel's motifs of perversion through sex, money, talent, play, and ideas.

<sup>5</sup>Quite rightly the criticism on Daisy is negative. She

plays with Gatsby to spite Tom, plays with him out of nostalgia and as an escape from boredom (John W. Bicknell, "The Waste Land of F. Scott Fitzgerald," Virginia Quarterly Review, 30, 1954, 556-572).

has been "hardened" and "made . . . careless and ruthless in her malice" by four years with Tom (Perosa, The Art of F. Scott Fitzgerald, p.68).

is "fatally irresponsible" (Charles E. Shain, F. Scott Fitzgerald, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Pamphlets on American Writers, 1965, p.9). Mr. Shain says the same thing of Nicole Diver.

is "the type of person who does not want to be bothered with responsibility and must live a life of luxury, . . . the type of woman who brings disaster to the man without money who dares to love her" (Hilton Anderson, "The Rich Bunch in The Great Gatsby," Southern Quarterly, 6, (1967-68, 166).

possesses a "vicious emptiness" (Charles Thomas Samuels, "The Greatness of 'Gatsby,'" Massachusetts Review, 7, 1966, 786).

possesses a "vicious emptiness" (again) and "a monstrous moral indifference" (Marius Bewley, "Scott Fitzgerald's Criticism of America," The Sewanee Review, 62, 1954, 132-133).

possess a "criminal amorality" (Robert Ornstein, "Scott Fitzgerald's Fable of East and West," College English, 18, 1956-57, 140).

The criticism on Gloria is also negative and too often neglects any positive view of her at all. She

is "a superficially sophisticated girl whose only virtue is her great beauty" (Miller, F. Scott Fitzgerald: His Art and His Technique, pp.59-60).

is, like Zelda, "egocentric, pleasure seeking, wild, impractical, and careless. She is primarily concerned with getting her legs tanned, spends money with reckless abandon, is unpredictable and slightly suicidal, . . . and she drives like a maniac" (Richard D. Lehan, F. Scott Fitzgerald and the Craft of Fiction, Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1966, p.80).

represents Fitzgerald's typical heroine with her "impatience with men and her vanity 'that was almost masculine,' her beautiful and immaculate body that is incapable of passion and can hardly tolerate physical contact; the gum drops, indeed, that she must chew to avoid chewing her nails; and by contrast the cool perfection of her brow" (Maxwell Geismar, The Last of the Provincials: The American Novel 1915-1925, Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1947, p.300).

Only Barry Gross ("The Dark Side of Twenty-five: Fitzgerald and The Beautiful and Damned," Bucknell Review, 16, No.3, 1968, 40-52) gives Gloria the kind of sympathy she deserves. For Gross, Gloria gives Anthony his only moments of awareness and is "the only character in the novel who is not compromised by the meaningless world, who does manage to salvage some personal honor"(49).

<sup>6</sup>Zelda's phrasing at the birth of her daughter was, "Isn't she smart--she has the hiccups. I hope it's a beautiful little fool." Quoted in Andrew Turnbull, Scott Fitzgerald (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1962), p.127.

<sup>7</sup>For the deletions in The Beautiful and Damned referring to Gloria's abortion see Nancy Milford, Zelda: A Biography (New York: Harper and Row, 1970), p.88. For the possibility of Zelda's abortion, see Milford, p.88 and Sara Mayfield, Exiles from Paradise: Zelda and Scott Fitzgerald (New York: Delacort Press, 1971).

<sup>8</sup>Edwin Fussell ("Fitzgerald's Brave New World," ELH: A Journal of English Literary History, 14 1952, 291-306) discusses Fitzgerald's quest for wonder in terms of its American objects: beauty, youth, and wealth. He rightly sees in Fitzgerald an acceptance of these objects coupled with a recognition of their futility. However, he errs in seeing Daisy, and, especially, Nicole only as symbols of these objects.

<sup>9</sup>F. Scott Fitzgerald, The Crack-up, ed. Edmund Wilson (New York: New Directions Paperbook, 1956), pp.69,72.

<sup>10</sup>The Letters of F. Scott Fitzgerald, ed. Andrew Turnbull (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1963), p.79.

<sup>11</sup>This, of course, is equally true of Zelda's correspondance to Gloria Gilbert, and we must take Fitzgerald at his word when he writes his daughter that "Gloria was a much more trivial and vulgar person than your mother . . .the emphasis was entirely different. We had a much better time than Anthony and Gloria had" (quoted in Arthur Mizener, The Far Side of Paradise, Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1949, pp.124-125). But Nancy Milford still seems to me correct in her observation that Gloria does suggest to Zelda someone she must stand up for (Zelda, p.90).

<sup>12</sup>The Crack-up, pp.138-139.

<sup>13</sup>Too many critics exaggerate only this negative side of Nicole. She

uses Dick "in the manner of a patient's exploiting her doctor's will" (Frederick J. Hoffman, Freudianism and the Literary Mind, Louisiana State University Press, 1945, p.269).

is a parasite who marries a psychiatrist hero because he can save her from madness, but who cannot give to her husband anything beyond the "bribery of her wealth" (Alfred Kazin, "An American Confession" in F. Scott Fitzgerald: The Man and His Work, ed. Alfred Kazin, New York: The World Publishing Co., 1962, p.179).

possesses a "ruthless materialism" (Marvin LaHood, "Sensuality and Asceticism in Tender Is the Night," English Record, 17, 1967, 10).

responds to Tommy Barban because she sees in him the "hardness and unscrupulousness" of her own character (Robert Stanton, "'Daddy's Girl': Symbol and Theme in Tender Is the Night," Modern Fiction Studies, 4, No.2, 1958, 139).

is a symbol of modern America which is beautiful but insane and disintegrating (K.G.W. Cross, Scott Fitzgerald, Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1964, p.85).

is a "perverse phoenix arising from the ashes of her distorted youth [who] achieves her 'freedom' through becoming vicious" (Geismar, The Last of the Provincials, p.331).

is damned by Zelda Fitzgerald who says, "What made me mad was that he made the girl so awful and kept on reiterating how she had ruined his life and I couldn't help identifying myself with her because she had so many of my experiences" (quoted in Milford, Zelda, p.286).

Even those who are sympathetic toward Nicole (John Chamberlain, "Tender Is the Night" in Kazin, F. Scott Fitzgerald: The Man and His Work, p.179; Kent and Gretchen Kreuter, "The Moralism of the Later Fitzgerald," Modern Fiction Studies, 7, No.1, 1961, 71-81; Arthur Mizener, "The Poet of Borrowed Time" in Kazin, pp.203-213) undermine their sympathy by seeing her as the agent of Dick's decline. On the other hand, Eugene White ("The Intricate Destiny of Dick Diver," Modern Fiction Studies, 7, No.1, 1961, 55-62) more accurately accepts Nicole as relatively innocent in responsibility for his decline.

<sup>14</sup> Matthew J. Bruccoli, The Composition of Tender Is the Night (Pittsburg: University of Pittsburg Press, 1963), p.122.

<sup>15</sup> The Crack-up, p.208.

V. THE LOVELY CREATURE IN THE GREEN HAT: THE  
HEROINES OF ERNEST HEMINGWAY

<sup>1</sup>Leslie Fiedler (Love and Death in the American Novel, rev. ed., New York: Stein and Day, 1966, pp.316-320) sees in Hemingway a reversal of the light-dark roles, the light becoming the bitch destroyer and the dark becoming the subserviant.doll. Remembering that the color of a woman's hair has in the twentieth century little to do with the light-dark tradition, this seems to me overly simplified. If the dark lady has sometimes become the light American bitch and the light girl has become the dark slave, both have at other times merged and remained something more moderate, the lost woman who wishes to renounce for someone she loves and who accepts the isolation such renunciation involves.

