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A Socialist Realist Perspective on *Sister Carrie*

Olga Volkova
Clemson University

The 1900 publishing fiasco of Theodore Dreiser’s first novel *Sister Carrie* has become legendary not only in the United States but also in the former Soviet Union. The causes, however, of Doubleday, Page’s reluctance to issue the book and the subsequent poor sales and sparse reviews have been interpreted quite differently in the two countries. Writing from a Western perspective, Yoshinobu Hakutani states that one “of the major reasons why this novel was frowned upon in 1900 was . . . Dreiser’s obvious adherence to the deterministic view of human conditions” (3). In other words, early American critics considered *Sister Carrie* to be an illustration of the theory that human actions are controlled by natural forces such as environment, instincts, heredity, and chance. Indifferent to the amorality inherent in such a theory, Soviet critics have seen the economic and class questions posed by the novel as central. They maintain that the publisher’s desire to “shut the mouth” of the young writer can be explained solely by the fact that his “truth was not pleasant to the American bourgeoisie” (Zasursky, *Teodor Dreiser* 40–41). Such contradictory responses can serve as a starting point for answering the question of why in the Soviet Union, where “Western literature was [considered] nonsense,” Dreiser was “one of the few foreign authors praised by the Soviet press” (Friedberg 267, 272) and his novel enjoyed greater popularity than in his home country.

Dreiser’s well-known popularity in the Soviet Union can partly be explained by his affiliation with the Communist Party, which he eventually joined in 1945 after many years of flirtation with the left. But, as Yasen Zasursky—the leading Soviet critic of foreign literature—explains, Dreiser “was very popular in our country long before he joined the Communist Party” (*Teodor Dreiser* 13). Indeed, Dreiser’s books were translated not
only into Russian but also into Ukrainian, Lithuanian, and other languages of the former Soviet Union (305). *Sister Carrie* was the first to be translated into Russian in 1927, and hardly a year passed that did not see a new edition or new issue of a Dreiser work. The records of Amur Regional Library, one of eighty-nine regional libraries in Russia, indicate that *Sister Carrie*, probably the most popular of Dreiser’s works, enjoyed frequent reprintings of from 100,000 to 280,000 copies by both the central and regional publishing houses. A copy of the book was carried to the North Pole by Russian explorers, and a version has been put to music by Reimond Paulus, a Latvian composer well known in the Soviet Union (Bassis 40).

The most obvious reason for such popularity is that *Sister Carrie* served the Communist Party exceptionally well as anti-American propaganda. Since, as Maurice Friedberg suggests, “[f]oreign works of fiction were regarded by [the Soviet readers] first and foremost as a trustworthy source of information on life abroad” (267), Soviet critics, thoroughly informed by the Party’s ideology, represented the novel as an accurate depiction of the worst aspects of American urban life, such as its consumerism and crass materialism.

A second reason for the book’s popularity is its relation to the great Russian literary tradition, the realistic narrative forms that dominated Russian literature roughly from 1845 to 1905, almost, according to Dmitry Mirsky, “at the exclusion of other forms of imaginative writing” (169). Besides owing much to the satirical naturalism of Gogol, the classical realism of Pushkin and Lermontov, and the critical writings of Belinsky, Russian realism derives from such important foreign influences as Sand and Balzac. As one reviewer of the 1907 reissue of *Sister Carrie* put it, “[t]he Balzac-like treatment, the Balzac-like attitude is everywhere apparent” (Lyon 37) in the novel, and Dreiser himself asserted that Balzac taught him “how a book should be written” (“Now” 186). As the Balzacian “novelist of the city and of the finances of sex” (Moers 74), Dreiser would have been recognized as having indirectly appropriated the tradition of Russian realism, whose elements, as defined by Mirsky, are easily recognizable in *Sister Carrie*: a general sympathetic attitude to human beings regardless of class, a massing of concrete details, a journalistic prose style that seemingly answers to the reality it speaks of, and subjects taken exclusively from contemporary life (170–72).

Without denying the significance of these two causes of *Sister Carrie*’s popularity, I shall in this essay consider only the novel’s relation to literary conventions dominant during the Soviet period, beginning in 1917 with the Socialist Revolution and ending in 1991 with the dissolution of the Soviet
In these years, the official literary method and theory was socialist realism, which in 1934 was proclaimed “the sole method appropriate for literature” (Clark 174) at the First All-Union Congress of Soviet Writers. A relatively “pure” socialist realism existed from that point until 1953, when the death of Stalin closed an era in which “literature and politics were more intimately interconnected than at any time during the entire span of Russian literary history” (Terras 458). However, for decades after Stalin’s death the conventions of socialist realism “had become so ingrained as habits of composition that . . . even dissident writers rarely broke out of its . . . mold” (Clark 174). And so ingrained had these conventions become as habits of reading and critical evaluation that *Sister Carrie* was virtually assured of a warm reception in the Soviet Union.

As defined by a statute of the First All-Union Congress of Soviet Writers, socialist realism above all demands of the artist a truthful, historically specific depiction of reality in its revolutionary development. At the same time this truthfulness and historical specificity in the depiction of reality must be linked to the task of ideologically remolding and educating the workers in the spirit of socialism. (qtd. in Terras 459)

According to Abram Tertz, the author of *On Social Realism*, probably the most popular essay written on the topic, the method “is founded on the concept of Purpose with a capital P” (150). This all-embracing ideal turns the history of all epochs and nations into “the history of humanity’s march toward Communism” (159), and it channels all literary works in the same teleological direction. Such an explanation of social realist purpose prepares us to understand why Sergey Baturin, a Soviet critic, writes that in *Sister Carrie* Dreiser “acts from the aesthetic positions of socialist realism” (371) and why Yasen Zasursky, another Soviet critic who sees the emerging class struggle in the novel, credits it with “opening the twentieth century of American literature” (Teodor Dreiser 42).

These critics are struck most of all by Dreiser’s treatment of the main contradiction in capitalist society, the opposition between labor and capital, revealed most powerfully in Hurstwood’s experience as a scab during the violent Brooklyn streetcar strike. According to Walter Benn Michaels, Dreiser’s views on American capitalism in the novel resemble “the early-twentieth-century Marxist critique of imperialism” (49–50). Although Michaels, applying new historicist reading strategies, finally considers the novel’s endorsement of desire as the prime mover in human affairs to be “an unequivocal endorsement of . . . unrestrained capitalism of the late nine-
As Michaels explains, nineteenth-century economists generally embraced Adam Smith’s postulate that “labour . . . never varying in its own value, is alone the ultimate and real standard by which the value of all commodities can . . . be estimated and compared. It is their real price; money is their nominal price only” (qtd. in Michaels 31). Yet, in a capitalist society, money ceases to be a symbol of actual labor performed, since, as Marx notes, a “certain amount of labor goes ‘unpaid’” (qtd. in Michaels 32). In other words, a capitalist controlling the means of production can force a laborer to work additional time for the same price, thus buying the actual labor more cheaply and creating a “surplus value,” which is the “source of profit” and, hence, “the essence of capitalism” (qtd. in Michaels 33). Furthermore, for capitalism to prosper, this surplus should circulate, “for so long as the hoard remains in the condition of a hoard, it does not function as capital, does not take part in the process of creating surplus value” (qtd. in Michaels 48). Thus capitalism is driven by what Michaels calls “the fear of stationary state” (50).

More important for a Soviet reader of Sister Carrie is Michaels’s reference to Vladimir Lenin’s “Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism,” which was included in every school’s curriculum in the former Soviet Union. Here, Lenin proclaims the most important contemporary phenomenon of capitalism to be “the enormous growth of industry and the remarkably rapid concentration of production in ever-larger enterprises” (196), that is, in monopolies acquiring “superprofits over and above those obtained by the ‘pure’ [i.e., non-combined] enterprises” (198). Monopolies do not cut into their superprofits to raise their own workers’ standard of living; rather, they increase their profits by “exporting capital abroad to the backward countries” (241). Such “speculative” activity further cheapens the cost of labor and creates the social-political conditions that will overturn the entire imperialist system and make way for the last, and highest, phase of social development, communism (254). The force behind this overturn is, naturally, the unleashed outrage of subjected workers.

Dreiser’s novel has significance for socialist readers because it creates, as Donald Pizer puts it, “one of the best portrayals of industrial violence in American fiction to that time” (40). Pizer attributes the authenticity of Dreiser’s depiction of the strike to an effective combination of the personal and the documentary. In March of 1894, Dreiser, on assignment as a reporter for the Toledo Blade, rode a car manned by scabs during a streetcar strike in Toledo. About a year later, in January 1895, when he was out of
work in New York, he read newspaper reports of a more violent streetcar strike in Brooklyn. For *Sister Carrie*, he drew upon both his Toledo experience and “the details of geography, and the weather of the Brooklyn strike, the exact nature of the strikers’ demands, . . . the mood and actions of the mob,” and even the ad in which the Atlantic Avenue Railway offered work to strike-breakers (40).

Soviet readers would interpret the strike depicted in *Sister Carrie* as an indication of Lenin’s “decaying” American imperialism. Although there is no evidence that the streetcar companies are monopolies exporting capital to backward countries, behind the actions of the strikers is the desire of the railways (just the sort Lenin talks about in “Imperialism”) to buy cheap labor and thus increase the “surplus value” of their lines at the expense of the working class. The motormen and conductors had been steadily receiving a two-dollar-a-day salary until the railways introduced “trippers,” an action that “cut down their [the regular workers’] chance of livelihood one-half and increased their hours of servitude from ten to twelve, and even fourteen” (Dreiser, *Sister Carrie* 296). These trippers were hired for the rush hours only and normally made, at best, two car trips a day for only twenty-five cents each. When the regular employees “demanded that the system be abolished, and that ten hours be considered a day’s work, barring unavoidable delays, with $2.25 pay” (297), the railways used “the scarcity of labour [that] winter and the panicky state of the financial market” (296) to their advantage by replacing the striking motormen and conductors with strike-breakers from the large army of unemployed. By the time Hurstwood enters the scene, the trolley companies not only “take anybody” (298) but also receive the “guaranteed protection” (this phrase is repeated three times on pages 298–99) of the police, who, mercilessly swinging clubs at the heads of the workers, “plunged left and right” (308) and “poured ponderous oaths upon the troubled waters” (309). The immorality of such tactics is obvious.

What is not so obvious is how Hurstwood’s centrality to the account of the strike might have affected Soviet readers. By the time of the strike, “utterly idle” (296) Hurstwood rarely reveals even “the least shadow of what was once shrewd and pleasant strength” (299). As an instance of the naturalistic plot of decline, Philip Fisher argues, Hurstwood’s fall illustrates the Darwinian “individual life cycle . . . that rises from the helplessness of infancy to the capacity to ensure individual survival and then [declines] from that point to death” (171). But this decline is not without ideological implications for readers. June Howard argues that middle-class Americans would not sympathize with Hurstwood because his “proletarianization” would have reminded them of their own tenuous hold on their place in the
social hierarchy: “The narrative of proletarianization, demonstrating that one can tumble down as well as climb up the social ladder, implicitly proposes a frightening question to the reader: is anyone safe?” (101). Soviet readers too would have had difficulty sympathizing with Hurstwood, but for quite different reasons—his identification with the capitalist ruling class and his insensitivity to others’ suffering. He is introduced as a well stuffed and impeccably dressed manager of “a truly swell saloon” (33), a “very acceptable individual of our great American upper class” (34). Leaving the theater one night with Carrie and Drouet, he reveals his insulation from the suffering of the lower classes when he ignores the pleas of “a gaunt-faced man . . . who looked the picture of privation and wretchedness” while Drouet hands over a dime “with an upwelling feeling of pity in his heart” (103).

Moreover, Soviet readers would likely see Hurstwood’s decline of energy and physical strength as accompanied by further depletion of his moral power. Even earlier, when torn by opposing impulses before the open safe at Fitzgerald and Moy’s, he is incapable of understanding the “true ethics of the situation” (193). The same is true with his decision to join the strikebreakers; he does argue for several hours “pro and con with [his] mental counselor” but only about chances for making money safely, not about the ethics of taking another man’s job. The fact that the venture is “a matter so sure of profit” (299; emphasis mine) is clearly the deciding factor. After signing on for training as a motorman, he cannot fully accept his loss of class status. Even the physically and morally degraded Hurstwood feels “superior . . . [and] a little better off” than the other scabs, who seem to him “ignorant and commonplace” (302). Given this lack of repentance, Soviet readers might well have considered his suffering an instance of poetic justice.

Still, for Soviet readers Hurstwood’s proletarianization would have provided the basis for recognizing an emerging solidarity among workers of all stripes. As Dreiser describes them, the scabs are as much victims as the strikers—“queer, hungry-looking men, who looked as if want had driven them to desperate means” (301). It becomes evident from the conversation Hurstwood overhears on his arrival at the Brooklyn car barn that at least some of the scabs have been exploited in the same way the conductors and motormen have:

“I don’t blame these fellers for striking,” said one. “They’ve got the right of it, all right, but I had to get something to do.”

“Same here,” said the other. “If I had any job in Newark I wouldn’t be over here takin’ chances like these.”
“It’s hell these days, ain’t it?” said the man. “A poor man ain’t nowhere. You could starve, by God, right in the streets, and there ain’t most no one would help you.”

“Right you are,” said the other. “The job I had I lost ’cause they shut down. They run all summer and lay up a big stock, and then shut down.” (301–02)

Just as the streetcar lines “run” their cars in the most profitable way regardless of the human cost, so the second speaker’s company chooses to “run” its operation only during the season when productivity is highest and overhead—heating and transportation costs, perhaps—is lowest, workers’ welfare be damned. Even though the scabs are wrong in their actions, they “don’t blame these fellers for striking” because they are all “in the right” together against the capitalists.

The police too are largely blameless for their brutal repression of the strikers. “In his heart of hearts,” Dreiser says of one officer, “he sympathized with the strikers and hated this ‘scab’ [Hurstwood]. In his heart of hearts, also, he felt the dignity and use of the police force, which commanded order. . . . Strip him of his uniform, and he would have soon picked his side” (300). Just as Hurstwood does not recognize the “true ethics” of any moral dilemma, the officer lacks the “mind” to see the “true social significance” of the strike; he acts against his fellow man only because sympathy and duty “neutralized one another” (300) in his heart, reducing him to a tool of the corporations and politicians.

Hurstwood’s heart is also in the right place, for he “at first sympathized with the demands of these men—indeed, it is a question whether he did not always sympathize with them to the end, belie him as his actions might” (297). Himself a victim of the profit motive—the lease on the Warren Street saloon having been terminated when the building was sold to a real estate speculator—he has been conditioned to believe in the “unassailable power of the companies” (298): “He didn’t sympathize with the corporations, but strength was with them. So was property and public utility” (297). From a socialist perspective, Hurstwood, like the police officer, suffers from a lack of education about the source of true power and utility, the revolutionary energy of the workers. His tragedy lies in his failure to accept the strike leader’s plea for solidarity at the barricades: “We’re all working men, like yourself” (308). Ironically, by the novel’s end, he does lose all sense of class distinction as he joins the line of bums outside the flophouse where he will gas himself: “It was all sullen endurance, unlightened by either wit or good fellowship” (366). Such, a Soviet reader might add, is the inevitable end of minds unenlightened by the Purpose.
Despite the fact that the strike chapters, lacking any extended authorial commentary, are famous for their journalistic objectivity, Dreiser’s handling of them supports the Party’s resolution that “there cannot exist neutral art” (“O Politike Partii” 151). But the Soviet reader has already been prepared to interpret Dreiser’s position as pro-proletarian by the explicit and implicit criticism of social injustice in the Chicago shoe factory where Carrie finds her first job. Much as Lenin condemns exploiters who, having “converted into money the raw material called the energy of the masses, have of course not been interested in enhancing the value of that raw material” (Gorky 228), Dreiser explicitly points out the lack of concern for the laborers’ health and comfort resulting from the company’s thirst for profit:

Under better material conditions, this kind of work would not have been so bad, but the new socialism which involves pleasant working conditions for employees had not taken hold upon manufacturing companies. . . . Not the slightest provision had been made for the comfort of the employees, the idea being that something was gained by giving them as little and making the work as hard and unremitting as possible. (30)

If the workers in the sweatshop are not exactly raw material, they certainly have been dehumanized. Machines and the men who work them have become welded into “clattering automatons” (27), and Carrie, hunched over her hole-punching machine, becomes “one mass of dull, complaining muscles, fixed in an eternal position and performing a single mechanical movement which became . . . absolutely nauseating” (29). Such details about the mind-numbing, physically-exhausting, and morally-degrading conditions in the sweatshop, along with the even-more-detailed account of the strike, explain Yulia Palievskaya’s definition of *Sister Carrie* as “a historical document of our time” (14) revealing the unfolding Purpose of history, the global march towards Communism.

For socialist realist writers, the global march requires leadership by a “positive character” (Clark 176). Though conventionally endowed with such virtues as intelligence, will power, and moral integrity, the positive character is not simply a good man. “He is a hero illuminated by the light of the most ideal of all ideals [Communism]” (Tertz 172) and, putting it in words of Leonid Leonov, “a peak of humanity from whose height the future can be seen” (qtd. in Tertz 172). Always knowing right from wrong, the positive hero takes the most direct route to the Purpose, ready, as the father of socialist realism Maxim Gorky puts it, “fearlessly to perish in the struggle for it” (qtd. in Wolfe 23).
Some of these features are easily recognizable in Dreiser’s Robert Ames. A cousin of the rich and mercenary Mrs. Vance, Ames is clearly a positive character whose ideals oppose those of his cousin and the world she represents. This opposition resembles a convention in socialist realist fiction, the “use of mostly negative comparisons” (Tertz 153) to present positive ideals in the utmost splendor.

Most obviously, Ames’s idealism opposes the commodification of life characteristic of Dreiser’s fictional world. As Carrie ascends through various social layers, such as those of Minnie, Drouet, and Hurstwood, individuals become identified with the commodities they possess, which, besides having functional use, symbolize the social status, taste, and emotional quality of the owner. For example, Minnie’s flat, whose “walls . . . were discordantly papered” and whose floors “were covered with matting and the hall laid with a thin rag carpet” (9), suggests not only Sven Hanson’s lowly place in the social hierarchy (he cleans refrigerator cars in the stockyards) but the family’s “lean and narrow life” (9), a life without intimacy, beauty, and pleasure. Quite a different quality of existence, that of “a hundred dollars a week,” is symbolized by “a piano, a heavy piano lamp, with a shade of gorgeous pattern, a library table, several huge easy rockers . . . pictures . . . upon the walls . . . soft Turkish pillows upon the divan, footstools of brown plush upon the floor” (331) of the Wellington Hotel, where Carrie moves after her great breakthrough on Broadway. Here, at least potentially, is music and other forms of beauty (the piano and pictures), not discord; a thick (“plush”) sensuality, not a thin asceticism; a sense of life’s breadth (the Turkish pillows), not narrowness. But Soviet readers would also see in these commodities an image of capitalist excess as Carrie is inundated with sums of money far beyond any labor she has expended in earning it. (And they might find in the name Wellington a veiled allusion to the hero of Waterloo and the emerging imperialist struggle for world domination that the battle represents.)

Leisure activities also are a symbol of social class and quality of heart and mind. For instance, Hurstwood frequents expensive bars and comedy theatres, and his wife attends races, not because they really care about these activities but because of the social opportunities they provide for themselves and their daughter. Hurstwood’s socializing with his lodge brothers in the lobby of the Avery Theater before Carrie’s acting debut is an obvious example: “Look at him any time within the half hour before the curtain was up, he was a member of an eminent group—a rounded company of five or more whose stout figures, large white bosoms, and shining pins bespoke the character of their success” (131). “Character” here has nothing to do with
the men’s inner qualities, with their virtue and vice; it is simply the place in
the social hierarchy signified by their commodities, which have even usurped their owners’ power to speak.

