

VANDOVER AND THE BRUTE

By FRANK NORRIS

The MS of this story was found in a box of Frank Norris's personal effects that survived both the San Francisco earthquake and fire.

We are sending this advance copy to you, first, because of the interest that attaches to the author's unrevised draft, and second, because this tremendous piece of realism conveys a moral lesson that no one who reads it can forget. If, like Arthur of old, you are engaged as minister or layman in making the sway of the Brute grow less and less in the land, then this story has a message for you — as it has for every human being who fights the eternal fight between good and evil in his own soul.

— The Publishers.

Dust Jacket
The "Advance Copy" Binding for Reviewers
Vandover and the Brute

Unlike the dust jacket for the "trade edition" which sensationally featured the profile of a howling wolf, this one was designed to tame the novel and encourage reviewers to recommend it as a highly moral "cautionary tale." Courtesy of the Alderman Library, Barrett Collection.

The Marriage, Divorce and Demise
of a Father of Novelists: B.F. Norris

Richard Allan Davison
University of Delaware

Relatively little is known about B.F. (Benjamin Franklin) Norris, Sr. (1836-1900), the self-made businessman, enigmatic husband of former actress Gertrude Doggett Norris (1840-1919), and father of novelists Frank Norris (1870-1902) and Charles G. Norris (1881-1945). He has remained a shadowy figure whose apparently contradictory personality has long invited speculation. He, on one hand, was the contented husband who loved his wife's dramatic readings from Dickens as he relaxed in the evening after a day's work at his Chicago-based wholesale jewelry business. On the other, he resented Gertrude's devotion to literature and the performing arts that prompted her co-founding of the San Francisco Browning Society, for which she was featured reader and prima donna. The picture that also develops is that of a father who objected to the "thimble-headed bobism" of Frank's artistic endeavors, which ran counter to his own dreams of his first son joining him in the business world; and yet, he generously financed almost two years of Frank's art study in London and Paris.

As will be seen below, one can now also visualize a son-in-law highly praised by Gertrude's parents, whom he welcomed into his Chicago home shortly after his marriage. For many years this filial kindness extended itself, showing him in a most positive light. But, B.F. was as well a husband and father who (like Mr. Wingfield in *The Glass Menagerie*) fell in love with long distances, leaving his family in San Francisco as he took a trip around the world. He also fell in love with another woman, whom he married. They settled down back in Chicago, and he was never to see his first family again.

After 1894, when his exasperated response to Gertrude's charge that he had become "imbued with the desire to get rid of matrimonial shackles" was reported in the *Chicago Tribune* and the *Chicago Daily News*, little information about B.F. appeared in the newspapers prior to his death.¹ Some of the mystery surrounding his life, however, is to a degree diminished in light of newly discovered documents which provide more detail regarding his personality and the specifics of his history. With them it is possible to flesh-out a bit more our conception of him and even, perhaps, view him in a more sympathetic light than has been possible up to now. The first welcome addition to the spare store of information is one which illuminates the "better side" of his nature prior to the move to California in 1884. It is an 1883 letter by his mother-in-law focusing upon a thirteen year period and taking the reader back in time, circa 1870.

The young jewelry salesman apparently started his wholesale business in Chicago almost a decade earlier, in 1861. He most probably wooed and won as his wife the former Chicago school teacher, Gertrude Doggett, not long after he saw her performing the spunky role of Emilia in *Othello* at the McVicker's Theatre in Chicago in January of 1867²—by which time he was established enough to offer her financial and social security, and a measure of independence:

Gertrude agreed to marry him in light of a promise not to interfere with her professional stage career.³ Whether or not he intended to honor his word, the children born to them in the early years of their marriage effectively rendered the point moot. To this cause of stress in their marriage was added other complications. Their loss of two young daughters (Grace and Flora) made more central to Gertrude's life her dotage on Frank and then, her favorite, the fair-haired Lester. It was the sudden, premature death of Lester at 9, years later in San Francisco, that prompted Gertrude to take Charles and cousin Ida Carlton with her as she joined her husband on the trip to Europe to settle Frank in art school at the Académie Julian in Paris. Then there is the matter of Gertrude reluctantly enduring the birth of an apparently unwanted Charles (*not* the eagerly awaited daughter!), to whom she offhandedly gave the name of her physician.⁴ Nevertheless, she certainly enjoyed the good life in Chicago with a large house, servants, a coach and horses, and private schools for Frank and Lester that B.F., with his substantial income, provided. If one ignores for a moment the Norris children as he here recalls the story of *The Pit*, Laura Jadwin's experience of the same kind during the early years of her marriage quickly suggests itself as the appropriate analogue.