<sup>2</sup>Leo Gurko (Ernest Hemingway and the Pursuit of Heroism, New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1968, p.117) comments nicely that Jordan's calling Maria "rabbit" is like Antony calling Cleopatra "Sweetie" or Aeneas calling Dido "doll." Arturo Barea ("Not Spain but Hemingway" in Carlos Baker, Hemingway and His Critics, New York: Hill and Wang-American Century Series, 1961, 202-212) exposes Hemingway's misuse of Spanish: the term "rabbit" connotes the female sex organ--hardly an endearment that would be used both privately and publicly.

<sup>3</sup>Pilar is, of course, quite obviously barren and though the biology is questionable, she would have us believe that were Maria not barren she would have conceived during her rape.

<sup>4</sup>The problem of isolation and society has been discussed by numerous critics. Among those who believe Hemingway endorses the brotherhood of man are Robert W. Lewis (Hemingway on Love, Austin: University of Texas Press, 1965), and Mark Schorer ("The Background of a Style," Kenyon Review, 3, 1941, 101-105). Among those who believe he still depicts isolation despite the theme he suggests in his title are Maxwell Geismar (Writers in Crisis, Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1942), Lionel Trilling ("An American in Spain," The Partisan Reader, eds. William Philips and Philip Rahv, New York: Dial Press, 1946, pp.639-644), Stanley Cooperman ("Hemingway's Blue-Eyed Boy: Robert Jordan and 'Purging Ecstasy,'" Criticism, 8, 1966, 87-96), and Robert P. Weeks ("Hemingway and the Uses of Isolation," University of Kansas City Review, 24, 1957, 119-125).

<sup>5</sup>Again the conflict is seen by many critics, most notably Floyd C. Watkins (The Flesh and the Word: Eliot, Hemingway, Faulkner, Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1971), Leo Gurko (Ernest Hemingway and the Pursuit of Heroism), and William Toole ("Religion, Love and Nature in A Farewell to Arms: The Dark Shape of Irony," College English Association, 29, May, 1967, 10-11). Watkins believes that A Farewell to Arms shows that no man can be an island, but that in a chaotic world he must try to be one and that when once his trial fails he must accept the world he is faced with. Gurko traces part of the shortcomings of the novel to Frederic's and Catherine's giving up society for a love that deprived of its social roots turns inward to the point of boredom. Toole believes that Hemingway is illustrating that even when love takes the place of religion and exists outside of society, it cannot escape nature which is a part of physical love and which destroys.

<sup>6</sup>This willingness to cultivate a memory seems to me to argue against a critic like Robert Lewis (Hemingway on Love) who believes that Frederic becomes disillusioned over his romance with Catherine because it cannot last and learns that his escape with her is wrong because it ignores universal love. James F. Light ("The Religion of Death in A Farewell to Arms," Modern Fiction Studies, 7, No.2, 1961, 169-173) and Richard B. Hovey (Hemingway: The Inward Terrain, Seattle, University of Washington Press, 1968) suggest this same kind of misconception. Light believes that Frederic Henry rejects the ideals of service to God, land, work, and love and learns that all one can believe in is death. Hovey thinks that Frederic, in contrast to Catherine, learns love destroys and, therefore, regresses having loved. The very fact that Frederic celebrates his past love suggests that he does not reject this ideal but despairs of the loss of it, that he does not cease to believe in his ideal with Catherine but ceases to believe it can last.

<sup>7</sup>See Hovey (Hemingway: The Inward Terrain) for a discussion of Frederic's failure in responsibility and sympathy when he learns of Catherine's pregnancy.

<sup>8</sup>"Making Monogamy Work," syndicated by Metropolitan Newspaper Service, February, 1924. Referred to in Arthur Mizener, The Far Side of Paradise, (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1949).

<sup>9</sup>Hemingway explicitly states this concept of a woman being innocent until loved, and then being totally sensual, in Islands in the Stream. Here Thomas Hudson is conjuring a dream of an ideal Princess: "She must be as grave and as delicate and as beautiful as Princessa [his cat--one hopes that at least some satire of Hudson is intended here] before they were ;in love and made the love and then be as shameless and wanton in their bed as Princessa was [when in heat](221-222).

<sup>10</sup>See William A. Glasser ("A Farewell to Arms," The Sewanee Review, 74, 1966, 453-469) for one of the best and most detailed discussions of Frederic's tendency to make Catherine a sexual object.

<sup>11</sup>John J. McAleer ("Frederic Henry's Rejected Passion," Renaissance, 14, 1961-62, 72-79, 89) points up the difference between Frederic and Catherine here: where Frederic has illusory hopes about his life with Catherine, Catherine knows only that it will be a "strange life."

<sup>12</sup>See Glasser (A Farewell to Arms) for an excellent discussion of Catherine's death as a service to Frederic and of the reasons this service works to enlarge him. In Glasser's view Frederic learns that love involves more than love of her body, and learns too late that he too wishes to serve Catherine in something other than a sexual way. Other discussions of the death as service idea are included in McAleer ("Frederic Henry's Rejected Passion) and in Fred H. Marcus (AA Farewell to Arms: The Impact of Irony and the Irrational," The English Journal, 51, 1962, 527-535).

<sup>13</sup>Hemingway's fear of parenthood can in part be explained by the birth of his first son when he could not financially afford to be a parent and a writer both. See Gertrude Stein, (The Autobiography of Alice B. Toklas, (New York: Random House, 1933)) for Hemingway's reaction to his first wife's pregnancy. The theme of parenthood as a complication is also dominant in "Cross Country Snow" where the responsibility of a baby is regretted but accepted and in "Hills Like White Elephants" where a planned abortion makes matters even more complicated and where pregnancy is used as the excuse that if only this one factor were different the distant hills like white elephants could be attained. By the time of Islands in the Stream, however, parenthood seems to have taken the place of love and, like love, it is destroyed by death.



<sup>14</sup> See H.K. Russell ("The Catharsis in A Farewell to Arms," Modern Fiction Studies, 1, No.3, 1955, 26-30) for a discussion of Frederic's need of society and his recognition of the power of the world order which may break him but which he can survive within.

<sup>15</sup> This would argue against Julianne Isabelle (Hemingway's Religious Experience, New York: Vantage Press, 1964, p.47) who believes that Catherine ~~shows the will~~ instead of courage and with thoughts only of herself. True, Catherine is not, as Ms. Isabelle points out, repentant, but neither is there any indication that Hemingway feels she committed any sin to repent of.

<sup>16</sup> Hemingway actually rewrote the ending many times. See Carlos Baker, ed., Ernest Hemingway: Critiques of Four Major Novels, (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1962), p175 for the ending in question here.

<sup>17</sup> Sheldon Grebstein ("Sex, Hemingway, and the Critics," The Humanist, 21, 1961, 213-219) believes that Hemingway always condemns promiscuous sex and only celebrates the joys of sex with love. This is true to a degree, but Hemingway increasingly insists on dealing with loveless sex and even when he allows his characters to feel guilty about such sex, he refuses to be anything but matter of fact about their actions. His hero progresses from what is presented as normal whorehouse encounters to, in Islands in the Stream, abnormal group sex which he enjoys but feels guilty about. Still sex must be dealt with in The Sun Also Rises and in A Farewell to Arms, and William Frohock ("Ernest Hemingway: Violence and Discipline," Southwest Review, 32, 1947, 89-97 [v1], 184-194 [v2]) is closer to an accurate judgment of Hemingway than is Grebstein when he sees that Hemingway writes about sex more and more when the themes of his novels require that he should write about it less.

<sup>18</sup> Richard Floor ("Fate and Life: Determinism in Ernest Hemingway," Renaissance, 15, 1962, 23-27) points up this difference between Brett and Catherine when he sees that Brett "seeks an escape into the world instead of separating herself from it and creating something of value which would serve as a sanctuary for her mind" (25). This, however, should not, it seems to me, be used as a judgment against Brett who,

being a woman, has only the sphere of love in which to fulfill herself and who has been denied this sphere.