According to Clare Eby, Dreiser’s views on the interdependence of economics and culture are indebted to Thorstein Veblen, whose “influence during Dreiser’s time was so pervasive that Dreiser could . . . have ‘read’ him without ever opening a single book” (8). Veblen argues that the desire to imitate the rich, what he calls “pecuniary emulation,” is “probably the strongest . . . of the economic motives proper” (qtd. in Eby 117) in Western culture. To gain the “esteem” of others, consumers surround themselves with the possessions and adopt the leisure activities of those they believe are higher in the social scale. Emulation keeps “the capitalist engine moving . . . the class structure in place” (Eby 5). Eby, quite appropriately, interprets *Sister Carrie* as a “microeconomic view of the psychology of desire” as Carrie continually re-creates herself by “assuming ever more elusive desires” (117).

However, the Soviet reading public, unfamiliar with Veblen’s ideas, would probably have viewed Dreiser’s critique of capitalism through the lens of Marx’s categories, primarily the category of commodity. In his *Capital*, Marx writes that “[t]he mysterious character of commodity-form consists . . . simply in the fact that the commodity reflects the social characteristics of men’s own labor as objective characteristics of the products of labor themselves, as the socio-natural properties of these things” (qtd. in Zayani 126). These social overtones detach commodities from the objective world and establish for them a fantastic world of their own, the world of commodity fetishism. The result is “an organized passivity” (126) among consumers, especially, as is the case in *Sister Carrie*, when the advertising industry has reached “the full development of an organized system of commercial information and persuasion, as part of the modern distributive system in conditions of large-scale capitalism” (Williams 417). As a result of this new power, notes Zayani, “the real consumer (driven by genuine needs) [turns] into a consumer of illusions (motivated by created desires)” (118). Illusion invades every aspect of sociality and makes it part of a controlled and programmed capitalist consumption.

Such control is revealed in *Sister Carrie* not only through characters’ pursuit of illusions in the form of objects and leisure activities but through their becoming commodities themselves. Decked out in expensive clothes and jewelry at Fitzgerald and Moy’s, Hurstwood is a sort of fetish object, considered “worth knowing” (33) by social climbers like Drouet primarily as a status symbol. As soon as Carrie’s image begins appearing in the maga-
zines and her name in the papers, she also becomes a fantastic object, a fetish with religious significance, for “gentlemen who prayed for an engagement” (333) in their mash notes.

Interesting in this respect is the fact that Mikhail Volosov, the novel’s first Soviet translator, persistently eliminated the specific dates that contribute to the original’s documentary effect. The result, Bassis argues, is an impression that American “capitalism has no future—only an unidentifiable past” (42). Thus, for generations of Russian readers, Dreiser’s depiction of capitalism resembled a static shot taken through the lens of Marxism-Leninism.

It is against this negative background that Ames stands out for the Soviet reader. Until recently, relatively little attention had been paid to Ames, who appeared mainly as an “impossibly perfect” (Moers 158) and static fictional spokesman for Dreiser’s own ideas. Some critics, however, have begun to find more complexity in his characterization. Stephen C. Brennan, for example, points out that “the young genius inventor and social theorist” is not simply an extension of Dreiser’s own personality but “a composite figure who has been linked with men Dreiser especially admired, most notably Edison and Tolstoy” (“Two Endings” 18). David Humphries reads Ames as “a dynamic character,” attention to whom “yields new insights” (36) into the novel’s themes. For Lawrence Hussman, an alert and close reader will detect in Ames many contradictions that can be explained only in terms of the formidable task Dreiser assigns to him as “a gloss of the modern experience and a recommendation for personal fulfillment in a naturalistically conceived world” (32).

Alert and close readers could also be found in the Soviet Union, but their interpretive activities would have been shaped by writers in the socialist realist tradition. “Just as the [medieval] icon painter looked to an ‘original’ to find the correct . . . colours for a given theme,” explains Clark, “the Soviet writers could copy the gestures, facial expression, actions, and symbols used in the text already pronounced canonical” (177). And some of these markers, towards which the Soviet reader was especially sensitive, are found in Robert Ames, who becomes for Carrie “an ideal to contrast men by” (239) and who represents for Soviet readers the traditional positive hero, “an emblematic figure whose biography was to function as a model for readers to emulate” (Clark 176).

Paradoxically, one such marker is something he does not have—the commodities, especially the clothes and jewelry, that express other characters’ class status and aspirations. Presenting Drouet in the first chapter, Dreiser is careful to portray him mainly as “a type of the traveling canvasser
for a manufacturing house” (3). With a precision of a social historian, Dreiser examines Drouet’s suit “of a striped and crossed pattern of brown wool, new at that time, but since become familiar as a business suit,” his “highly polished” shoes, and his “several rings” and “large, gold plate buttons, set with the common yellow agates known as ‘cat’s-eyes’” (3). Similarly, Hurstwood’s higher social class and “elegance” are revealed in clothes that do not “strike the eye so forcibly” as Drouet’s while being “particularly new and rich, . . . . The vest was of a rich Scotch plaid. . . . His cravat was a shiny combination of silken threads. . . . [His] shoes were of soft, black calf, polished only to a dull shine” (73; emphasis mine).

Strikingly different is the way Ames first impresses Carrie: “[She] caught in a glance the dimensions of a very stalwart figure. She also noticed that he was smooth-shaven, good looking, and young, but nothing more” (232; emphasis mine). Dissociated from commodities of the sort that characterize Drouet and Hurstwood, Ames enters the novel as an essentially classless figure. Moreover, his youth and physical strength invite comparison with the archetypal young socialist realist hero, who is “robust” (Clark 179) and “brimming with greater energy and initiative” (180) than the common man, whom he otherwise resembles. Indeed, as Carrie gets to know Ames a little better, she sees him as hero-like. Throughout the dinner at Sherry’s restaurant, he seems “wiser [not more elegant] than Hurstwood, saner and brighter [not richer] than Drouet”; he looks “innocent and clean”; he speaks “in an intelligent way”; and “[h]e’s so strong” (237).

Instead of selling manufactured goods or his personality to the rich, as Drouet and Hurstwood do, he is an inventor, the kind of creative occupation that frequently marks the positive character. That he is “connected with an electrical company” (233) is another positive signifier for the reader of socialist realist literature. According to one of the fathers of socialist realism, Andrei Zhdanov, intellectual history is nothing more than “the history of the birth, rise and development of the scientific world view and its laws” (qtd. in Tertz 159). Given the scientific theories that underlie much of the novel—the famous passage on evolution that opens Chapter VIII and the infamous use of poisonous “katastates” (240) to explain Hurstwood’s rapid dissolution come readily to mind—Dreiser no doubt intends Ames’s scientific background to lend authority to his pronouncements on morality and art.

Ames is also superior because of his moral integrity. He remains sympathetic to all “types of people,” allows “nothing sarcastic or supercilious” (237) to appear in his manner, and looks at Carrie as an individual. Unlike Hurstwood, Drouet, and Lola, the free-spirited chorus girl who be-
friends Carrie and sets her up with men later in the novel, Ames has “respect for the married state” and thinks “only of some pretty marriageable girls in Indianapolis” (232). Even though Dreiser changed his original intention of making Ames a perfect marriage partner for Carrie (Brennan, “Two Endings” 17–20), the inventor’s espousal of traditional family values seemingly validates the narrator’s earlier sentimental essay on “the beneficent influence” of a loving home and the “mystic chords which bind and thrill the heart of the nation” (63). These passages, which identify personal and national virtue, would strike a Soviet reader as a close rendering of official state mythology, according to which the nuclear family is second in importance only to the notion of the “Great Family” (socialist society in its entirety).

Even more significant is Ames’s explicit denunciation of commodity fetishism during the dinner at Sherry’s. While Carrie and the Vances are impressed by “the imprint of Sherry upon the napery, the name of Tiffany upon the silverware, the name of Haviland upon the china” (235), he simply denies the worth of a world where objects stand for people and vice versa. “Operating with reason and speaking with clarity” (West 60) in the company of people dazzled by the illusory qualities of wealth and material display, Ames undermines the very foundation of their values, stating that he “shouldn’t care to be rich. . . . A man doesn’t need this sort of thing to be happy” (237). Like his scientific researches, this affinity to reason—which at the end of evolution will enable “[t]he needle of understanding . . . [to] point steadfast and unwavering to the distant pole of truth” (57)—inspires trust in Ames’s other opinions, especially about art.

Ames’s first statement on art is highly ambiguous, however. When, after the Sherry’s dinner, the group attends a play, Carrie asks if Ames agrees that it’s “rather fine be an actor”; he replies, “Yes, I do, . . . to be a good one” (238) but fails to define “good.” Unknown to him, Carrie has already shown her ability to express the sincere feeling he will later identify with artistic genius, for in her Chicago days she has performed in an amateur performance of Under the Gaslight, briefly producing “radiating waves of feeling and sincerity” (135) that transcend the boundaries of the conventional melodrama.

By the time Carrie meets Ames again several years later, she has become a celebrated actress but not a good one. While still living comfortably in New York as Hurstwood’s wife, she is not only stirred to emulate “elegantly dressed ladies” (227) parading on Broadway but is also deluded by the plays she attends with Mrs. Vance. These “drawing-room concoctions” present “charmingly overdressed ladies and gentlemen” suffering
“pangs of love and jealousy amid gilded surroundings. . . . So affected was her mind by what she had seen, that the play now seemed an extraordinarily beautiful thing. She was soon lost in the world it represented, and wished never to return” (228–29). With Hurstwood’s fall, however, she finds herself in the same financial straits she was in upon her arrival in Chicago, and her job in the chorus line parallels her job in the sweatshop. Most obviously, both produce the alienation Marx attributes to labor under capitalism, reducing workers to pieces of machinery “with the aim of transforming the subjective element of labour into objective, measurable, controlled processes” (Cox). Thinking the theater “[b]lessed” and “above the common mass,” Carrie finds herself again subjected to grueling, repetitious, and demoralizing work. She had drilled leather in the shoe factory; now she finds herself “drilling” endlessly under the gaze of Mr. Millice, the chorus’s conductor, with his “insistence coupled with almost brutal roughness” and his “contempt for any assumption of dignity or innocence on the part of these young women” (280). Carrie is hardly an actress at all at this stage, much less a good one.

As Carrie moves out of the chorus and into character roles, her success is “measurable” not so much in terms of acting talent as in the growth of her dollar value. Carrie’s first achievement makes her “proud of her new laurels,” but she is “especially gratified to find that her salary was now eighteen instead of twelve” (290; emphasis mine). Carrie changes theaters and receives an engagement “at twenty per week,” only two dollars more, but she is so “delighted” that she began “to feel that she had a place in the world” (295). The minor role of a “modest sweetheart” (316) pays thirty-five dollars, a fact she finds astonishing and delighting. Her final “artistic” achievement brings the kind of newspaper celebrity guaranteed to make the play a hit and is accompanied by an amazing increase of her salary from thirty to one hundred and fifty dollars a week.

What is notable about this rise from the perspective of Soviet readers is that her salary is inversely proportional to the labor she performs. When Dreiser writes in the opening of Chapter VII that the “true meaning of money” has a moral basis as a symbol of “honestly stored energy” (47–48), he states a version of the labor theory of value. In New York, Carrie’s beginning salary of twelve dollars hardly seems sufficient representation of the grueling labor in the chorus, suggesting her exploitation by the capitalist owners. But the role that makes her a hit, the non-speaking part of “a silent little Quakeress,” requires no labor, virtually no talent, at all. Feeling “disconsolate” at the triviality of her part, Carrie frowns during the rehearsal of a comic “skit” (325) and creates such a ludicrous contrast with
the main action that the stage manager tells her to do the same on opening night. When the “portly gentlemen in the front rows,” bored at the performance, begin to focus on the incongruity her frown creates, she becomes an object of sexual fantasies, “a delicious little morsel” whose frown “they would have loved to force away with kisses. . . . She was capital” (326). The newspaper critic has it right the next day when he attributes Carrie’s success to the “characteristic perversity” (326) of the audience, not to Carrie’s ability.

Carrie’s response to the astounding quintupling of her salary reveals her enchantment by commodity fetishism:

“One hundred and fifty a week!” she murmured, when she was again alone. She found, after all—as what millionaire has not?—that there was no realizing, in consciousness, the meaning of large sums. It was only a shimmering, glittering phrase in which lay a world of possibilities. (327)

Carrie has become immersed in the “shimmering, glittering” world of unrestrained capitalism that Ames has explicitly repudiated. Equating Carrie with a millionaire and emphasizing her unconscious perception of the possibilities money has to offer, Dreiser shows here Carrie’s “popular understanding” of money, first encountered in Chapter VII, as “something everybody else has and I must get” (48). “[M]oney for her,” Michaels writes, “is never simply a means of getting what you want, it is itself the thing you want, indeed, it is itself your want” (33–34). “One of her order of mind,” Dreiser explains, “would have been content to be cast away upon a desert island with a bundle of money, and only the long strain of starvation would have taught her that in some cases it could have no value” (48). This understanding is close to Marx’s interpretation of money as a “universal pimp” (qtd. in Cox) mediating between men and their desires.

It is also significant that the “gentlemen” whose appreciation brings her such success consider her to be “capital,” for in a sense she embodies the mysterious process by which capital generates itself. As Marx writes, money is “an outstanding instance of capitalist fetishism, reaching its height in interest bearing capital. Here people think they see money creating more money, self-expanding value . . . and money itself is made the producer of wealth” (qtd. in Cox). As Carrie moves from theater to theater, circulating like capital, her value increases with almost every move, eighteen dollars a week becoming twenty dollars a week, as if the lower salary had generated the higher out of itself in the process of circulation, and thirty dollars a week becoming one hundred and fifty as public “interest” in Carrie is multi-
plied by mass advertising. In his desperate effort to halt his downward slide, Hurstwood too will attempt to make money out of money in high stakes poker games, but he is unable to convince the other gamblers that his bets represent the true value of his hands. Still, his failed bluffs, like Carrie’s success, express that fear of “stationary state” central to capitalist ideology. That Carrie’s attitude to her job as an actress makes her art part of a mechanical system of capitalism is, to the Soviet reader, shocking. And as such, it constitutes “an important part of the indictment of American culture and values that runs throughout the novel” (Brennan “Sister Carrie” 10). Or, as a Soviet critic puts it, “[h]aving climbed the social ladder, she cannot, nevertheless, identify herself with the rich and the prosperous because . . . she has risen only by means of a moral fall” (Zasursky, Teodor Dreiser 23).

Yet, for the Soviet reader, Carrie is somewhat vindicated by her idealism, her perpetual longing for something that would lift her “above the common run of clothes and material success” (323). Her ideal is voiced through Ames, the trustworthy positive hero whose ideas on art would resonate with Soviet readers because of their Tolstoyan basis. Even before the Socialist Revolution of 1917, as early as September 1908, Lenin proclaimed Tolstoy the “mirror of the Russian revolution.” Dismissing as irrelevant Tolstoy’s Christianity and the numerous contradictions in his philosophy, Lenin asserts that Tolstoy “must be appraised . . . from the standpoint of protest against advancing capitalism, against the ruining of the masses” (“Leo Tolstoy” 206). Elevating Tolstoy to the status of a “great writer,” Lenin established Tolstoyism as a criterion of art. For Zasursky, it is perhaps the lack of Tolstoyan breadth (Americanskaya Literatura 52) that keeps Stephen Crane from being the father of twentieth-century American literature and the obvious presence of Tolstoyism that qualifies Sister Carrie for the honor.

According to Brennan, Leo Tolstoy’s What To Do? and What Is Art? “had a significant effect on the characterization, structure, and theme of the novel” (“Sister Carrie” 2). Tolstoy roundly denounces elitist art, with its emphasis on beauty and technique, and identifies true art with emotional expression. As Brennan explains, “Tolstoy’s archetypal artist . . . is an actor who is able to express sincere emotion and arouse that same emotion in others who lack expressive ability” (5). In describing Carrie’s acting talent, Ames comes close to this idea:

Most people are not capable of voicing their feelings. They depend upon others. That is what genius is for. One man expresses their desires for them in music; another one in poetry; another one in a play.
Sometimes nature does it in a face—it makes the face representative of all desire. That’s what has happened in your case. (356)

Ames also echoes Tolstoy’s belief, expressed in What To Do? that artistic expression is among the “most burdensome of all man’s avocations; a cross, as the Gospels phrase it,” in that it requires “self-devotion, the sacrifice of self for . . . the benefit of others” (qtd. in Brennan, “Sister Carrie” 2). As Ames tells Carrie, the artist’s natural ability to communicate feelings brings “a burden of duty,” and the artist who rejects this duty will find that the talent “will go fast enough” (356).

Tolstoyan idealism has links with the official stance of the Communist Party, which placed immense responsibility on the painters, theater workers, and writers of the new partiinoye (standing on the platform of the Party) art. Speaking at the First All-Union Congress of Soviet Writers, Gorky stated that he and his fellows have

a strict responsibility for our work and social behaviour. That not only places us in the position, traditional for realistic literature, of “judges of the world and of the people,” and “critics of life,” but also entitles us to a direct participation in the construction of a new life and the process of “changing the world.” (265–66)

Though Ames is not himself a writer, when he speaks to Carrie of her duty he is certainly a critic of life who would change the world. The “weary” look on his face is due to “[h]ard work” (354), and his enthusiasm in educating Carrie expresses a broader interest “in forwarding all good causes” (357). Here is no aesthete but a hero who would unite his fellow workers of the world.

Another link between Dreiser and Tolstoy, intentional or not, involves the place of art in human evolution. For Tolstoy, sensitivity towards art distinguishes man as a higher being, for if “men lacked this . . . capacity of being infected by art, people . . . might be almost more savage . . . like wild beasts” (387–88). Such a view certainly permeates Sister Carrie, which presents mankind in “a middle stage,” evolving from the instinct-driven “beast” towards the “human” (56) life of reason and free will. As Carrie evolves, her growth is indicated in part by her improving taste in men and art. Neither Drouet nor Hurstwood is a wild beast, but the former is “a merry, unthinking moth of the lamp” (48) who enjoys mostly low-brow popular romances and comedies. Hurstwood, although “stronger and higher” (82) than Drouet, is not dramatically higher on the evolutionary scale as manager of a saloon described as “a strange, glittering night-flower, odour-yielding, insect-drawing, insect-infested rose of pleasure” (36). He
loves a “good time”—going “to the races, the theatres, the sporting enter-

tainments at some of the clubs” (34)—and is capable only of “giving the

commonplace rendition of approval” (82) to an actor in Chicago. Carrie

stands higher than both Drouet and Hurstwood. From the start, she has

“more taste” than Drouet and “a finer mental strain” (53). She progresses
towards the more advanced vision of art voiced by Ames, who not only re-

sponds emotionally to serious art but also understands it rationally. During

the dinner at Sherry’s he makes her realize that the pulp novels she has

liked are “not worth reading” (237), and it is on his advice that at the

novel’s end she is reading Balzac’s Père Goriot and catching almost “the

full sympathetic significance” (363) of a book exposing the heartless scram-

ble for place in Parisian society.

Despite his Tolstoyism and his resemblance to the conventional positive

character of socialist realism, Ames is only embryonically a true socialist

hero. Although illuminated by the Purpose, he is not “ready . . . to perish”

for it. Soviet critics explain this failing as owing to Dreiser’s relatively in-
mature ideas in 1900. “Not knowing the ways of fighting with capitalism,

condemned in the novel, Dreiser does not see his positive character among

the striking workers. . . . [F]logging the capitalist America, the writer has

not yet created his program of struggle. Important, however, is the fact that

Sister Carrie initiates this struggle which is . . . to lead the writer to his new

program—Communism” (Zasursky, Teodor Dreiser 29). Viewed thus as

still in a middle state, the novel becomes the first great instance of an

American art of the Purpose.

