DREISER STUDIES

ISSN 0996-6362

Volume 23, Number 1 Spring 1992

Table of Contents

C. B. De Camp and *Jennie Gehardt*,
by James L. W. West III 2

Sister Carrie and Thomas Hardy, Regained,
by John B. Humma 8

The Rudest American Author: Grant Richard's Assessment
of Theodore Dresier, by Lucia A. Kinsaul 27

Addenda and Corrigenda to *Theodore Drieser: A Primary Bibliography and Reference Guide*: Japaneae Translations of Writings by Theodore Dreiser,
by Shigeo Mizuguchi 38

Book Reviews
Dreiser's Perpetual Quest for the "Reality of Life,"
by Miriam Gogol 42
Unexpurgated Dreiser,
by Federic E. Rusch 45

News and Notes 50

International Dreiser Society *Constitution* and *Bylaws* 51

C. B. De Camp and *Jennie Gerhardt*

James L. W. West III
Pennsylvania State University

A 13 March 1911 letter to Dreiser from Charles B. De Camp, in the Dreiser Collection at the University of Pennsylvania, has cast some additional light on the matter of Lester Kane's deathbed scene in *Jennie Gerhardt.* In an earlier article in *Dreiser Studies*, I traced the textual history of this scene and showed that Lester's confession of love to Jennie must have been added in some intermediate stage between manuscript and first print--either in Dreiser's typescript, or in a typescript prepared at Harper and Brothers, or in some form of proof.[1] The addition of the passage was bungled in a small but telling way so that Lester's admission of love is not enclosed within quotation marks in the published book. Strictly speaking, he does not say these words to Jennie. The error was not caught during Dreiser's lifetime; it was first corrected in the Dell paperback edition of 1963, and has since been corrected in texts published by Library of America and Penguin Books. (It was not corrected, however, in a recent paperback reissue of the British text by Oxford University Press.)

The most important question, to both editor and critic, is whether Dreiser himself added the passage or whether it was put into the text by someone at Harper and Brothers. Collations and other research for the upcoming Pennsylvania edition of *Jennie Gerhardt* have revealed that subeditors at Harpers, under the supervision of senior editor Ripley Hitchcock, made thousands of changes in the text of the novel before publication. These are

substantive revisions--major cuts and alterations in the words and dialogue of the text, not just the common accidental variants in spelling, capitalization, and punctuation that one normally finds in textual work. The editors at Harper and Brothers came close to rewriting *Jennie Gerhardt* completely; the pages of Dreiser's typescript must perforce have been covered with their markings.

The alterations made at Harpers fall into several categories. Some, for example, mute sexual frankness; others remove references to alcohol; still others blunt the force of Dreiser's criticisms of organized religion. Of particular interest with regard to Lester's deathbed confession, though, was the tendency of Hitchcock's subeditors to descend on key spots in the story and "milk" them for emotion and sentiment. Dreiser's method, in the text that he had originally submitted, was to keep the narrative flat and direct at such moments; he avoided words or phrasing that would elicit an emotional reaction from the reader, preferring to let the facts of the story speak for themselves. The Harpers editors rewrote these spots and added the words and phrasings that they thought would call forth emotion and sentiment from the reader.[2] One's suspicions about Lester's deathbed speech are therefore naturally aroused: was it introduced at the Harper offices in an attempt to make the scene more touching, or did Dreiser add the speech himself?

My own conclusion in the earlier article was that Dreiser added the passage, but the only evidence for that decision was stylistic. The vocabulary, phrasing, and rhythm of the lines seemed to be typical of Dreiser's writing during this period. Stylistic judgments, of course, are impressionistic and are never as strong as decisions based on documentary evidence. That is why it is good to report that De Camp's letter helps confirm the judgment that Dreiser himself added Lester's confession.

Dreiser finished an initial version of *Jennie Gerhardt* in January 1911 and had it typed in two copies--a ribbon and a carbon. These he showed to various friends and associates whose literary judgment he trusted, asking for a reaction from each one. The best-known reactions are those of James Huneker, who praised the story but criticized Dreiser's "opaque" style, and of Freemont Rider, who advised Dreiser not to let Lester and Jennie marry--advice Dreiser took in revising the last chapters of his novel.[3] De Camp was also one of these early readers. He had been one of Dreiser's assistants at Street and Smith in 1904-05;

Dreiser remembered him years later as "so wise, so sensitive, so esthetic and kind." De Camp had some promise as a writer but had a weakness for alcohol and died of pneumonia at a relatively young age.[4]

Like Huneker and Rider, De Camp had a mixed opinion of *Jennie Gerhardt.* Below is the text of his letter to Dreiser:

March 13th, 1911

Dear Theodore

I sent the MS to Adachi today.[5]

Your novel is a tremendously big and impressive thing - solid hewed out of life. I don't know of any one who has so depicted American life in the broad terms of human nature, with so much objective sincerity and absence of prejudice. It is a great achievement and I congratulate you from my heart.

You have asked me to criticise it and I am going to try to do so, briefly, for I want a chance to talk it over with you.

It is too life-like. By that I mean that it is inconsequential and not sufficiently inevitable. You feel that it might have eventuated any of several ways without making much difference. It contains dramatic motives and potentialities which never develop, as in the coming of Gerhardt to the Hyde Park home, with his belief in Jennie's marriage - and in the visit of O'Brien to Jennie at a critical moment & its lack of any effect on Lester's action in separating from her. However these instances are not important. It is the lack of significance in the story as a whole that I mean.

I know what you mean the story to show (as much as you want to show anything). You state it in your afterword - a most beautiful bit of prose. But I do not think that is enough - otherwise any series of misfortunes or blows from the "system" we call life would suffice. Perhaps the lack that I feel comes from something in your own temperament & attitude: that any true picture of life doesn't show anything one way or the other. Of course, you know I am not talking about a "lesson" or a "moral" & yet in a larger sense I think art has to draw one, implicitly at least. If life is merely thrown down in front of you, as it were, in a heap it is depressing. And if any one thing will limit the wide success of this book it will be that depressing effect.

Now I think this effect springs specifically from the absence of

any uplifting spiritual reaction on the part of any of the characters. Perhaps you mean it to in Jennie and in a way, yes. But Jennie to me is too passive a creature to show anything satisfying. I don't doubt she represents something terribly moving and appealing to you. But I think she is too pitiful to furnish much real tragic interest. Lester, on the other hand, interested me tremendously, and it is right here in finishing with him that I think a slight change would help a lot. You have him very naturally say but few words to Jennie on his death-bed but I think you could make him just as naturally say a little more. He is introduced to the reader as a strong, self-confident person with very materialistic ideas of life & certainly no spiritual views on marriage. Now whether he loves Jennie very intensely or not he has undoubtedly come to feel that there is a peculiar & spiritual relationship between them. I would have him confess it at the last - that theirs was a true marriage (or at least his truest marriage) and that there is a spiritual something in life that he was ignorant of. (I am not talking about the sanctity of marriage.) That would be his spiritual reaction & give significance to his experience with life. Think that over. I haven't been able to think of any other generally different ending.

But one thing more: I would cut out the funeral & depot scenes. It intensifies the woe rather gratuitously, I think - I was going to say cheaply. I would have her say goodbye to his body in the bed & leave - but of this part more when I see you.

Ever Sincerely,

C. B. De Camp[6]

* * * * *

When De Camp criticizes *Jennie Gerhardt* as "too life-like," he means that Dreiser does not sufficiently differentiate one scene or occurrence from another in his narrative. This practice, of course, is a conscious attempt at realism, but De Camp seems to find it frustrating, and he is asking Dreiser to introduce some directions or hints for the reader. Which of the moments in the story is meant to be crucial? Which of the plot shifts will eventually develop into something important? When Gerhardt comes to live with Lester and Jennie in Hyde Park, for example, one expects a full reconciliation between father and daughter. But Dreiser withholds that moment of catharsis: Old Gerhardt, on his deathbed, says only a few words to his oldest daughter: "You've

been good to me," he tells her. "You're a good woman."[7] She must settle for this; it is all she will ever have from him.

Jennie's disappointment--and the reader's--helps explain De Camp's suggestion to Dreiser, later in the letter, that Lester "say a little more" to Jennie before he dies. De Camp perceives that the central dialectic in the novel is between Lester's "materialism" and Jennie's "spiritualism." He wants Dreiser to resolve that dialectic, at least partly, by having Lester admit to Jennie that "there is a spiritual something in life that he was ignorant of." Ultimately Dreiser did not give this satisfaction to the reader. He did, however, apparently come to agree with De Camp that Lester should tell Jennie that he loved her.

Here we must digress briefly to the documents again for confirmation that Dreiser added Lester's speech. Dreiser had De Camp's handwritten letter transcribed by a typist in order to show the comments to other readers of *Jennie Gerhardt*. At the top of De Camp's original letter, someone has written "6 more copies of this." Dreiser kept one of the six copies for himself; it survives today in his papers, along with De Camp's handwritten original. At the top of the original letter, Dreiser has written "*Jennie Gerhardt*" in black pen. Then, in this identical black pen, he has marked parentheses around the sentences in the typed transcription which urge that Lester "say a little more" to Jennie. These are the ten sentences, in the fifth paragraph of the letter, from "But Jennie" to "experience with life." One assumes that this is the portion of the letter that Dreiser found most useful, the advice from De Camp that he decided to follow. Obviously he did not follow all of De Camp's suggestions: we can be thankful, for example, that he did not cut Lester's funeral or the final scene at the train station--scenes which many readers consider to be among the best in the novel.

None of these individual pieces of evidence, stylistic or documentary, is entirely conclusive. What one wants, of course, is the actual document--typescript or proof--on which Dreiser added Lester's confession in his own handwriting. But in the absence of that document, it is good to have De Camp's letter, with Dreiser's parentheses on the typed transcript, as extra bits of corroborating evidence. An editor can now admit Lester's deathbed confession into the text with greater confidence than he might if stylistic evidence were all that were available.

[1]"Double Quotes and Double Meanings in Jennie Gerhardt," *Dreiser Studies*, 18 (Spring 1987), 1-11.

[2]Two examples, from among many in *Jennie Gerhardt*, are Senator Brander's seduction of Jennie in chapter VII and Jennie's banishment by her father in chapter IX--especially the final paragraph of that chapter.

[3]See Huneker to Dreiser, 4 June 1911, Dreiser Collection, Van Pelt Library; also Dreiser's responses to both Huneker and Rider in *Letters of Theodore Dreiser: A Selection*, 3 vols., ed. Robert H. Elias (Philadelphia: Univ. of Pennsylvania Press, 1959), I: 110, 117.

[4]For Dreiser's recollections of De Camp, including the words quoted in the previous sentence, see his letter to Mencken of 8 March 1943 in *Dreiser-Mencken Letters*, ed. Thomas P. Riggio, 2 vols. (Philadelphia: Univ. of Pennsylvania Press, 1986), p. 684.

[5]Adachi Kinnosuke, a prolific journalist whose articles on Japanese culture and other Far East topics were appearing in *Harpers*, the *Century*, *Collier's*, and Dreiser's *Delineator*. His appreciative letter to Dreiser, written after having read *Jennie Gerhardt* in typescript, is in the Dreiser Collection. Adachi was the author of *Iroka: Tales of Japan* (1900) and *Manchuria: A Survey* (1925). He was one of Dreiser's supporters during the controversy over *The "Genius"* several years later.

[6]This letter is located in The Theodore Dreiser Collection, Special Collections, Van Pelt-Dietrich Library Center, University of Pennsylvania.

[7]Jennie Gerhardt (New York: Harpers, 1911), p. 346.

Sister Carrie and Thomas Hardy, Regained

John B. Humma
Georgia Southern University

Whatever one thinks of the original manuscript version of *Sister Carrie*, its publication in 1981 by the University of Pennsylvania Press has proved valuable for Dreiser scholars. One's preference probably depends upon one's orientation. If, like me, one has come back to *Sister Carrie* through the Pennsylvania Edition after a long wandering abroad in British literature, one will probably prefer the Pennsylvania version. It may seem to have a richness--a shade of richness at least--that the substantially cut version Dreiser published in 1900 lacks. Specifically, the section in which Ames last appears changes considerably with the excisions. Thomas Hardy, who was central in the dinner-table conversation that takes place in this scene, now is missing entirely. This seems unfortunate to me for two very different reasons. First, it changes our perception--and appreciation--of Carrie; second, it eliminates a vital concrete piece of evidence--the smoking gun--for what I think must surely be one of the most important sources for *Sister Carrie*: the novels of Thomas Hardy.