Benjamin Franklin Norris Sr., the son of Josiah and Lois Colton Norris, was born on a farm in Michigan on 10 January 1836 and married the youngest daughter of Samuel Wales Doggett (9 July 1800-27 August 1872) and Harriet Wotten Doggett (2 April 1804-7 February 1892) in a ceremony performed in Chicago by the Rev. Robert Collyer on 27 May 1867.⁵ What Franklin Walker termed "the undercurrents" which brought on "the crisis" in the marriage most probably did not dramatically manifest themselves during the Chicago years.⁶ As with the hero of *The Pit*, Curtis Jadwin, contentment and a desire to please his wife were stronger then than later. Or, so one might infer from the words of a family witness to B.F. Norris's affability and generous nature prior to the move to San Francisco. Gertrude's mother left behind a telling testimony to what her son-in-law was like before the "undercurrents" took his life in a different direction.

The widowed Mrs. Doggett was living with B.F., Gertrude, Frank (12 1/2), Lester (5 1/2), and Charles (almost two) when she wrote a very revealing introduction for B.F. on 1 February 1883 to her son Samuel in San Francisco.⁷ (The year was not specified in the letter but is inferable from the contents.) Here, then, is one summary of the early years:

My dear Son Samuel,

This letter will be given you by Mr. Norris who is visiting California hoping to benefit his health, which has for the past year been considerably impaired. Mr. Norris is the husband of your youngest sister Gertrude with whom I have lived for the last thirteen years. I know my dear Son it will please you to know from me that in all these long years that I have known Mr. Norris I have proved him to be a modest, benevolent and honorable gentleman—a devoted husband and affectionate Son.

Your own father who lived with Mr. Norris for the three years preceding his death both loved and re-

spected him. I need not assure you my beloved boy how rejoiced would be your dear mother and your sister Gertrude if you could be induced to return with Mr. Norris to Chicago if only for a brief visit. Blessed indeed would I be if I could but once more see and embrace my first born 'ere I go hence and am no more.

Ever your loving Mother
[?] Doggett

The years Harriet Doggett spent with the "devoted" and "affectionate" B.F. Norris would have allowed her ample opportunity to note anything of the aberrant in his nature. If she did, it hardly shows in this paen to a paragon. But, as we know, problems did develop at some time, and reference to the autobiographical dimensions of *The Pit* aids little in the matter of fixing a date for burgeoning difficulties within the family.

Charles' recollections of B.F. Norris's traits aid us little in specifying the time at which the "undercurrents" became stronger. But Charles, in fact, does provide many more insights into his father's idiosyncrasies than Frank ever did. He did so in a series of unpublished letters which, from a much later vantage point, tell a different and more negative tale than that offered earlier by Mrs. Doggett. Further, letters to Charles from his wife-to-be offer even more data, particularly regarding Gertrude whose contributory role in the marriage debacle more than once suggests itself and mitigates somewhat the onus that B.F. has long shouldered.⁸

In a 25 October 1908 letter to his fiancée, Kathleen Thompson (later the best-selling novelist Kathleen Norris, 1879-1966), Charles points to at least one of the sore points in his parents' marriage. Amidst the candor of his own confessions of personal shortcomings, he declares: "I told her [Patricia, Charles's former fiancée] how jealous I was and how my father and brother were also, that it was a family trate [*sic*]." It is not the only time in their correspondence that he makes this point and thus glosses the possessiveness of B.F. which prompted resentment regarding Gertrude's personal enthusiasms.

Kathleen soon found that Gertrude could be as candid as her son. What was revealed to her in an intimate conversation with Gertrude became the substance of her 17 November 1908 letter to Charles, and it allows the first opportunity to note that there were, indeed, problems shortly before the family's departure from Chicago:

And do you know your mother told me all about your father,—the beginning of his nervous trouble—and your coming out here, and Ida [Carlton], and his trip, and all—terrible, terrible story. It made me sick to look at her, stately and handsome in silk, and think of her husband, after 27 dignified, confident years—suddenly daring to hurt her that way. And so irretrievably. And what a pitiful end for a fine man. For he must have been fine too, although one can see that her fine sons are like her. But his generosity to her people—and all that—its [*sic*] all unspeakably sad.