A final consideration in relation to Dreiser’s popularity in the Soviet Un-

ion is his prose style. To a certain extent, the “roughness and ungainli-

ness” (Trilling 41) of Dreiser’s prose was smoothed by the translator Mik-

hail Volosov, who, following “the policy of language adopted by the Com-

munist Party” (Bassis 45), tried to impose more or less proper Russian

grammar and idiom on the original. As a consequence, the Russian Sister

Carrie is largely devoid of slang (44) and much “less saturated with super-

fluous language than the original” (50). Still, Soviet critics, like Dreiser’s

American admirers, defended his style as an expression of his roots in the

soil of the working class. As Lionel Trilling mockingly summarizes such
defenses, “when Dreiser thinks stupidly, it is because he has the slow stub-

bornness of a peasant; when he writes badly, it is because he is impatient of

the sterile literary gentility of the bourgeoisie” (39). It is precisely his peasan-

t roots and his absence of a genteel education that, for Palievskaya, put

Dreiser on the same level with the giants of socialist realism such as Gorky,

Sholochov, and Tvardovsky (3).
In summary, it is the presence of the two main principles of socialist realism, the Purpose and the positive hero, that makes *Sister Carrie* appear to possess “partiinost”, adherence to the ideological position of the Communist Party. The ease by which Soviet critics and readers could discover *partiinost* in the book to a large extent explains its immense popularity in the former Soviet Union, thus clarifying the high position of Dreiser’s first novel in world literature.

**Note**

1. This and all other translations are mine unless the work being quoted is already a translation. I wish to thank Mrs. Vera Volkova, Dr. Susanna Ashton, and Mrs. Barbara Ramirez for help with this essay.
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Herland and Hisland: Illness and “Health” in the Writings of Charlotte Perkins Gilman and Theodore Dreiser

Hildegard Hoeller
College of Staten Island, CUNY

Wednesday, January 7th Worked all morning at story, but without success. Gave it up at noon and went down town where I secured Smith college stories, read in Nicolay Life of Lincoln and saw Coates. Did not feel very well during morning and afternoon but ate a moderate dinner at six and came home to try to read. (Dreiser, American Diaries 81)

Wednesday 12 Find that I am really low again. O dear! It is so long.—Try to write something on Social Evolution to rest my brain. . . . (Gilman, Abridged Diaries 170)

Monday Dec. 22—(Day) After my fair sleep of the night I fancied I was going to have a good day, mentally, but unfortunately it was not to be so. Physically I was apparently well enough, but mentally I was incapable of consecutive thought as a child. Tried to write a story but went entirely to peices [sic], became sick of it. . . . (Dreiser, American Diaries 75)

Fri. Aug. 28, 1896. Up at 8:20 or so. Answer notes. Try to write—can not. Brain will not work. I notice, gradually in the past month or two, a loss of my ready control of words.—aphasia? (Gilman, Abridged Diaries 171)
“Illness is the night-side of life,” writes Susan Sontag in *Illness as Metaphor*, “a more onerous citizenship. Everyone who is born holds dual citizenship, in the kingdom of the well and in the kingdom of the sick. Although we all prefer to use only the good passport, sooner or later each of us is obliged, at least for a spell, to identify ourselves as citizens of that other place” (3). Suffering from neurasthenia, Charlotte Perkins Gilman and Theodore Dreiser had to use both passports throughout their lives. The astonishingly similar entries in their illness diaries describe their long residence in the kingdom of the sick. They also forcefully highlight both writers’ greatest fear about illness: aphasia, the end of their lives as writers and thinkers. Dreiser reports going “to pieces” when trying to write and losing the ability to have a “consecutive thought,” just as Gilman notes that her “[b]rain will not work” and that she is losing her “ready control of words.” Both diaries suggest, in turn, that writing about their illness offers them a third point of view, a voice that is at once doctor and patient, well and sick. Dreiser’s and Gilman’s “dual citizenship” is central to their lives, and it offers critics one way to examine the strong—and hitherto largely unexplored—connections between their writings.

Both authors produced narratives about their illness and their treatments: Gilman most directly in “The Yellow Wallpaper” (1892) and Dreiser most directly in the less well-known autobiographical fragment *An Amateur Laborer*, probably written in 1904 (Dowell xxxi) but not published until 1983. Gilman’s story, of course, would become her most famous piece of writing, centralizing her illness in the critical narrative of her life and work; to many twentieth century feminist critics, Gilman’s story, while based on her illness experience, is a sophisticated fiction about the plight of all women. Dreiser’s account, on the other hand, has interested critics primarily as a biographical document and has not played a central role in assessments of his other work. These very opposite critical fates perhaps explain why the two texts have never been read together. Yet many of the features that have made Gilman’s narrative canonical can also be found in *An Amateur Laborer*.

While Dreiser and Gilman continued to write about their illnesses in both fiction and non-fiction, they also produced what I will call “health narratives.” For those struggling with illness, especially perplexing, culturally loaded, and metaphorized illnesses such as neurasthenia, health itself might become a utopian space. Dreiser’s *The Financier* (1912) and Gilman’s *Herland* (1915) are health narratives that offer a utopian vision of health that is the very mirror of their authors’ illness. Yet like illness, these narratives seem to say, health comes with the price of the very thing both
authors cherished: the ability to write.

Bringing together their illness diaries, “The Yellow Wallpaper” and An Amateur Laborer, and Herland and The Financier, I will here explore largely overlooked connections between Dreiser and Gilman. Even though these two contemporaries shared an interest in evolution and socialism, offered trenchant critiques of capitalism, felt an aversion to bourgeois morality and conventional ideas of marriage, and challenged the restrictive gender roles of the day, critics have treated them separately. There are virtually no cross-listings in indexes of books on either writer, and the MLA bibliography lists not a single article that explores the relation between them. It appears that this surprisingly uncharted territory results from the critical tendency to assess Gilman in Herland and Dreiser in his: the former in the realm of feminism and utopianism, the latter in the world of realism and naturalism. Concentrating on both writers’ concerns with their illness and its treatment and their ambivalent fantasies about “health,” I wish to issue them visas to a place where they are fellow citizens.

His and Her Illness

In the late nineteenth century, neurasthenia was diagnosed more and more frequently as an affliction of the upper middle class caused by the demands of modern life. Whether it was or not, “observers believed nervousness was on the rise, and treated its spread as a cultural problem” (Lears 51), especially as a problem of gender transgression. As Gail Bederman writes,

[T]he implications of neurasthenia differed for men and women, according to medical experts. Whereas men became neurasthenics because the mental labors of advanced civilization drained them of the nervous energy necessary to build a strong, masculine body, women became neurasthenics when they tried to combine their normal function—motherhood—with the masculine, enervating intellectual demands of modern civilization. (130)

Medical diagnoses thus were intimately linked to gender ideology. Treatment of the illness meant that women were relegated to the domestic sphere while men were trained to strengthen themselves in outdoor activities. Neurasthenia was understood and treated as a disease of gender transgression, a disorder that afflicted those who did not conform to increasingly outmoded gender stereotypes.

Both Dreiser and Gilman fell ill within this highly charged cultural context. While their illness diaries clearly record similar symptoms, doctors in-
terpreted and treated their ailments differently. Dowell notes that as early as 1899 Dreiser suffered from insomnia and a “tension-related illness” (xi) but that the “commercial failure” of Sister Carrie and the death of his father on Christmas day of 1900 worsened his condition (xii). Dreiser later recalled a “black storm of combined ill-health and morbid depression” (qtd. in Dowell xii) afflicting him at the time. Through the following years, Dreiser would experience difficulties writing, growing increasingly desperate and poor. Almost four years after the first symptoms, in October of 1903, he began treatment for “nervous exhaustion” with Dr. Louis Adolphus Duhring, a well known Philadelphia dermatologist. Duhring prescribed various medications and got Dreiser to record his daily symptoms. Although he had a number of physical problems ranging from headache to skin irritations to digestive disturbances, his “overriding concern . . . was insomnia and the attendant emotional instability: listlessness, depression, irritability, and an incapacity to sustain mental activities. In particular, he noted that his imagination had abandoned him and that his power to reason was greatly diminished” (xvi–xvii). Duhring’s treatment did not help, and, as his condition worsened, Dreiser fell into abject poverty and depression. “He was saved,” as Thomas Riggio reports, “by his brother Paul, who fed and clothed him and paid his way to Muldoon’s health spa in White Plains” (13).

In what Kathy Frederickson calls William Muldoon’s “body shop of shame,”6 the Olympia sanitarium, Dreiser experienced a world of severe control and exercise, which he describes at length in An Amateur Laborer. Swanberg portrays Muldoon as “a human tiger despite his sixty-odd years, [who] had a contempt for weakness and a conviction that the way to cure it was exercise and an army discipline that bordered on savagery—a regimen he got away with because his patients were in mortal terror of him” (106). In An Amateur Laborer Dreiser describes the daily routines in the sanitarium, in which every act is regulated and enforced under the pressure of punishment. “The main thing I soon discovered was to get to your meal on time and to eat what was set before you,” he writes. Patients tried their best to comply because Muldoon “did not hesitate to enforce his commands with oaths and blows” (70). Dreiser narrates in detail his desperate attempt to take a one-minute shower in the exact way specified by Muldoon, as well as the extensive and exhausting outdoor exercises such as horseback riding. Muldoon’s treatment—to which Dreiser responded and which did help him—clearly enforced a form of extreme and somewhat outmoded masculinity as a cure. It was thus a perfect response to the medical interpretation of “male” neurasthenia as a failure of masculinity.

Conversely, Gilman’s neurasthenia was perceived as a failure in femi-
ninity. Gilman suffered her first “bout of depression” in 1882, when she rejected Walter Stetson’s marriage proposal. Her depression continued through the next few years, during which she accepted the proposal and married Stetson. In 1885 after the birth of her child Katherine, her condition worsened into “hysteria,” and in 1886 she was subjected to Dr. S. Weir Mitchell’s rest cure (Bauer 31). Mitchell’s famous cure, like Muldoon’s, was designed to restore traditional gender roles. Thus, while Dreiser was made to ride horses, Gilman was forced to stay in bed doing nothing. As Muldoon stressed vigorous activity for his male patients, Mitchell stressed idleness and passivity for the women in his care. Ultimately, when Gilman was sent home “cured,” Mitchell prescribed “a regimen that stressed domestic life” (Erskine and Richards 4), which “almost drove [her] insane” (6). Despite their opposite prescriptions, both treatments infantilized their patients, and both made artistic creation impossible.

**Horrors of Imprisonment: Illness, Gender, and Metaphors**

Much the way medical science treated Gilman’s and Dreiser’s illnesses, literary criticism has treated their illness narratives in separate and gendered ways. In “Why I Wrote ‘The Yellow Wallpaper,’” which she published in her own magazine *Forerunner* in 1913, Gilman gives a very pragmatic reason for her story: “It was not intended to drive people crazy, but to save people from being driven crazy, and it worked” (349). Yet, once the story was rediscovered by twentieth century feminists, the narrator’s confinement and insanity have consistently been read as typifying the plight of all women rather than as simply warning against Mitchell’s rest cure. Sandra Gilbert and Susan Gubar make that case in their classic reading of Gilman’s story in the context of “a uniquely female tradition in this period” (85). “The Yellow Wallpaper” to them is the “paradigmatic tale, which (like *Jane Eyre*) seems to tell the story that all literary women would tell if they could speak their ‘speechless woe’ ” (89). This metaphorical reading is consistent with the predominantly feminist critical assessments of Gilman’s entire work.

*An Amateur Laborer*, on the other hand, has been largely read as the account of one man’s emotional crisis rather than as speaking to the fates of, let’s say, all literary men. Dowell, for example, considers it to be a record of “uncompromising and verifiable truth” whose publication “should do much to separate fact from fiction” (xlix). Yet, when writing it and before, Dreiser had thought of the imaginative possibilities of such an illness narrative and had always remained ambivalent about its nature. Lingeman reports that
after beginning the book Dreiser “could never decide whether to make it autobiographical . . . or to recast it as a novel” (*Theodore Dreiser: At the Gates* 381–82). In addition, Stephen C. Brennan rightly argues in his reading of *An Amateur Laborer* that “the neurotic makes a history, or, as psychoanalysts are wont to say, makes a personal myth. The ‘I’ of the analysand is always a fictional construct existing only in language and expressing the truth of the unknowable self only as the last link in a chain of metonymical and synecdochal signifiers” (67). Nonetheless, Dreiser’s male illness narrative has never been probed for the kind of meanings feminists have found readily in Gilman’s female text. This may be so because Dreiser’s work as a whole has been mostly discussed within the male traditions of realism and naturalism. These traditions, unlike Gilman’s feminist context, do not specifically invite close attention to the metaphoricity of Dreiser’s illness narrative and its images of confinement. In a way, gender thus accounts not only for the divergent medical treatments of both writers’ illnesses but also for the different literary interpretations of their illness narratives.  

This parallel gendering of medical and literary discourse can be traced back to the late nineteenth century when, most famously, William Dean Howells used the medical discourse of his time metaphorically to argue that male literary realism provided a “healthy” (*Criticism* 9) alternative to the neurosis of female sentimental writing and, in his programmatic novel *The Rise of Silas Lapham*, had the Reverend Sewell associate such writing with female excess and “psychical suicide” (183). In turn, for naturalists like Frank Norris, even the realism of a William Dean Howells was too feminine, merely “the drama of a broken teacup” and not a representation of “life” (172). Naturalism, as Donna Campbell points out, “grew in part as a gender-based countertradition not only to realism but to female-dominated local color writing” (5). Late twentieth-century reconsidereations of American sentimental writing and the American canon have furthermore revealed that these gendered genre definitions have had a lasting impact in American literary critical discourse, which has continued to cast American writing in separate spheres (Hoeller 23–24). This explains why the two writers’ illness narratives have never been read together.

Yet when one reads Dreiser’s account of imprisonment in dingy Brooklyn rooming houses next to Gilman’s text, the gender differences between *An Amateur Laborer* and “The Yellow Wallpaper” largely disappear. When men write tales of imprisonment, Gilbert and Gubar argue, they are more “comfortable” than women in imposing a “visionary theme” on the situation: “The distinction between male and female images of imprisonment
is—and always has been—a distinction between, on the one hand, that which is both metaphysical and metaphorical, and on the other hand, that which is social and actual” (86). I would argue, however, that both Gilman’s and Dreiser’s illness narratives are equally grounded in the “social and actual” and are equally expressive of the “metaphysical and metaphorical.”

Most obviously, both narratives contain gothic elements. Much as Gilman’s narrator believes herself to be in a “haunted house” (“Yellow” 29) and begins to “creep” (46), Dreiser’s narrator describes how he “daily crept to my room haunted by the most dreadful sense of impending disaster” (Amateur 14). This room, “the smallest room I have ever lived in in my life” (23) becomes the place of the “dreadiest” part of Dreiser’s life. Gilbert and Gubar argue that women’s confinement narratives—including Gilman’s—are often able to capture the “anxiety-inducing connections between what women writers tend to see as their parallel confinements in texts, houses, and maternal bodies” (89). In such works, spatial imagery contains multiple meanings and at its most intense culminates often in the vision of what Ellen Moers calls the “female Gothic” (qtd. in Gilbert and Gubar 83). Dreiser’s An Amateur Laborer fits into this definition of the gothic. It begins with a gothic voice, and it gains power precisely from capturing the “anxiety-producing” connection between different confinements: that of the writer, that of the pauper, and that of the patient. Throughout the narrative, Dreiser links health and wealth, showing not only that prosperity and well-being go together but also that, trapped on the “nightside” of America, a sick and poor author is invisible and unable, independently, to make sense of the world.

Both narratives show the struggle of a sick mind to impose order and meaning on a world of increasing chaos. Lingeman reports that Dreiser “spent most of his time staring at an evil brown stain on the peeling wallpaper where the rain had leaked in” (Theodore Dreiser: At the Gates 362). Dreiser’s narrator stares at other dismal sights: “A spider weaving its net in a window ledge; a house fly caught in the toils of some untoward paste and slowly dragging out its life in a vain effort to obtain its freedom . . . oh how I gazed at these spectacles of misery, feeding my cankered soul upon the heartlessness and brutality of it and asking myself over, and over and over—why?” (Amateur 24). Even after long pondering the spectacle, he cannot understand the struggle: “If nature were wise . . . why conceal it? . . . What purpose was served by so vast, so grim, so merciless a strife? There was none. It was all a great cruel mystery” (24). At the same time, he—like the woman narrator in “The Yellow Wallpaper”—begins to have trouble
making out lines and patterns and begins to see things in strange angles: “I began to have the idea or hallucination that angles or lines of everything—houses, streets, wall pictures, newspaper columns and the like, were not straight and for the life of me I could not get them to look straight” (26). Gilman’s narrator, too, struggles with the lines in the wallpaper, complaining that they “plunge off at outrageous angles” (“Yellow” 32) and cannot be made to adhere to any known principles of order: “I determine for the thousandth time that I will follow that pointless pattern to some sort of conclusion. I know a little about the principle of design, and I know this thing was not arranged on any laws of radiation, or alternation, or repetition, or symmetry, or anything I have ever heard of” (37). Gilman and Dreiser depict the horror of an illegible world in which interpretation and observation fail. Despite desperate attempts to read from all possible perspectives, at the height of their illness their world defies categorization, structure, and meaning.

This horror is aggravated by insomnia, which enforces endless hours of this futile reading. “And worst of all,” writes Dreiser, “my insomnia seemed to be racking the soul out of me. I do not know when I ever suffered such tortures. Night after night I used to lie in my little uncomfortable bed thinking, thinking through the long stretches of silence, and wondering what was to become of me and how I was to get well” (Amateur 24). Sometimes, he thinks, he will even “go mad” (25) without sleep. Similarly, it is when Gilman’s narrator lies sleepless in the moonlight studying the wallpaper that her incipient madness asserts itself: “I . . . lay there for hours trying to decide whether that front pattern and the back pattern really did move together or separately” (“Yellow” 41).

Insomnia frees the imagination and leads to a splitting of the personality. In a state of “strange half-wakefulness” resembling a dream, Dreiser recalls,

> I seemed to lose consciousness of that old, single individuality which was me and to become two persons. One of these was a tall, thin, greedy individual who had struggled and thought always for himself and how he should prosper, but was now in a corner and could not get out, and the other was a silent, philosophical soul who was standing by him, watching him in his efforts and taking an indifferent interest in his failures. (Amateur 25)

Often when lying alone in his room, he hears footsteps—“a person perhaps or a spirit”—and feels a hand on his pillow, causing him to “jump up and look about me, terrified and cold with sweat” (25). Like Gilman’s narrator, who at times sees one woman in the wallpaper and at times sees “a great
many women” (“Yellow” 45), the sick Dreiser peoples his lonely sickroom, finding himself in conflict with imagined others.

Both Dreiser and Gilman ultimately dramatize the effort to transcend the limits of their solipsistic worlds. Even when outside his room, Dreiser’s narrator struggles against a sense of confinement: “Always when I was walking I would look straight ahead, wondering at the obstruction which fixed objects like houses and trees offered to a direct progress and feeling an irresistible desire to be rid of them or to go right through them” (Amateur 26). The same impulse appears in Gilman’s narrator, who, locked in her own room with its barred window, first fancies people walking freely through the “numerous paths and arbors” (“Yellow” 34) of the daylight outside world, then in the moonlight imagines that the wallpaper’s surface pattern “becomes bars” (42) confining a woman, then hallucinates that the woman “gets out in the daytime” (45), and finally succeeds in freeing the woman from her prison.