<sup>19</sup>D.E.S. Maxwell (American Fiction, New York: Columbia University Press, 1963, p.268) thinks that part of Brett's renunciation of Romero stems from his insistence that she conform to his ways, but it seems to me that Brett's refusal to grow her hair indicates that she has, instead, won Romero over to her ways. Nor is Earl Rovit's (Ernest Hemingway, New York: University of Louisville-Twayne Series, 1963, p.156) attempt to turn Brett's belief that her affair with Cohn meant nothing into her (Cohn's) refusal to believe the affair with Romero (Brett) meant nothing any more convincing. For it is the sufferer Brett who decides to leave Romero and we do not see her dignity degenerating as does Cohn's.

<sup>20</sup>Tom Burnam ("Primitivism and Masculinity in the Work of Hemingway," Modern Fiction Studies, 1, No.3, 1955, 21-24) sees the positive qualities attributed to men in all of Hemingway's admired women and divides his heroines into witches or women become men. It seems to me, however, that the similar qualities he notes--courage, loyalty, self-sufficiency, aggressiveness--are suitable for men and women and that these do not make Maria and Catherine man-ish heroines. For this reason I judge as more accurate Gerald Gillespie's ("Hemingway and the Happy Few," Orbis Litterarum, 23, 1968, 286-299) belief that Hemingway requires the same standards of men and women lest they become bastards or bitches.

<sup>21</sup>A distinction should be made here between Brett's reaction to Jake whom she returns to again and again because she has to, not because she wants to. With Jake she has to take precedence because she is--or believes herself to be--in love with him. With Romero love is not involved and to pretend to have to go with or renounce him is to indulge in weakness and excuse. Notably Brett progresses out of such weakness, both having to and wanting to become Romero's mistress but merely wanting to renounce for him.

<sup>22</sup>Arnold L. Goldsmith ("Henry James's Reconciliation of Free Will and Fatalism," Nineteenth Century Fiction, 13, 1958, 109-126), in a fine comparison between Hemingway and James, notes that both see that "everyone in this world suffers, but decent people bear it if they are to get anything from life"(111).

<sup>23</sup>Richard Hovey (Hemingway: The Inward Terrain) notes an exception to this increasing brainlessness in Dorothy of The Fifth Column. She lies out of the scope of this study, however, because even though she knows that her attempts at journalism cannot replace love, she neither escapes nor faces the woman's dilemma with dignity but instead cries and begs when her lover leaves her. In one sense Anita, the moorish tart of the play, lies closer to the lost woman than Dorothy: she is honest in her hatred of Dorothy but unlike the lost woman, she will have nothing to do with sacrifice and will stoop to begging her and Dorothy's lover to come back to her.

<sup>24</sup>Hemingway may have been quite aware of his increasing inability to produce a credible heroine. In the first and best section of Islands in the Stream, he has Tom Hudson, Jr., in a mock scene, say that the writer Roger Davis's new book has the same girl in it as in all his books (167,175). Though this may be Hemingway's judgment against his critics, we sense that he feels the comment is a "little bit accurate" (175). The girl who makes this latter comment is, in fact, an undeveloped Brett Ashley type, perhaps even a recreation of Brett as disapproving critics saw her: she will become Davis's mistress because it "might be good for him" (191), she is "married to some sort of son of a bitch" (192), and she may rekindle Davis's power to write by rekindling his power to love.

<sup>25</sup>Renata has been defended on a symbolic level by Carlos Baker (Hemingway: The Writer as Artist, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963) who believes she represents Colonel Cantwell's youth and innocence prior to his wound at the age of nineteen and represents the present and the actual over the past suggested in her emeralds and the art suggested in her portrait. Horst Oppel ("Hemingway's Across the River and into the Trees" in Baker, Hemingway and His Critics, pp.213-226) defends her by relating her to ideal of service, her aim being to aid Cantwell to die a happy death. Jackson Benson (Hemingway: The Writer's Art of Self-Defense, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1969) goes as far as saying that she, and Brett Ashley, are satirical portraits. This may be justified: Islands in the Stream Hemingway is definitely satirizing an Across the River type sexual scene when he has a Princess allow Thomas Hudson, and presumably others, all the liberties he wants but shies away from sexual intercourse. But if it is essentially satirical, Across the River and into the Trees becomes an even worse novel than it is generally considered to be.

## VI. WILLIAM FAULKNER AND THE "HEART'S DARLING"

<sup>1</sup>For a discussion of the relationship between Faulkner and Hawthorne see William Van O'Connor, "Hawthorne and Faulkner: Some Common Ground," (Virginia Quarterly Review, 33, (1957), 105-123), Randall Stewart, "Hawthorne and Faulkner" (College English, 17, 1958, 258-262), and Peter Swiggart, The Art of Faulkner's Novels (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1962). For a more detailed discussion of Faulkner and The Scarlet Letter, see Richard Bridgman, "As Hester Prynne Lay Dying," (English Language Notes, 2, 1965, 294-296) and Harold J. Douglas and Robert Daniel, "Faulkner and the Puritanism of the South," (Tennessee Studies in Literature, 2, 1957, 1-13).

<sup>2</sup>Frederick L. Gwynne and Joseph L. Blotner, Faulkner in the University (New York: Random House-Vintage Books, 1965), p.6.

<sup>3</sup>In many ways it is Margaret Powers who suggests the lost woman in Soldier's Pay. Having lost a husband in the war, she attempts to expiate her feelings of guilt for not loving him enough by marrying Donald Mahon, a dying flyer. When she loses Mahon also to death, she refuses a chance for happiness with Joe Gilligan, the man who helped to return Mahon to his home and who has fallen in love with her. Though Margaret never seems to really believe in love she acts for her men with little regard for herself. She marries Powers to give him something of herself before he goes to war. She refuses Gilligan lest she cause his death too. Even when she marries the dying Mahon to expiate her guilt over Powers, she, like Gilligan, also hopes that she can "help nature make a good job out of a poor one" (303) by finding someone--as the last alternative herself--to give him comfort at death and to give his father a few more months of hope.

<sup>4</sup>See David M. Miller, "Faulkner's Women" (Modern Fiction Studies, 8, No.1, 1967, 3-17) for a discussion of the importance of motherhood in Faulkner. Though Lawrence Bowling ("William Faulkner: The Importance of Love," Dalhousie Review, 43, 1963, 474-482) also sees the importance of the theme of familial love, he seems to me to misapply it, especially when he says that Caddy Compson fails as a mother to her daughter Quentin.

<sup>5</sup>If we cannot trust Gavin Stevens's theory that Eula wants her daughter to have a suicide rather than a whore for a mother, we can trust Eula's own actions: she continually protects her daughter from learning that Flem Snopes is not her father and extracts a promise from Gavin Stevens to carry on the protection her suicide provides by marrying Linda if it becomes necessary. But beyond this, Eula is also Faulkner's version of Zenobia, the sexual woman who is shamed by all the men around her and so chooses suicide over boredom. She has, however, been left out of this study because her boredom too often plunges her into an inertia that is not typical of the lost woman and because despite her capacity for loyalty to Manfred de Spain, her sexuality seems divorced from any capacity to love.

<sup>6</sup>Faulkner in the University, p.36.

<sup>7</sup>Olga Vickery (The Novels of William Faulkner, Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1959, p.152) quite rightly sees that central to the meaning of Pylon is the fact that Roger, Laverne, and Jack are "capable of commanding all the loyalty, love, and self-sacrifice that the more conventional social unit, the family, habitually regards as its prerogatives."

<sup>8</sup>John Faulkner, My Brother Bill (New York: Trident Press, 1963), p.212. Faulkner made this comment to his Brother while giving him advice on writing.

<sup>9</sup>Faulkner in the University, p.279.

<sup>10</sup>James B. Meriwether and Michael Millgate, eds., Lion in the Garden (New York: Random House, 1968), p.128.