One of the central issues is how much Carrie learns, how far she comes intellectually and morally. Conditioned in part by the labelling of the novel as naturalistic, the reader is inclined to think, not very much, not very far. Or, allowing Carrie some degree of advancement, the reader may perhaps justifiably conclude that the change is negligible, since she seems no closer to finding what she is seeking. Julian Markels, who when he wrote this over thirty years ago did not have available the original manuscript version, remarks that "Dreiser becomes fussy and hesitant

at the prospect of making Carrie as conscious and responsible as Ames challenges her to be" (444). Markels believes that although Dreiser allows Carrie certain "brief glimmerings of consciousness," he undercuts these by having Carrie misremember her struggles in Chicago to survive: "The facts are that although she did struggle in Chicago, she also eventually stopped trying, and was ready to pack up and go home when Drouet rescued her" (445). Most damning is the fact that "for most of her life her desires . . . were in the realm of money. But now that her experience with Ames has transformed them into desires for affection, now that money has shown its impotence, she decides that she must have more money" (446). Robert Penn Warren addresses the same point--Carrie's having arrived nowhere really--in his observation about Carrie's rocking chair: "Carrie has everything, and she has nothing, and the rocking chair--motion without progress, life spent in mere repetition, a hypnotic dream without content--is a perfect image of the success that 'got nowhere'" (29). The decided implication is, as Donald Pizer puts it, that along with McTeague and Henry Fleming, Carrie has moved "through experience but still only dimly comprehend[s] it" (38). Pizer argues instead that although the naturalistic novel reflects "a vast skepticism about the conventional aspects of experience," it does nonetheless endorse "the significance and worth . . . of the character who continues to look for meaning in experience even though there probably is not meaning." Carrie, of course, is one that Pizer recognizes within the terms of this "seeking temperament" (39). If nothing else, though Pizer contends against the claim for the Pennsylvania Edition as authoritative,[1] the edition does have the virtue of lending solid support to Pizer's remarks.

It lends support through that additional shade of richness I spoke of earlier, through an intensification of meaning. What is left out in that last intercourse between Ames and Carrie is about two pages of text. In deleting it, Dreiser deleted a dinner, for the conversation takes place at Mrs. Vance's table, and without these pages we do not know that a dinner party is taking place. But it is more than two pages and more than a dinner that we are doing without, if we do not have these pages. They serve to establish the depth of Carrie's thinking now. She may not be well-read yet, but she is reading--and thinking. The later turn of the conversation toward "comedy-drama" takes on texture and increased credibility as a result of these two pages. Essentially the passage

is rendered scenically, through dialogue, but what is given as summary is essential to our understanding of the intellectual and emotional sympathy between Ames and Carrie:

> At table the tendency was to talk lightly of things in general, there being other guests, besides Carrie and Ames, but the latter was too much of an original thinker to have much regard for convention. The fact is, he was prone to forget the little niceties of attention unless constantly reminded. Now Carrie seemed the most pleasing character present. She extended to him that sympathy and attention which he needed to show his mind at its best. At its best it was speculative and idealistic--far above anything she had as yet conceived, and yet, curiously, he could talk to her. She made him feel as if she understood, and he unconsciously strove to make himself plain. Thus the bond between them was drawn closer than they knew. (481)

Ames is an author-like, that is to say Dreiser-like character. In one sense, his appearance in the novel is artificial, unwarranted. He is a tribute to how much Dreiser came to like his heroine. If the novelist, Pygmalian-like, cannot bring his character to life, into his world, then he can, alternately, put himself, *his* character, into his fiction.[2]

As Dreiser's surrogate, Ames is an almost perfect exemplification of Edwin H. Cady's remark that "there really are no naturalists in American literature," only "the terrible pull of a sensibility in the grounds for which nobody finally believed" (45). In the words of Donald Pizer, Dreiser and Norris and Crane were "only covert humanists and ameliorists playing with naturalistic ideas and subject matter" (31). Ames, of course, is an *overt* humanist and, though lacking the darker and more tragic character tones of a Hardy character (besides having plenty of money) is not so far removed from a Clym Yeobright or a Jude Frawley, almost a sort of half-brother or first cousin. Ames asks Carrie what she has been reading:

> "I've been reading the books you suggested," she said in one place, when the conversation was between them alone.

> He turned his serious eyes upon her, and a happy sense of having fulfilled a duty answered in her own, until he said:-- "What were they?"
> "Saracinesca,'" she answered. "'The Great Man from the Provinces.' 'The Mayor of Casterbridge.'"
> "Oh, yes," he interrupted. "How do you like Balzac?"
> "Oh, he's delightful to me. I liked 'The Mayor of Casterbridge,' though, as well as any," she answered.
> "I should imagine you would, he said, submitting one of those keen observations which was the result of his comprehension of her nature.
> "Why?" she asked.
> "Well," he said, "you are rather gloomy in your disposition, and all of Hardy's novels have that in them."
> "I?" she asked.
> "Not exactly gloomy," he added. There's another word--melancholia, sad. I should judge you were rather lonely in your disposition." (481)

Carrie's liking for *The Mayor of Casterbridge* speaks in her distinct favor. When Mrs. Vance, immediately after this, says she disliked *Tess of the d'Urbervilles*, "or something like that," because it was "too sad" and Ames is constrained to say, "No one who didn't feel the pathetic side of life would," the reader, of course, understands that Carrie *does* see this side of life. Without this passage, Carrie's "thrilling," two pages later, "to be taken so seriously" (484) lacks coherence, since it is these details about her perceptions and feelings, as evidenced by her reading, that chiefly authenticate her seriousness and her intelligence. Hardy is not easy to read, and comprehend, as the instance of Mrs. Vance shows.

I am not really concerned here with the closure of the novel--will Carrie marry Ames?--or with whether one edition is better than the other. What I am concerned with is the way that the original version softens or dilutes the stricter naturalism of the 1900 edition--for, among other things, Dreiser removed the softening humanistic elements when he published the book. He had written a novel whose tone and texture were closer in some ways

to a Hardy novel than to what we would come to call a Dreiser novel. And it is interesting that in cutting Hardy from the book Dreiser also cut the part that, in Stephen C. Brennan's words, makes his protagonist "something like a perfect Carrie" (17), one whose consciousness goes considerably farther and deeper than many commentators have allowed. And correctly not allowed, given Dreiser's epilogue undercutting the complexity he had accorded her the chapter before in the uncut text. Her broad sympathies now constrict to a narrow compass. I would contend that the cutting of 36,000 words does not alter materially the complexion of the novel. But the cutting of fewer than five hundred words (the Hardy discussion) does.

The 1900 *Carrie*, *sans* Hardy, is an appreciably different novel than the one his wife Jug and his friend Arthur Henry, together with Dreiser's approval to be sure, took the scissors to. What Dreiser did, it seems to me, was to cut his novel from its source. Just how blindly, or innocently, he did this there is no way to tell. But he did eradicate Thomas Hardy (the name at least), and Hardy, as I will try to show, influenced not only the tone and spirit of the novel but also character and plot.[3]

Material evidence exists for the importance of Hardy to Dreiser. Mencken in a letter of 10 May 1916 expresses his puzzlement about "influence": "You have told me that you had not read Zola or any of the Russians. Did Hardy influence you?" Mencken remarks on the difficulty for the author of this question, but goes on: "Saving H. B. Fuller, I can think of no American novelist of the 80's or 90's who steered in anything even remotely approaching your own direction" (*Dreiser-Mencken Letters I* 229). Dreiser replied the next day, but then on the next he writes: "I find in glancing over your letter that I haven't answered all your questions. After Balzac, (1894) came first Hardy (1896) and then Sienkiewicz . . . About this time I did a lot of general reading. Tolstoy, Stevenson, Barrie, Dumas--I cant [sic] think of a tenth of the stuff. But Hardy, Tolstoy and Balzac stood forth in my mind all the time." Speaking of the Russian authors, he says he "couldn't possibly call them influences. They came too late. Actually I should put Hardy and Balzac first in that respect." Then comes a disclaimer: " . . . though I seriously doubt whether I was influenced for in St. Louis (1892) I was already building plays of a semitragic character. My mind just worked that way" (*Letters I* 234).

One can take an author's disclaimer of this sort as one pleases. Clearly, there are some differences. Hardy's fiction is rife with symbolism; Dreiser's, though symbols are present, is symbolically spare. Hardy's fiction features what he sometimes calls Fate (at other times the "Immanent Will"). At times it directly, if satirically, takes on the God Hardy did not believe in: "the President of the Immortals, in Aeschylean phrase, had ended his sport with Tess" (489). It is difficult even to imagine a sentence like this in Dreiser. In Hardy the tone or mood is Greek, or tragic; in Dreiser it is contemporary, more nearly that of pathos, perhaps "semitragic," to borrow Dreiser's phrase. The following passage from *The Mayor of Casterbridge* spells out the difference: "But most probably luck had little to do with it [the rise of Donald Farfrae, the decline of Michael Henchard]. Character is Fate, said Novalis, and Farfrae's character was just the reverse of Henchard's, who might be described as Faust has been described--as a vehement gloomy being who had just quitted the ways of vulgar men, without light to guide him on a better way" (185-86). It is not that chance ("crass Casualty") does not play its part in Hardy or that character does not play its in Dreiser--if Drouet's character were different (or had Carrie's been), she would not have left him: it is that relatively the outcomes of Hardy's actors proceed largely from character, those of Dreiser largely from circumstance (which includes genetic inheritance). At least the emphasis falls these ways. Hardy morally approves or blames his characters; Dreiser, for the most part, steers clear of either approval or blame. Rather he makes (again and again) excuses.

But that said, philosophically the two have much in common. In cosmic terms, each author sees the pitiful smallness and insignificance of the individual. In *Newspaper Days*, Dreiser recounts how Spencer and Huxley turned what Christianity remained with him upside down, blew it "to bits," bringing down "all I deemed substantial--man's place in the universe, this too, too solid earth, man's very identity save as an infinitesimal speck of energy . . . blown here and there by larger forces . . ." (457). In *Sister Carrie*, men and women "are insects produced by heat and wither and pass without it [material comfort]" (90-91). We are pushed and pulled about, beyond our knowing, by "great forces" (118). And here is Hardy: "Not quite sure of her direction Tess stood still upon the hemmed expanse of verdant flatness, like a fly on a billiard-table of infinite length, and of no more consequence to the

surroundings than that fly" (159). Passages from works by the one author frequently could be carried over to works by the other with very little forcing or harm to the integrity of the other. Here, in this regard, are two quotations the question of whose authorship, I believe, would test the mettle of most readers:

> 1. In the ill-judged execution of the well-judged plan of things the call seldom produces the comer, the man to love rarely coincides with the hour for loving. Nature does not often say 'See!' to her poor creature at a time when seeing can lead to happy doing; or reply "Here!' to a body's cry of "Where?' till the hide-and-seek has become an irksome, outworn game. We may wonder whether at the acme and summit of the human progress these anachronisms will be corrected by a finer intuition, a closer interaction of the social machinery than that which now jolts us round and along; but such completeness is not to be prophesied, or even conceived as possible. Enough that in the present case, as in millions, it was not the two halves of a perfect whole that confronted each other at the perfect moment; a missing counterpart wandered independently about the earth waiting in crass obtuseness till the late time came. Out of which maladroit delay sprang anxieties, disappointments; shocks, catastrophies, and passing-strange destinies.
>
> 2. There are large forces which allure, with all the soulfulness of expression possible in the most cultured human. The gleam of a thousand lights is often as effective, to all moral intents and purposes, as the persuasive light in a wooing and fascinating eye. Half the undoing of the unsophisticated and natural mind is accomplished by forces wholly superhuman. A blare of sound, a roar of life, a vast array of human hives appeal to the astonished senses in equivocal terms. Without a counselor at hand to whisper cautious interpretations, what falsehoods may not these things breathe into the unguarded ear! Unrecognized for what they are, their beauty, like music, too often relaxes, then weakens, then perverts the simplest human perceptions.