In both narratives the desire for a world of permeable walls is connected with linearity, that desire of the sick mind to find patterns of straight lines amidst the confusion of things. Circularity thus becomes the logical figure for insanity. Failing to get the “angles or lines of everything” to “look straight,” Dreiser recounts, he felt “the strangest desire to turn around, as if I must go in a circle whether I would or not, which was nothing more or less than pure insanity” (Amateur 26). One cannot help but recall Gilman’s narrator’s failed “great effort . . . to think straight” (“Yellow” 39), especially the chilling final scene when she creeps over her unconscious husband to resume her insane journey along her “path by the wall” (50), presumably inserting her shoulder into the “long, straight, even smooch” that goes nowhere: “Round and round and round—round and round and round—it makes me dizzy” (45).

These numerous parallels between the two narratives—the creeping, the insomnia, the failed attempts at interpreting things, the splitting of the self, the turning of linear efforts into circular movement—challenge Gilbert and Gubar’s distinction between male and female texts of imprisonment. Both narratives occupy a middle ground between the “actual and social” and the “metaphysical and metaphorical,” and to the extent that they push towards the latter they may be read as parables of the plight of the American writer, male or female.

Attention to the splitting of the self in both narratives supports such a reading. When Dreiser describes his “single individuality” dividing into one self that is “greedy” and self-interested and another that is his “philosophical,” “sane,” and “conservative oversoul” (Amateur 27), his ref-
erence to Emerson’s oversoul connects his split to the ideological split in America between capitalism, which requires single-minded, self-interested struggle, and the idealism of the transcendentalists, who envisioned a transcendent space of harmony, beauty, and universality. Indeed, when returning to his “bleak room” after another failed attempt to secure a position at a magazine and make money with his writing, the “oversoul,” Dreiser writes, “laughed at me as I stared hopelessly out of the window” (27).

Dreiser’s attitude towards his oversoul resembles Gilman’s narrator’s towards her husband, who, when she becomes obsessed about the wallpaper, “laughs at me so” (“Yellow” 33) and whose disdain she later projects onto the “awful pattern” of the wallpaper, which “began to laugh at me” (47). In her heart, she believes that John’s antagonism towards the imaginative life is wrong, yet she feels “basely ungrateful” for resenting his “very careful and loving” (31) suppression of her creativity and tells herself he won’t listen to her “because he is so wise, and because he loves me so” (40). Dreiser’s narrator is equally defensive of and dependent on his oversoul. Despite the fact that this superior being looks at him “as I looked upon those flies I had so often seen caught in the paste of a paper, or the moths that I watched turning about my lamp and burning their wings,” the narrator excuses him as being a “very wise and sane” being who “would not go crazy” and who “would bring me through” (Amateur 27). But in neither narrative does the representative of sanity bring the sick writer through. The splitting of the self, in each narrative, expresses the dread of the failure, even the impossibility, of art in a world that values survival at the expense of imagination.

In that sense, Dreiser’s fantasies, like Gilman’s, encode his desire as a writer to move on, creating linear narratives rather than going in circles as the mad, silenced writer does. “Always when I was sitting in a chair,” Dreiser’s narrator reports as if speaking about the moment when he sits down to write, “I would keep readjusting it—trying to bring myself into correct alignment with something” (26). But he never finds the right position to align himself with the world around him. “At the same time if I were reading a newspaper,” he continues, “I would keep turning it from angle to angle trying to get the columns to look straight, a thing which they never did” (26). The narrator cannot see the paper or the world—two important sources for Dreiser’s own works—straight and thus fails to achieve one goal of a writer, to understand how the world is organized. Nor can he satisfy his need for transparency and permeability, the author’s need to penetrate the world around him, to see through it to its underlying meaning. The room Dreiser describes is indeed the “dreariest” he can imagine, that of abject
poverty, disease, and aphasia.

In both narratives, the writer’s dilemma seems unsolvable. Gilman’s narrator may have achieved a moment of triumph as she crawls over her husband’s body, but her path is circular and her husband will wake in a few moments to reassert his will. She rejects the thought of hurling herself out the window and doesn’t “like to look out the windows even” at the many “creeping women” she imagines out there. Before her husband’s arrival, she supposes she will “have to get back behind the pattern” (“Yellow” 49) at nightfall, and the chances are that she is right. In short, the ending of the “Yellow Wallpaper” is, as many critics have observed, tragic since it does not offer a “healthy” solution but leaves the narrator in utter madness. The one implied liberation of the story lies in Gilman’s being able to look back on her illness and to give it meaning in a linear narrative.

Dreiser never completed An Amateur Laborer, but the twenty-four chapters he did finish constitute a “continuous narrative” (West liii), and the fragmentary Chapter XXV the editors have appended does end the published work on a note surprisingly similar to that of Gilman’s ending. The book begins with an apparently triumphant first paragraph:

> After a long battle I am once more the possessor of health. That necessary poise in which the mind and body reflect the pulsations of the infinite is mine. I am not overconscious. I trust I am not under so. All that is, now passes before me a rich, varied and beautiful procession. I have fought a battle for the right to live and for the present, musing with stilled nerves and a serene gaze, I seem the victor. (3)

Returning to this paragraph after reading the entire narrative, we see that the narrator has seemingly healed his split psyche; the philosophical “oversoul” has become integrated into a not “overconscious” state of “poise” between mind and body. The linear and circular have also been brought into harmony, as the recurring “pulsations” of the cosmos express themselves in the “beautiful procession” of life. But in the end, the “I” of the narrative proves the importance of the word “seem” in his sense of victory. After leaving Muldoon’s apparently well on the mend, Dreiser has spent some two weeks as an amateur manual laborer in the Spuyten Duyvil carpentry shop of the New York Central Railroad. But being “safely ensconced” in the labor world still has a “depressing effect,” for, like his Brooklyn rooming house, the carpentry shop denies him “the freedom of the world outside” (123). Obviously, he has not yet received his good passport: “I went over in my mind the various afflictions of my recent days and wondered whether I should ever really recover from them. To get maimed as an insect. To get a
hurt that would not heal” (124). He has come full circle. He will always, he implies at the end, stay on the “nightside” of life, never fully regaining his citizenship in the land of the healthy.

Like the texts of women writers Gilbert and Gubar discuss, An Amateur Laborer is about multiple confinements—though in illness, poverty, and aphasia rather than in texts, houses, and maternal bodies; it is, indeed, paradoxically in many ways a “female Gothic” text. Reading it together with “The Yellow Wallpaper” questions the assumptions about illness, gender, and metaphors that have led to such widely divergent critical treatments; it lets the two authors speak to each other in the “kingdom of the sick”—a land that was for both frighteningly real and horrifically figurative.

**Realism, Feminism, and the “Far Country” of Health**

When, in the last line of her poem “Tulips,” the recovering Sylvia Plath speaks of “a country far away as health,” she envisions a utopian space that the sick person finds unreachable. Gilman in Herland (1915) and Dreiser in The Financier (1912) create such utopian visions of “health” as mirror fantasies to their horrifyingly dark illness narratives. As Janet Beer argues, “there is an ideal republic in Gilman’s imagination, and its health and fitness haunt her fiction. . . . Her fictional utopia contrasts implicitly with her autobiography” (67). While Gilman’s work is obviously in the utopian tradition, Dreiser only hints at the utopian element in his creation of Cowperwood. As he wrote William Lengel while researching The Financier in 1911, “I should like to see a race of people . . . for once on this earth who like Niccolo Machiavelli could look life in the face” (qtd. in Swanberg 146). Though he did base his hero on the street-railway tycoon Charles T. Yerkes, Dreiser yet, as Richard Lingeman writes, “transformed the historical Yerkes into . . . a projection of his own psyche. The cool self-contained, supremely confident Cowperwood was the beau ideal of his anxiety-ridden, sometimes gauche creator” (Theodore Dreiser: An American 66). Both Herland’s citizens and Frank Cowperwood are almost perfect opposites to the hallucinating and humiliated narrators of the illness narratives.

Significantly, the health of Herland involves the absence of the very illness that plagued its author. “We had expected hysteria, and found a standard of health and vigor, a calmness of temper” (Gilman, Herland 69; my emphasis), writes Gilman’s narrator. There is no female hysteria because there is no oppressive bourgeois motherhood. As the narrator reports,

And the mother instinct, with us so painfully intense, so thwarted by conditions, so concentrated in personal devotion to a few, so bitterly
hurt by death, disease, and barrenness, and even by the mere growth of the children, leaving the mother alone in her empty nest—all this feeling with them flowed out in a strong, wide current, unbroken through generations, deepening and widening through the years, including every child in all the land. (81)

The dash in the middle of this quote—almost functioning as a mirror—holds up an image of health against an image of illness much like that presented in “The Yellow Wallpaper.” Before the dash, in the image of the woman “alone in her empty nest,” there is a suggestion of the short story’s circular entrapment; after the dash is an image of maternal love as an irresistible linear force that promises to leave no child behind.

In opposition to the narrator of “The Yellow Wallpaper,” women in Herland are “clear-eyed and intelligent” (Gilman, Herland 53); they see everything in its right proportion, with perfect clarity, openness, and understanding. As Gilman’s male narrator affirms, the women are not only “deeply wise” but characterized by “the most perfect patience and good nature” and “the absence of irritability” (40). This emphasis on the impressive lack of irritability shows how much Gilman’s vision is haunted by her illness narrative. “I get unreasonable angry with John sometimes,” the narrator writes in “The Yellow Wallpaper.” “I am sure I never was so sensitive. I think it is due to this nervous condition” (31). Almost every passage in Herland suggests—both in form and content—that the poised, rational, cool, and patient women of Herland are healthy alter-egos to the nervously depressed narrator of “The Yellow Wallpaper.”

The same can be said of The Financier in its relation to An Amateur Laborer. The sick Dreiser would wonder at the fate of a fly on the wall but never solve “the mystery” of who made this suffering world and why. On the other hand, the healthy Frank Cowperwood, “a sturdy youth, courageous and defiant” (Dreiser, Financier 4), watches a lobster eat a squid in a fishmonger’s tank and immediately understands the Darwinian struggle that informs life:

It answered in a rough way that riddle which had been annoying him so much in the past: “How is life organized?” Things lived on each other—that was it. Lobsters lived on squids and other things. What lived on lobsters? Men, of course. Sure, that was it! And what lived on men? He asked himself. Was it other men? . . . Sure, men lived on men. (13–14)

Shortly thereafter, the boy hero decides to go into banking, a financial men-eat-men world that in some ways represents the most developed form of the
universal struggle for existence. Throughout the narrative, Dreiser continues to stress Cowperwood’s ability to see clearly, his “clairvoyance” (106). Cowperwood “could see how it was” (22); “clearly, very clearly, at nineteen, twenty, and twenty-one years of age, he saw all this” (85); his “clearseeing eyes . . . took it all in at a glance” (691). Cowperwood’s Social Darwinism here functions not so much as Dreiser’s own thesis but as his metaphor for his “healthy” character. As Donald Pizer argues in “The Problem of Philosophy in the Naturalistic Novel,” an author’s philosophical comments may serve “principally a metaphoric function” (114), the famous passage in Sister Carrie on “untutored man” as a “wisp in the wind,” for example, serving more as “an apology for Carrie’s impending choice of an immoral life” (116) than as an expression of Dreiser’s philosophical determinism. A fictional character’s philosophizing can function similarly, as when Jennie Gerhardt’s Lester Kane, in declaring “all of us . . . more or less pawns . . . moved about like chessmen,” expresses only a “personal truth”—most obviously his own “sense of ineffectualness . . . and a covert supernaturalism” (Pizer, Novels 119). Cowperwood’s ability to read the world in Darwinian terms is a metaphor for health, mental and physical; it makes the sturdy, clear-minded Cowperwood a utopian alter-ego to the fragile “cankerled soul” of the illness narrative.

While illness in An Amateur Laborer is connected with abject, life-threatening poverty, health in The Financier is connected with financial brilliance. “He was to be rich, very rich,” Dreiser writes of the young Cowperwood, “because he was strong, young, healthy, shrewd, subtle. And he did not dream” (153). When Cowperwood goes to prison for misusing public funds, the severe test of his health and wealth evokes the gothic horror of the illness narrative. The prison has a “somewhat melodramatic and stagy appearance” (680) with its “great Gothic gate,” “its iron-riveted door and its sentinel towers and the dreary expanse of high wall disappearing on either side” (679). Like Dreiser’s narrator in An Amateur Laborer, Cowperwood feels “degraded” and “depressed” (688), “very strange, very humiliated, very downcast” (689). Enduring this “horrible fate” (697), he, like the ill Dreiser, suffers from insomnia and “sits in his single chair, meditating” (698) and “[cogitating] while the hours slipped by” (698). But when Dreiser comments that “The strongest have their hours of depression” (700; my emphasis), he reveals the fleeting nature of such a state for a healthy mind. Unlike the Dreiser of An Amateur Laborer, Cowperwood “bore it all like a stoic” (723), for “such a man could not be conquered” and never loses his “level gaze” (758). “Cowperwood’s imprisonment is the beginning of the second rise to wealth and power,” Pizer argues. “In prison he maintains
his poise and self-confidence and even continues to conduct his business affairs” (179–80). After his release, when a financial panic gives the opportunity for renewing his fortune, Cowperwood rises above the “panic-struck” common lot of financiers because he remains “perfectly calm, deadly cold . . . vigorous and energetic” (441). Till the end of the novel, he possesses a vitality and equilibrium that identify him as a citizen of the “far country” of health.

Strangely enough, however, for both Gilman and Dreiser health is not compatible with writing. Gilman’s male character Terry proclaims the literature of Herland to be “[p]retty punk” (Herland 38) and judges the plays to be especially inept: “They make me sick” (85; emphasis mine). Gilman’s narrator, who normally defends Herland against Terry’s views, cannot help but agree: “He rather had us there. The drama of the country was—to our taste—rather flat” (85). Similarly, while Cowperwood has many strengths, he “care[s] nothing for books” (Dreiser, Financier 10) and considers literature merely “silly” (26). The “healthy” Cowperwood, whose motto throughout the novel is “I satisfy myself,” reminds one of that “greedy” self Dreiser imagined in his sick room, who “struggled and always thought for himself and how he should prosper,” in contrast to that other self, the “sane,” bemused Emersonian “oversoul.” Just as the “healthy” art of Herland appears “sickening” to Gilman, Cowperwood—this man “who did not dream”—possesses a one-sided “health” that to Dreiser must seem a form of disease.

Dreiser and Gilman can fantasize and write about the utopian far country, but they cannot imagine becoming naturalized citizens there. Dwelling in a land bordering the two kingdoms of health and sickness, they are intensely aware that crossing over into the one or the other could well mean silence.

A Gloomy Look: Herland and Hisland

In The Living of Charlotte Perkins Gilman, Gilman recounts her only known meeting with Dreiser. It was 1909, and Gilman, beginning to realize that works on social theory, “however ingeniously presented,” would not sell, received an unwelcome piece of advice: “Theodore Dreiser, then on the Delineator, as I remember, looked gloomily at me over the desk, and said, ‘You should consider more what the editors want’ ” (304). This account suggests that Dreiser, planted more firmly in the business of writing, has the realist answer to Gilman’s all-too-idealistic pursuit. Gilman’s comment on this episode reinforces such a reading:
Of course I should have, if I had been a competent professional writer. There are those who write as artists, real ones; they often find it difficult to consider what the editor wants. There are those who write to earn a living, they, if they succeed, must please the editor. The editor, having his living to earn, must please his purchasers, the public, so we have this great trade of literary catering. But if one writes to express important truths, needed yet unpopular, the market is necessarily limited. (304)

Gilman draws a distinction between herself and Dreiser, who in this story seems to be cast as either the “competent professional writer” or the male “editor” engaged in “this great trade of literary catering.” He is the man who has the sober answer to Gilman’s impractical idealism, while Gilman, in turn, “writes to express important truths” and therefore cannot be bothered with the market.

Yet the word “gloomily” reveals how closely Dreiser’s and Gilman’s lives were connected at this moment. In his 1903 essay “True Art Speaks Plainly,” Dreiser had written that the artist must express what he or she sees honestly and without subterfuge: this is morality as well as art” (qtd. in Lingeman, Theodore Dreiser: At the Gates 348). The “needed truths” expressed in Sister Carrie had not found a market, and by 1904 depression had caused him to give up fiction and to devote himself to magazine work in order to make a living. He thus knew intimately the distress Gilman expressed at their meeting. When, shortly thereafter, Gilman started her own “one-man magazine” (Gilman, Living 304), the Forerunner, to publish her writings, the parallel between the two was etched even more sharply. That gloomy look that Dreiser cast at Gilman should have spoken volumes, yet the anecdote describes a missed opportunity.

In her anecdote, Gilman seems almost tragically unaware of the connection between her and Dreiser, and she suggests that perhaps gender difference obscured it, preventing the two from seeing in each other reflections of their own struggles, ambitions, and failures. Nonetheless, Dreiser and Gilman speak to each other in their writings. I have tried to supply a sound track to that gloomy glance that Dreiser directed at Gilman in 1909, when both had written their illness narratives and were about to compose their ambivalent utopian fictions about the “far country” of “health.”
Notes

1. Reflecting on illness in her life, Gilman writes in her autobiography, “That leaves twenty-seven years, a little life-time in itself, taken out, between twenty-four and sixty-six, which I have lost. Twenty-seven adult years, in which, with my original strength of mind, the output of work could have been almost trebled. Moreover, this life-time lost has not been spent in resting. It was always a time of extreme distress, shame, discouragement, misery” (Living 103).

2. There are very few critical treatments of An Amateur Laborer, and it is rarely mentioned in discussions of Dreiser’s other writing. A notable exception is Stephen C. Brennan’s psychoanalytical reading in “Theodore Dreiser’s An Amateur Laborer: A Myth in the Making.” In “Working Out to Work Through: Dreiser in Muldoon’s Body Shop of Shame,” Kathy Frederickson takes a psychoanalytical approach to “Culhane, the Solid Man,” an account of Dreiser’s weeks in Muldoon’s sanitarium that resembles the account in An Amateur Laborer.

3. “Gilman’s writing,” Janet Beer argues, “both fiction and non-fiction, is permeated with metaphors of infection and sickness” (54). Typical in this regard are The Crux (1910), “Wild Oats and Tame Wheat” (1913), “The Vintage” (1916), and Unpunished (written in 1929 and published in 1997). Richard Dowell points out that Dreiser’s illness and its treatment, too, “served as the basis of various semi-autobiographical essays, sketches, and episodes of The Genius [1915]” (xi). Among these works are “Scared Back to Nature” (1903), “The Mighty Burke” (1911), and “Culhane, the Solid Man” (written in 1907, published in the 1919 Twelve Men).

4. Tom Lutz’s American Nervousness, 1903 deals with both Dreiser and Gilman but in separate chapters. One section of the Dreiser chapter is headed “Women and Economics,” a phrase echoed in the title of the chapter “Women and Economics in the Writings of Charlotte Perkins Gilman and Edith Wharton.” Lutz may thus be intending an ironic connection between the two writers.

5. On 8 July 2003, I searched the MLA online bibliography (1963–2003) looking for items connecting Gilman and Dreiser with the subjects of realism, naturalism, feminism, and utopia. The results demonstrate clearly the separate critical spheres that confine each writer:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>naturalism</th>
<th>realism</th>
<th>utopia</th>
<th>feminism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dreiser</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilman</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. In her essay on “Culhane, the Solid Man,” Kathy Frederickson sets out to “explore [Dreiser’s] representation of remasculinization as process and performance, particularly as it is conjoined with the function of shame” (116). Much of what she says applies to the treatment of Muldoon in An Amateur Laborer.
7. It is interesting in this context that critics rarely highlight that Gilman herself notes on the manuscript of “The Yellow Wallpaper” that she wrote the story on a day when she ran a high fever; in contrast, Lingeman in his biographical discussion of *An Amateur Laborer* stresses the medical explanations for Dreiser’s hallucinations (*Theodore Dreiser: At the Gates* 365).