<sup>11</sup>See Donald T. Torchiana, "Faulkner's Pylon and the Structure of Modernity" (Modern Fiction Studies, 3, No.4, 1957-1958, 291-308) for a discussion of the theme of money in Pylon. For a discussion of the conflict between love and money, especially in the Snopes trilogy, see Paul Lavine, "Love and Money in the Snopes Trilogy" (College English, 23, 1961, 196-203).

<sup>12</sup>This evidence that Laverne cares about her child enough to abandon him so he may live argues

against Joachim Seyppel (William Faulkner, New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Co., 1971, p.62) who believes that in Pylon "motherhood, loyalty, and care break down in the face of bondage, sex, and art."

<sup>13</sup>Walter Brylowski (Faulkner's Olympian Laugh: Myth in the Novel, Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1968, p.64) underlines this point in terms of myth when he says that the morality in The Sound and the Fury is judged by agape not eros and that Faulkner is dealing not with the myth of the fall but of the god of love crucified.

<sup>14</sup>Faulkner in the University, p.1. There has been some dispute about Faulkner's success in using indirection: Michael Millgate (The Achievement of William Faulkner, New York: Random House, 1963, pp.97-98) thinks Caddy is too indefinite, that (Miss) Quentin's plight, because more direct, is more moving, and Olga Vickery (The Novels of William Faulkner, p.35) goes so far as to say Caddy is more a focal point of the novel than a character. If read carefully, however, Caddy does emerge as the controlling figure of kindness and selflessness as opposed to the other Compsons who bury themselves in hypochondria, alcohol, suicide, monetary speculation, and, unavoidably, idiocy.

<sup>15</sup>Faulkner once told Maurice Coindreau ("Preface to Le Bruit et la Fureur," trans. George Reeves, Mississippi Quarterly, 19, No.3, 1966, 108-114) that he fell in love with Caddy and loved her so much that he could not let her live for only the duration of a short story, so he created a novel. For Faulkner's statements on Caddy's muddy drawers as the controlling image in The Sound and the Fury, see Faulkner in the University, p. 1 and William Faulkner, "An Introduction to The Sound and the Fury" (ed. James B. Meriwether, Southern Review, 8, No.4, 1972, 705-710).

<sup>16</sup>Lawrence Thompson ("Mirror Analogues in The Sound and the Fury," English Institute Essays, New York: Columbia University Press, 1954, pp.82-106) suggests that Quentin, through his relationship with Natalie, actually goads Caddy into her sexual encounters. It would seem, however, that Caddy is one of those women who is born sexual and Quentin or no Quentin would escape the restrictions placed upon Compson women by acting upon this sexuality.

<sup>17</sup>In the most sympathetic article to date on Caddy, Catherine Baum ("The Beautiful One: Caddy Compson as Heroine of The Sound and the Fury," Modern Fiction Studies, 13, No.1, 1967, 33-40) thinks that Caddy gives herself to Dalton Ames because she loves him and that Dalton betrays her so that she no longer can trust anyone, that she accepts responsibility for her marriage by marrying Herbert Head, and that she hasn't much choice after her marriage. But there is no evidence that Dalton does betray Caddy and her acceptance of responsibility via marriage appears to come after many more sexual encounters so that the father of (Miss) Quentin is not known. Olga Vickery (The Novels of William Faulkner, p.38) seems closer to the point when she sees Caddy's affair with Dalton as another symbol of change, but she strikes me as too extreme, saying "that Caddy places little importance on it." A more moderate and, I think, more correct view is that Caddy does view her affair with Dalton--though not her loss of virginity--as important but that she neither loves him nor feels betrayed by him.

<sup>18</sup>Both Who's Who in Faulkner (Margaret Ford and Susan Kincaid, Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1963) and Faulkner's People (Robert Kirk and Marvin Klotz, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1963) assume that Dalton Ames is (Miss) Quentin's father. Caddy, however, tells Quentin that she does not know the father of her child. Certainly at the time she suggests she might tell Dalton she is pregnant, she cannot know of her pregnancy. For a time line that disproves Dalton's candidacy for father, as well as others who have been blamed--Quentin, Benjy, Gerald Bland--see Carvel Collins, "Miss Quentin's Paternity Again" (Texas Studies in Literature and Language, 2, 1960, 253-260).

<sup>19</sup>Rather than seeing Caddy's final condition as a triumph of renunciation, Lawrence Bowling ("Faulkner and the Theme of Innocence," Kansas Review, 20, 1958, 476) harshly interprets Faulkner's description of her as "ageless and beautiful, cold serene and damned": she is "ageless" because she has gained no maturity, "cold" because she has no love, "damned" because she lives in sin without hope for redemption and because she failed to accept her duty toward her child, and "serene" because she is empty, not peaceful.

<sup>20</sup>For a discussion of The Wild Palms and A Farewell to Arms, see H. Edward Richardson, "The Hemingwayes' in Faulkner's 'Wild Palms!'" (Modern Fiction Studies, 4, No.4, 1958-1959, 357-360), William Van O'Connor, "Faulkner's One-Sided Dialogue with Hemingway" (College English, 23, 1962, 208-213), and Thomas L. McHaney, "Anderson, Hemingway, and Faulkner's The Wild Palms" (Publications of the Modern Language Association, 87, 1972, 465-474).

<sup>21</sup>See Faulkner in the University, pp.171-185 for a statement of the counterpoint method.

<sup>22</sup>Irving Howe (William Faulkner, rev.ed., New York: Random House-Vintage Books, 1951) places the failure to live in society and isolation on Charlotte and Harry both, and he especially blames Charlotte for Harry's destruction. Charlotte, however, continues to love and be productive regardless of outward conditions of life; the failure belongs more properly to Harry alone.

<sup>23</sup>For a discussion of Harry's guilt feelings see Peter Swiggart, The Art of Faulkner's Novels (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1962), Dorothy Tuck, Crowell's Handbook of Faulkner (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1964, pp.138-142), Carl Galharn, "Faulkner's Faith: Roots from The Wild Palms" (Twentieth Century Literature, 1, 1955, 139-160), and Joseph Moldenhauer, "Unity of Theme and Structure in The Wild Palms" (William Faulkner: Three Decades of Criticism, ed. Frederick J. Hoffman and Olga Vickery, New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, 1960, pp.305-322). Moldenhauer sees parallels in The Wild Palms and The Scarlet Letter and suggests that Harry wants Charlotte to have a child so that it may be a sign to the world of their guilt. However, he, like all the above critics, seems to me to overstress Harry's guilt and neglect his final acceptance of love.

<sup>24</sup>Rev. Mahon in Soldier's Pay indicates exactly the opposite of The Wild Palms: "The saddest thing about love," he says, "is that not only the love cannot last forever, but even the heartbreak is soon forgotten" (318). His motive, however, is to seek comfort for himself over the loss of his son and for Gilligan over the loss of Margaret, so that his statement does not carry the weight the opposite view is given in The Wild Palms.



<sup>25</sup>Faulkner stresses the need for this kind of responsibility in an address to the Delta Council of Cleveland, Mississippi (William Faulkner: Essays, Speeches and Public Letters, ed. James B. Meriwether, New York: Random House, 1965, pp.126-134), and says at the University of Virginia (Faulkner in the University, p.81) that isolation sooner or later destroys because "one has got to belong to the human family, and to take a responsible part in the human family."

<sup>26</sup>Olga Vickery, The Novels of William Faulkner, p.164. William Van O'Connor ("William Faulkner" in Seven Modern American Novelists, ed. O'Connor, Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, 1959, pp.118-152) also seems to me correct when he says that Faulkner sees excessive love, not society, as self-destructive. As Miss Vickery indicates, this does not, however, negate the value of this love.

#### VII. YOU DON'T MARRY SEMIRAMIS

<sup>1</sup>Fitzgerald's conception of Nicole as foreign is documented in Matthew J. Bruccoli, The Composition of Tender Is the Night (Pittsburg: University of Pittsburg Press, 1963, p.80) who quotes the author: "She is American with a streak of some foreign blood."