Among other things, the letter supports B.F.'s mother-in-law's praise of his benevolence and gentle-

manly honor, for Gertrude and/or Charles seem to have convinced Kathleen that B.F. had indeed been generous to the Doggetts. But, Kathleen's reference to "his nervous trouble" dating back to the early 1880s in Chicago is a provocative new datum taking us beyond the long established fact of his *physical* problem, the congenital lameness seen as explaining his initial trip to San Francisco before he settled his family there.⁹ Trouble with "nerves," of course, suggests more than a physical disability. Further, Kathleen's description of his death as the "pitiful end for a fine man" is also a suggestive new notion; and, as will be seen below, the newspaper account of his demise was not the stuff of which the conclusions of sentimental romances are made.

While registering (in his 2 and 4 December 1908 responses to Kathleen) a real pleasure over his mother's sharing of her intimate life with his fiancée, Charles discloses (along with unspecified accusations about his father's "terrible" and "sickening" behavior) more information about the nature of his father's—and his own—"jealousy." On 2 December 1908, he offers an ennobled response to Kathleen's description of her growing closeness with his mother: "I love to hear of mother talking to you so intimately about her life and about my father. It is proof positive to me of how she has learned to love you. God bless you both." Two days later, however, Charles frankly elaborates on his earlier admission of the Norris male trait of jealousy, which evidently included his father's continued frustrations over one of Gertrude's most avid expressions of her artistic side: "Frankly, dearest,—it's not a very pleasing thought to me to think of all the fun you will have—without me . . . perhaps it is a teeny-wee bit a feeling of jealousy. I admit I am ashamed to admit that. My father used to be jealous of the books my mother enjoyed—which he did not understand or appreciate. . . ."

The portrait of B.F. Norris becomes increasingly complex, with Charles next stressing his father's *considerate* nature vis-a-vis Gertrude in his 9 December 1908 letter to Kathleen: "I don't mind telling you my secret. It is a watchword—an open sesame. Some men can never-never acquire it. Ask mother if during the 27 years of her happy married life—my father was considerate. Oh—and I have what neither of them ever had. I know . . . I can make a woman supremely happy" Kathleen's letter to Charles almost a month later (6 January 1909) then reinforces the *positive* image of his parents' married life. She reports that Gertrude, "lying down with a lame shoulder," told her of how well she had been provided for—"of her early married life, and the Carlton cousins—and of course of Frank—his tutors and his pony—and all the luxury of those days."

At this point, and the "jealousy" of B.F. aside, one wonders about Gertrude's part in the drama and how she may have aggravated such a considerate person. Before coming to a suggestion of an answer to this question, though, the sequence of letters first documents Gertrude's grievances

In her 16 February 1909 letter to Charles, Kathleen reveals Gertrude's sense of an early betrayal in her marriage as prompted by B.F.'s conservative view of a wife's role in the late nineteenth century: "She likes to tell me, you Norrises don't want your wives

to be characters, your mother loves to tell me that your father promised that she could go on without [sic] her theatrical career, before they were married and did not for an instant think of keeping his word." Perhaps feeling she has gone too far in her disclosure of Gertrude's confidences, Kathleen adds: "I'm writing a little recklessly, an [sic] will regret this. You know your mother so well that you know how little importance to place on it. Don't if you love me, mention a word of it to her" In his 2 March 1909 letter to Kathleen, Charles (perhaps with the assumption of some twenty-seven-year olds that anyone over sixty-five is ancient) continues his litany of the unhappiness in his mother's life, unhappiness prompted by the premature deaths of her infant girls, of her favorite son, of her next favorite, Frank, and the desertion by her husband: "she has but a few years yet to live . . . and after all the suffering she's been through, isn't it a wonder that she isn't a tongue lashing, bitter, cruel, unloving distrusting shrew? Lord, I'd hate and distrust and abuse everyone if I had gone through what she has. So be generous, dear,—you can afford to be." The exhortation was timely since, as Charles letter was making its way to Kathleen, she was experiencing the latest of many complications in her relationship with Gertrude.¹⁰