8. Lingeman, when speaking about “passages of great power and unrelenting gloom” in *An Amateur Laborer*, places them within a male literary tradition by likening them to Melville’s *Pierre* and Dostoevsky’s *Notes from the Underground* (*Theodore Dreiser: At the Gates* 382).

9. In *Sister Carrie*, Dreiser had represented a similar split in his own psyche in the self-serving Carrie Meeber and the high-minded Robert Ames, who becomes her sympathetic guide on the path towards a selfless art. Dreiser’s interest in transcendentalism has long been noted. Pizer, for instance, points out that in *The Genius* the artist hero Eugene Witla’s “strength lies in his romantic aesthetic. The beauty he finds in the city is essentially an Emersonian and Whitmanesque beauty” (*Novels* 145). More recently, Paul A. Orlov has dealt with the subject in “An Emersonian Perspective on Dreiser’s Characterization of Carrie” (*Dreiser Studies* 32.2 [2001]: 19–37).

10. Lingeman notes considerable ambivalence in Dreiser’s attitude towards his financier: “Cowperwood also embodied a conflict within Dreiser. On the one hand, he admired and envied the famous rogue builders of American capitalism, reflecting his own boyhood ambitions . . . and his strong lust for power. On the other, his acute sense of social justice condemned them as exploiters of the common people” (*Theodore Dreiser: An American* 66). Furthermore, Dreiser himself stresses his ambivalence towards Cowperwood in his two epilogues. In the first, about the Black Grouper, Dreiser connects this “healthy creature” (*Financier* 778) with trickery and deception. In the second, Dreiser imagines the witches in *Macbeth* holding out to Cowperwood an illusory fame. “But like the Weird Sister,” Dreiser proclaims, “they would have lied, for in the glory was also the ashes of Dead Sea fruit” (779). He implies that Cowperwood’s “having” also implies “not having” (780) and that his clear-eyed vision is far from infallible. Finally, in the narrative itself Dreiser hints at the limits of Cowperwood’s mind: “It was a big mind turning, like a vast searchlight, a glittering ray into many a dark corner; but it was not sufficiently disinterested to search the ultimate dark” (700).
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Theodore Dreiser’s Relevance to the Modern Moslem World

Nadjia Amrane
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“It’s a long story. If you come through N. Y. breakfast or dine with me and I will tell you the whole story. Scheherazade has got nothing on me.” (Dreiser, Letters 1: 166)

The Moslem world is currently synonymous with fanatic crowds defending a rigid interpretation of the Koranic word, intolerance and refusal of difference, patriarchal sexism, indiscriminate application of the Sharia, and an all out jihad against the “infidel.” These stereotypes overlook the basic fact that the Moslem world is composed of human beings who think, work, love, suffer and dream in specific parts of the globe. As such, it is bound to be open to transactions with other communities if it wants to survive. In particular, it must accept and adapt to modern life and thinking, however strange and challenging these might be.

Because they deal with the difficulties of adjustment to modernity felt by the Americans of his time, Dreiser’s novels strongly appeal to the modern Moslem reader who, for the present purpose, is mostly a graduate or postgraduate student of English who reads Dreiser’s novels in English; he or she might also be a student of literature who will read extracts of these novels translated by an enthusiastic lecturer. By “modern” I mean “living in today’s world,” and by “modernity” I mean a set of values placing matter over spirit, reason over emotion, change over tradition, plurality over exclusion, gender equity over sexism and dialogue over coercion. Indeed, I contend that Moslem readers deeply appreciate Dreiser’s portrayal of emotion, subjectivity, and communal life as well as his depiction of the magic of this modern America in images which integrate rather than reject the Moslem Orient, together with his reaffirmation of such basic beliefs for the Moslem
mind as the continuity of the family and the existence of God. Indeed, Dreiser’s novels illustrate a modernity with which the modern Moslem reader feels thoroughly familiar and therefore he or she willingly empathizes with the plight of its inhabitants. Whereas Moslem readers may be shocked by crude naturalistic accounts of a cruel modern world, they look with interest at Dreiser’s characters’ strategies of adjustment and of self-representation in a complex and bewildering world which seems to hold so much in common with his own. At the same time as I examine those elements of Dreiser’s novels that appeal to the modern Moslem reader, I will show that the latter can help illuminate aspects of Dreiser’s novels that have been either overlooked or minimized by other readers. I believe, indeed, that, despite its diversity, the modern Moslem world shares enough beliefs and assumptions for it to constitute “an interpretive community” in the sense given to this expression by Stanley Fish. As such, it is liable to respond to, to be shaped by, and in turn to shape a text.

I am aware that my intention to assess Dreiser’s popularity in the Moslem world by extrapolating the reactions of a university English-reading elite of a specific Moslem country, together with my claim for a Moslem interpretive community, might be received with skepticism by my reader. One may object that the average Moslem mind can hardly be represented, as I claim it can be, by an elite group of university students whose command of English may indicate that they are influenced by Western culture in a way the average Moslem is not. Furthermore, an accurate and precise assessment of Dreiser’s popularity in the modern Moslem world should also include an assessment of the scholarly work devoted to the novelist, a task which I do not fulfill in the present paper. Finally, one might point out that my speaking for the modern Moslem world may appear too ambitious, given the diversity of this world in terms of space, culture, and recent history. Therefore, before moving to the specific concern of this paper, I will explain why I believe that Moslem university students’ favorable reception of Dreiser’s novels can be considered as a reliable indication of the writer’s relevance to the modern Moslem world and of the existence of a specific Moslem interpretive community.

First, the usual academic method of determining a writer’s popularity by the amount of research, number of conferences, and volume of critical writing devoted to him cannot apply in Moslem countries where such scholarly activity is very recent either because they are newly independent countries or because they have only recently opened to the study of western cultures and literatures which used to be the privilege of a social elite trained in Western universities. For the same historical reasons, cultural life in society
will often be heavily dependent on the activities going on in universities, and the reading public will mostly consist of university students and teachers. Because of the mixed social and cultural background of university students, their reactions to a specific writer or novel can be considered to be a fair indication of the average Moslem mind, even if these students are exposed to Western culture in a way the average Moslem is not. Moslem universities, indeed, are generally state-controlled and receive students from all social classes provided that they fulfill the academic requirements for entering the university. Moreover, the limited number of such universities means that they receive students from remote and highly conservative areas as well as from cosmopolitan cities. Most remarkably, those students react similarly to a text regardless of their previous degree of exposure to Western culture. This points to the equally remarkable fact that the Moslem cultural background which has prevailed over large areas of the world for centuries and which is common to many countries has not been significantly altered by either cultural or historical change. In fact, this common background has been reinforced by a long and equally common story of colonial or ideological or cultural oppression which makes them react to a given situation in a very similar way. It is thus safe to assume that there is a cultural background common to the Moslem world and that this background is set into action when circumstances and events appeal to it. One of these circumstances is the reading of a literary text.

Just as they refuse visions of a cruel world ruled by indifferent or even malignant Darwinian forces, Moslem readers are critical about the desperate decadent Western world, which God is “agonizing” over or absent from, as depicted in T. S. Eliot’s “The Waste Land” or Georges Bernanos’s *Mouchette*. At best, these literary works will strengthen his conviction that no good comes from a modernity which signifies degeneration, sterility, and spiritual death. He is rather after renewed trust in a modern world where it is possible to continue living in the midst of chaos, doubt, uncertainty, and confusion, a feat performed by most of Dreiser’s characters. Aware that the refusal of an overpowering modernity leads either to a denial of reality or to a debilitating state of mental paralysis occasioned by its complexity, and thus to self-destruction, the Moslem reader seeks an acceptable and congenial model of adaptation. Dreiser’s novels are all the more readily selected for this purpose as their characters, situations, landscapes, plot development, and ideas do not have the distant and cold characteristics associated with the West and with the Western mindset. The Moslem reader, indeed, readily identifies with Dreiser’s deeply emotional, intuitive, and often apprehensive protagonists who seem to have little in common with what is stereotypically
viewed by Moslems as an excessively rationalistic and self-assertive Westermer. The ruthless Cowperwood owes his success to intuition and imagination rather than to logic and science. Being newcomers to the city, Carrie, Jennie Gerhardt, and Clyde Griffiths are victimized by the same impersonal and indifferent forces by which many Moslem immigrants feel diminished. Moslem readers also readily identify with the presence, unlike most novels of the time, of Arab-Americans who play an active part in Dreiser’s pluri-ethnic America. In The “Genius,” Saljerian, a Syrian-American born in America from a Syrian-born father, is said to be the first to have “built up a tremendous business out of designing [a] series of ads . . . for big corporations” (402). Moreover, unlike what is again perceived as a fiercely independent and egotistic Western subject, Dreiser’s other-directed subject, like the Moslem subject, cannot do without the group who, as Deborah M. Garfield has noted, gives him reality and meaning and a part, that is life, in the continuous theatrical performances which constitute social life (237).

Dreiser’s social gatherings, in streets, restaurants or parties, and the emotional rather than rational exchange which characterizes them, forcefully remind Moslem readers of the wedding, circumcision, or return from pilgrimage celebrations which are similar opportunities for wordless battles during which the other’s emotional strength and power of acting is carefully assessed. In both worlds, lavish decorum, dazzling lights, beautiful clothes—in short, power display—are a necessity.

What looks like chance resemblance turns out to be conscious cultural borrowing when Oriental and Arabian Nights imagery is explicitly used to account for the tremendous wealth and the highly subjective other-directed inhabitants of Dreiser’s corporate and technologically advanced America. The mythical figures of this modern world, which include Cowperwood, the Oriental potentate and financier of genius, and the Aladdin-like Carrie, live and work in splendid Oriental interiors. The Arabian complexity and mysteries are equally useful to depict both the intricate labyrinth of corporate finance and the hieroglyphic corporate reality. Dreiser actually resorts to the term “arabesque” to account for the highly sophisticated mechanisms ruling the economy, politics, and society of his time. In The Titan, for example, he mentions the dark “arabesque council chambers” in which Cowperwood’s financial future is decided. The Arabian Nights metaphor, which was developed in Medieval and cosmopolitan Baghdad, is thus complex enough to inform and to suggest fully the unprecedented reality of the magically efficient, tremendously wealthy, and hedonistic urban corporate world which emerged in turn-of-the century America and broke away from centuries of agrarian penuriousness, austerity, and hard work. Dreiser has perceptively...
realized that the Arabian Nights are about the only narratives in world culture dealing with a highly sophisticated urban world of merchants; as such they anticipated in more than one way the sophisticated and equally commercial corporate civilization. It is worth noting, indeed, that in almost all cultures the dominant narratives deal with an agrarian rather than a complex urban commercial reality. To a Moslem reader, most interested in noting the unusual combination of a highly developed technological world and an Oriental environment, Dreiser tells the American corporate saga in the familiar terms, images and form, of an Arabian Nights tale.

More than any other reader, the Moslem reader will mark the difference between Dreiser’s Arabian Nights imagery and Moslem Ottoman images. He will unveil in the process an aspect of Dreiser’s novels which, to my knowledge, has escaped the attention of critics. In The Financier, Dreiser’s repeated affirmations that in some parts of the world monogamy is not a rule, coupled with his mention of Turkey, Turkish baths, and the Oriental costumes of his heroines, suggest that the Moslem Ottoman Empire—which still existed at the time he wrote his novels—deeply appealed to him. The cultural alternative to Europe represented by Ottoman Empire may have fed Dreiser’s search for a new American cultural identity more suitable to a harmonious development of a multi-ethnic America. This new American identity broke, in a significant way, with the British cultural roots of America to which a dominant WASP establishment, deeply intolerant of the ethnic diversity of America, was attached. At the same time he portrays brilliant ethnic characters such as Carrie Meeber and Aileen Butler as independent Oriental beauties, Dreiser does not fail to remind his reader that they are defying an Anglophile, anti-ethnic, and, to him, anti-American WASP class whom he indicts both in his novels and his prose writings. The Titan’s Mrs. Merrill, who relentlessly prevents the authentically American Frank and Aileen Cowperwood from entering the social world of Chicago and later of New York, is an unmistakable representative of this intolerant Anglophile WASP establishment. Her New England Puritan background and her British friends, Cowperwood tells us, do not care for Americans: “She was Eastern-bred—Boston—and familiar in an off hand way with the superior world of London, which she had visited several times. Chicago at its best was to her a sordid commercial mess” (61). In “Some Aspects of Our National Character,” Dreiser sarcastically exposes this Anglophile America’s all-out support for England, which may run counter to American democratic principles and economic interests:

   England, before our very eyes, suppressed attempts at “self-determination by smaller nations of their rights” in Egypt, Ireland,
India, the Boer Republic. Yet we thought nothing, or at least did nothing. Yet the Balkans, for some peculiar reason not easily to be explained, aroused another sentimental emotion in us. Although one would have said the interest of America in the question of what should become of Russia, Turkey and the Balkans was not direct, and from an old-time practical and political point of view never could be, yet America interfered there as elsewhere, laying down, or attempting to, a rule for the future organization of Europe (self-determination of nations!), and that without any referendum to the American voter, any definite constitutional inquiry as to what he thought of all this.

Yet the neglect of the latter, most important in a self-determining democracy or republic, one would suppose, was passed over as nothing, while it was assumed or preached by those in the lead, and in the face of much repressed grumbling, that we were engaged unquestionably with those who were nearest to and best for us intellectually, spiritually and in every other way, nations which would seek, or had invariably sought our welfare in the past... In all those instances we were anything but pro-British. (31–32)

In the same essay, he derides America’s blindness to German achievements and thus unmistakably relates this Anglophile WASP America with anti-German American policy:

Between chortles over an immense trade increase, a finally united railway system, new and better methods of food control, intensive agriculture, lessons in self-denial and thought, still, and idiotic as it may seem, the war was an unmixed evil; the Germans were all wrong. “The passage of a thousand will not obliterate the memory of Germany’s crime. She will get her good name back when Judas does.” (38–39)

He also denounces the fact that the U.S. has always favored the British against its own interests and against Germans and French; he is quick to point out that Americans especially disliked Germany and did not hesitate to ally with a much uncongenial France during WWI: “[Although] opposition to France on moral grounds had been steadily growing in America, still in the contest with Germany all the refused sympathy and gratitude of 1800 was revived and France became once more the object of our tenderest solicitude. So much for national moods and gratitudes” (35). This resentment of the WASP establishment, though more vocal after WWI, was also expressed in the many letters that he wrote before America was involved in
the conflict. In a 19 December 1915 letter to Harold Hersey, he complains: “I am now being tied up with all the evils which the Germans are supposed to represent” (*Letters* 1: 205).

Dreiser’s use of the Orient to depict modernity is almost unique in modern Western literature. It strongly contrasts with Zola’s use, in *Au Bonheur des dames*, of sexual metaphors to account for the emotions raised by contact with soft and shining clothes and fabrics in a modern department store. Rather than depicting the refined magic and wonder of modern consumer society, Zola prefers to stress its sensuality. Dreiser’s Arabian modern America further distances him from those artists who depicted the “exotic” Orient in their writings. He is thus markedly different from Poe, Baudelaire, or even Balzac, who focused their attention on hashish eaters and other such sensational characteristics of the Orient to legitimise their own world of dream and phantasmagoria. By doing so, they further rooted the Orient in deviance and exclusion. For their part, Washington Irving and Walt Whitman, though dealing with the Orient more positively in so far as they stressed its contribution to universal history and culture, nonetheless did not integrate it into their accounts of America, for they considered the Orient to be a thoroughly different world.

Dreiser’s Orient therefore limits Edward Said’s claim that the Orient was used disparagingly in Western literature as part of a strategy to secure the colonization of the Oriental mind. Far from walking in the steps of the nineteenth-century Orientalists, Dreiser in fact renewed the cultural contacts between the East and the West which characterized the Middle Ages and the Renaissance; he follows the tradition begun by the Troubadours, Chaucer, Boccacio, and Dante. Renaissance Europe, which had much in common with the America he lived in, in terms of personages, lavishness, subtlety, and finance-oriented economy, and to which he refers enthusiastically in such novels as *The Financier* and travel books such as *A Traveler at Forty*, had close links with the Moslem world and culture from which it borrowed its love of lavish display, its mercantilism, and its new appreciation of materialism. Dreiser shows his awareness of this influence in his description in *A Traveler at Forty* of Venice as “Gothic, crossed with Moorish and Byzantine fancy” (406). Prompted by his search for a new cultural identity, he probably considered that the East, in the present case the Ottoman Empire which was all the more attractive as it was a close ally of Germany, could once more revitalise culture at a time of momentous change.

It is highly probable that Dreiser’s debt to the Orient is not limited to imagery but also extends to the oral form of its tales. His long formless sentences, repetitions, and sudden digressions that break the flow of a carefully
contrived argument suggest a tale-teller more than a writer respectful of conciseness, economy, and consistency. The oral form of Dreiser’s writings has been noted by Stephen C. Brennan in his Lacanian study of an *Amateur Laborer* as the confession of an analysand (66–67). In a letter to Mencken, Dreiser describes the events surrounding the publication of *The “Genius”* in terms of a new Scheherazade tale, which suggests that he viewed narration as an oral rather than written exercise (*Letters* 1: 166) This leads us to wonder whether Dreiser, in his search for a new cultural alternative to the rigid and highly articulate agrarian mode of representing the world, wanted to distance himself from traditional written narrative.

Thomas P. Riggio has pointed out that Dreiser had to repress his ethnicity in order to become a national writer (55). This desire for national recognition explains well the change in Dreiser’s use of Oriental imagery, which was originally a means of experimenting with alternatives to the dominant WASP culture. In his later novels, Dreiser abandons Turkish imagery, recalling the presence of the Moslem Ottoman empire that was hostile to Britain and thus unsavory to Anglophile WASP America, and instead borrows *Arabian Nights* motifs from tales about improvident and weak characters that serve to express illusion and disillusion. Dreiser adopts a culturally correct representation of the Orient. This tendency reaches a peak in *The Stoic* and in short stories such as “Khat” and “The Prince Who Was a Thief” where Dreiser employs the usual stereotypes about the Moslem Orient that illustrate Edward Said’s *Orientalism*. Moreover, Dreiser gives Oriental characters only a minor place in his works. In *The Stoic*, Aileen is courted by a hard-drinking and lecherous Arabian Sheik who lives not in exquisitely decorated Oriental palaces but in the dry and thirsty desert. The Oriental world of “Khat” and “The Prince Who Was a Thief” is comprised of dirty places on the verge of the desert that are inhabited by beggars, water carriers, and carpet merchants and that project the medieval world of autocracy, social injustice, and ignorance popularly believed to be the Moslem Orient to which the modern Moslem reader living another reality strongly objects. Far from suggesting the magic of a new American reality, Dreiser’s Orient emphasizes an inability to control reality and irrationality, both of which are usually associated with the Moslem world. *The Stoic* shows that it is the Moslem Orient and not the whole Orient, however, which vanishes from Dreiser’s novels. Images of India and Brahmins, which are more respectable, through their adoption by such cultural institutions as the Transcendentalists and perhaps their close association with such Western giants as Plato, now serve to express the writer’s approval of the Oriental Other. The price paid for such an evolution, however, was very high. It seems, indeed,
that Dreiser’s creativity as a novelist dries up with his submission to mainstream culture, for he writes no major novel after *An American Tragedy*.