<sup>2</sup>See Elizabeth M. Kerr, "William Faulkner and the Southern Concept of Woman" (Mississippi Quarterly, 15, No.1, 1961, 1-16) and Dolores E. Brien, "William Faulkner and the Myth of Woman" (Research Studies, 35, 1967, 132-140) for a discussion of Faulkner's feelings toward the southern myth of womanhood.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Noted below are all works cited within the text and, in addition, works which especially relate to the lost heroine topic or which have served in some way to enlarge my thinking.

## I. GENERAL

- Bewley, Marius. The Complex Fate. London: Chatto and Windus, 1952.
- Booth, Wayne C. The Rhetoric of Fiction. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.
- Fiedler, Leslie. Love and Leath in the American Novel. rev.ed. New York: Stein and Day, 1966.
- Geismar, Maxwell. The Last of the Provincials: The American Novel, 1915-1925. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1947.
- Geismar, Maxwell. Writers in Crisis. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1942.
- Hoffman, Frederick J. Freudianism and the Literary Mind. Louisiana State University Press, 1945.
- Leavis, F.R. The Great Tradition: George Eliot, Henry James, Joseph Conrad. New York: G.W. Stewart, 1948.
- Lewis, R.W.B. The American Adam: Innocence, Tragedy and Tradition in the Nineteenth Century. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1955.
- Maxwell, D.E.S. American Fiction. New York: Columbia University Press, 1963.
- O'Connor, William van, ed. Seven Modern American Novelists. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1959.
- Ossoli, Margaret Fuller. Woman in the Nineteenth Century. ed. Arthur B. Fuller. Boston: Roberts Brothers, 1893.
- Porte, Joel. The Romance in America: Studies in Cooper, Poe, Hawthorne, Melville, and James. Middletown, Connecticut: Wesleyan University Press, 1969.

- Robinson, Lillian S. "Dwelling in Decencies: Radical Criticism and the Feminist Perspective." College English, 32 (1971), 879-888.
- Shapiro, Charles, ed. Twelve Original Essays on Great Novels. The Wayne State University Press, 1958.
- Smith, Page. Daughters of the Promised Land. Toronto: Little, Brown and Co., 1970.
- Trilling, Lionel. The Liberal Imagination: Essays on Literature and Society. New York: Viking Press, 1951.
- Wasserstrom, William. Heiress of All the Ages: Sex and Sentiment in the Genteel Tradition. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1959.
- Watkins, Floyd. The Flesh and the Word: Eliot, Hemingway, Faulkner. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1971.
- Wilson, Edmund. The Wound and the Bow. New York: Oxford University Press, 1947.
- II. NATHANIEL HAWTHORNE
- Arvin, Newton, ed. The Heart of Hawthorne's Journals. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1929.
- Askew, Melvin W. "Hawthorne, the Fall, and the Psychology of Maturity." American Literature, 34 (1962), 335-343.
- Baym, Nina. "The Blithedale Romance: A Radical Reading." Journal of English and Germanic Philology, 67 (1968), 545-569.
- Beidler, Peter G. "Theme of the Fortunate Fall in The Marble Faun." Emerson Society Quarterly, 47 (IIQ 1967), 56-62.
- Bell, Michael Davitt. Hawthorne and the Historical Romance. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1971.
- Carpenter, Frederic I. "Puritans Preferred Blondes: The Heroines of Melville and Hawthorne." New England Quarterly, 9 (1936), 253-272.
- Carpenter, Frederic I. "Scarlet A Minus." College English, 5 (1944), 173-180.
- Crews, Frederick. The Sins of the Fathers: Hawthorne's Psychological Themes. New York: Oxford University Press, 1966.

- Dobbs, Jeannine. "Hawthorne's Dr. Rappaccini and Father George Rapp." American Literature, 43 (1971), 427-430.
- Doubleday, Neal. "Hawthorne's Hester and Feminism." Publications of the Modern Language Association, 54 (1939), 825-829.
- Erlich, Gloria Chasson. "Deadly Innocence: Hawthorne's Dark Women." New England Quarterly, 41 (1968), 163-179.
- Fairbanks, Henry G. The Lasting Loneliness of Nathaniel Hawthorne. Albany, New York: Magi Books, Inc., 1965.
- Fogle, Richard Harter. Hawthorne's Fiction: The Light and the Dark. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1952.
- Guilds, John C. "Miriam of The Marble Faun." Cairo Studies in English (1960), 61-68.
- Hall, Lawrence Sargent. Hawthorne: Critic of Society. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1944.
- Hawthorne, Julian. Hawthorne and His Circle. New York: Harper and Brother, 1903.
- Hawthorne, Nathaniel. The Complete Novels and Selected Tales of Nathaniel Hawthorne, ed. Norman Holmes Pearson. New York: Random House, ~~Modern~~ Library, 1937.
- Hawthorne, Sophia, ed. Hawthorne's Works: Passages from The American Notebooks. 2 vols. Cambridge, Mass.: H.O. Houghton and Co., 1868.
- Hawthorne, Sophia, ed. Hawthorne's Works: Passages from The English Notebooks. 2 vols. Cambridge, Mass.: H.O. Houghton and Co., 1868.
- Houston, Neil. "Hester Prynne as Eternal Feminine." Discourse, 11 (1966), 230-244.
- Lefcowitz, Allan and Barbara. "Some Rents in the Veil: New Light on Priscilla and Zenobia in The Blithedale Romance." Nineteenth Century Fiction, 21 (1966), 263-275.
- Letters of Hawthorne to William D. Ticknor: 1851-1864. 2 vols. Newark, New Jersey: Carteret Book Club, 1910.
- Male, Roy. Hawthorne's Tragic Vision. New York: W.W. Norton, 1957.
- Marks, Barry A. "The Origin of Original Sin in Hawthorne's Fiction." Nineteenth Century Fiction, 14 (1960), 359-362.

- Montgomery, Judith. "The American Galatea." College English, 32 (1971), 890-899.
- Rahv, Philip. "The Dark Lady of Salem." Partisan Review, 8 (1941), 362-381.
- Sandeen, Ernest. "The Scarlet Letter as Love Story." Publications of the Modern Language Association, 77 (1962), 425-433.
- Smith, Julian. "Why Does Zenobia Kill Herself?" English Language Notes, 6 (1968), 37-39.
- Spigel, Helen T. The Sacred Image and the New Truth: A Study in Hawthorne's Women. Diss. Washington University, 1969.
- Tharp, Louisa Hall. The Peabody Sisters of Salem. Boston: Little, Brown, 1950.
- Tharpe, Jac. Nathaniel Hawthorne: Identity and Knowledge. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1967.
- Wagenknecht, Edward. Nathaniel Hawthorne: Man and Writer. New York: Oxford University Press, 1961.
- Waggoner, Hyatt. Hawthorne: A Critical Study. Cambridge, Mass.: The Belknap Press of Harvard University, 1955.
- Zivkovic, Peter D. "The Evil of the Isolated Intellect: Hilda in The Marble Faun." The Personalist, 43 (1962), 202-213.
- III. HENRY JAMES
- Anderson, Quentin. The American Henry James. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1957.
- Anderson, Quentin. "Henry James and The New Jerusalem." The Kenyon Review, 8 (1946), 515-516.
- Baxter, Annette K. "Independence vs. Isolation: Hawthorne and James on the Problem of the Artist." Nineteenth Century Fiction, 10 (1955), 225-231.
- Bell, Millicent. "The Dream of Being Possessed and Possessing: Henry James's The Wings of the Dove." Massachusetts Review, 10, (1969), 97-114.
- Berland, Alwyn. "Henry James and the Grand Renunciation." Kansas Magazine, 4 (1958), 82-90.
- Bersani, Leo. "The Jamesian Lie." Partisan Review, 36 (1969), 53-79.