If you said *Tess* (82-83) for the first, *Carrie* (4) for the second, you would be correct. Here are two more:

> 1. So they drove on through the gloom, forming one bundle inside the sail-cloth, the horse going as he would, and the rain driving against them. She had consented. She might as well have agreed at first. The 'appetite for joy' which pervades all creation, that tremendous force which sways humanity to its purpose, as the tide sways the helpless weed , was not to be controlled by vague lucubrations over the social rubric.
>
> 2. Trite though it may seem, it is well to remember that in life, after all, we are most wholly controlled by desire. The things that appeal to desire are not always visible objects. Let us not confuse this with selfishness. It is more virtuous than that. Desire is the variable wind which blows now zephyrlike, now shrill, filling our sails for some far-off port, flapping them idly upon the high seas in sunny weather, scudding us now here, now there, before its terrific breath . . . . Selfishness is the twin-screw motive power of the human steamer. It drives unchangingly, unpoetically on. Its one danger is that of miscalculation. Personalities such as __________'s would come under the former category. The art by which her rather confused consciousness of right and duty might be overcome is not easily perceived.

Here the solution is easier, since the Hardy passage more readily identifies itself through its situation. But there are two interesting things to note about both sets of excerpts: both instance strikingly similar preoccupations with, or nearly symmetrical viewpoints of, the same subjects; and both make use of a type of editorial omniscience that makes it difficult to distinguish one from the other. I do not think it would be difficult to distinguish either Hardy or Dreiser from, say, Dickens, or George Eliot, or any other contemporary writer, English or American who writes in the editorial mode. But it is not all that easy to distinguish, unlikely though it may seem, Hardy from Dreiser. My point is that, in the instance of Dreiser, some measure of what we call "voice" was learned, or absorbed, from Hardy.

Critics have been interested in Dreiser's voice in *Sister Carrie* for some time. Over thirty years ago William J. Handy remarked upon "the looming presence of Dreiser throughout," whose "unseen presence . . . integrates his own point of view with that of his characters" (523). Handy says that "the ultimate effect" of this creates "the expression of the powerful, omniscient presence of Dreiser, [makes it] an integral part of every action, every attitude, every implicit and expressed value" (524). Dreiser imposes, Handy goes on to say, his own more complete understanding upon the unperfected knowledge and consciousness of Carrie in a way that embraces the "effective artistic meaning of the novel" (525). In the same manner, in the passages that we have looked at and have yet to look at from Hardy, it should be clear that Hardy's own consciousness conflates with Tess's superior instinctual understanding of things in a fashion that also might be said to represent the "effective artistic meaning" of his novel. Rather, then, than the sort of "fractured" presence (although an effective one in terms of the novel) that Richard Poirier ascribes to the narrator in *Carrie*, the narrator forcefully and coherently meshes his presence with those of his characters.[4] His is an omniscient voice, like Hardy's, forceful in its descriptions of social morality, forceful in its understanding of those larger external elements in whose midst the individual, frequently unknowing, has his or her being.

This brings me to the crucial point of this essay. Though records do not exist for how much of Hardy Dreiser read, read Hardy he most obviously did, as the letters and manuscript make very clear. *The Mayor of Casterbridge* was published in 1886, *Tess of the d'Urbervilles* in 1891. Dreiser makes no mention of *Jude the Obscure*, published in 1896, but the likelihood is that Dreiser read *Jude*, the bleakest of all Hardy's novels and the one that finished him as a writer of fiction, close to the time of the writing of *Sister Carrie*. The "ache of modernism" (*Tess* 180), was one that both authors felt: the Hardyan temperament, or sensibility, its pessimism and questioning of or rebellion from conventional morality, had to have been congenial to the young Dreiser. The urban American writer imbibed heavily from the rural British one. F. R. Leavis, in *The Great Tradition*, speaks of the way that writer learns from writer, that form (often) influences form. I would hardly argue that Dreiser in formal matters is an improvement upon Hardy. Hardy, though he can be clumsy him-

self on occasion, was usually a much better writer than Dreiser. But Leavis's satellite point is the one I am making here, and extending. Leavis contends that certain novels would not have been written as they were had they not had predecessors, as James's success in certain scenes in *The Portrait of a Lady* results directly from certain scenes in Eliot's *Daniel Deronda*. My claim is that *Sister Carrie* takes much of its shape and texture from Hardy's *The Mayor of Casterbridge* and *Tess of the d'Urbervilles*, indeed might never have been written at all had Hardy not written his novels. For it is not just tone, "philosophy," narrative perspective (broad editorial overview), all of which subsume into voice, that Dreiser took at least in part from Hardy: he also took character and plot.

The plot of *Sister Carrie*, contains two central actions which can be charted along intersecting diagonals: the degeneration of George Hurstwood and the corresponding rise of Carrie Meeber. The decline and the rise each are material and spiritual: Hurstwood when he first appears in the novel has a certain magnitude of character. For instance, at the amateur play, we are told that "Through it all one could see the standing of the man. It was greatness in a way, small as it was" (180). Much later, even after he has sunk far down the social and economic scale, his pride remains "unbroken": reading of Carrie's dramatic success, he thinks, "Let her have it. I won't bother her' (449). But of course he does bother her, as he begins to bother whoever on the street might be susceptible to the beggar's appeal. Carrie, on her part, in the struck passage we have already looked at, shows a profound refinement both of intellect and character. Dreiser presents her return to the apartment with Hurstwood in a scene that encapsulates the different courses the two have already begun to take:

> Hurstwood had returned and was already in bed. His clothes were scattered loosely about. Carrie came to the door and saw it, then retreated. She did not want to go in yet awhile. She wanted to think. It was disagreeable to her.
>
> Back in the dining room she sat in her chair and rocked. Her little hands were folded tightly as she thought. Through a fog of longing and conflicting desires, she was beginning to see. Oh, ye legions of hope and pity--of sorrow and pain . She was rocking and beginning to see. (337)

Hurstwood's strewn clothes and Carrie's rocking symbolize the opposite courses they are beginning to take. And it is important to note that Carrie's rocking is more than the static, mindless activity that Warren says it is: it is deliberate and meditative, appropriate to one who is "beginning to see."

In *The Mayor of Casterbridge* Hardy charts the degenerative course of a man of character; in *Tess of the d'Urbervilles* the fall and rise of a young woman who has begun to see. It is Michael Henchard I am concerned with principally in *Mayor*; in *Tess* it will be the title heroine, but others as well. The most important actions in these novels are retraced in *Carrie*. And the conclusion, or epilogue, that Dreiser, having taken out the discussion of the two Hardy novels, wrote for the published version, reabsorbs Hardy in the classic pessimism of the direct address to Carrie: "In your rocking chair, by your window, shall you dream such happiness as you may never feel" (Norton 369).

I would stop short of asserting an allusion to *The Mayor of Casterbridge* in Hurstwood's name; but I do believe that the similarities in the two names Henchard and Hurstwood--the syllable count, the beginning and closing sounds and initials--signify something more than coincidence. We encounter Hurstwood first at the height of his career as the prosperous manager of a respectable saloon. *The Mayor of Casterbridge* begins with the wife-selling incident at Weydon Prior but moves quickly ahead (chapter three) to present time with Henchard established as mayor and prosperous merchant of Casterbridge. Both novels contain important dimensions of both the middle-class and working-class novel, and both men are bourgeois "heroes" in their confident--at times blustering--success and the concern they place upon status and material prosperity. Both authors do the houses of their protagonists in some detail. A certain pride and arrogance characterizes each, Hurstwood in his relations with his family and later with Carrie, Henchard in his with Donald Farfrae, and then later with Lucetta, Elizabeth-Jane, and others. Though in fact we see Hurstwood's fall as a result, in good measure, of what Dreiser calls "super-intelligible forces" (78) and "the great forces of nature [that] must not be arrogated by the intellectual alone" (118), so that "the forces which regulate two individuals of the character of Carrie and Hurstwood are . . . strange . . . and subtle" (119), still he shows, whatever the reason, sufficient willful *self*-destruction as to warrant inclusion with Hardy's

"Character is Fate, said Novalis" passage. In fact, in Hardy's words, Hurstwood "might be described," in terms of what he becomes, "as Faust has been described--as a vehement gloomy being who had quitted the ways of vulgar men, without light to guide him on a better way" (186-87). Hardy, in describing Henchard here, apparently no more blames him than Dreiser blames Hurstwood.

Although *The Mayor of Casterbridge* contains several more dimensions than *Sister Carrie*, and although the dimensions of Henchard's character are more various and interesting, finally, than those of Hurstwood, the details pertaining to their deterioration have a distinctive resonance. Here is Hardy: "His [Henchard's] mood was no longer that of the rebellious, ironical restless misadventurer; but the leaden gloom of one who has lost all that can make life interesting, or even tolerable." With all of his friends and relatives "gone from him, one after the other, either by his fault or by his misfortune," he had remaining "no interest, hobby, or desire" (370-71). Later, when he parts from Elizabeth-Jane at Grey's Bridge near the end, she observes that the years and circumstances "had considerably lessened the spring of his stride, that his state of hopelessness had weakened him, and imparted to his shoulders . . . a perceptible bend" (388). And here is Dreiser on Hurstwood: "Constant comparison between his old state and his new showed a balance for the worse, which produced constant state of gloom, or at best depression. Now it has been shown experimentally that a constantly subdued frame of mind produces certain poisons in the blood, called katastates, just as virtuous feelings of pleasure or delight produce helpful chemicals, called anastates. The poisons, generated by remorse, inveigh against the system and eventually produce marked physical deterioration" (337). Moreover, "in the course of time, it told upon his temper. His eye no longer possessed that buoyant, searching shrewdness. . . . His step was not as sharp and firm" (339). To be sure, there may be only so many ways of representing physical and moral decline; nonetheless, take out the chemical explanation Dreiser provides for Hurstwood's condition and the passages could be interchanged.

In its pessimistic determinism, the scene near the end in *The Mayor* in which Henchard finds himself at the site of his crime twenty-odd years before, could not help but appeal to an impressionable aspiring author like Dreiser: Henchard thinks that "ex-

ternally there was nothing to hinder his making another start on the upward slope." The problem, however, is that "the ingenious machinery contrived by the Gods for reducing human possibilities of amelioration to a minimum--which arranges that wisdom to do shall come *pari passu* with the departure of zest for doing--stood in the way of all that" (395). The difference between Hardy and Dreiser here is that Hardy blames "the Gods," Dreiser the "katastates." Dreiser addresses--lower case--"ye gods" in the scene in which Carrie first begins to "see" the "sorrows and pains" of life as they are, or, as Hardy concludes *The Mayor of Casterbridge*, to see, with Elizabeth-Jane, "that happiness was but the occasional episode in a general drama of pain" (411), a view that almost embraces that last sentence of the published version: "In your rocking chair, by your window, shall you dream such happiness as you shall never feel" (Norton 369). Between dreaming of happiness one cannot have, and having brief spasms of it amidst much woe, there is not a lot to choose.