In a world made congenial by a Dreiserian environment and subject that are very different from the cold, rationalistic, and distant image which he nurtures about the modern West, the modern Moslem reader can “suspend disbelief” and look for models and situations which would explain and dramatize modernity in concrete terms and which would enable him to work out his own strategies of integration and self-representation. Rather than being rejected as examples of a dangerously degenerate West, the disintegrating patriarchal families, transgressing sons, runaway daughters, and betrayed or even dispossessed fathers make up a secular narrative telling about the impact of modernity on such sacred institutions as the family and feminine submissiveness and on such respected authority figures as the father and the elders. This narrative has a unique cultural value in that it shapes and articulates and thus helps to encompass a hitherto confusing inchoate modern reality.

And this reality is all the more bewildering as it is only reluctantly acknowledged and even more reluctantly put into words in the Moslem world. Carrie’s flirtation with Drouet and her revolt against her sister and brother-in-law who are indifferent to the fact that the world is changing have similar counterparts in the modern Moslem world. But few writers describe such facts about modern Moslem life and modern Moslem teenagers with as much freshness and spontaneity as did Dreiser. Romance, the generation gap, or broken families are either ignored as signs of unspeakable moral degeneration or intellectualized and thus deformed by writers placing ideology above plain representation of life. This simplicity makes Dreiser’s narrative a welcome version of modern, everyday reality whose mysteries are unraveled and made familiar.

Dreiser’s narrative is constituted of familiar episodes and motifs and ends with the equally familiar reaffirmation of the necessity for such fundamental social institutions as the family which do not disappear after all. Most striking is the novelist’s inability to do without either the father or the family in spite of his vocal assertions to the contrary and his attacks against his father and his family. The latter resentment partakes of a desire to conform to the Freudianism of his time more than of genuine anger. Indeed, with the exception of *Sister Carrie*, his novels tell another story. The cautionary tale showing Edward Butler warning Aileen that she will not know happiness with Cowperwood in *The Financier*, repenting children such as Stuart and Etta Barnes in *The Bulwark*, family reconciliations such as that occurring between Father Gerhardt and his daughter, all stress the strength
of the family as an institution and the role of the father in a world which seemed to deny it in the first place. A most remarkable aspect of Dreiser’s novels, indeed, is his inability to exclude the father from his modern world. Even An American Tragedy contains the avuncular figure of Samuel Griffiths and thus stresses a family kinship which is very familiar to Moslem readers where an uncle can replace an absent or irresponsible father and, if older, can even prevail over the father. Taking place in a chaotic modern environment, very much like that of the modern Moslem reader, and affirming the continuity of life, this family romance is without the forbidding disastrous and sensational accounts of disintegration, insanity, perversion, and ultimate annihilation told in Hardy’s Jude the Obscure, Zola’s La bête humaine, or even Balzac’s cynical La cousine Bette and Le père Goriot. In these novels, the fear that the world has fallen into the hands of a relentless force is counterbalanced by no sign of hope, which is so important a value to the modern Moslem believing in the ultimate protection of God who is both mighty and merciful.

Dreiser’s inability to exclude God from this world, whatever the perceptual or scientific evidence pointing to the contrary, and whatever his attachment to the secular tenets of naturalism, is another appealing feature of his novels. The quest for the divinity, which is often an involuntary one, is never absent from his novels which all start with a materialistic and secular profession of faith and end with some reflection on the divinity. In this way they give fictional form to Dreiser’s admission that he could not rule out the existence of a superior entity in this world. In A Traveler at Forty, Dreiser confesses, “In fact I have always innately presumed the existence of a force or forces that, possibly ordered in some noble way, maintain a mathematical, chemical, and mechanical parity and order in visible things. I have always felt, in spite of all my carpings, that somehow in a large way there is a rude justice done under the sun, and that a balance for, I will not say right, but for happiness is maintained” (162). It is therefore unsurprising that Dreiser returned to religion at the end of his life.

Because of his concern with providing the new America of his time with an appropriate culture, Dreiser’s novels can be viewed as modern myths encapsulating the struggle for transcendence, for rising beyond a heavy and stifling matter, of a modern man made a prisoner of material possessions by his envelope of flesh and the straightjacket of sense and instinct. Most fascinating is the course leading the man or woman indifferent to religion, such as Carrie, or dedicated to secular materialism, such as Eugene Witla, to confront the possibility of the hereafter. After a period of immersion in earthly pleasure or of secular attachment to the material, Dreiser’s characters be-
come cognizant of the existence of a divine force or presence. Often this evolution occurs at a difficult time. Condemned to death and about to be executed, Clyde Griffiths, who has previously violently rejected his frustrating Evangelical upbringing, is faced with “his uncertainty as to the meaning of the hereafter” (867). After “a season in hell,” marked by his wife’s death and the loss of a senior position in a firm, Eugene Witla reviews all the philosophical, scientific, and metaphysical arguments for and against the existence of the divine and ends up acknowledging the limitations of the human mind. An illuminating episode dramatizing the irruption of the divine into the coarsely materialistic present occurs at the end of *Sister Carrie*. This highly suggestive scene, whose numerous symbols transform it into an allegory of modern Everyman, portrays Carrie, who has had the best of what this earth can offer, feeling vaguely discontented and reading *Père Goriot* in a thickly carpeted and soundproof room. This heavy luxury suggests the smothering impact of matter. This impression of weight and gravity is reinforced by the fact that Carrie is sitting down and is thus unable to ascend to higher spiritual spheres. Taking place simultaneously, Hurstwood’s Christ-like agony in the hands of the vituperative porter of Carrie’s hotel further underlines the religious meaning of the scene. At the same time, the novel which Carrie is reading acquires a religious significance. *Père Goriot*, indeed, suggests both father and God. Carrie is reading the novel because it was recommended by Ames, who is the first character to mention the force working for the benefit of mankind through Carrie’s dramatic gift and face. Ames’s words have prompted in Carrie a desire to know more about this force which Alfred G. See interprets as “an absence” signaling “the possibility of a metaphysics otherwise cancelled by the prerogative of sense” (158). These two scenes, depicted with care and occurring simultaneously, form a striking diptych reminding the modern worshipper of the difficulty but also the inevitability of the quest for the divinity. This comparison is all the more apt in view of Dreiser’s familiarity with the religious art of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, of which Cowperwood is a fine collector, and of his tendency to depict reality in terms of pictures and tableaux as evidenced by *The “Genius.”*

The rationalistic and secular Lester Kane and the emotional and spiritual Jennie Gerhardt form another such modern diptych that dramatizes the principles vying for the control of the modern world. Dreiser sides with Jennie whom Lester Kane abandons to please society. After leaving Jennie, Kane falls physically ill, a fact which suggests that his materialistic mindset, missing the purifying effect of Jennie’s spirituality, has poisoned his body. Jennie, indeed, represents the way out of the mental prison into which the
modern secular individual has been put by rationalism. She illustrates the
dynamic spiritual perspective from which to look at the life-giving and re-
generating aspects of reality:

She had not the incisive reasoning capacity of either Mr. or Mrs.
Lester Kane. She had seen a great deal, suffered a great deal, and
had read some in a desultory way. Her mind had never grasped
the nature and character of specialized knowledge. History, phys-
ics, chemistry, botany, geology, and sociology were not fixed
departments in her brain as they were in Lester’s and Letty’s.
Instead there was the feeling that the world moved in some
strange, unstable way. . . . Was it all blind chance, or was there
some guiding intelligence—a God? Almost in spite of herself she
felt there must be something—a higher power which produced
all the beautiful things—the flowers, the stars, the trees, the
grass. (390)

It is worth noting how congenial to the modern Moslem reader this notion
of a divine force is. In Islam, indeed, God has no human shape and has not
made man in his own image. He does not beget and is not begot. Dreiser’s
novels’ relevance to the modern Moslem experience once more forces itself
upon the Moslem reader.

When they were first published, nothing predisposed Dreiser’s novels to
be relevant to the Moslem world, which was considered and considered it-
self to be religiously and culturally alien. The chaotic America with which
they dealt had no real counterpart in a Moslem world that was hardly af-
ected by the economic, cultural, and social upheavals tearing America and
Europe apart. The irruption of modernity into a Moslem world, hardly pre-
pared for this violent onslaught on his culture, left the Moslem mind at grips
with modernity and in search of acceptable modes of adjustment and self-
representation. This situation was tragically ironic as Islam itself had con-
tributed to the rise of this modern world by making the European Renais-
sance and, hence, modernity possible.

In this paper, I have attempted to show that Dreiser’s novels deeply ap-
peal to the modern Moslem reader because they dramatize the conflict be-
tween modernity and tradition which besets his own society; Moslem read-
ers thus identify with Dreiser’s characters’ quest for strategies of modern
integration and self-representation. Even if one does not make them one’s
own, these efforts to come to terms with modernity are nonetheless fol-
lowed with sympathy and understanding whereas they would be rejected if
they were set in the cold and godless backdrop of most naturalistic novels.
Most of all, Dreiser’s novels distance themselves from the dominant modes of thought and representation of Western culture. Their integration of Moslem and Oriental motives into modern Western reality, as a result of this difference, allow, in imaginative terms, for that very blend of Islam and modernity that Moslem readers, aspiring to change, look for in real life. Ironically, the Moslem reader is an ideal reader for Dreiser’s novels. Still immersed in the agrarian moral values of Dreiser’s time but also aware, in a way Dreiser’s Victorian reader could not be, of the social, moral, and cultural upheavals entailed by a modernity whose impact on the West he has witnessed, and able to understand the significance of the Oriental dimension of these novels, the modern Moslem reader fully appreciates their cultural and literary value. This, I think, signals the interest of a cross-cultural approach to literature.
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Writings about Theodore Dreiser
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White House counsel Charles F. C. Ruff. Notes that Dreiser once made an unsuccessful pass at her in a clumsy manner.


American literature within the context of concurrently developing theories of productive leisure between 1840 and 1940. Uses *An American Tragedy* to discuss ambiguities in Dreiser’s views on play reform.
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The following checklist records items overlooked in Theodore Dreiser: A Primary Bibliography and Reference Guide, by Donald Pizer, Richard W. Dowell, and Frederic E. Rusch (Boston: G. K. Hall, 1991), as well as the four updates appearing in previous issues of Dreiser Studies. A future checklist will focus on translations of Dreiser’s works and works on Dreiser in languages other than English. This bibliography will also be published on the Dreiser Studies website: <http://www.uncw.edu/dreiser/studies/>.
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ter to George Douglas dated 28 Jan. 1936.
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*Sister Carrie*. Opera in Three Acts. Freely Adapted from the Dreiser Novel. Vocal score with piano; music by Alfred Heller; libretto by Alfred Heller and Lissy Heller. n.p., 1968. It is not known if this piece was performed.
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Carson, Jo. *A Preacher with a Horse to Ride*. Play based on the investigative hear-
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Review of *Back Street*, by Fannie Hurst. *Chicago Tribune* 17 Jan. 1931. “It gives the reader some of the same sense of power and beauty that *Jennie Gerhardt* had.”

Waly. “Newsreels.” *Variety* 24 Nov. 1931: 31. “Theodore Dreiser tells his story about toothpicking in Kentucky and fails to impress the average reel fan. As an actor he is an amateur compared to George Bernard Shaw.”
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dren: A Background Note on the Calling of the 1909 White House Conference.”

Mencken, H. L. “The Case of Dreiser.” The Bathtub Hoax, and Other Blasts and
Bravos from the Chicago Tribune. Edited by Robert McHugh. New York:

1959

Brooks, Van Wyck. “Theodore Dreiser.” American Critical Essays, Twentieth Cen-


1960


Hindus, Milton. Review of Dreiser-Mencken Letters: The Correspondence of Theo-
80–83.


1962

Chandler, Raymond. Raymond Chandler Speaking. Ed. Dorothy Gardiner and
Chandler letter of 20 May 1949 in which he comments about distinctions among
various types of novels and observes that Dreiser’s An American Tragedy “has
no more to do with mystery or detection than [the film] The Lost Week-End.”

1964


mentary evidence related to legal battles in 1914 over the publication of The
“Genius.”

1965


1966


1967


1968


1969

1970

1971

1972

1973

1974

1975


1976


1977


1978


1979


1981

Overlooked Items in Previous Dreiser Checklists

the film A Place in the Sun.


1983


1985


1986


1987


1988


1989


Garrison, Dee. *Mary Heaton Vorse: The Life of an American Insurgent*. Philadel-


1990


1991


1992


1993


1994


1995

Burke, John J. “Theodore Dreiser.” From Home and Abroad: American and British


lected Poems (1993), above.


1996


1997


**WRITINGS ABOUT THEODORE DREISER: MASTER’S THESIS AND PH.D. DISSERTATIONS**

1926

1927

1929

1933

1941


1943

1947

1948

1949
1950


1953


1954


1956


1957


1958

1959

1960

1961

1962

1963

1964

1965

1966

1968

1969

1970

1971

1972

1973
Hertzog, Susan Kathryn. “The American Dream of Success in the 1925 Novels An


1974


1975


1976


1977

1978


1979


1980
Describes the career of screenwriter Harry Brown. Notes that the film *A Place in the Sun* emphasizes romance and personal tragedy in place of Dreiser’s social determinism.


**1981**


**1984**


**1985**

1986


1987

1988


1989


1990


1991


1992

to escape domesticity is portrayed in turn-of-the-century novels.


1993


1994


1995


Furer, Andrew Jonathan. “‘The Strength of the Strong’: (Re)Forming the Self in


Whyde, Janet M. “Encoding Imperialism: Homelessness in American Naturalism, 1890–1918.” Ph.D. dissertation, Louisiana State U, 1995. DAI 56 (1996): 4402A. Includes a chapter using Edith Wharton’s Summer and Dreiser’s Jennie Gerhardt to demonstrate that, because of social expectations that women should embody domestic values, women’s homelessness is represented as a failure to project the self into the world.


1996


1997

Claman, Elizabeth Monteith. “Refiguring Ill Repute: Representations of Prostitute Women in the United States (1880–1920) and France (1945–1977).” Ph.D. dis-


*Theodore Dreiser Encyclopedia*, edited by Keith Newlin, is a major contribution to Dreiser scholarship, perhaps the most important book since the Swanberg biography, almost forty years ago. The coverage here is inclusive, involving Dreiser’s biography (including notes on his family, friends, mistresses, etc.); critiques of his major and minor works (including the short stories, plays, autobiographies, travel and political writing); a discussion of the major events in Dreiser’s life (for example, the dispute over the publication of *Sister Carrie*, the censorship problems connected with the publishing of *The Titan* and *The "Genius"*, or his argument with Liveright over the percentage of movie rights for *An American Tragedy*); included also is the background to both the times and events in Dreiser’s life, including discussions of the major ideas Dreiser brought to his fiction. In sum, this book is a biography, critical study, intellectual and cultural history, and much more. It is a book that should be on every Dreiserian’s shelf, although the $99.95 price tag will seriously curtail that.

Newlin is to be congratulated for overseeing a task both as difficult and impressive as this. The book contains several hundred references by almost seventy scholars and critics. Many of the contributors are well known to Dreiser studies (e.g., Richard Lingeman, Donald Pizer, Thomas Riggio) while others are young scholars still in graduate school. In a book of this sort, one expects the contributions to be uneven, but in my reckoning all the references were well done (not that there isn’t occasional room for disagreement), and Newlin is to be congratulated for matching the contributor with the contributed.

I could continue in this mode of praise because the book’s accomplishments far outweigh what might be considered its limitations. But while the inclusions do justice to any imaginary index, there are some inconsistencies.
For example, there is a discussion of capitalism but not of communism (although Dreiser’s trip to Russia is included as are references to Earl Browder and William Z. Foster); there is a discussion of Ernst Haeckel but not of T. H. Huxley; there is an entry on Schopenhauer but not Nietzsche; there are references to those who contributed major books on Dreiser (e.g., the work of Robert Elias) but not to those who contributed major chapters to Dreiser criticism (e.g., Charles Walcutt). There is no reference to the idea of the double that runs throughout literary naturalism, especially the works of Dreiser: Carrie taps this residual self when she is on the stage; his cousin Gilbert serves ironically as Clyde Griffiths’s double, and there is a second, demonic self that pursues him through the novel, frightening even him. On a more mechanical matter, I found the index incomplete.

Individual entries cannot give us the complete picture. There is, for example, ample discussion of the friends who most helped to advance Dreiser’s career: Arthur Henry, H. L. Mencken, William Lengel, and others. Each entry notes that these friendships cooled, often the result of Dreiser’s pique. What is left unsaid, however, is the collective significance of these events. One does not really get a sense of how insecure or how difficult Dreiser could be. While his many mistresses are duly catalogued, little is said of the obsessiveness of the man when it came to sexual love. And while there is an excellent discussion of neurasthenia and Dreiser’s nervous breakdown following the fate of Sister Carrie with Doubleday, there is little suggestion of how pursued he was by fits of depression (often giving way to manic spurts of energy) his whole life.

One of the biggest difficulties with a book like this is simply unavoidable: life, alas, does not unfold alphabetically. This becomes even more of a problem when we come to the treatment of key ideas and influences. While there is a discussion of mechanism and of spiritualism, there is no real distinction in emphasis between them—and to the less-informed reader one might think that Charles Fort had as much influence on Dreiser as did Jacques Loeb. The contour of Dreiser’s ideas is blurred by the necessity of the alphabetical format. Added to this is the problem that Dreiser, as Eliseo Vivas pointed out in 1938, was an inconsistent mechanist: he was not concerned with creating a coherent philosophy of life—at least not in his fiction. But that does not mean that some of his ideas do not take precedence over others.

If Freud influenced Dreiser, for example, it was in a way different from the influence of Herbert Spencer or Loeb. As a determined view of human nature, Freud’s theories were consistent with elements of naturalism. Freud’s theory of repression, of inhibition, of the effect of civilization on
primitive instincts, of the animal basis of the crowd—these and his discussion of sexual taboos and the hidden meaning of dreams were of interest to Dreiser, who discussed these matters with A. A. Brill, the psychoanalyst who translated Freud in America. But at the center of Freud’s theory is the idea of trauma, while a mechanistic sense of chemical motives (the heliotrope syndrome) dominates Dreiser’s major works. For Freud, psychic injuries determine future behavior: motives come from within. For Dreiser, a given temperament responds to environmental stimuli: motives come from without.

If there was a topic that ran like a thread through Dreiser’s fiction it involved the nature of conventions. In a story like “Convention,” conventions are a chain; in a story like “Marriage—for One,” conventions are made to be broken. But whether one accepts conventions and its chains or breaks the chains and seeks freedom, the end result seems to be the same. The separate accounts of Dreiser’s works do not add up to what I believe is a general truth: that Dreiser’s fiction, his worldview, involves a no-win situation. Conventions, inseparable from the environment that characters are unable to go beyond, are affirmed with regret, broken with guilt. Dreiser seldom deviated from his conclusion to Sister Carrie: life was simply “blind striving,” never remedied by “surfeit,” always lacking “content.”

What does not coherently emerge from a book like this—becoming a built-in limitation that could not be avoided—is a composite view. As a result, the connection between Dreiser’s ideas and his fiction is often incompletely straddled. What is important to see is that the key to Dreiser’s literary philosophy is his belief in a cosmic balance, a mechanistic equation of forces that brings all reality into physical opposition: ugliness and beauty, poverty and wealth, desire and guilt, sickness and health, life and death—one is impossible without the other. Matter in motion involved material responses that kept the balance in place, an emphasis Dreiser took from Spencer. Dreiser’s interests in political causes like communism stemmed from his belief that such political systems would help restore the imbalances caused by capitalism. Dreiser had no trouble reconciling Marx and Nietzsche: one took as his subject the industrial community; the other the heightened figure that went beyond that community. They diverged in the crowd, that force that so intrigued Carrie—the balancing force between the two. Behind that force was mystery, a sublimity the artist perceived. Given the interconnectedness of opposites, such beauty could often be found amidst the ugly, like the blinking railroad lights glazed with rain.