Kathleen stood five feet nine and a half inches and weighed approximately two hundred pounds. On 3 March 1909, she wrote this to Charles: "One day [Gertrude] asks me if I think I will like wheeling a perambulator through the streets of New York, and the next reminds me that no men really like large women! And perhaps the third day she will be absolutely charming as she well knows how to be." That Gertrude's unnerving bitterness and displaced aggression over B.F.'s desertion continued to spew forth in her conversations with Kathleen is evident in Kathleen's hurt response to her future mother-in-law's verbal cruelty. In a 12 April 1909 letter to Charles, written less than three weeks before their marriage, she complains that she "can't help getting hot and sick and frightened when [Gertrude] talks about men and their hideous inconsideration and babies and hot weather and a small income over and over and over! She says repeatedly that she would not do it—and indeed she wouldn't."

We now know what Mrs. Doggett thought about her model son-in-law. It is quite unfortunate that she left no such record about her daughter when in Chicago.

Some twenty years later, in a 1930 interview with Walker, Charles was to give a fuller version of his own memories of the results of his parents' marital tensions. Once more the data are suggestive but ambivalent in their import. Charles recalled that his "good Presbyterian" father (who smoked cigars but did not drink) embarked on his trip around the world alone—because Gertrude refused to go with him. He went, and that tells against him. At the same time, Gertrude might have accompanied him with Charles in tow (Frank was already on his own at Berkeley). Charles also told Franklin Walker that Gertrude later objected to B.F. sending checks to Frank and that Frank tore up at least one of them. One can sympathize with Frank's and her hostility. Yet, B.F. *did* send checks: he was hardly the heartless rake. According to

Charles, when B.F. died his money went to his second wife, Belle; but that is hardly an anomaly, especially in light of Gertrude's response to the divorce and Frank's *sang froid* attitude toward B.F.

B.F., then, now seems less of a puzzle than formerly, and the relationship with Gertrude itself seems even more of one. To return to *The Pit*, how much was the far-from-faultless Laura Dearborn Jadwin like Gertrude? Why, exactly, did B.F. become less affectionate, the way that Curtis Jadwin did? *The Pit* does not offer a clear explanation for the death of Curtis's ardor, prior to his turning to speculation for new stimulations. As the novel allows one only inferences in this regard, so the biographical data examined here satisfies in a way that whets one's appetite for yet more information.

By way of a coda, there are some "final" details that can now be offered. As was noted by Kathleen, the death of the husband of Belle Norris less than a decade after the divorce could be viewed as a "pitiful" end, despite the posh setting in which it occurred, the Hotel Lexington.¹¹ The following, hitherto unnoted items concerning his end appeared in the *Chicago Tribune*. The first was the terse death notice, 29 October 1900, p. 5: "NORRIS—Benjamin F. Norris at the Lexington Hotel in his 65th year. Funeral notice hereafter." On p. 9 appeared the obituary:

OLDEST JEWELER IN CITY DIES
Benjamin F. Norris, Head of Wholesale
Firm, Expires at Lexington
After Brief Illness

Benjamin F. Norris of the wholesale jewelry firm, B.F. Norris, Alister & Co., 103 State Street, died at the Lexington Hotel yesterday afternoon. Death was caused by kidney trouble, from which he has been suffering for two weeks. The funeral will be held from the hotel on Thursday. Burial will be at Grace-land. Mr. Norris was the oldest man in the jewelry business in Chicago, coming here to establish himself in 1861. He was born near Grand Rapids, Michigan, in 1836.

The next day, 30 October 1900, two more items were published in the *Tribune* (p. 5). A burial permit had been issued for "Norris, Benjamin F., 64; Lexington Hotel. October 28." Under "DEATHS" appeared "NORRIS—Sunday, Oct. 28th—at the Lexington Hotel, Benjamin F. Norris, beloved husband of Belle Norris. Services 1:30 p.m. Tuesday at hotel. Burial private. No flowers."