Tess of the d'Urbervilles, which gives *Sister Carrie* its second (and crossing) plot, contains even more anticipations of, parallels and resemblances to, *Sister Carrie*. Relationships might be claimed on several levels. Hardy's subtitle, "A Pure Woman," asserts aggressively a counter-morality to society's conventional codes, and Tess's "fall," like Carrie's, is a fall only in the eyes of society. Hardy and Dreiser, in their editorial passages on morality, as elsewhere, sound uncannily similar. Hardy in the following passage describes Tess's "grief at her weakness in the mind of some vague ethical being whom she could not class definitely as the God of her childhood, and could not comprehend as any other." And he goes on:

> But his encompassment of her own characterization, based on shreds of convention, peopled by phantoms and voices antipathetic to her, was a sorry and mistaken creation of Tess's fancy--a cloud of moral hobgoblins by which she was terrified without reason. It was they that were out of harmony with the actual world, not she. Walking among the sleeping birds in the hedges, watching the skipping rabbits on a moonlit warren, or standing under a pheasant-laden bough, she looked upon herself as a figure of Guilt intruding into the haunts of Innocence. But all the while she was making a distinction where there was no dif-

> ference. Feeling herself in antagonism she was quite in accord. She had been made to break an accepted social law, but no law known to the environment in which she fancied herself such an anomaly. (135)

And there is this, much later, after Tess has put the birds, wounded by hunters, out of their misery:

> 'Poor darlings--to suppose myself the most miserable being on earth in the sight o' such misery as yours!' she exclaimed, her tears running down as she killed the birds tenderly. 'And I be not bleeding; and I have two hands to feed and clothe me.' She was ashamed of herself for her gloom of the night, based on nothing more tangible than a sense of condemnation under an arbitrary law of society which had no foundation in Nature. (35)

Dreiser's reflection on Carrie's state of mind, after she succumbs to Drouet, catches up the same themes: society's unfair conventional standards, nature's (or the "earth's") opposing ones, and the human victims trapped (Tess, later, is described as "a bird caught in a clap-net"--366-67) between the two:

> For all the liberal analysis of Spencer and our modern naturalistic philosophers we have but an infantile perception of morals. There is more in it than mere conformity to a law of evolution. It is yet deeper than conformity to things of earth alone. It is more involved than we as yet perceive. Answer first why the heart thrills, explain wherefore some plaintive note gone wandering about the world undying, make clear the rose's subtle alchemy, evolving its ruddy lamp in light and rain. In the absence of these facts lie the first principles of morals.
>
> "Oh," thought Drouet, "how delicious is my conquest."
>
> "Ah," thought Carrie, with mournful misgivings, "what is it I have lost." (87-88)

Dreiser goes on to say that "We do not make sufficient allowance for the natural elements in our philosophy. Our logic is bare of

the voice of the wind" (90). Or, as Hardy puts it, "The 'appetite for joy' which pervades all creation, that tremendous force which sways humanity to its purpose, as the tide sways the helpless weed, was not to be controlled by vague lucubrations over the social rubric" (255). The sex instinct, strong in each author, is strong in both novels; it is the propelling force behind the chief actions of the characters. Allowing for Dreiser's introducing Spencer and his mention of "naturalistic philosophers," he is really only restating, while using several of the same terms within the same framing set of oppositions, Hardy's views on morality and nature, society and the individual.

Central in both novels is the spiritual and intellectual growth of their heroines. The two scenes with Ames show, as already noted, Carrie's enlarged and refined sense and sensibility. As Drouet might be said to be all mere sense and Hurstwood a refinement of Drouet in his possession of a very modest amount also of sensibility, Carrie is, correspondingly, much *his* superior in the extent to which she possesses this quality--the presence, that is, beyond intellect, within oneself of a finer sort of feeling and instinct. The presence of Ames, in fact, may be Dreiser's way of showing us Carrie's now larger morality. Among other things, Ames provides us with a gauge by which to measure Carrie's progress.

Hardy's description of Tess before she leaves home might be that of the farm-bred Carrie also at a similar stage of her development. Tess "at this time of her life was a mere vessel of emotion untinctured by experience" (51), lacking necessary sense and sensibility. After her fall, though, at the hands of Alec d'Urberville, and with the passage of several months--like Carrie, Tess lives with her seducer for some time--Tess is considerably wiser. Returning to the Vale of Blackmoor from Trantridge, the landscape "was very beautiful to Tess to-day, for since her eyes last fell upon it she had learnt that the serpent hisses where the sweet birds sing, and her views of life had been totally changed by the lesson. Verily another girl than the simple one she had been at home was she who, bowed by thought, stood still here" (124). Thus as Hardy tells us a few pages on, "Almost at a leap Tess changed from simple girl to complex woman. Symbols of reflectiveness passed into her face, and a note of tragedy at times into her voice. Her eyes grew larger and more eloquent. . . . But for the world's opinion those experiences would have been simply a

liberal education" (150). Instead, both women are now complex creatures, given to reflection. One may become a milkmaid, the other an actress: their *real* development, though, is charted in terms of their spiritual growth. For Carrie, the success in the theater that she achieves is empty once Ames causes her to aspire to "comedy-drama," *toward* the "tragic" as Hardy describes it for Tess.

The plot of *Carrie*, as it involves Carrie's development, is a sort of inverse parody of *Tess*, depending on the version of *Carrie* one considers. Though poor, and though she dies by hanging at the end of the novel, Tess achieves "fulfillment"--the title of the last of the novel's seven books--with Angel. Carrie, though relatively rich and successful, remains unfulfilled, knowing not "content" (369) in the published version. In the unrevised version, Ames--together with fulfillment--remains a distinct possibility. If Carrie passes through two men to (almost and perhaps) a third, so too, in a very real sense, does Tess. The first, Alec d'Urberville, is, in fact, a prototype for Drouet: he is a dandy, a seducer, not much more, at best, in the beginning, than a good-humored, if calculating, fop. Dreiser's description of Drouet as "a creature with an inborn desire" (63) might do for Alec as well, who is given to looking at Tess in the same fashion that Drouet looks at Carrie. His "bold rolling eye" (79), as Hardy describes it, "rivet[s itself] upon her. It was a luxuriance of aspect, a fullness of growth, which made her appear more of a woman than she really was" (82).[5]

The second and third men in Tess's life are both Angel Clare. The Angel that returns from South America, though, is a radically different Angel from the early Angel. Both Angels have qualities similar, though, to those of Ames: a broad humanistic perspective founded on a formal education. Both women are immediately attracted to the men's large acquaintance with life. It is here that the chief difference between the two novels occurs. Tess, though she never acquires Angel's greater formal understanding about things, easily outstrips him in *real* knowledge. If Clare has a strong but artificial appreciation of pagan myth, Tess *is* the myth. She may seek guidance from Angel, but she is Angel's true guide. Ames, though, nonetheless, is a type of Angel, as I have said, just as he is a type of Clym Yeobright of *Return of the Native*. Hardy, however, develops his young finer-feeling intellectuals and idealists, complicates them. It is only as we first

meet them that they are prototypes for Ames, who does not develop (which is just as well for Ames, if the development is to take a course similar to those of Hardy's young enterprisers).

I would not press very hard here for the later development of Carrie Meeber, after she becomes Carrie Madenda, as a kind of inverted parody of Tess. I do believe, however that the course of Carrie's life in the first part of the novel is in essentials that of Tess and that more than coincidence accounts for it. Similarly, I believe that the second part of *Sister Carrie* traces, through Hurstwood, the main action of *The Mayor of Casterbridge*: the degeneration of Michael Henchard. To me more than coincidence accounts for the similarity here.

Dreiser had no more interest in carrying over the personalities of Henchard and Tess into Hurstwood and Carrie than he had in carrying over Hardy's creaking machinery of dark omens and superstitions (e. g. the d'Urberville coach). More importantly, he carried over Hardy's philosophic broodings, his cosmic speculations of man and universe. Had Dreiser had Hardy's ironic turn of mind and familiarity with the Greeks, he might have written of Hurstwood's dying as Hardy did of Tess's: "'Justice' was done, and the President of the Immortals, in Aeschylean phrase, had finished his sport with Tess. And the d'Urberville knights and dames slept on in their tombs unknowing" (488)--unknowing as Carrie, in her hotel room, of Hurstwood's death. Hardy's passage, though it has a different spin from what Dreiser would have put on it, has a definite Dreiserian resonance.

It would be hard to say which is the more important in *Carrie*: the informing presence, slightly modified, of Hardy's world view or the more concrete presence of the plots and characters from *The Mayor of Casterbridge* and *Tess of the d'Urbervilles.* In the passages I quoted many pages back showing the similarities in Dreiser's and Hardy's treatments of desire, it is probably chance that Dreiser's wind-*sails*-high seas metaphor for desire is an enhancement of Hardy's literal rain-*sail*cloth detail that precedes the description of the "appetite for joy" as a tremendous force which "sways humanity to its purpose, as the tide sways the helpless weed" (255). But chance or not in this instance, such passages in their broader aspects bear so thorough a similarity that it seems only natural to detect a Hardyan influence in the instance of *Sister Carrie* that is certainly as important as the well-recognized one of Balzac for the work of Dreiser as a whole. It might be, finally,

that Dreiser was pleased to cut the Hardy discussion that appears in the manuscript version because of the connections, or associations (the anxieties of influence), that it invited.

---

[1]See Donald Pizer, "Self Censorship and Textual Editing," collected in *Textual Criticism and Literary Interpretation*, ed. Jerome J. McGann (Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1985): 144-61. Pizer does concede, in his Preface to the second Norton Critical Edition that "despite its questionable claims," the Pennsylvania Edition provides "a valuable record of Dreiser's process of revision" (x).

[2]See Stephen C. Brennan, "The Two Endings of Sister Carrie." Brennan disagrees with those who believe Dreiser identified himself with Ames. Brennan believes Ames resembles Dreiser's wife Jug: Ames "holds the place in Carrie's emotional life that Jug held in Dreiser's during their five-year courtship and their early maried life" (18).

[3]Zola and Balzac frequently are mentioned as influences upon Dreiser. But it is widely suspected that Dreiser had not yet read Zola at the time he wrote Carrie, and Balzac, for whatever influence he had upon Dreiser in the manner of presenting social detail, did not effectively, that is vitally, influence Dreiser's thinking. In *Newspaper Days*, writing of H. B. Wandell, editor of the St. Louis Republic, and Wandell's love of Zola, Dreiser records that "Zola at this time was apparently his ideal of what a writer should be. . . . He was always calling upon me to imitate Zola's vivid description of the drab and the gross and the horrible if I could, assuming I had read him, which I had not, but I did not say so" (207). Dreiser would have been familiar with Zola's theories, however, and with the naturalistic theories of American contemporaries like Crane and Norris, who of course read the manuscript of *Carrie* for Doubleday, Page. But Dreiser, significantly, did not proceed from the same starting point as Zola. As Charles C. Walcutt puts it, "The gap between Dreiser's work and the experimental novel of Zola is a wide one, for Dreiser does not make even a pretense of controlling his conditions and discovering truths about the nature of human psychology and physiology. Just where Zola, for example, would theoretically put most emphasis--i.e. on the extraction of laws about human nature--Dreiser is most uncertain and most sure that no certainty can be attained," since, according to Walcutt, for Dreiser "such laws would be fruitless for the very reason that external conditions cannot ever be controlled" (193, n. 7). It is with Hardy, finally, I believe, that we see the strongest affinities, that we see the greatest influence.

[4]An interesting recent article is that of Alan Trachtenberg, who argues that Dreiser anticipates modernism in creating a *subjective* narra-

tive voice that goes beyond eighteenth- and nineteenth-century omniscience in it self-conscious narrative strategy confirming "that *consciousness* is precisely what this novel is about" (101). I would not push the point so far myself; I am interested, though, in the centrality of consciousness in Trachtenberg's discussion since consciousness--Tess's consciousness--is in high degree what *Tess* is about.

[5]Of course, Hardy is heavier in his treatment of Tess than Dreiser of Carrie. Dreiser would not make out Drouet to be "the tragic mischief of her drama--one who stood to be the blood-red ray in the spectrum of her young life" (81). Tess, of course, literally murders Alec later; Carrie merely metaphorically kills off Drouet.

Works Cited

Brennan, Stephen C. "The Two Endings of Sister Carrie." *Studies in American Fiction* 16 (Spring 1988): 13-26.

Cady, Edwin H. *The Light of Common Day: Realism in American Fiction.* Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1971.

Dreiser, Theodore. *Dreiser-Mencken Letters: The Correspondence of Theodore Dreiser & H. L. Mencken 1907-1945.* Ed. Thomas P. Riggio. 2 vols. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 1986.

---. *Newspaper Days.* New York: Beekman, 1974.

---. *Sister Carrie.* Ed. Donald Pizer. 2nd. ed. New York: W. W. Norton, 1991.

---. *Sister Carrie.* Ed. John C. Berkeley, Alice M. Winters, James L. W. West III. Philadelphia: U of Pennysylvania P, 1981.