If Dreiser was often curious about matters supernatural and superstitious (as in a story like “The Lost Phoebe” or a play like The Blue Sphere) these
works can also be read as involving characters caught in the throes of delu-
sion or hallucination—that is, they can be read more consistently with the
mechanistic assumptions that control most of his fiction. Throughout his life
Dreiser entertained many ersatz philosophical and religious theories, but
they never outweighed his mechanistic conclusions. He may at times have
expressed interest in Christian Science and Quakerism, but behind this in-
terest was the influence, early and late, of his two wives and of people like
Anna Tatum and Margaret Tjader Harris. Indeed, Dreiser’s “spiritualism” is
probably more often a matter of curiosity than of intellectual commitment,
the product of those around him, especially at the end of his life, than the
pure product of his own belief. This is a question that has long plagued
Dreiser studies, and a definitive response to it is hard to pin down. I thus do
not raise this as a question of my speculation being right or wrong, but as a
matter of ambiguity that is simply absent from the book.

But whatever this book may lack in one direction, it makes up for it in
another. And for an accomplishment this important, it is appropriate to end
on a positive rather than negative note. A Theodore Dreiser Encyclopedia
will long be the standard source of reference for the study of Dreiser—the
man, his works, his world. Anyone interested in Dreiser will immediately
recognize the extreme usefulness of this book and will appreciate the im-
mense amount of labor that went into its making. Thanks are due to the con-
tributors—and especially to Keith Newlin, for the extraordinary task of
overseeing this project. To all, my congratulations on a difficult job, well
done.

—Richard Lehan, University of California, Los Angeles

On the Banks of the Wabash: The Life and Music of Paul Dresser,
by Clayton W. Henderson. Indianapolis: Indiana Historical So-

As the final days of 1905 dwindled away, Paul Dresser found himself
driven by poverty from his beloved Broadway to the isolation of a back
bedroom in sister Emma’s flat. There he was beset by premonitions of
death. This fear and depression, however, could be temporarily allayed by
visits from Theodore Dreiser, Paul’s brother, who would listen and take
notes while Paul reminisced about his early life. “On those occasions,”
Dreiser later recalled, “he was his old self . . . .” It was Paul’s expressed
wish that Theodore might “write a story some time, tell something about
him.” Fourteen years later, in 1919, Theodore fulfilled Paul’s wish by pub-
lishing “My Brother Paul” in *Twelve Men*. “And you, my good brother!” Dreiser wrote in conclusion to that sketch. “Here is the story you wanted me to write, this little testimony to your memory, a pale, pale symbol of all I think and feel.”

When H. L. Mencken read the proofs of *Twelve Men*, he pronounced “My Brother Paul” one of Dreiser’s premier achievements and became an instant and persistent cheerleader for a book-length portrait of Dresser, whom Mencken termed a “genuine American original.” Dreiser was indeed tempted and on one occasion wrote Mencken, “Ah, the opportunity that lies there, my good brother.” Ultimately, however, he determined that Paul’s life would be so fully interwoven into his own autobiographical works that a tribute beyond “My Brother Paul” was unnecessary. Despite Mencken’s periodic urgings, there the matter stood—until recently.

Now, almost a hundred years after Paul’s death, the “opportunity” Dreiser spoke of has been realized by music historian Clayton W. Henderson in *On the Banks of the Wabash: The Life and Music of Paul Dresser*. A tribute that will not be described as a “little testimony,” Henderson’s study, with apparatus, runs almost five-hundred pages and is divided into five sections. The first four tell of the “life,” which Henderson calls “a rags-to-riches-to-rags tale” (xvii). The first “rags” portion began during Dresser’s early teens, when his father, after years of modest success, failed in the woollen business, reducing the family to comparative poverty. Further stress was created by Paul’s rebellious nature, which brought him into conflict with his father’s religious strictures and led to at least one major brush with the law. He was diverted from this ominous path, however, by his love of the stage. Blessed with a gift of broad humor, a keen awareness of middle-class tastes, incredible energy, and supreme confidence, Paul began while still a teenager to work his way up the theatrical ladder—from medicine-wagon performer to black-faced minstrel, vaudeville comedian, and actor/singer in farce comedies, including one of his own composition, *The Green Goods Man*.

His “riches,” however, came from the songs he wrote. With what Henderson terms “modest musical abilities” (xvii) and a minimum of formal training, Dresser began with parodies and adaptations but by at least 1886 was composing original songs. His was “an intuitive art” (109). During his lifetime, he published over 140 songs, including such hits as “Just Tell Them That You Saw Me,” “My Gal Sal,” and Indiana’s state song, “On the Banks of the Wabash, Far Away.” Paul left the theatre circuit in 1897 to devote his full time to song writing and promoting Howley, Haviland, and Company, a music-publishing firm in which he was a partner. For the next
five years, he was at his pinnacle of success. He was a man of considerable, if indeterminate, wealth; he was a familiar figure on Broadway, surrounded by an entourage of well-wishers and sycophants; he was, Theodore wrote, “the ballad-maker of a nation” (xviii). But shortly after the turn of the century, the musical tastes of that nation shifted to ragtime, and Paul would not or could not adjust to that change. Within three years, his music firm had gone bankrupt; the public as well as his entourage had abandoned him; and he had died alone and disillusioned.

On the human level, Henderson found the ebullient, bigger-than-life Dresser a study in contradictions: the tender, generous brother and friend, so concerned about the welfare of others, coexisted with the wastrel whose lifestyle of excesses was literally self-destructive; the practicing Catholic was known for his ribald humor and cronyism with corrupt politicians; and the balladeer who idealized womanhood practiced a sexual varietism that amazed and disgusted even his own brother Theodore. As Henderson ably demonstrates, there were “two Paul Dressers” (xxii).

Of course, many of the insights into Paul’s personal life were drawn from “My Brother Paul,” Dawn, Newspaper Days, and other Dreiser pieces in which Paul played a role. But these rich sources were a mixed blessing, for Dreiser, as Henderson notes, was “often exasperatingly inaccurate” (xix). He was careless with dates, muddied the waters with fictitious names, collapsed the time frame of events to accommodate narrative demands, and allowed his ambivalent attitude toward Paul to color his treatment of their relationship. Also, contrary to Dreiser’s insistence to Mencken, there were many biographical holes in his story of Paul’s life. Through twelve years of painstaking research, Henderson worked to fill those holes, including, most notably, the more than twenty years Paul was on the road in his various performing capacities. Henderson pored over collections of correspondence and memorabilia, examined municipal records, collected the sheet music of Paul’s songs, visited areas relevant to his life, and scoured microfilms of trade journals and newspapers of the period for reviews, interviews, and news of Dresser’s activities. And in the process, he corrected many long-standing biographical errors and dismissed or challenged several anecdotes and assertions by Dreiser and Dresser himself that seem to have no bases in fact. The completeness and accuracy of On the Banks of the Wabash are a testament to those twelve years of persistence.

It should also be noted that Dresser’s life and music are studied against a richly developed backdrop of the period in which he lived and worked, a period that, according to Henderson, has “received neither the scholarly attention nor the contemporary popular acceptance that Foster and the twenti-
eth-century Tin Pan Alley composers have” (xvi–xvii). Henderson includes thumbnail biographies of many of Paul’s contemporaries, describes noteworthy theatres in which he performed, provides background on vaudeville, medicine wagons, and minstrelsy, follows the evolution of the music-publishing industry, and analyzes the effects of various historical and cultural events on popular music. And this is, of course, the short list, for there is hardly a chapter that does not attempt to remind the reader of the “rich heritage” (xvii) of this neglected era in American song.

Separated from the biographical portion of the book to prevent its interrupting the narrative flow, section five is an in-depth study of Dresser’s songs and their place in the late-nineteenth-century American culture. Aimed at the general reader, this analysis is couched to the extent possible in lay terms. In this section, Henderson, a musician in his own right, demonstrates through the use of numerous lyric examples and occasional flashes of humor that Dresser’s songs dealing with love, religion and patriotism seldom rise above the level of mediocrity and at times sink to bathos and melodrama. Nor were his comic songs outstanding. On the other hand, in his songs linking mother and home, Dresser excelled, achieving a sincerity and poignancy that few of his generation could match. Doubtless written with Paul’s own mother, Sarah, in mind, these mother-and-home songs resonated with a generation that had moved in large numbers from villages to urban environments and yearned for the simplicity and security of the past. In capturing this mood of nostalgia, Dresser became a worthy successor to Stephen Foster. Henderson concludes this section, and the book itself, with a lament that Dresser’s songs have not withstood the test of time; yet, “for those willing to listen then and now, [his] music was a gift, one of time and place, recalled lovingly and poignantly and captured forever as in musical amber” (396).

With On the Banks of the Wabash, Clayton W. Henderson has made a significant and long-overdue contribution to Dreiser studies. As a biography, his book is thorough, accurate, and meticulously documented. As the story of a “genuine American original,” it is indeed most engaging. Mencken would be pleased.

—Richard W. Dowell, Indiana State University

The question of who would write the biography of Edgar Lee Masters did not escape the attention of Masters himself or his widow, Ellen Coyne Masters. According to Herbert K. Russell, the assignment was originally intended for William Marion Reedy, but he predeceased Masters by thirty years. Masters then turned to novelist and lecturer John Cowper Powys but found him wanting. In the early 1940s Masters came to an agreement with poet and scholar Kimball Flaccus to pen the official biography. After Masters’s death in 1950, Flaccus worked on the project intermittently for nearly twenty years. His manuscript, however, remains unpublished, because “Ellen no doubt wanted Flaccus to write a ‘critical’ biography, one that would focus on Masters’s books and touch only lightly on the man, instead of a ‘straight’ biography, that is, one that would focus on his life” (363). Russell’s book constitutes the “straight” biography from which Masters and his second wife, in particular, seemed to shy away. It benefits from the availability of important personal papers in repositories such as the Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center at the University of Texas at Austin and from the cooperation of surviving family members such as Hilary Masters (son of Edgar and his second wife Ellen). If “straight” means a traditional, chronological recounting of dates, friends, lovers, and events in a person’s life, Edgar Lee Masters: A Biography represents a thorough and professional job. Russell meticulously paints not only the outlines of Masters’s life but also its intimate details. The scholarship and writing in this text are exemplary.

The biography comprises an introduction, twenty numbered chapters (a cradle-to-grave account of Masters’s life), an afterword that ties up loose ends regarding those who survived him, a chronological list of Masters’s books and pamphlets, excellent footnotes, and a detailed index. As Russell acknowledges in the first paragraph of the first chapter, the life of Edgar Lee Masters is defined and must be organized around his single greatest accomplishment, the Spoon River Anthology. By the third chapter the renowned collection of poems has been published, but it will haunt the remainder of the biography as it haunted the remainder of Masters’s life. Russell is sure-footed in documenting and presenting Masters’s enormous literary output and the events of and people in Masters’s life. Russell is also unflinching in his portrayal of the man himself—Masters’s personality, his relationships with women, his achievements, and his failures. Much is clarified about “who was who when” in Masters’s romantic life and to whom he
was referring in certain poems. This biography testifies to Masters’s “twenty-nine volumes of verse, seven novels, seven plays, five biographies, a book of essays, and an autobiography, as well as two histories and one edited volume” (1), among other miscellaneous and posthumous pieces, but it also bears witness to the difficulties of a literary career in commercial America, particularly given the human weaknesses and limitations of the author himself. The last half of the biography proves exhausting in its representation of the marital, legal, romantic, and publishing confrontations and catastrophes that plagued Masters’s life and career.

Regarding the people in Masters’s life, this biography tends to linger on his romantic liaisons rather than his relationships with male friends and professional colleagues. All the key men in Masters’s life are noted, but rarely does the text provide any depth into the quality of the associations. Vis-à-vis Theodore Dreiser, his first mention appears in the epigraph to Chapter 2—a quotation from a 1939 letter from Dreiser to Masters. References to Dreiser appear on nearly forty more pages, with the most substantive in the section concerning the creation, publication, and critical reception of Spoon River Anthology. Correspondence between the two men essentially serves to confirm dates and mutual assistance, although quotations from such letters do offer a flavor of their camaraderie and shared vision. By the end of the biography, Dreiser becomes the example of what Masters failed to achieve as a professional writer: ‘His acquaintances Dreiser and Sandburg had managed to gain growing recognition, but Masters by now [1931] seemed more like certain other ‘one-book’ authors from the Midwest, Ben Hecht, Floyd Dell, and Glenway Wescott” (284).

Edgar Lee Masters: A Biography has been written by a scholar who stands unsurpassed in his dedication to the Illinois man who authored “the most read and most talked-of volume of poetry that had ever been written in America” (2). Herbert T. Russell has been resourceful and exhaustive in his search for primary materials; he has compiled a thorough and exacting chronology of the circumstances of and fellow travelers in Masters’s life; he has conveyed vividly the essence of the man—the strengths, the genius, the charm, the faults, the intractability; and he has juxtaposed Masters with the country in which he was born, educated, employed, admired, and sometimes rejected or ignored. For those who study the life and times of Theodore Dreiser, reading about the life and times of Edgar Lee Masters will be a rewarding albeit familiar experience. The usual suspects from Dreiser’s experience in American publishing in the first half of the twentieth century appear in Masters’s biography. Similar artistic and philosophical concerns about the direction of American literature from the nineteenth to the twenti-
eth century underpin both life stories. And perhaps most recognizable of all to Dreiser scholars is Masters’s Midwestern background—“prairie” roots that the two authors share and carry with them to Chicago and New York and to national prominence.

—Nancy M. Shawcross, University of Pennsylvania


Yoshinobu Hakutani’s third installment of reprintings of Theodore Dreiser’s magazine articles rounds out the publication of all of Dreiser’s free-lance magazine writing prepared or written before the publication of Sister Carrie in 1900. The selections compiled for this collection are a varied hodgepodge of subject matter ranging from stories of success, small arms production, carrier pigeons during wartime, and animal cruelty, to the rapid ascension of the apple industry in America, and even an article about face painting practices among native Americans. The articles collected in this volume ostensibly did not mesh with the thematic design of Hakutani’s previous collections, Selected Magazine Articles of Theodore Dreiser: Life and Art in the American 1890s (2 vols., 1985, 1987) and Art, Music, and Literature, 1897–1902 (2001), but it would be premature to relegate them to a “what’s leftover” category. On the contrary, these selections offer a more expansive, richer representation of Dreiser’s journalistic writings and American society and culture during the 1890s, including its own varied interest in these subjects. Hakutani’s introduction is fresh and focused—priming the reader with the philosophical, social, economic, and technological climate of the time—with a few visits to ground already plowed in his previous collections. As with his other collections, the editor’s notes are well researched and detailed, providing an informative supplement to each article.

Noteworthy to Theodore Dreiser’s Uncollected Magazine Articles, 1897–1902 is the inclusion of photographs and/or illustrations that provide a visual context for many of the articles, some of which were provided by the editor when the original publication did not have any. This collection also contains an appendix with a complete listing of all 111 magazine articles arranged chronologically by date of publication and their locations in this and Hakutani’s previous collections.

The book is divided into five parts: Success Stories; Science, Technol-
ogy, and Industry; American Landscapes; The City; and Other Sites and Scenes. Part I, Success Stories, examines men who have achieved great success and how they did so. Dreiser’s approach to eliciting responses from such men as prominent New York lawyer Joseph H. Choate and railroad executive Chauncey M. Depew is formulaic with stock questions such as “Does lack of opportunity justify failure?” and “Does success bring content and happiness?” Nonetheless, Dreiser ably permeates their façade to show them as average men who worked hard, stayed focused, and acted on opportunities to become successful.

Dreiser’s interviews are marked by an attention to detail that has since become the hallmark of written interviews. He never limits his interviews to a mere Q and A session; rather, he permits the reader to enter his shoes by conveying the milieu of the places where he interviews. For instance, upon arriving at Choate’s residence, Dreiser describes Choate as stoking his fireplace and making introductions without turning to greet him. In the same interview, he also describes without reservation the awkwardness of having Choate reverse roles and ask him questions. (Dreiser wrote two articles about Joseph Choate: one for Success, republished here, and one for Ainslee’s republished in volume 1 of Selected Magazine Articles of Theodore Dreiser. Of interest is Dreiser’s different representation of Choate in each article.) What is most important about Dreiser’s stories of success is that they reflect the middle-class readership’s desire to learn the secrets of success at a time when the gap between the haves and the have-nots was widening.

Part II, Science, Technology, and Industry, further illustrates Dreiser’s insatiable curiosity about the world he lived in. From “weather prophets” to Edward Atkinson’s investigation into the eating habits of Americans and even an account of the American apple industry, Dreiser documents, as an historian might, the importance of these events to both himself and his generation.

Part III, American Landscapes, includes four short articles—two on the well-to-do artistic retreat at Bronxville, New York; one on the artistic retreat at Brandywine, site of the famous Revolutionary War battle; one account of the United States government’s experiment building and testing road surfaces—and a fifth and more lengthy sketch of the state of Illinois written for Pearson’s “The Story of the States” segment in 1901.

The first selection in Part IV, The City, continues Dreiser’s first-hand experience with Illinois in an article about the Chicago suburb of Pullman. While reading “The Town of Pullman,” I could not help but feel that I had been here before. It reads very much like Carrie Meeber’s observations of
Chicago in the opening of *Sister Carrie*. That Dreiser drew upon his experiences as a reporter to establish setting in his works is of great interest to Dreiserians, and this article is a good one to see that influence.

The final section, Part V, Other Sites and Scenes, opens with a surprisingly interesting article about carrier pigeons during wartime. That carrier pigeons were used so extensively during the latter part of the nineteenth century in many ways testifies to human ingenuity, yet their subsequent obsolescence reflects the technological advances that replaced them: mail delivery, the telephone, and the telegraph. Dreiser’s ability to transform the seemingly mundane into a thought-provoking narrative is reflected in his excellent investigatory work. In each of his articles he breaks the surface and delves deep into his subject to offer his readers much more than they expected, making this and previous collections an essential resource, largely due to Hakutani’s sustained and commendable effort, for those interested in Dreiser’s literary apprenticeship as well as in American culture and society of the 1890s.

—Gregory M. Neubauer, University of North Carolina at Wilmington


By virtue of its topic, Anthony Arthur’s *Literary Feuds: A Century of Celebrated Quarrels—From Mark Twain to Tom Wolfe* is bound to be a hybrid volume. Scanning the table of contents and jacket blur, one expects a book composed of equal parts scholarly rigor and guilty pleasure. After all, the artistic sensibility is volatile and often perverse. When their rhetorical mitts come off, writers can be among the most aggressive in attacking their peers. *Literary Feuds* is a well-researched volume of literary history with a little bit of something that should interest scholars of all periods, including the era of realism and naturalism. The title, however, would also seem to promise a book with some bite—a compilation of high-order literary gossip ballasted by serious analyzing of the figures involved: their backgrounds, their social and literary attitudes, and often their political sympathies.

While Arthur certainly gives a nod in these directions, his approach to his subjects tends to be somewhat formulaic. Each chapter is laid out essentially like the ones before and after it, and the personalities of the figures involved really don’t emerge in the accounts of their disputes. Arthur also doesn’t delve very deeply into the sources of these feuds, which were, for
The most part, bloodless. In most cases, it was a bad review that started the skirmish, which then seems to have followed a pattern, escalating first into a contained battle, and later into an all-out war.

The lack of insight may partly be due to the author’s choice of subjects. The more recent matches he recounts, especially the well-known Lillian Hellman–Mary McCarthy bout, during which McCarthy said of her adversary, “Every word that she writes is a lie, including ‘the’ and ‘and,’ ” (143) are the most compelling. But some of the other figures, such as C. P. Snow and F. R. Leavis, were rather wooden personalities engaged in dry debate—like two bald men fighting over a comb, as Jorge Luis Borges described the British-Argentine dispute over the Falklands.