Notes:

¹Regarding the bitter divorce proceedings, see my "Some Light on Gertrude Doggett Norris's 1894 Divorce Suit," *Frank Norris Studies*, No. 6 (Spring, 1988), pp. 3-4, as well as the new *Chicago Daily News* item made available by James Stronks in this issue of *FNS*. Another previously unnoted piece sheds some more positive light on B.F. in 1894; the *Chicago Tribune* (4 February 1894, p. 6) reported that B.F. Norris, Alister & Co. subscribed \$100.00 to the Jewelry Auxiliary of the Central Relief Association "in aid of the unem-

ployed.”

²Gertrude’s role was listed in the advertisements appearing that month in the *Chicago Tribune*.

³See the Charles and Kathleen Norris correspondence quoted below.

⁴Kathleen Norris, *Family Gathering* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1959), p. 74. Although Carlton Booth Norris is the name on Charles Gilman Norris’s birth certificate, Gertrude’s attending physician was Charles Gilman Smith.

⁵These and other details of the kind are derived from the Norris family Bible, now in a private collection.

⁶*Frank Norris: A Biography* (New York: Doubleday, Doran and Co., 1932), p. 86.

⁷William Dawson recently donated this letter to the Bancroft Library. The letters by Charles Norris and Kathleen Thompson quoted below are also in the Bancroft Library. I am indebted to James D. Hart, Director, and the Norris family for permission to quote from them. I also thank Trey Philpotts for assistance with the research for this essay.

⁸Charles was serving as an editor for *American Magazine* and Kathleen was a journalist in San Fran-

cisco. They exchanged daily letters during their engagement from September 1908 until Gertrude escorted Kathleen across the country for the 30 April 1909, New York City wedding.

⁹This datum that B.F. Norris suffered from “nervous trouble” is more evidence supporting the claim of Frank’s widow Jeannette Black Norris in a 1930 interview with Walker (Franklin Walker Collection, Bancroft Library). She related that “many of the characteristics of his [Frank’s] father” are “in Jadwin of *The Pit*.” The interview with Charles, cited below, is also in the Walker Collection.

¹⁰Kathleen’s letters to Charles throughout their engagement register her ambivalent attitude towards Gertrude. Gertrude’s radical shifts from disarming generosity to unreasonable perversity provoked Kathleen’s adoration and love one day and tearful chagrin and bitter resentment the next.

¹¹In his *The Tale of Chicago* (New York: G.F. Putnam’s Sons, 1933, p. 234), Edgar Lee Masters describes the Lexington as the hotel President Cleveland “stopped at . . . when he came to the Fair . . . it was rapidly filled with the elite of the neighborhood who began to leave their residences for hotel life, as the era of the apartment building became increasingly the means of a less burdensome manner of existence.”



A Metro-Goldwyn Picture.

NOW HE WAS A FULL-FLEDGED DENTIST.

McTeague Photoplay title "Greed."

GREED

Like many another element in *McTeague*, the fabulous Golden Molar was cut from *Greed* in the version released in 1924. This still was reproduced in the Grosset & Dunlap “Photoplay Edition” of *McTeague* (1924). From the Collection of Joseph R. McElrath, Jr.

Naturalism in the Cinema: Erich von Stroheim's
Reading of *McTeague*

Mary Lawlor
New York University

Erich von Stroheim used to claim that his first reading of *McTeague* was the experience that initiated his desire to become a film-maker.¹ During the shooting of *Greed* in 1923, he told the critic Edwin Shallert, "It has always been my determination to produce the story exactly as it was written."² His work was, in his own estimation, not only to render a faithful translation of the novel, but to provide an authentic account of human behavior as he found it. Later, in talking about his intentions for this and other films, von Stroheim asserted in terms very like Norris's own claims for naturalist fiction, "I was going to film stories which would be life-like to the Nth degree. I intended to show men and women as they are all over the world . . . their good and bad qualities, their noble . . . and their vicious, mean and greedy sides."³

Documentary intentions like these are appropriate enough for a naturalist project, and for the visual realism that von Stroheim was trying to emphasize with the camera. But there is something excessive about his expressed fidelity to Norris, just as there is in his voyeuristic probe for the real in *Greed*. Perhaps the necessary anxieties of adaptation, like those of translation—of being simultaneously faithful and different—explain to some degree these rather obsessive-sounding declarations. Von Stroheim's wish to duplicate *McTeague* precisely on film, and the identification of his work with Norrisian naturalism, indicate distinctly enough the influence that the author had on him. Other statements of artistic concern match even more precisely those of Norris. For example, in von Stroheim's 1919 *The Devil's Pass Key*, the protagonist's publisher charges, "You must write of life as it is—real drama is all around you—being played on the streets of Paris now—That is what we want!" The distinction, however problematic, between "life" and "literature" in Norris's call to potential writers in "An Opportunity for Novelists" can be heard in the publisher's charge, which, according to von Stroheim's most recent and comprehensive biographer, Richard Koszarski, "summarizes what we may take as von Stroheim's artistic credo."⁴