Handy, William J. "A Re-Examination of Dreiser's *Sister Carrie.*" *Texas Studies in Literature and Language* 1 (Autumn 1959): 380-89.

Hardy, Thomas. *The Mayor of Casterbridge.* New York: Penguin, 1983.

---. *Tess of the d'Urbervilles.* New York: Penguin, 1984.

Markels, Julian. "Dreiser and the Plotting of Inarticulate Experience." *The Massachusetts Review* 2 (Spring 1961): 431-48.

Pizer, Donald. *Realism and Naturalism in Nineteenth-Century American Literature.* Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1984.

Poirier, Richard. *A World Elsewhere: The Place of Style in American Literature.* New York: Oxford UP, 1966.

Trachtenberg, Alan. "Who Narrates? Dreiser's Presence in *Sister Carrie.*" In *New Essays on Sister Carrie.* Ed. Donald Pizer. New York: Cambridge UP, 1991.

Walcutt, Charles C. *American Literary Naturalism: A Divided Stream.* Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1956.

Warren, Robert Penn. *Homage to Theodore Dreiser.* New York: Random House, 1977.

The Rudest American Author: Grant Richards' Assessment of Theodore Dreiser

Lucia A. Kinsaul
Florida State University

Every rendition of Theodore Dreiser's relationship with the English publisher Grant Richards remains problematical. Consequently, critics frequently relegate Richards' role in Dreiserama to the documentation section of scholarly works. Biographers, particularly Richard Lingeman in his recent *Theodore Dreiser: An American Journey: 1908-1945*, do note their correspondence from 1903 to 1914 and acknowledge Richards' assistance and visibility in Dreiser's first "grand tour" in 1911-1912. Yet such acknowledgements attribute Richards with the role of little more than a travel agent and, perhaps, a travel advisor. While Richards certainly deserves such titles, his position in Dreiser's life is much more complex: a thorough study reveals exceptional insights into the psychological nuances of Dreiser's early development, both authorially and personally.

Not only did Dreiser and Richards begin corresponding in 1903, but also, their correspondence reveals, they met for the first time shortly afterward, in 1906, rather than in 1911.[1] Richards visited the United States every year, basically on "author hunting" expeditions. His initial interest in Dreiser is, justly, credited to enthusiastic Frank Norris, who had read and admired *Sister Carrie* while working as a reader for Doubleday, Page & Co. And from the first contact with Dreiser in 1903, Richards' admiration for Dreiser's authorial ability never waned.

The bulk of their correspondence until 1911 was of a professional nature. Dreiser was, after all, almost totally absorbed with

editorial chores rather than with his art. Richards continually chastised him for neglecting his talent as a fictional writer. He even enlisted Dreiser's wife, "Jug," in this campaign--having met her during his 1908 trip to America.[2] In fact, during their 1906 meeting, Dreiser related to Richards the story of *Jennie Gerhardt* as it was then formed in his mind.[3] After repeated pleas (beginning as early as 6 December 1905), Dreiser, finally, sent him a copy of the first twenty chapters of *Jennie* in 1908, and Richards returned the copy with praise and a few editorial suggestions.[4] As he had done several times previously, he expressed his wish to publish the English edition of the novel. Much to the disappointment of Richards, on 16 June 1911, he learned that Harper's had been given both the English and American rights to *Jennie*.[5] Nevertheless, on his visit to the States in November, 1911, he met again with Dreiser. During this meeting, Dreiser urgently expressed the desire and the necessity of touring Europe. (He had, for years, promised Richards that he would do so.) Subsequently, Richards arranged all of the financial aspects of the trip, and Dreiser and he left on the *Mauretania* bound for England on 22 November 1911. This journey was the beginning of an intense, emotionally volatile, love-hate relationship between the two men. During this trip, their friendship could by no means have remained solely professional, and their easy familiarity with each other is to be seen repeatedly in later letters.

Certainly Richards endeavored, during and after their voyage, to pry Dreiser away from Harper's fold. And, just as certainly, Dreiser allowed him to think that such an undertaking could likely succeed. Both men had much to gain: Richards would have advanced financially by attaining a contract for the English publication of Dreiser's novels and Dreiser, of more immediate concern, would have a convenient and carefully arranged European tour, one which involved introductions to noteworthy personages in the arts and in society at large, as well as various securities that traveling in an unfamiliar territory would not normally afford. Indeed Richards' home was at Dreiser's disposal, as was the home of many of his friends. Neither party was naive concerning the potential advantages of their relationship.

Fortunately there exist direct personal accounts of each one's attitude toward the other. Thomas P. Riggio made available Dreiser's account of Richards in a 1987 publication, "Dreiser: Autobiographical Fragment, 1911."[6] Now Richards' opinion of

Dreiser is available in an unpublished letter to his mother. However, it would be well to keep in mind that both of these accounts are *early* perceptions. Richards and Dreiser had as yet actually spent very little time together, face-to-face. Early perceptions, however, must precede any possibility of ascertaining later ones. Therefore, here follows a verbatim transcript of Richards' 26 December 1911 typescript letter to his mother, Mrs. Franklin Thomas Richards, in Rome.[7]

Cookham Dean,
December 26th, 1911.

My dear Mother,
My Aunt[8] told me incidentally that you say that Ethel[9] never gives you any news. Well, I never! You see you say the same thing about me, and I appeal to God and the record of my letters to show that it is not true in my case. Perhaps it is not true in hers.

It has been a very green Christmas. To-day, Boxing Day, it has rained all the time. Gioia[10] has ridden out, anxious to use one of two new hunting crops which have been given to her; my Aunt and I have walked out; and Grantie[11] has motored Charlie[12] to town to see the little dog; and Miss Hemmerde[13] has arrived wet through; and Mr. Dreiser is homesick. We have done a lot of eating and drinking, and at my instance Grantie donned a complete Father Christmas disguise and distributed presents to the children's amusement. They hardly tumbled, though, to who he was. The presents were a very generous lot and the children are still in a state of joy. Both the Allens[14] are stopping till Thursday morning.

No; I did not get your letter till Boxing Day.

I think the death of Julian Whelen[15] rather humourous. People like that don't generally die.

Now to deal with Mr. Dreiser and his visit to Rome.[16] He certainly is very coldin [*sic*] spite of the temperature being about fifteen degrees higher than it ought to be at this time of year. But all the same he had better not come to Rome yet. You see he has not yet thoroughly assimilated English characteristics. (Mr. Dreiser interpolates here: "Oh, haven't I? That's all your son knows." Your sister adds that he abuses us from morning till night and that he considers us a damned rotten lot). Your sister is saving her

money, she says, in order to go out to Rome-not to the same hotel, since she thinks it bad for families to be together, -when Grantie goes to America. But to go on with Mr. Dreiser. He thinks that from all accounts "Ma and I will get on fine - will hit it off right". All the same, if you don't mind he had better not go South until he has seen a little more of England. For instance, T. P. O'Connor[17] is coming over here this afternoon to see him. He has to go to the manufacturing districts, and to the Hoxton pantomime. Towards the middle of January he will go to Paris for a week end. I shall accompany him and leave him there. It will be an economical journey as we shall not take a room anywhere but change our clothes in the railway stations. You see I can do with so little rest in Paris; the atmosphere invigorates me.[18]

There is one thing that distresses me. My Aunt Nellie[19] is drinking rather much champagne, smoking a good deal, and carrying on in a most unseemly manner. Mr. Dreiser is greatly shocked and means to put her in his book.[20] I am sorry as she happens to be in my house and it makes it very awkward.

As perhaps you know, American authors are very trying. This one is quite the rudest I have encountered yet. I am constantly telling him of his faults but he has the American capacity for bumptiousness which will not be put off. The manner in which he approaches our established traditions is one of my present pains. Still, I am putting up with him for the present. To return to the question of his going to Rome. When he does go, which is likely to be at the end of February, really and truly he had better not go to the Continental.[21] You see he is very irritable and truculent and he would very likely knock the directors' heads against the wall if he did not like them. Also he is very anxious not to be preoccupied by any of his compatriots, and the Continental I remember was full of distinguished Americans. Now I am being quite serious. He had better go if not to an Italian hotel because of its obvious disadvantages, then to some other place where he can live incognito and go round and fetch you in the early morning in order to be shown the Baths of Caracalla and that sort of stuff. You see he cannot play Bridge and he has no small talk, and he talks about the most awful subjects on the slightest provocation. Why, the other night the very food rebelled and he got ptomaine poisoning at the Trocadero and for twenty-four hours was in agony, attended by a doctor from Pall Mall. I don't think you would like him in the hotel. He would

accuse the valet of theft and the maid of child murder ....Of course he would spend more in the Quirinal[22] but when you are selling a thousand copies of your book every day a lira or two extra does not matter. It is very fortunate for him that he is out of America because everybody there wishes to see him and to interview him, and the President has sent for him three times; in fact he is one of the significant forces. Perhaps you will let me know about the thoroughly Italian hotel you mention. After all he can always move on to the Continental if he is not comfortable elsewhere. There is another matter that I mention with some hesitation and that is that the Continental is full of women and his attitude towards them is not conventional.

As I said, dear little Grantie has gone to London. How he manages to pay for the tyres of his bicycle I cannot think. He is aiming to go to America. My opinion is that it is very good for families to be divided in different hemispheres, and after all, if he goes his mother will soon follow him.

Please try to get Mr. Dreiser an audience with the Pope.[23] If he once approaches the Ambassador he is lost: that big American colony will rise as one man to welcome so great a representative of their national literature. I wonder whether he would like Dr. Ashby.[24] I doubt it. I think Dr. Ashby is respectable. The publisher you mention is not very high class, you know. I think it is monstrously stupid to sign away six novels.

Now about Mr. Sciortino. You say: "I heard all about Sir Hugh Lane[25] and his correspondence". If you know all about it you know more than Sir Hugh Lane knows. I wrote all the letters myself and Sir Hugh Lane as far as I know has never read them. Your friend's friend's suggestion that Mr. Sciortino should write direct to Mrs. Phillips[26] sounds to me very much like blackmail, and that is an ugly business. I do resent very much your saying: "Think of keeping a young man out of twenty pounds and keeping a motor car". In the first place I am quite sure that in this matter Sir Hugh Lane has acted with perfect correctness and with no lack of generosity. And in the second it does hurt me that you should take the word of some dago and be so readily willing to believe that a friend of yours has behaved dishonestly. However, I shall not mention the matter to Sir Hugh. I daresay he has forgotten it by now.

The children are writing to you forthwith. Their fingers are all sticky with ink already.

At this moment my Aunt and Mr. Dreiser are playing Patience on the grand piano - not the comic opera but the game of cards. I am none the worse for Christmas and I resent having to go to London to-morrow (Wednesday) and to leave all my pleasant guests.[27]

Your affectionate son,
GRANT RICHARDS

That Richards had quite a sense-of-humor is evidenced in his many correspondences with family, friends, and business associates. But, even though the letter contains a light-hearted tone, he is also serious, for, as Richards himself states, "Now I am being quite serious." Without a doubt, Richards is preparing his mother for the upcoming meeting with Dreiser--preparing her, that is, for the worst. Whether or not such a negative anticipation was justified may only be answered by considering the personalities of both men and, partially, by witnessing in retrospect the outcome of the meeting itself.

It would be difficult to find two men with more dissimilar backgrounds than those of Richards and Dreiser. Richards' father was an Oxford don; he was reared in a traditional, upper-middle class, English environment. He considered himself, and was likewise considered, very much the "English gentleman." In addition to, or perhaps as a consequence of, such notions, he maintained an elitist attitude. Certainly the reference to "some dago" is only one of many places in the letter in which a superior attitude is apparent. It would not be too much to suspect that Richards was overly sensitive to a lack of social grace in Dreiser, who was reared in a world of poverty and societal disapproval.

Considering the vast differences in family backgrounds, it is surprising that the meeting in Rome went as smoothly as it did. Dreiser did stay at the Grand Continental Hotel in Rome, despite Richards' protestations. The relationship between Richards' mother and Dreiser appears to have been a friendly one, even though Dreiser evidently became bored with her company after a short while.[28] He may, however, have simply preferred the company of the interesting and lovely American woman who was staying at the hotel.[29] And Mrs. Richards did not entirely approve of their spending so much time together as the woman was

married. Nevertheless, Richards' dire warnings to his mother were definitely exaggerated.