- Blackmur, R.P., ed. The Art of the Novel: Critical Prefaces. New York: Scribner's, 1934.
- Blackmur, R.P., ed. The Golden Bowl. New York: Laurel-Dell, 1963.
- Blackmur, R.P., ed. "The Loose and Baggy Monsters of Henry James." Accent, 11 (1951), 129-146.
- Bontley, Thomas John. "The Aesthetics of Discretion: Sexuality in the Fiction of Henry James." Diss. Stanford University, 1966.
- Buitenhuis, Peter. "Henry James on Hawthorne." New England Quarterly, 32 (1959), 207-225.
- Cargill, Oscar. The Novels of Henry James. New York: Macmillan, 1961.
- Clair, John A. The Ironic Dimension in the Fiction of Henry James. Pittsburg: Duquesne University Press, 1965.
- Crews, Frederick. The Tragedy of Manners: Moral Drama in the Later Novels of Henry James. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1957.
- Dupee, F.W. Henry James. New York: Delta-American Men of Letters Series, 1951.
- Dupee, F.W., ed. The Question of Henry James: A Collection of Critical Essays. New York: Henry Holt, 1945.
- Edel, Leon. Henry James. 5 vols. New York: J.P. Lippincott, 1953, 1962, 1969, 1971.
- Falk, Robert P. "Henry James and the 'Age of Innocence.'" Nineteenth Century Fiction, 7 (1952), 171-188.
- Ferguson, Francis. "The Golden Bowl Revisited." Sewanee Review, 63 (1955), 13-28.
- Firebaugh, Joseph T. "The Ververs." Essays in Criticism, 4 (1954), 400-410.
- Gard, A.R. "Critics of The Golden Bowl." Melbourne Critical Review, 6 (1963), 102-109.
- Geismar, Maxwell. Henry James and the Jacobites. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1963.
- Goldsmith, Arnold. "Henry James's Reconciliation of Free Will and Fatalism." Nineteenth Century Fiction, 13 (1958), 109-126.
- Gordon, Caroline. "Mr. Verver, Our National Hero." Sewanee Review, 63 (1955), 29-47.

- Holland, Laurence B. The Expense of Vision: Essays on the Craft of Henry James. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1964.
- Holland, Laurence B. "The Wings of the Dove." ELH: A Journal of English Literary History, 26 (1959), 549-574.
- James, Henry. The Complete Tales of Henry James, ed. Leon Edel. 12 vols. Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott, 1961-1964.
- James, Henry. Hawthorne, ed. Tony Tanner. New York: Macmillan, 1967.
- James, Henry. Notes on Novelists. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1914.
- James, Henry. The Novels and Tales of Henry James. 26 vols. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1937.
- James, Henry. Partial Portraits. New York: Macmillan, 1905.
- Jefferson, D.W. Henry James. Edinburg: Writers and Critics Series-Oliver and Boyd, 1960.
- Johnson, Courtney, Jr. "The Problem of Sex in the Writings of Henry James." Diss. University of Michigan, 1966.
- Kimball, Jean. "The Abyss and The Wings of the Dove: The Image as a Revelation." Nineteenth Century Fiction, 10 (1956), 281-300.
- Kimball, Jean. "Henry James's Last Portrait of a Lady: Charlotte Verver in The Golden Bowl." American Literature, 28 (1957), 449-468.
- Koch, Stephen. "Transcendence in The Wings of the Dove." Modern Fiction Studies, 12, No.1 (1966), 93-102.
- Krook, Dorothea. The Ordeal of Consciousness. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1962.
- Lebowitz, Naomi. The Imagination of Loving: Henry James's Legacy to the Novel. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1965.
- Lee, Brian. "Henry James's 'Divine Consenses': The Ambassadors, The Wings of the Dove, and The Golden Bowl." Renaissance and Modern Studies (Nottingham), 6 (1962), 5-24.
- Lubbock, Percy, ed. The Letters of Henry James. 2 vols. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1920.
- Matthiessen, F.O. and Kenneth B. Murdock, eds. The Notebooks of Henry James. New York: Oxford University Press, 1947.

- Meldrum, Ronald. "Three of Henry James's Dark Ladies." Research Studies (Washington State University), 37 (1969), 54-60.
- Mordell, Albert, ed. Literary Reviews and Essays by Henry James on American, English, and French Literature. New York: Twayne Publishers, 1957.
- Nuhn, Ferner. The Wind Blew from the East. Port Washington, New York: Kennikat Press, 1940.
- Owen, Elizabeth. "'The Given Appearance' of Charlotte Verver." Essays in Criticism, 13 (1963), 364-374.
- Reid, Stephen. "Moral Passion in The Portrait of a Lady and The Spoils of Poynton." Modern Fiction Studies, 12, No. 1 (1966), 24-43.
- Rypins, Harold L., M.S. "Henry James in Harley Street." American Literature, 24 (1953), 481-492.
- Samuels, Charles Thomas. The Ambiguity of Henry James. Urbans: University of Illinois Press, 1971.
- Schwertman, Mary Sprague. "Henry James's Portraits of Ladies." Diss. University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1969.
- Sears, Sallie. The Negative Imagination: Form and Perspective in the Novels of Henry James. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1968.
- Segal, Ora. The Lucid Reflector: The Observer in Henry James's Fiction. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1969.
- Snow, Lotus. "A Story of Cabinets and Chairs and Tables: Images of Morality in The Spoils of Poynton and The Golden Bowl." ELH: A Journal of English Literary History, 30 (1963), 413-435.
- Spender, Steven. The Destructive Element. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1936.
- Stafford, William T., ed. Perspectives on James's Portrait of a Lady: A Collection of Critical Essays. New York: New York University Press, 1967.
- Stevenson, Elizabeth. The Crooked Corridor: A Study of Henry James. New York: Macmillan, 1961.
- Tanner, Tony. "The Golden Bowl and the Reassessment of Innocence." London Magazine, 1 (1961), 38-49.
- Trieschmann, Margaret. "The Golden Bowl: An Analysis of the Sources of Evil in Human Relationships." Iowa English Yearbook, 12 (1967), 61-67.



- Volpe, Edmond L. "James's Theory of Sex in Fiction." Nineteenth Century Fiction, 13 (1958), 36-47.
- Ward, J.A. "Evil in The Golden Bowl." Western Humanities Review, 14 (1960), 47-59.
- Ward, J.A. The Imagination of Disaster: Evil in the Fiction of Henry James. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1961.
- Ward, J.A. "Social Disintegration in The Wings of the Dove." Criticism, 2 (1960), 190-203.
- Wegelin, Christof. "Henry James's The Wings of the Dove as an International Novel." Jahrbuch für Amerika-studien, 3 (1958), 151-160.
- Wright, Walter. The Madness of Art: A Study of Henry James. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1962.
- Wright, Walter. "Maggie Verver: Neither Saint nor Witch." Nineteenth Century Fiction, 12 (1957), 59-71.
- IV. F. SCOTT FITZGERALD
- Anderson, Hilton. "The Rich Bunch in The Great Gatsby." Southern Quarterly, 6 (1967-68), 163-173.
- Bewley, Marius. "Scott Fitzgerald's Criticism of America." Sewanee Review, 62 (1954), 125-141.
- Bicknell, John W. "The Wasteland of F. Scott Fitzgerald." Virginia Quarterly Review, 30 (1954), 556-572.
- Brucoli, Matthew J. The Composition of Tender is the Night. Pittsburg: University of Pittsburg Press, 1963.
- Cross, K.G.W. Scott Fitzgerald. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1964.
- Drake, Constance. "Josephine and Emotional Bankruptcy." Fitzgerald/Hemingway Annual, (1969), 5-13.
- Fitzgerald, F. Scott. The Beautiful and Damned. New York: The Scribner Library, 1922, 1950.
- Fitzgerald, F. Scott. The Crack-up, ed. Edmund Wilson. New York: New Directions Paperback, 1956.
- Fitzgerald, F. Scott. The Great Gatsby. New York: The Scribner Library, 1925, 1953.
- Fitzgerald, F. Scott. The Last Tycoon. New York: The Scribner Library, 1941, 1969.