It might have been interesting to add a chapter or two on several smaller but more intellectually edifying debates, like those between Styron and Mailer, Edmund Gosse and John Churton Collins, and Henry James and Sir Walter Besant. And what of Poe? Poe must be the most disputatious figure ever to appear on the literary scene; his battles with his fellow literati were legendary and almost constant. (The Poe-Griswold feud, which ended with reconciliation and then posthumous character assassination, may be the most intriguing biographical episode ever.) Or, what of the famous fistfight between Frost and Stevens?

Dreiserians will obviously be most interested in the chapter describing another famous “slap”—that delivered by Dreiser to Sinclair Lewis, then his rival for the Nobel Prize, at a dinner in New York honoring the Russian novelist Boris Pilnyak in 1930. The context is well known: earlier, Lewis had publicly accused Dreiser of purloining material from his wife Dorothy Thompson’s book on the new Soviet regime during a visit to the U.S.S.R. that both writers made there in 1927. Dreiser claimed that the government press office had given all the visitors the same packet of material, which he drew on liberally, in time-honored journalistic fashion. The verdict of literary history has largely been to accept Dreiser’s excuse, but mostly as a pretext for damning Lewis on general critical grounds.

There is a substantial body of published evidence (most recently in Dreiser’s Russian Diary [1996]) to support the view that Dreiser was being uncharitable and even somewhat malevolent toward Lewis. He made negative comments about him in public and in private. This evidence was drawn on in a note I coauthored in the fall 1999 issue of American Literary Realism on the relationship between Dreiser and Lewis. The note focused on hitherto unpublished letters from Lewis to Dreiser that praised Dreiser and thus rejected the view that Lewis was out to get him. Unfortunately, evidence has since come to light that calls into question the authenticity of the
letters, and so in a retraction published later in this and other journals I asked scholars to discount the conclusions drawn in that note. Arthur’s book obviously went to press before the retraction appeared, and so he was not able to consider it in his assessment. However, the “new” material fortunately comprises only a smallish paragraph of Arthur’s chapter-length analysis, and the published evidence that Arthur cites makes a very strong case that Lewis did genuinely admire Dreiser and got “very little in return” from the older man (75).

The nature of literary relationships is a fascinating subject. Arthur’s book is a sensible and interesting treatment of the topic, but room remains for more to be said. New books on similar topics are due out: Rachel Cohen’s A Chance Meeting: Intertwined Lives of Writers and Artists During a Century of American History is to appear in spring 2004 from Random House, and Richard Lingeman (biographer of both Dreiser and Lewis) is at work on a book on literary friendships. It will be instructive to see how these critics approach their subjects.

—James M. Hutchisson, The Citadel


You enter a Greenwich Village haunt (a bar, a coffee shop, a bookstore), and a bespectacled, bearded gentleman, spouting tales of Village life, corners you. Each story focuses on a different writer, activist, artist, or eccentric: Jack Reed, Emma Goldman, Theodore Dreiser, William Carlos Williams, Eugene O’Neill, Jackson Pollock. As the elderly man tells stories, you wonder: Is this all true? How does he know this? Is this storyteller old enough to have been there? He seems to be on a first-name basis with all Village celebrities: Jack Reed is “Jack”; e. e. cummings is “Estlin”; Eugene O’Neill is “Gene”; Edna St. Vincent Millay is “Vincent”; William Carlos Williams is “Bill”; and the erudite Edmund Wilson is “Bunny.” At some point, the storyteller mentions that he moved to the Village from Montana in the 1960s, and you feel stupid to have imagined that he might have attended Mabel Dodge’s salons. As you listen, you hear of the Villagers’ sex lives, their psychiatric problems, their schemes, their betrayals, their alcohol abuse, and their creative endeavors. And as you listen longer, you realize the speaker has spent years collecting anecdotes from biographies, second-hand witnesses, newspaper articles, histories, interviews, memoirs, Village
gossip, and autobiographical novels. Blending all this information into entertaining tales, the speaker is mesmerizing, but you wonder if he can be trusted; you wonder if the stories are more myth than history, more dramatic tragedy than reality, and, at times, the storyteller admits that the Village luminaries are mythical creatures—the legends became their reality. The stories are so hypnotic that you suspend your disbelief and again imagine that you are listening to a man who was there, a man who knew “Bill” and “Gene.” And though you may doubt the storyteller’s sources, you are enthralled by the sex, alcohol, madness, infidelity, and creativity of these bohemians. This is the feeling one has when reading Ross Wetzsteon’s Republic of Dreams, Greenwich Village: The American Bohemia, 1910–1960, a history that proceeds by offering a series of highly entertaining biographies.

Wetzsteon, a contributing editor with the Village Voice for thirty-two years, entered Greenwich Village in the 1960s, just about the time his history ends. Although the book title implies a coverage of the years 1910–1960, a time when Greenwich Village was a bohemian sanctuary for American artists, the author focuses on a very few years, 1912–17, “the lyric years,” when the Village was home to Mabel Dodge and the Provincetown Players. According to Wetzsteon, “Everyone knew everyone—Wobblies and poets, anarchists and painters, recent Harvard graduates and recently imprisoned strikers, free-lovers and philosophers, pacifists and playwrights—for weren’t they all participating in the same joyous crusade?” (12). From 1913–16, Mabel Dodge entertained in her salon: “the center of the country’s radical intelligentsia” (21). On an evening at the salon, one might find Edwin Arlington Robinson, Big Bill Haywood, Max Weber, A. A. Brill, Margaret Sanger, Hippolyte Havel, Max Eastman, Hutchins Hapgood, Jack Reed, and Isadora Duncan. And during these “lyric years,” the Provincetown Players staged their first play on Hapgood’s Provincetown veranda under the direction of “Jig” (George Cram Cook). Soon after, “Gene” (Eugene O’Neill) joined the Players, a group that already included “Susan” (Susan Glaspell). The early struggle of the Provincetown Players to create the first serious American theater, from 1915–17, is for Wetzsteon the giddy height of the bohemian village. The Provincetown Players offered an intellectual experience that was an alternative to light Broadway musicals. And unlike the Washington Square Players, the Provincetown Players exclusively produced American plays. But according the Wetzsteon, these halcyon days were few: the Players attracted wealthy patrons and subscribers. By 1917, they were commercially successful, and the “lyric years” ended. April 8, 1917, the day the U.S. entered World War I, marks the end of the dream: “But in the winter of 1917–18—Gene’s third in
the Village—the joyous rebelliousness of the bohemians and radicals began to fade. Commercialization was well under way, the tourists had discovered the titillations of immorality, the poseurs had learned how to capitalize on unconventionality. More important, the war and the Bolshevik revolution splintered the Village sensibility” (137). The radicals, such as Jack Reed, Max Eastman, and Floyd Dell, turned their attention to war and politics—they were under indictment in Federal court while Jig Cook continued to produce plays. By 1920, Eugene O’Neill had won a Pulitzer Prize, and the Provincetown productions of O’Neill’s plays were becoming Broadway hits: *The Emperor Jones* moved from the Village to Broadway where it ran for 204 performances.

Of course, Wetzsteon traces the lives of these artists and activists beyond 1917. Even after Mabel Dodge ended her salons, the Villagers gathered, but Wetzsteon convinces us that that the bohemian idealism ended and only the memories of a lost bohemian dream remained. As a drama critic, Wetzsteon delineates well the Provincetown experiment—he has a good knowledge of the theater and a great appreciation of Jig Cook’s monumental struggle to create serious American theater, and this struggle is clearly the climax of Wetzsteon’s history. Throughout the book, there is a tone of nostalgia, a sense that bohemia and the Village are lost, and that they were only ideas in the heads of those early Villagers, ideas destroyed by war, alcohol, mental illness, and commercialization. This focus on “the lyric years” (1912–17) adds a mythical quality to the book—those associated with the lyric period are titans, a race apart, and their accomplishments can never be recaptured—we live in a fallen time when bohemia, creativity, and non-commercial activities are impossible, even though young people continue to enter the Village searching for artistic freedom. After tracing the lives of the early titans, Wetzsteon offers few biographies, so we are left to question the subtitle: “The American Bohemia, 1910–1960.” A chapter on Delmore Schwartz represents the 1930s, and a chapter on Jackson Pollock covers the 1940s and early 1950s, but Schwartz’s and Pollock’s struggles with alcohol and mental illness so dominate Wetzsteon’s biographical sketches that one feels only a sense of loss, a sense of the Village as a dystopia.

For someone unfamiliar with Greenwich Village and its artistic movements, this book is fascinating. In fact, for someone interested in tales of artists and their eccentricities, this book is a voyeuristic romp. But for a reader studying a particular artist, looking for new information, *Republic of Dreams* fails to provide adequate documentation or careful representations of the artists’ lives or works. While the history of the Provincetown Players,
especially the production side of the movement, is insightful and fascinating, the Washington Square Players, another experimental theater group that inspired the Provincetown Players, is mentioned only briefly and disparagingly. And the analysis of the artists’ works is superficial. Although Wetzsteon writes a chapter of more than fifty pages on Edna St. Vincent Millay and although he quotes her poetry more than he quotes anyone else’s work, he dismisses Millay as an author: "Her reputation was as devastated as her health: neither would recover" (291). Throughout his long chapter on "Vincent," Wetzsteon drops unanalyzed chunks of her poetry, seldom commenting on the quotations, but he speculates endlessly on her sex life: her possible lesbian relationships, her first encounter with Floyd Dell, and her long romance with "Bunny" (Edmund Wilson). In describing her first night with Floyd Dell, Wetzsteon writes, "For all her flirtatious bravado, Vincent proved a timid beginner, and for all his sophistication Floyd proved an awkward seducer" (253). As if he were in the room taking notes, Wetzsteon details the lovers’ fumblings. In the chapter on Djuna Barnes, we learn of her father’s sexual indiscretions, some of which included bestiality—"frequent sexual intercourse with several of his prize specimens"—and we learn of the seduction of "Djuna” as a teenager by her grandmother (433). But a page later Wetzsteon briefly mentions that these “disturbing accounts” have been deduced from comments that “Djuna” made to friends and from an analysis of her fiction. In other words, Wetzsteon is passing on lurid gossip and wild speculation as biographical fact.

Again, for someone unfamiliar with these artists looking for brief entertaining biographies, Wetzsteon’s book is wonderful. But the sketches can give one a slanted view. Readers unfamiliar with Theodore Dreiser will leave Republic of Dreams believing that Dreiser is an author whose books are no longer read, an ugly, anti-social person who was best known for pursuing and seducing Kirah Markham, a Provincetown Player whom Floyd Dell hoped to marry. Not being an author admired by Wetzsteon, Dreiser, along with others, is consigned to a chapter titled “Eminent Villagers,” which includes Willa Cather, Guido Bruno (an author of Village guidebooks), Margaret Anderson (publisher of The Little Review), Baroness Elsa von Freytag-Loringhoven (a poet who helped edit The Little Review), Robert Clairmont (a man with the means to throw great parties), and Harry Kemp (the hobo poet). In the section on Dreiser, Wetzsteon claims, “Three of the greatest American novels were written in Greenwich Village—Huckleberry Finn, O Pioneers!, and An American Tragedy. The irony is that all three, and the novelists themselves, are as far as possible from the Village ethos” (297). In fact, Dreiser did much of his writing in the Village,
which Wetzsteon doesn’t discuss, but when working on *An American Tragedy*, Dreiser moved to Brooklyn, so he could concentrate. Dreiser is described as a “boorish and graceless man” whose only virtue is that he is not craven: “Sour and humorless, he was hardly a likable man. Not to put too fine a point on it, he was in many ways a monster. He could be cruel, deceitful, gross, cold, and ungrateful—sometimes it seemed that the best thing that could be said about him was that at least he wasn’t craven” (300). Focusing on Dreiser’s sex life, Wetzsteon tells a tale of Dreiser bringing home a woman and forcing another woman, with whom he was living, out of the bedroom, but we are not given names or dates or a location. In discussing Dreiser’s interaction with other Villagers, Wetzsteon paints an unattractive picture: “Unlike most Villagers, Theodore was no host, no joiner, no mixer. In a community where everyone knew everyone else with an easygoing intimacy, he had few close friends” (302). Again, Wetzsteon generalizes unfairly. In 1915, when living with Kirah Markham, Dreiser and Markham held open houses every Sunday evening, November through March, and it must have been at one of these Sunday salons that Kenneth Burke, only eighteen, met Dreiser. In one of his earliest existing letters, Burke writes to Malcolm Cowley of a transforming encounter with a literary giant:

> Last night I had the fullest hours of my life; I was at Dreiser’s. I am not going to write you about all I experienced. It would seem almost like sacrilege to me. You see, to me the evening was an epoch. For all the time I was making my debut, I was wondering if my debut was to be my end. ([*The Selected Correspondence of Kenneth Burke and Malcolm Cowley*](#))

Apparently, Dreiser had a social side that Wetzsteon failed to discover. In assessing Dreiser’s fiction, Wetzsteon at one point gives a backhanded compliment: “Though little read these day, and less admired, he deserves homage for contributing to the liberation of American fiction from its Victorian optimism and puritanical hypocrisy” (302). But there is no sense that Wetzsteon read any of Dreiser’s works, and in assessing Dreiser’s contribution to the theatrical life of the Village, Wetzsteon mentions Dreiser’s play *The Girl in the Coffin*, produced in 1917 by the Washington Square Players, and *The Hand of the Potter*, produced in 1921 by the Provincetown Players, but only the bad reviews of the latter production are cited, not its extremely controversial content, nor the relative success of the former production.

Dying before the book was finished, Wetzsteon did not have an opportunity to write a conclusion that would have focused on “the lyric years,” a period that is covered well. In fact, this book might have been far more ef-
Wetzsteon would likely have restructured the final chapter, which ends abruptly with Jackson Pollock’s death. A long and structurally-flawed chapter, it begins with a narrative of Pollock’s life and career, switches to a survey of other Abstract Expressionists, such as Mark Rothko, Franz Kline, and William de Kooning, and then returns to Pollock’s life and death. Structurally, the book ends in a falling apart, which may actually be appropriate but unintended. Wetzsteon’s daughter writes a thoughtful afterword that describes her father well and that reasserts the theme of the Village as a state of mind, an optimistic theme that Wetzsteon intended but that disappeared in tragic stories of Village misfits lost in a bohemian dystopia.

— Roark Mulligan, Christopher Newport University


The Library of America edition of An American Tragedy arrived at my door late one summer afternoon and initiated a reencounter of the finest order: the familiar made more familiar by its encasement in fitting garb. How wonderful that Dreiserians can now refer to a handsome cloth-bound edition of Dreiser’s masterpiece.

As the 140th book in the Library of America series (Sister Carrie, Jennie Gerhardt, and Twelve Men comprise volume 36), An American Tragedy joins a distinguished series dedicated to “publishing, and keeping in print, authoritative editions of America’s best and most significant writing.” Dreiser’s novel keeps company with the work of such great American writers as Herman Melville, Edith Wharton, Henry James, William Faulkner, Charles Chestnutt, Willa Cather, and Dashiell Hammett. If the richness of the novel’s content and import earns it a place in the series, its material excellence wins it a place in our hands and before our eyes. The lure of materiality that the novel warns against keeps one reaching for and not letting go of this fine new edition. Holding the book—slipping off its shiny laminated paper cover to embrace its cloth binding—and turning its pages made of acid-free paper thrills and satisfies. The readability of the text is no less remarkable. Like Clyde’s handsome face, the face of the typeset impresses.

We see the novel face first, as unlike some other volumes in the series, the book does not include a distracting introduction. Following the novel
proper appear a chronology, a note on the text, and notes to references within the novel, all of which were expertly prepared by Dreiser biographer and editor Thomas P. Riggio. Riggio writes that this edition offers the text “without change, except for the correction of typographical errors,” explaining that inconsistencies in “spelling, punctuation, and capitalization are often expressive features” of an author’s style and thus are not altered in this edition (968). The notes identify the many Biblical passages Dreiser wove into his narrative as well as a number of cultural references such as dances and songs of the period. The remarkably detailed chronology provides a compelling summary of Dreiser’s life and invites a biographical reading of the novel since the parallels between Clyde’s early life and Dreiser’s are especially striking.

The framing of the text, both material and textual, no doubt shapes the reading. Thus, this reader’s sense that An American Tragedy still reads like new after several readings testifies either to her weak memory or to the richness of Dreiser’s work. In this fine edition one can again encounter the joy of the plot, the power of Dreiser’s prose, and the morality inherent in this psychological study of human frailty and social corruption. Though I know what happens, I keep reading to find out. Dreiser’s prose flows as smoothly as the pages turn.

A cursory reading of other reviews of this edition of Dreiser’s great work demonstrates that many reviewers resist the seductions of the text and succumb instead to old jokes about Dreiser’s labored prose. But the novel (not this edition per se) fares better with general readers: sixty-six of Amazon.com’s somewhat more discerning reader-reviewers award it four out of five stars. Thus, the moment of this fine new edition of Dreiser’s work mirrors the moment of its original publication in 1925 when Dreiser’s friend H. L. Mencken complained in his famous review about its excessive detail and repetitions. The novel, as Riggio points out in the chronology, “sold over 13,000 copies in the first two weeks” (955). It eventually sold over 50,000 copies, earning royalties that totaled more than $47,000. Not bad for 1925.

This new edition of a classic text has a great deal to teach: sometimes the package accurately reflects the value of what it holds.

—Linda Dunleavy, Brown University
Errata, noted by Robert H. Elias, which are present in his *Letters of Theodore Dreiser: A Selection*, 3 vols. (Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 1959). Only substantive errors in the texts and annotation of the letters are noted; obvious typographical errors are omitted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vol./Page/Line</th>
<th>Error</th>
<th>Correction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I/47/10</td>
<td>Spring?</td>
<td>January</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I/48/37</td>
<td>(May 1901)</td>
<td>(May 1900)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I/49/35</td>
<td>(October 1901)</td>
<td>(October 1900)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I/63/8</td>
<td>August 16</td>
<td>August 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I/74/28</td>
<td>Madern</td>
<td>Maddern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I/164/35</td>
<td>The prototype</td>
<td>Emilie Grigsby was the prototype</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I/183/5</td>
<td>December 10</td>
<td>November 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/511/16</td>
<td>trail</td>
<td>trial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/795/9</td>
<td>[1938]</td>
<td>[1939]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/896/9</td>
<td>then</td>
<td>them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/936/33</td>
<td>Lord</td>
<td>Lords</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/947/26</td>
<td>score</td>
<td>scare</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Cambridge Companion to Theodore Dreiser*, edited by Clare Virginia Eby and Leonard Cassuto, has just been published by Cambridge University Press. The volume includes the following essays:

- “Dreiser and the Profession of Authorship,” by James L. W. West III
- “Dreiser and the Uses of Biography,” by Thomas P. Riggio
- “Dreiser’s Style,” by Paul Giles
- “Dreiser and the History of American Longing,” by Jackson Lears
- “Dreiser, Class, and the Home,” by Catherine Jurca
- “Can There Be Loyalty in The Financier? Dreiser and Upward Mobility,” by Bruce Robbins
“Dreiser, Art, and the Museum,” by Miles Orvell
“Dreiser and Women,” by Clare Virginia Eby
“Sister Carrie, Race, and the World’s Columbian Exposition,” by Christopher Gair
“Dreiser’s Sociological Vision,” by Priscilla Wald
“Dreiser and Crime,” by Leonard Cassuto

In Memoriam

With this issue, Roger W. Smith joins *Dreiser Studies* as its bibliographer. Items of bibliographic import may be sent to

Roger Smith  
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Also with this issue, Carol Loranger joins as book review editor. Books for review may be sent to

Carol Loranger, Book Review Editor  
*Dreiser Studies*  
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Wright State University  
3640 Colonel Glenn Hwy.  
Dayton, Ohio 45435-0001  
carol.loranger@wright.edu
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