The familiar tone of Richards' letter is not unlike that of many letters written to Dreiser in their sporatic absences from one another during the tour. These two men *did* become friends. Yet Dreiser's financial and emotional insecurities would not allow him to sign a future contract (if not, understandably, break an existing contract) with Richards' firm. And Dreiser had reason to doubt the stability of Richards' financial dealings; he had, after all, declared bankruptcy before and would do so again (at least, three times) in his professional career. Richards' failure to publish anything of Dreiser's, other than the travel book, *A Traveler at Forty*, was instrumental in ending their relationship. Yet, more importantly, Richards regarded the manuscript of the travel book as a breach of trust in itself. Dreiser had not only included real names and places, but also, in Richards' estimation, he had slandered Richards' name, as well as those of his family and friends.

Only after the initial anger was over, only after their friendship ended, is it possible to accurately assess the depth of their relationship. Richards remained bitter toward Dreiser, even twenty-two years later at the publication of *Author Hunting*.[30] Dreiser, however, finally expressed his poignant regret that the relationship had not continued.[31] Seemingly, Richards maintained a more professional attitude toward their friendship than did Dreiser.

---

[1]The correspondence from Grant Richards to Theodore Dreiser, at the Rare Book and Special Collections Department of the University of Illinois Library, has been collected in a Masters Thesis, "The Letters of Grant Richards to Theodore Dreiser: 1905-1914" by Lucia A. Kinsaul (Florida State U, 1990). They were used in this research project with the kind permission of the Curator, Gene K. Rinkle. The letters also are available on microfilm as *The Archives of Grant Richards* (London: Chadwyck-Healey; Teaneck, New Jersey: Somerset House, 1979). Richards to Macrae, 5 November 1906, reel 11, frame 69, in the *Archives*, indicates Richards' 1906 visit to America. Directly referring to their 1906 meeting are: Richards to Dreiser, 16 January 1907, reel 10, frame 486; Richards to Dreiser, 11 February 1907, reel 10, frame 685; Richards to Dreiser, 6 March 1908, reel 13, frames 116-117.

[2] In a 1909 handwritten letter to Richards, Sara Dreiser states, "I wonder if after meeting me you think I am to blame for its [*Jennie Gerhardt*] not being finished (Sara Dreiser to Richards, 24 February [?]

1909, reel 55, frame DR, L1).

[3]Richards to Dreiser, 6 March 1908, reel 13, frames 116-117.

[4]These suggestions are in the letter noted above (n3).

[5]Richards to Dreiser, 16 June 1911, reel 18, frame 851. In this letter, Richards begins, "You are a very disappointing person; in fact your letter was rather a shock."

[6]*Dreiser Studies* 18.1 (1987) : 12-21.

[7]Reel 45, frames 340-43. It is derived from a carbon-copy of a four-page, typed letter which is signed. Dreiser was present in the same room in which Richards was typing this letter.

[8]Nellie Allen, the sister of Richards' mother and the wife of Charles Grant B. Allen, Richards' largest benefactor.

[9]Ethel Richards Bicknell (Mrs. Ethrayne A. Bicknell), Richards' sister.

[10]Gioia Grant Richards, Richards' daughter.

[11]Gerrard Grant Allen, son of Mr. and Mrs. Charles Grant B. Allen. See n8. "Grantie" was six years younger than his cousin, Grant Richards. The entire staff of Richards' first publishing house, which opened on 1 January 1897, consisted of Grantie, an errand boy, and Richards himself.

[12]Charles L. Beddington, a friend of the Richards family.

[13]Pauline Hemmerde, Richards' secretary.

[14]See n11.

[15]A relative of Richards. John Lehman Whelen, a banker, was Richards' uncle by marriage. He helped finance Richards' first publishing venture. J. L. Whelen's son, Frederick Whelen, was the editor of Richards' first (and only) issue of *Politics* in 1896. See *Author Hunting*, 16.

[16]Dreiser arrived in Rome around midnight of 9 February 1912. Richards' mother escorted him on sightseeing expeditions, introduced him to prestigious persons, and kept him company while he visited Rome.

[17]A Member of Parliament. He gave Dreiser a tour of the Parliament building, as well as the places mentioned in the letter, on this same day of 26 December 1911.

[18]Richards and Dreiser arrived in Paris on 13 January 1912. They stayed at the Normandy Hotel, Rue de l'Echelle. The next day, 14 January, is described in a letter from Richards to Dreiser, 17 January 1912, reel 45, frames 371-72. Dreiser had forgotten the sequence of evens and asked Richards to detail the day's happenings.

[19]See n8.

[20]Aunt Nellie is not in *A Traveler at Forty*. However, during Richards' 1912 trip to America, he read the manuscript of the travel book, which Douglas Z. Doty of The Century Company lent him, and insisted on massive deletions. The original manuscript was, at any rate,

far too long to publish. A 23 December 1912 letter, from Richards to Doty, discusses his review of the manuscript and also records the final meeting between the two men (which differs somewhat from the *Author Hunting* version).

> You will remember that on Dreiser writing to suggest meeting me before I left New York I replied indicating that there was nothing we wanted to meet about as far as I could see. He came. He explained at once that the one thing he wanted to know was whether I proposed to publish the travel book in England. I replied that I had not given the matter any serious attention; that I did not know what shape the book would take since it was obviously impossible now, and so on; and I added that I understood that in view of my objection to much of the book the Century Company would not publish a line of it without my approval. In effect that is all that came of the interview. He wanted to know whether I had not seen all the book. I said I had had a good part of it and had read in it, but that as I had not read it all I was not very much of a judge. He asked me incidentally, apropos of something I said, to be good enough to correct, when I saw the proofs, any obvious errors of spelling, or anything of the kind. (reel 20, frames 854-55)

[21]Dreiser did board at the Continental for the entire visit to Rome.

[22] An Italian hotel in Rome.

[23]Dreiser did have the opportunity to meet with the Pope; however, Richards' mother did not arrange the meeting.

[24]Thomas Ashby, a friend of the Richards family.

[25]Art critic and Director of the Municipal Art Gallery in Dublin. He was a close friend of Richards' whom Dreiser met during the Christmas at Richards' home in England. Dreiser, Richards, and Lane spent some time on the Riviera together. As Lane was ill during this time, Richards handled this correspondence, dealing with a failed business agreement between Lane and Sciortino. In a letter, Richards to Sciortino, 15 September 1911, Richards states, "The agreement was, I am given to understand, quite definite: that you were to receive twenty pounds when the first picture was delivered and twenty pounds on the arrival of the second picture. Now Sir Hugh Lane sees no immediate prospect of getting the second picture" (reel 45, frame 195). As is evident in further correspondence, Lane had paid Sciortino twenty pounds for a "bust," created by Signor Mancini, and was awaiting a second delivery of a painting by the same artist. At which time, Lane would pay the other twenty pounds, making forty pounds total, agreed upon origi-

nally for two works of art by the "young" artist. See also Richards to Sciortino, 22 September 1911, reel 45, frame 202; Richards to Sciortino, 29 September 1911, reel 45, frame 220. This correspondence (at least on Richards' side) ends on 29 September 1911. Yet in an 8 January 1912 letter to Lane, Richards wrote, "I do hope that you won't give way to Sciortino and that you won't let Lady Phillips pay him either. He seems a first class hand at misrepresentation (reel 45, frame 351). Also a 14 March 1912 letter, Richards to Lane, states, "I understand you have turned the Sciortino matter over to Lady Phillips [see n26], but if it comes back to you in any form don't pay him. If you do it will be construed into a confession of error on your part. The whole of that gang seem to be perfect devils" (reel 45, frame 451).

[26]Lady Phillips, possibly the person who introduced Lane and Sciortino. Here follows (a portion of) a 28 March 1912 letter, Richards to his mother:

> Yes; Mr. Sciortino is evidently being taken in if what you say is correct. But that is not the kind of reputation he has. I heard of him first through some Italians who had bought some of his work. . . . . . . However, it does not much matter. I learn now that Lady Phillips has had all the correspondence and facts for several weeks and I believe she wrote and told him she could not do anything. (reel 45, frame 483)

[27]Richards was returning to work in London the next day.

[28]In a 16 February 1912 letter to Richards, Dreiser wrote some rather caustic remarks concerning Richards' mother: "Your mother is the soul of courtesy and attention but if you know me at all by now you know that I am bored to extinction by the conventional understanding & interpretation of life. . . .Your mother's opinion of you ought not to count for two cents with you. Her outlook is absolutely without significance. And this is true of your sister and your aunt" (Elias 134).

[29]Rella Abell Armstrong, estranged wife of an American author.

[30]Richards states in the preface to *Author Hunting*: "To Theodore Dreiser also I am grateful for permission to quote as fully as I have done from his letters to me and from his writings. I could hardly have written of him at all without that permission" (xii).

[31]"I would give anything not to have quarreled with him, and over money too! I owe him so much; that trip to Europe! It was like a tonic that lasted me for years; it was a new life to me" (Dudley 284).

Works Cited

Dreiser, Theodore. *A Traveler at Forty*. New York: Century, 1913.
Dudley, Dorothy. *Forgotten Frontiers: Dreiser and the Land of the Free*. New York: Smith & Haas, 1932.
Elias, Robert H. *Letters of Theodore Dreiser*. Vol. 1. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 1959.
Lingeman, Richard. *Theodore Dreiser: An American Journey: 1908-1945*. New York: Putnam, 1990.
Richards, Grant. *The Archives of Grant Richards*. Microfilm. London: Chadwyck-Healey; Teaneck, New Jersey: Somerset House, 1979.
---. *Author Hunting*. New York: Coward-McCann, 1934.
Riggio, Thomas P. "Dreiser: Autobiographical Fragment, 1911." *Dreiser Studies* 18.1 (1987): 12-21.

Addenda and Corrigenda to *Theodore Dreiser: A Primary Bibliography and Reference Guide*: Japanese Translations of Writings by Theodore Dreiser

Shigeo Mizuguchi
Rikkyo University (Emeritus)

A
Books, Pamphlets, Leaflets, and Broadsides

A00-1 SISTER CARRIE

Joyû Kyarî. Trans. Jirô Ozu. Tokyo: Santo-shobô, 1951. (Sales agent: Seikei-shoin.)

Tasogare [*The Dusk in Twilight*]. Trans. Jirô Ozu. Tokyo: Hayakawa-shobô, 1953. (Revised edition of 1951.)

Shisutâ Kyarî. Vol. 1. Trans. Jirô Ozu. Tokyo: Kenkyû-sha, 1959. (With minor revisions; only Vol. 1 was published.)

Tasogare «Kyari». Trans. Takashi Murakawa. Tokyo: Kadokawa-shoten, 1964. (An abridged edition.)

A11-1 JENNIE GERHARDT
Jenî Geruhâto. Trans. Matsuo Takagaki. Tokyo: Shinchô-sha,

1931. (With Jack London's *White Fang.*)

Jenî Geruhâto. Trans. Matsuo Takagaki. Tokyo: Shinchô-sha, 1934. (Shincho Books.)

Jenî Geruhâto. Trans. Matsuo Takagaki. Tokyo: Shinchô-sha, 1954. (Republication of 1934 with minor revisions by Kichinosuke Ôhashi within the limits of inlay.)

A23-1 THE COLOR OF A GREAT CITY

Dai Tokai no Shikisai. Trans. Tatsuya Honma. Tokyo: Fudô-shobô, 1933. (An abridged edition.)

A25-1 AN AMERICAN TRAGEDY

Amerika no Higeki, vol. 1. Trans. Jun Tanaka. Tokyo: Taishû-Kôron-sha, 1930. (An abridged edition; vol. 1 only was published.)

Amerika no Higeki. Trans. Jun Tanaka. Tokyo: Mikasa-shobô, 1940. (An abridged edition.)

Amerika no Higeki. Trans. Jun Tanaka. Tokyo: Hayakawa-shobô, 1950. (An abridged edition.)