- Fitzgerald, F. Scott. Tender Is the Night. New York: The Scribner Library, 1933, 1962.
- Fitzgerald, F. Scott. This Side of Paradise. New York: The Scribner Library, 1926, 1948.
- Fitzgerald, F. Scott. The Stories of F. Scott Fitzgerald, ed. Malcolm Cowley. New York: The Scribner Library, 1965.
- Fussell, Edwin. "Fitzgerald's Brave New World." ELH: A Journal of English Literary History, 14 (1952), 291-306.
- Graham, Sheilah and Gerold Frank. Beloved Infidel. London: Frank Cassell, 1958.
- Goldhurst, William. F. Scott Fitzgerald and His Contemporaries. Cleveland: The World Publishing Co., 1963.
- Gross, Barry. "The Dark Side of Twenty-five: Fitzgerald and The Beautiful and Damned." Bucknell Review, 16, No.3 (1968), 40-52.
- Hoffman, Nancy Y. "The Great Gatsby: Troilus and Criseyde Revisited?" Fitzgerald/Hemingway Annual (1969), 148-153.
- Kazin, Alfred, ed. F. Scott Fitzgerald: The Man and His Work. New York: The World Publishing Co., 1962.
- Kreuter, Kent and Gretchen. "The Moralism of the Later Fitzgerald." Modern Fiction Studies, 7, No.1 (1961), 71-81.
- Kuehl, John, ed. The Apprenticeship of F. Scott Fitzgerald, 1909-1917. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1965.
- LaHood, Marvin. "Sensuality and Asceticism in Tender Is the Night." English Record, 17 (1967), 9-12.
- Latham, Aaron. Crazy Sundays: F. Scott Fitzgerald in Hollywood. New York: Viking Press, 1970.
- Lehan, Richard D. F. Scott Fitzgerald and the Craft of Fiction. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1966.
- Mayfield, Sara. Exiles from Paradise: Zelda and Scott Fitzgerald. New York: Delacort Press, 1971.
- Milford, Nancy. Zelda: A Biography. New York: Harper and Row, 1970.

- Miller, James E. F. Scott Fitzgerald: His Art and His Technique. New York: New York University Press, 1964.
- Mizener, Arthur. The Far Side of Paradise. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1949.
- Ornstein, Robert. "Scott Fitzgerald's Fable of East and West." College English, 18 (1956-57), 139-143.
- Perosa, Sergio. The Art of F. Scott Fitzgerald, trans. Charles Matz and Sergio Perosa. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1965.
- Piper, Henry Dan. F. Scott Fitzgerald: A Critical Portrait. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1965.
- Samuels, Charles Thomas. "The Greatness of 'Gatsby.'" Massachusetts Review, 7 (1966), 783-794.
- Shain, Charles E. F. Scott Fitzgerald. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Pamphlets on American Writers, 1965.
- Spencer, Benjamin T. "Fitzgerald and the American Ambivalence." South Atlantic Quarterly, 66 (1967), 367-381.
- Stanton, Robert. "'Daddy's Girl': Symbol and Theme in Tender Is the Night." Modern Fiction Studies, 4, No. 2 (1958), 136-142.
- Stern, Milton R. The Golden Moment: The Novels of F. Scott Fitzgerald. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1970.
- Turnbull, Andrew, ed. The Letters of F. Scott Fitzgerald. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1963.
- Turnbull, Andrew. Scott Fitzgerald. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1962.
- White, Eugene. "The Intricate Destiny of Dick Diver." Modern Fiction Studies, 7, No.1 (1961), 55-62.
- V. ERNEST HEMINGWAY
- Baker, Carlos, ed. Ernest Hemingway: Critiques of Four Major Novels. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1962.
- Baker, Carlos. Ernest Hemingway: A Life Story. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1969.
- Baker, Carlos, ed. Hemingway and His Critics. New York: Hill and Wang- American Century Series, 1961.

- Baker, Carlos. Hemingway: The Writer as Artist. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963.
- Benson, Jackson J. Hemingway: The Writer's Art of Self-Defense. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1969.
- Burnam, Tom. "Primitivism and Masculinity in the Work of Hemingway." Modern Fiction Studies, 1, No.3 (1955), 21-24.
- Cooperman, Stanley. "Death and Cojones: Hemingway's A Farewell to Arms." South Atlantic Quarterly, 63 (1964), 85-92.
- Cooperman, Stanley. "Hemingway's Blue-Eyed Boy: Robert Jordan and 'Purging Ecstasy.'" Criticism, 8 (1966), 87-96.
- Cowley, Malcolm, ed. "Nightmare and Ritual in Hemingway," The Portable Hemingway. New York: The Viking Press, 1945.
- Donaldson, Scott. "Hemingway's Morality of Compensation." American Literature, 43 (1971), 399-340.
- Floor, Richard. "Fate and Life: Determinism in Ernest Hemingway." Renascence, 15 (Fall 1962), 23-27.
- Friedrich, Otto. "Ernest Hemingway: Joy Through Strength." American Scholar, 26 (1957), 470, 518-530.
- Frohock, William. "Ernest Hemingway: Violence and Discipline." Southwest Review, 32, No.1 (1947), 89-97.
- Ganzel, Dewey. "Cabestro and Vaquilla: The Symbolic Structure of The Sun Also Rises." Sewanee Review, 76 (1968), 26-48.
- Gillispie, Gerald. "Hemingway and the Happy Few." Orbis Litterarum, 23 (1968), 286-299.
- Glasser, William A. "A Farewell to Arms." Sewanee Review, 74 (1966), 453-469.
- Grebstein, Sheldon Norman. "Sex, Hemingway, and the Critics." The Humanist, 4 (1961), 213-219.
- Grenberg, Bruce L. "The Design of Heroism in The Sun Also Rises." Fitzgerald/Hemingway Annual (1969), 274-285.
- Gurko, Leo. Ernest Hemingway and the Pursuit of Heroism. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1968.
- Hemingway, Ernest. Across the River and Into the Trees. New York: The Scribner Library, 1970.

- Hemingway, Ernest. A Farewell to Arms. New York: The Scribner Library, 1929, 1957.
- Hemingway, Ernest. For Whom the Bell Tolls. New York: The Scribner Library, 1940, 1968.
- Hemingway, Ernest. To Have and Have Not. New York: The Scribner Library, 1937, 1965.
- Hemingway, Ernest. Islands In the Stream: New York: The Scribner Library, 1970.
- Hemingway, Ernest. The Old Man and the Sea. New York: The Scribner Library, 1952.
- Hemingway, Ernest. The Short Stories of Ernest Hemingway. New York: The Scribner Library, 1953.
- Hovey, Richard B. Hemingway: The Inward Terrain. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1968.
- Isabelle, Julianne. Hemingway's Religious Experience. New York: Vantage Press, 1964.
- Killinger, John. Hemingway and the Dead Gods. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1960.
- Koskimies, Rafael. "Notes on Ernest Hemingway's For Whom the Bell Tolls. Orbis Litterarum, 23 (1968), 276-286.
- Lewis, Robert W. Hemingway on Love. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1965.
- Light, James F. "The Religion of Death in A Farewell to Arms." Modern Fiction Studies, 7, No.2 (1961), 169-173.
- Marcus, Fred. H. "A Farewell to Arms: The Impact of Irony and the Irrational." The English Journal, 51 (1962), 527-535.
- McAlear, John J. "Frederick Henry's Rejected Passion." Renascence, 14 (1961-62), 72-79, 89.
- McCaffery, John K.M., ed. Ernest Hemingway: The Man and His Work. Cleveland: The World Publishing Co., 1950.
- Rovit, Earl. Ernest Hemingway. New York: University of Louisville-Twayne Series, 1963.
- Russell, H.K. "The Catharsis in A Farewell to Arms." Modern Fiction Studies, 1, No.3 (1955), 26-30.

- Sarason, Bertram. "Lady Brett Ashley and Lady Duff Twysden." Connecticut Review, 2, No.2 (1969), 5-13.
- Schorer, Mark. "The Background of a Style." Kenyon Review, 3 (1941), 101-105.
- Stein, Gertrude. The Autobiography of Alice B. Toklas. New York: Random House, 1933.
- Toole, William B., III. "Religion, Love and Nature in A Farewell to Arms: The Dark Shape of Irony." College English Association, 29 (May, 1967), 10-11.
- Trilling, Lionel. "An American in Spain." The Partisan Reader, eds. William Philips and Philip Rahv. New York: The Dial Press, 1946.
- Warren, Robert Penn. "Hemingway." Kenyon Review, 9 (1947), 1-28.
- Weeks, Robert P. "Hemingway and the Uses of Isolation." University of Kansas City Review, 24 (1957), 119-125.
- West, Ray B., Jr. "The Biological Trap." Sewanee Review, 55 (1945), 120-235.
- Young, Philip. Ernest Hemingway: A Reconsideration. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1966.

#### VI. WILLIAM FAULKNER

- Backman, Melvin. "Faulkner's The Wild Palms: Civilization Against Nature." University of Kansas City Review, 28 (1962), 199-204.
- Baum, Catherine B. "The Beautiful One: Caddy Compson as Heroine of The Sound and the Fury." Modern Fiction Studies, 13, No.1 (1967), 33-40.
- Blackwell, Louise. "Faulkner and the Womenfolk." Kansas Magazine (1967), 73-77.
- Bowling, Lawrence. "William Faulkner: The Importance of Love." Dalhousie Review, 43 (1963), 474-482.
- Bowling, Lawrence. "William Faulkner and the Theme of Innocence." Kenyon Review, 20 (1958), 466-487.
- Bridgeman, Richard. "As Hester Prynne Lay Dying." English Language Notes, 2 (1965), 294-296.
- Brien, Dolores E. "William Faulkner and the Myth of Woman." Research Studies, 35 (June 1967), 132-140.
- Brooks, Cleanth. William Faulkner: The Yoknapatawpha Country. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963.

- Brylowski, Walter. Faulkner's Olympian Laugh: Myth in the Novels. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1968.
- Coindreau, Maurice. "Preface to Le Bruit et la fureur," trans. George Reeves. Mississippi Quarterly, 19 (Summer 1966), 108-114.
- Collins, Carvel. "Miss Quentin's Paternity Again." Texas Studies in Literature and Language, 2 (1960), 253-260.
- Douglas, Harold J. and Robert Daniel. "Faulkner and the Puritanism of the South." Texas Studies in Literature and Language, 2 (1957), 1-13.
- Faulkner, John. My Brother Bill. New York: Trident Press, 1963.
- Faulkner, William. Collected Stories of William Faulkner. New York: Random House, 1950.
- Faulkner, William. The Hamlet. New York: Random House, 1940.
- Faulkner, William. "An Introduction to The Sound and the Fury," ed. James B. Meriwether. Southern Review, 8, No.4 (1972), 705-710.
- Faulkner, William. The Mansion. New York: Random House, 1959.
- Faulkner, William. Mosquitoes. New York: Boni and Liveright, 1926.
- Faulkner, William. Pylon. New York: Smith and Haas, 1935.
- Faulkner, William. Requiem for a Nun. New York: Random House, 1951.
- Faulkner, William. Sanctuary. New York: Cape and Smith, 1931.
- Faulkner, William. Soldiers' Pay. New York: The Liveright Publishing Corp., 1954.
- Faulkner, William. The Sound and the Fury. New York: Random House-The Modern Library, 1956.
- Faulkner, William. The Town. New York: Random House, 1957.
- Faulkner, William. The Wild Palms. New York: Random House, 1939.
- Ford, Margaret Patricia and Susan Kincaid. Who's Who in Faulkner. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1963.
- Galharn, Carl. "Faulkner's Faith: Roots from The Wild Palms." Twentieth Century Literature, 1 (1955), 139-160.

- Gresset, Michel. "Psychological Aspects of Evil in The Sound and the Fury." Mississippi Quarterly, 19 (Summer 1966), 143-153.
- Gwynne, Frederick L. and Joseph L. Blotner, eds. Faulkner in the University. New York: Random House-Vintage Books, 1965.
- Hoffman, Frederick J. and Olga Vickery, eds. William Faulkner: Three Decades of Criticism. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, Inc., 1960.
- Howe, Irving. William Faulkner, rev.ed. New York: Random House-Vintage Books, 1951.
- Jackson, Naomi. "Faulkner's Woman: Demon-Nun or Angel-Witch." Ball State University Forum, 8 (Winter 1967), 12-20.
- Kerr, Elizabeth M. "William Faulkner and the Southern Concept of Woman." Mississippi Quarterly, 15 (Winter 1961), 1-16.
- Kirk, Robert W. and Marvin Klotz. Faulkner's People. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1963.
- Levine, Paul. "Love and Money in the Snopes Trilogy." College English, 23 (1961), 196-203.
- Malin, Irving. William Faulkner. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1957.
- Marvin, John. "Pylon: The Definition of Sacrifice." Faulkner Studies, I (Summer 1952), 20-23.
- Massey, Tom M. "Faulkner's Females: The Thematic Function of Women in the Yoknapatawpha Cycle," Diss. University of Nevada, 1969.
- Meriwether, James B. and Michael Millgate, eds. Lion in the Garden. New York: Random House, 1968.
- Meriwether, James B., ed. William Faulkner: Essays, Speeches and Public Letters. New York: Random House, 1965.
- Millgate, Michael. The Achievement of William Faulkner. New York: Random House, 1963.
- Miller, David M. "Faulkner's Women." Modern Fiction Studies, 8, No.1 (1967), 3-17.
- Monteiro, George. "Bankruptcy in Time: A Reading of William Faulkner's Pylon." Twentieth Century Literature, 4 (1958), 9-20.



- Moses, W.R. The Unity of The Wild Palms. Modern Fiction Studies, 2, No.3 (1956), 125-131.
- McHaney, Thomas L. "Anderson, Hemingway, and Faulkner's The Wild Palms. Publications of the Modern Language Association, 89 (1972), 465-474.
- O'Connor, William Van. "Faulkner's One-Sided Dialogue with Hemingway." College English, 24 (1962), 208-213.
- O'Connor, William Van. "Hawthorne and Faulkner: Some Common Ground." Virginia Quarterly Review, 33 (1957), 105-123.
- Page, Sally Rigsbee. "Woman in the Works of William Faulkner, Diss. Duke University, 1969.
- Price, Reynolds. "Pylon: The Posture of Worship." Shenandoah, 19, No.3 (1968), 49-61.
- Richardson, H. Edward. "The 'Hemingwaves' in Faulkner's Wild Palms." Modern Fiction Studies, 4, No.4 (1958-59), 357-360.
- Seyppel, Joachim. William Faulkner. New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Co., 1971.
- Stewart, Randall. "Hawthorne and Faulkner." College English, 17 (1958), 258-262.
- Swiggart, Peter. The Art of Faulkner's Novels. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1962.
- Thompson, Lawrence. "Mirror Analogues in The Sound and the Fury." English Institute Essays. New York: Columbia University Press, 1954, 82-106.
- Torchiana, Donald T. "Faulkner's Pylon and the Structure of Modernity." Modern Fiction Studies, 3, No.4 (1957-58), 291-308.
- Tuck, Dorothy. Crowell's Handbook of Faulkner. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1964.
- Vickery, Olga. The Novels of William Faulkner. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1959.
- Waggoner, Hyatt H. From Jefferson to the World. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1959.
- Yorks, Samuel A. "Faulkner's Women: The Peril of Mankind." Arizona Quarterly, 17 (1961), 119-129.
- Zink, K.E. "Faulkner's Garden: Woman and the Immemorial Earth." Modern Fiction Studies, 2, No.3 (1956), 139-149.