Hi no Ataru Basho [*A Place in the Sun*] (*Amerika no Higeki*). Trans. Jun Tanaka. Tokyo: Hayakawa-shobô, 1952. (An abridged edition; only the title on the jacket was changed from 1950 edition.)

Hi no Ataru Basho (Amerika no Higeki). Trans. Jun Tanaka. Tokyo: Hayakawa-shobô, 1954 (Hayakawa Pocket Books). (An abridged edition.)

Amerika no Higeki. Trans. Yasuo Ôkubo. Tokyo: Kawade-Shobô-shinsha, 1958.

Amerika no Higeki. Trans. Yasuo Ôkubo. Tokyo: Shinchô-sha,

vols. 1-3, 1960; vol. 4, 1961 (Shinchô Books).

Amerika no Higeki. Trans. Fukuo Hashimoto. Tokyo: Kadokawa-shoten, vol. 1, 1963; vol. 2, 1965; vol. 3, 1967; vol. 4, 1968(Kadokawa Books).

Amerika no Higeki. Trans. Yôkichi Miyamoto. Tokyo: Shûei-sha, 1970. (An abridged edition.)

Amerika no Higeki. Trans. Yôkichi Miyamoto. Tokyo: Shûei-sha, 1975.

Amerika no Higeki. Trans. Yasuo Ôkubo. Tokyo: Shinchô-sha, 1978 (Shincho Books). (Republication of 1960 & 1961 editions in 2 vols.)

Amerika no Higeki. Trans. Yôkichi Miyamoto. Tokyo: Shûei-sha, 1978. (Revised edition of 1975 in 2 vols.)

A28-2 DREISER LOOKS AT RUSSIA

Doreisaa no Mita Sovieto · Rosia. Trans. Kamakich Shimoyama. Tokyo: Bunmei-Kyôkai, 1929. (An abridged edition.)

A46-1 THE BULWARK

Toride. Trans. Tsutomu Ueda. Tokyo: Kawade-shobô, 1952.

D
Miscellaneous Separate Publications

D57-1 *Inaka-Isha · Jiyû* [*The Country Doctor · Free*]. Translated by Takashi Sugiki and Motoo Takigawa. Tokyo: Eihô-sha, 1957.

Contains: "The Lost Phoebe," "Free" (*Free*); "The Shadow" (*Chains*); "The Country Doctor" (*Twelve Men*).

D60-1 *Naki Tsuma Fîbi · Arubâtin* [*The Lost Phoebe · Albertine*]. Translated by Hikaru Saitô and Nobuyuki Kiuchi. Tokyo: Nan'un-dô, 1960.
Contains: "The Lost Phoebe," "Nigger Jeff" (*Free*); "Sanctuary" (*Chains*); "Albertine" (*A Gallery of Women*).

D75-1 *Jiyû* [*Free*]. Translated by Kimiko Honma. Tokyo: Eikô-Shuppan-sha, 1975.

D83-1 *Doraisâ Tanpen-shû · Hito to Sahuhin* [*Short Stories of Dreiser · Man and His Works*]. Translated by Masayoshi Hidaka. Osaka & Tokyo: EM-Gaigo-Kenkyûjo, 1983.
Contains: "The Lost Phoebe," "McEwen of the Shining Slave Makers" (*Free*); "A Doer of the Word" (*Twelve Men*); "Convention," "The Old Neighborhood" (*Chains*).

Book Reviews

* * *

Dreiser's Perpetual Quest for the "Reality of Life"

The Quest for the Reality of Life: Dreiser's Spiritual and Esthetical Pilgrimage, by Miyoko Takeda. New York: Peter Lang, 1991. 138 pp.

Surely one aspect of Dreiser's greatness is his probing nature. As we all know, Dreiser probes, and probes, and probes, always trying to get at the essence of meaning. He is unable, it seems, to put his pen down. Many of his books are at least 500 pages long, some close to 800, including his best-selling novel, *An American Tragedy*. If we acknowledge Dreiser's incessant, almost compulsive, probing of what lies below the surface of reality, we may agree with H. L. Mencken who said, in one of my favorite quotations, that Dreiser "lift[s] the obvious to the inexplicable."

In *The Quest for the Reality of Life: Dreiser's Spiritual and Esthetical Pilgrimage*, Miyoko Takeda attempts to analyze Dreiser's search for the meaning of life. She examines the questions that all of us ask, the ones that Dreiser sought answers to: What are we? Why are we here? Where are we going? These are very large questions and one can admire someone for addressing them in the work of any writer, let alone one so complex as Dreiser. Although there are problems in language, organization, and coherence in *The Quest for the Reality of Life*, Takeda discusses something of essential importance in Dreiser's novels.

Takeda analyzes *The "Genius," The Bulwark*, and *The Stoic* as stages in Dreiser's spiritual progress. Although she refers to various cultural, social, and intellectual developments of the times and cites relevant facts about Dreiser's life, she is strongest and clearest when discussing the role that nature plays in leading Dreiser's characters toward spiritual revelation. Her emphasis on nature and spirituality, particularly her examination of beauty in Dreiser, perhaps reflects the Japanese aesthetic. It is an emphasis that informs us as much about the Japanese sensibility as about Dreiser's. This is one of the most valuable contributions of this flawed book.

Again, Takeda is at her best (and most coherent) when she undertakes to analyze the spiritual strain in Dreiser's novels. After sifting through a lot of material that attempts to offer a framework for these novels, the reader finally comes to such topics as "The Riddle of Existence" in which Takeda discusses earnestly the artist-philosopher's search for the meaning of life in Dreiser's most underrated novel, *The "Genius."* (1915).

Takeda sees *The "Genius"* as a product of Dreiser's own spiritual uncertainty. Like Dreiser in many of his essays, the protagonist, Eugene Witla, tries to reconcile Christ's otherworldly attitudes ("Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth") with the difficulty of their application. Furthermore, Eugene constantly questions his responsibility for his own carnal passions: If he looks at another woman longingly, is it *his* fault? Is it not in the scheme of Nature that it be so? To him, the concept of a good and omnipotent Divinity is beautiful. But the Divinity did not lend a hand to him or his long-suffering wife, Angela, in their hour of need. Beautiful as religious teachings are, time and again they prove untenable. Dreiser leaves Eugene philosophically open-minded and agnostic but with an abiding sense that "life is beautiful." The novel closes without resolving the question about the meaning of life and our role in it.

But according to Takeda, Dreiser takes up this task again some thirty years later. In his last two novels, *The Bulwark* (1945) and *The Stoic* (1947), Takeda argues that he makes progress in his quest to understand that inner reality of life. In *The "Genius,"* the hero was left in agnostic uncertainty; Solon Barnes, the hero of *The Bulwark*, reaches out to a Quaker God. After Solon's son commits suicide, Solon questions how God could permit such suffering to befall him and his family. But slowly he begins to recognize that cruelty and beauty coexist in the natural world. From this transcendent viewpoint that he achieves, human misery and tragedy do not contradict the mercy of God. Despite the tragedy of his son's death, Solon ultimately can affirm that God is nonetheless the God of love.

The Bulwark does not end Dreiser's spiritual quest, however. In fact, the novel closes with Solon's youngest daughter, Etta, crying "for life." She has understood her father's faith and religious feeling, but only intellectually, and she is, according to Takeda, Dreiser's spokesperson. We must look, then, to *The Stoic* for the resolution of Dreiser's spiritual conflict. In this

novel, Dreiser introduces his own brand of Hinduism which Takeda analyzes as his melding of Christianity, Hinduism and science. Most of Dreiser's critics and biographers generally disapprove of the introduction of Hinduism into *The Stoic*, but Takeda finds his use of Hinduism consistent within his canon, since she has traced his interest in spirituality in *The "Genius"* and *The Bulwark*. As she says, "It shows Dreiser's philosophical, spiritual and aesthetical pilgrimage persistent and constant from the beginning of his life to the end" (97).

And for Takeda, Dreiser's pronounced commitment to social justice was part of that spiritual pilgrimage. Indeed, one of Dreiser's most affecting qualities is his overwhelming feelings of concern for those in distress. As Takeda notes, Dreiser "was always on the side of the depressed in spite of his own desire for fame and wealth" (102). His sympathy may have derived from the hard knocks of his troubled childhood, in which he was always threatened by imminent poverty. Nevertheless Dreiser was able to translate his disadvantage into action. In all likelihood, his real motivation in his siding with labor in strikes and for eventually joining the American Communist Party was his humane compassion and spiritual hunger for something more than the material.

Takeda highlights Dreiser's concern in a subsection entitled "Compassion for Fellow Men." She discusses Dreiser's depiction of Cowperwood's last and most-loved mistress, Berenice, who founds and works in a charity hospital, where she nurtures and cares for neglected children (although Emilie Grigsby, the real-life figure on whom Berenice is modeled, did nothing of the kind). As Takeda shows, Berenice's acts of charity are not introduced suddenly or casually. Clearly charity was a virtue that Dreiser cherished in his heart from an early time until the end.

Despite the difficulty of reading, the book makes a valuable contribution in showing how aspects of American culture are interpreted by those who are outside of it. Also Takeda's effort to show Dreiser's perpetual search for the meaning in life and her effective use of his manuscripts and typescripts must be favorably acknowledged.

Miriam Gogol
University of Hartford

Unexpurgated Dreiser

Newspaper Days, by Theodore Dreiser. Edited by T. D. Nostwich. Textual Editor, Lee Ann Draud. General Editor, Thomas P. Riggio. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1991. xiv + 826pp. $49.95.

It is not known exactly when Dreiser decided to write a history of his life, but a diary fragment indicates that he was working on this project by the spring of 1914. By the summer of 1916 he had completed his life story to 1892, the year he left Chicago for St. Louis to work as a reporter for the *Globe-Democrat*. Setting this manuscript aside as volume one of what he planned to be a four volume "history of myself," he worked on the second volume intermittently until 1920, when he decided to offer it to Horace Liveright as a substitute for the novel he had been promising the publisher. At first Liveright was reluctant to publish it--he wanted *The Bulwark* instead, for which he had been paying Dreiser advances--, but by 1922, with the novel still uncompleted, he agreed to issue the second volume of Dreiser's life history under the title of *A Book About Myself*. The title was changed to *Newspaper Days* in 1931, when Liveright reissued the work.

Although *Newspaper Days* is organized around the years from 1892 to 1895 when Dreiser served his literary apprenticeship as a newspaperman, it is more than just an account of these experiences. In addition, he narrates and reflects on his sexual encounters and yearnings, his early courtship of his future wife Sara White, his discoveries about nature and society, his problems with his family, and his introduction to Balzac and Spencer. It is thus an extremely important work in the Dreiser canon for anyone who wishes to learn about the people, places and events that had an influence on his later life and work. It is also, in its early versions, a significantly different work from the version Liveright published in 1922.

The first complete version of *Newspaper Days* is a holograph manuscript of over 1700 pages. As Dreiser completed portions of this holograph, he gave them to Estelle Kubitz, his mistress and secretary during the years he worked on the volume, who prepared a "rough" typescript of the pages. After Dreiser revised the typescript, Kubitz then prepared a second typescript, which Dreiser again reviewed and revised. With the completion of the second typescript, Dreiser decided to send the work to H. L.

Mencken and William Lengel for their reactions, but before he did so, either he or Kubitz cut numerous passages that might have offended the readers. Later a third typescript was prepared for Liveright which included revisions based on the suggestions of Mencken and Lengel but did not include the passages that were cut from the text earlier. When he received this copy, Liveright made even more excisions and suggested some further revisions, most of which were approved by Dreiser.

As a result of this editing, countless sophistications in wording were added to the text that appeared in print in 1922 and approximately 30,000 words that appeared in the manuscript and first two typescripts were omitted from it. Among the excluded passages were extensive narratives about Dreiser's early sexual escapades with girlfriends, landladies and prostitutes; an account of his near-seduction of Sarah White; philosophical discourses on the Catholic church and human morality; anecdotes about persons Dreiser worked with and encountered as a reporter; and descriptions of the sights and scenes in the places he visited and lived. In T. D. Nostwich's words, what Liveright published was "probably . . . a more marketable book in 1922," but it was also not the one Dreiser had originally written. Nor, would it appear, was it the version he intended, for most likely he either made or agreed to many of the changes in order to get his work published.

Unlike the Liveright edition, the Pennsylvania Edition of *Newspaper Days* presents an unabridged and unexpurgated version of the text. The volume editor is T. D. Nostwich, who has spent much of his scholarly career researching Dreiser's newspaper work. Previously, he served as editor of the Pennsylvania Dreiser Edition's *Journalism Volume One*, a collection of Dreiser's newspaper writings during the years covered by his memoir. The textual editor is Lee Ann Draud, a newcomer to the Dreiser Edition, whose recent work on the NEH funded project to arrange and catalog the Theodore Dreiser Collection at the University of Pennsylvania makes her well-qualified for the task. In preparing the Pennsylvania edition, the editors were aided by the availability of most of the prepublication versions of *Newspaper Days*, including all but one chapter of the holograph manuscript, approximately 2/3 of the "rough" or first typescript, all of the second typescript, and the typescript edited by Liveright. Nostwich discusses the genesis and transmission of these versions in his historical commentary and describes them in detail in his textual

commentary.

Given the approach to editing used in earlier Pennsylvania Dreiser Editions, it is not surprising to find that Nostwich and Draud chose the holograph as copy-text for their edition. What is surprising, however, is the extremely conservative policy they have followed in emending the copy-text. For the most part, they have limited emendations from later versions to only the handwritten revisions Dreiser made in the first two typescripts. Excluded from consideration are the changes in punctuation and wording in these typescripts that are not in Dreiser's hand as well as the additions and revisions that appear in the typescript sent to Liveright and in *A Book About Myself*.

In his textual commentary, Nostwich supports the choice of copy-text and the emendation policy used for the first two typescripts by presenting James L. W. West III's theory that often the act of submission of a text to the publication process occurs at the time an author turns his text over to a personal editor or amanuensis rather than at the point he sends it to a publisher (see "Editorial Theory and the Act of Submission," *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of American*, 83 (1989): 169-85). At this point, according to the theory, the author either delegates authority and intention to the personal editor, in which case changes made by the editor can be regarded as authorial, or the author expects the editor to perform the functions of a trade editor by anticipating the objections of a publisher, in which case the changes lack authority. With respect to *Newspaper Days*, Nostwich claims that Estelle Kubitz performed both functions simultaneously when she made changes in the typescripts. Since the motivations for most of her revisions are difficult to judge, however, it was decided to exclude them in order to avoid introducing readings into the copy-text that Dreiser did not intend.

What is disturbing about Nostwich's defense is that he offers no external evidence for his claim that Kubitz was anticipating the objections of a publisher when she made some of her revisions. Judging from correspondence I have seen between Kubitz and Dreiser, it would appear that she felt she was collaborating with Dreiser when she edited his texts, at least in the early years of their relationship, rather than performing the function of a trade editor. Furthermore, as a former newspaperman (there seems to be some irony here), Dreiser was used to having someone copy-edit his work. The manuscripts he submitted to typists

are not fair copies (as Nostwich's description of the holograph for *Newspaper Days* illustrates), a fact that suggests he was delegating authority and intention for "cleaning them up" to his typists. Therefore, in terms of the theory used to justify the emendation policy for this new edition, it seems more reasonable to argue that Kubitz began to perform the function of a trade editor when and if she made the cuts in the copies sent to Mencken and Lengel and not before. At any rate, by rejecting the changes in punctuation and wording that Kubitz made in the first two typescripts, the editors were often forced to make these changes themselves in order to prepare the holograph for publication. And their changes clearly do not have Dreiser's authority or approval.

Equally conservative but more defensible is the emendation policy to exclude additions and revisions that appear in the Liveright typescript and the 1922 text. By the time these changes were introduced, Nostwich argues, the text had been cut significantly and hence "they result from intentions quite different from those that motivated Dreiser in the original work." Since most if not all of these additions are Dreiser's, the editors have provided a sampling of the additions in the Liveright typescript in an appendix and noted some of the ones in *A Book About Myself* in the historical notes.

Although Nostwich claims that "the only words taken from other edited versions are those few corrections inscribed by Dreiser himself to rectify factual errors carried over from the holograph," an examination of the schedule of selected emendations suggests that other word changes may have been adopted as well. The emendations at 361.13, 368.21 and 397.29 in the Pennsylvania edition, for instance, none of which involve factual errors and all of which are attributed to the editors, are in fact readings that appear in *A Book About Myself.* By attributing these emendations to themselves rather than one of the edited versions, the editors probably wish to indicate that they were made on the basis of their decision rather than on the authority of the text in which the changes first appeared. But even if this is the reason, the attribution seems misleading since one cannot help but wonder whether the emendations would have been made at all if the changes had not first appeared in the other version. There are, on the other hand, emendations to the text of the new edition that are made solely on the authority of the editors. Among these are the substitution of true names for persons whose identity Dreiser con-

cealed in his holograph, and corrections of historical or geographical errors. Although the editors are inconsistent in recording these changes, listing some in the schedule of selected emendations and others in the historical notes, their inclusion is helpful to readers and can be justified on the basis that *Newspaper Days* is a historical document.

In addition to the historical commentary and the standard textual apparatus found in all of the Pennsylvania Dreiser Editions, this new edition includes over 50 pages of historical notes and an index to the text. Written by Nostwich, the notes not only identify "unfamiliar persons, places and events as well as definitions of obscure terms, phrases and passages," but they also indicate the specific newspaper article(s) Dreiser wrote about the events he describes and provide citations for those that have been reprinted. Thus, the notes serve as both a source of information for a more complete understanding of the text and as a bibliographical guide to Dreiser's writings during his apprenticeship. Also prepared by Nostwich, the index is a useful guide to the text itself that includes entries for the wide variety of subjects Dreiser comments on as well as entries for the people, places and events he describes.

While there will be some debate about the editorial decisions that lie behind the Pennsylvania edition of *Newspaper Days*, this debate should not diminish its value or importance. Its publication allows scholars to read for the first time a version of Dreiser's memoir that reflects his original intentions far better than the version Liveright printed. In addition, its publication provides scholars, again for the first time, with an index to the subjects covered in the memoir as well as extremely useful background information on these subjects. This new edition, then, is a major contribution to both the Dreiser canon and the study of his life, for which the editors are to be commended.

Frederic E. Rusch
Indiana State University

News and Notes

The International Dreiser Society is now a reality as a result of actions taken by prospective members at a business meeting held at the third annual ALA Conference in San Diego in May. At the meeting, the members adopted the constitution and bylaws for the Society that appear on the last two pages of this issue and elected Society founder Miriam Gogol as its first official President. Also elected for the coming year were Larry Hussman, Vice President; Frederic Rusch, Executive Secretary/ Treasurer; Leonard Cassuto, Recording Secretary; and Yoshinobu Hakutani and Mary Lawlor, Directors at Large. In other business, the members decided to hold two sessions on Dreiser at the 1993 ALA Conference tentatively scheduled for May 27-30 in Baltimore, Maryland. A call for papers from Larry Hussman, next year's program chairman, can be found on the inside back cover of this issue. . . . As noted in the bylaws, *Dreiser Studies* will now become an official publication of the International Dreiser Society. Beginning with the fall issue, the journal's editorial policy will be determined by the Society's Editorial Board and Society members will receive a subscription as part of their membership. Individuals and institutions who do not wish to become members can continue to subscribe to *DS* at the rates shown on the inside front cover. For the foreseeable future, the journal's editorial office will remain in the Department of English at Indiana State University. . . . The Pennsylvania Dreiser Edition of *Jennie Gerhardt* is scheduled for publication in November according to a recent announcement from the University of Pennsylvania Press. Also scheduled for fall publication is a collection of Dreiser's short fiction from Black Sparrow Press entitled *Fulfilment & Other Tales of Women & Men.* Edited by Thomas Nostwich, the tales selected from *Free, Twelve Men, Chains,* and *A Gallery of Women* will be "supplemented by hitherto suppressed passages unearthed from Dreiser's archival papers." . . . . Although none of his works have been adapted for television, Dreiser would be pleased to know that he does have his admirers in the television industry. Among them is actor Joe Conley, whose credits include playing Ike Godsey on *The Waltons.* A collector of Dreiser first editions, Conley recently sent *DS* photocopies of Dreiser inscriptions and documents on the suppression of *The 'Genius'* that are in some of the copies he owns.

CONSTITUTION OF THE INTERNATIONAL DREISER SOCIETY

I. NAME. This Society shall be known as the International Dreiser Society.

II. PURPOSE. The purposes of the Society shall be the following:

1. To perpetuate Dreiser's name and literary reputation.
2. To publish Dreiser scholarship.
3. To provide forums for the formal and informal exchange of ideas among Dreiser scholars.
4. To meet regularly for the furtherance of our common interests; and
5. To develop an international network of communication among societies of kindred aims and interests.

III. MEMBERSHIP. Membership is available to anyone paying dues. The dues structure will be established in the bylaws.

IV. OFFICERS. The officers of the Society shall be a President, a Vice President (President-Elect), an Executive Secretary-Treasurer, a Recording Secretary and two Directors-at-Large. Their duties shall be established in the bylaws. The Executive Committee shall consist of the immediate past President and the duly elected officers for the year.

The Vice President will be elected for a two-year term, serving as Vice President for the first year and automatically becoming President for the second. The Executive Secretary-Treasurer will be elected for an indefinite term, being replaced by the Society at its annual meeting upon recommendation of the Executive Committee.

V. ELECTION OF OFFICERS.

1. Officers shall be elected annually by the members of the Society at the annual business meeting from a slate presented by the Nominating Committee. Additional nominations may be made from the floor.
2. A majority vote of members present shall be necessary for an election.
3. The Nominating Committee shall consist of three members of the International Advisory Board. The slate of new officers shall be submitted to the Executive Committee two months before the annual meeting.
4. New Officers will be installed at the conclusion of the annual meeting.

VI. PUBLICATIONS. Members shall receive all regular publications of the Society. Subscriptions may be purchased by non-members. Subscription rates will be established in the bylaws.

VII. MEETINGS. The Society shall hold an annual meeting at the American Literature Association Conference for the transaction of regular business, for the election and installation of officers, and for the edification of the Society. The members must be notified of the meeting and business matters at least one

month in advance.

VIII. AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION. Written notice of proposed changes must be submitted to the Executive Secretary-Treasurer not less than two months prior to the meeting at which the proposal is to be made. Not less than one month's notice of any such proposal shall be given by the Executive Secretary-Treasurer to the members. Changes in the constitution may be made only at an annual meeting or at a properly announced meeting for business. Change requires two-thirds majority of voting members present.

IX. BYLAWS. Bylaws may be adopted or changed by a simple majority vote at a properly announced business meeting.

BYLAWS OF THE INTERNATIONAL DREISER SOCIETY

I. DUES. The annual membership dues for the International Dreiser Society shall be $20.00 in North America and $30.00 elsewhere. Dues include subscriptions to Society publications.

II. DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF OFFICERS AND COMMITTEES.

1. The President of the Society shall preside at the annual meeting and chair all other meetings of the Executive Committee and special meetings of the Society.
2. The Vice President shall be responsible for the program of the annual meeting and shall substitute for the President when necessary.
3. The Executive Secretary-Treasurer shall be in charge of the central office of the Society and keep the records of the Society and receive and have custody of the funds of the Society.
4. The Recording Secretary shall keep minutes of the proceedings of the Society and of the Executive Committee.
5. The Executive Committee shall determine the time and place of the annual meeting and shall be empowered to act for the Society between meetings or in the event of an emergency that prevents the holding of the annual meeting.
6. In order to promote the study of Dreiser worldwide, an International Advisory Board made up of seven members with no less than four members from abroad will be appointed by the Executive Committee to advise the Executive Committee on appropriate forums for the exchange of ideas among Dreiser scholars and to serve as a liaison between our Society and other societies outside the U.S. that have an interest in Dreiser's life and works.

III. PUBLICATIONS. The publications of the Society will be *Dreiser Studies* and the *Dreiser Society Newsletter*. The editors and editorial policies of the publications will be determined by an editorial board appointed by the Executive Committee.