Koszarski's biography, *The Man You Loved to Hate*, published in 1983, argues that the director's life and work were so inextricably bound up in each other that it would be difficult to say which resulted from which. What Koszarski does not note, but which certainly supports his argument, is that, in the performance of his life, von Stroheim's attraction to Norris's novel meant not only that he would produce a film version of it but that he would also adopt the author's professed critical principles as his own. Several other statements related to the production of *Greed* indicate von Stroheim's assumption of a critical posture that virtually duplicates Norris's.

Koszarski's understanding of von Stroheim implies some of the many ironies in Hollywood realism. From the curious relations of the artificial to the real in the studio environment, connections can be drawn concerning the anxieties of adaptation; for von Stroheim, as perhaps for much of early Hollywood, the

representation of anything by anyone meant that the source first had to be *made* real in order to be copied on the screen—among other ways, by being manifested in the director's life and in his declarations of intention. Such an ideal of inseparable attachment of art to life in a construction of the kind means, of course, that the notion of realism would always be questionable. The "real" is thus at least as man-made, as much an artifice experientially induced, as it is related to naturally occurring phenomena. That the "real" in question was largely defined by a representation found in an 1899 novel further complicates the situation. And yet, directors like von Stroheim would insist upon their ability to generate a faithful embodiment of the true condition of things.

In 1912, three years after his arrival in the United States from Vienna, von Stroheim—as Koszarski puts it—"found himself . . . stranded in San Francisco."⁵ The New York garment company which he represented had suddenly gone out of business, and Von Stroheim took a job at an inn on Mount Tamalpais where he met his first wife, Margaret Knox. The marriage ended after one year, troubled by disputes over money and by von Stroheim's fits of depression, drinking, and violence. Across the bay, Margaret's mother, a respected Oakland doctor, nourished her disapproval of von Stroheim as her daughter's relationship with him grew worse. Finally, after being beaten by her husband almost as badly as Trina is by *McTeague*, Margaret divorced him.

Shortly thereafter, von Stroheim took a job as guide and lifeguard for a tourist business in the Sierra Nevada, at Lake Tahoe. Koszarski represents this episode as an opportunity for von Stroheim to retreat from the disasters of his life in the city, and to recuperate in the anonymity of the wilderness. The analogy to *McTeague*'s experience continues in his subsequent departure from the Sierra country for the south; but, rather than to the Owens Valley, von Stroheim headed for Los Angeles, where he produced his first play and began his career in film.

Greed, shot in 1923 and released in 1924, was his fifth film. It followed a series of love and seduction stories set in opulent, often aristocratic surroundings, with brilliantly beautiful women characters and dashing, Prussian gallants as the alternately villainous and heroic male protagonists. The social and economic conditions represented in *Greed* constituted a radical and brief change from his accumulated style; afterwards, he returned to the more glamorous material of his earlier films.

What von Stroheim produced in *Greed* was a very lengthy, visual translation, in effect a cinema-novel whose working script attempted a page-for-page transcription of *McTeague*. In his wish to respect and preserve the authenticity of the novel, von Stroheim organized a series of production methods that stressed his idea of a faithful adaptation. He filmed *Greed* on location, without using a single studio set. In San Francisco, he reconstructed the pre-earthquake scenes of the novel and required his principal actors to sleep in the building where most of the early portions of the story were filmed, so that they could "really feel 'inside' the characters they were to portray."⁶ The Death Valley episodes were shot at the peak of summer, when the wildly intense heat drove the actors to

their limits, and made them authentically hate each other. Von Stroheim managed to reopen the Big Dipper Mine and made everyone—camera and light crews included—go down three thousand feet to shoot the Sierra mining sequences.⁷

Von Stroheim's identification with Norris is evident in these complicated maneuvers, as in his presumption to speak for the author in the design of the film. Later he wrote, "I was given *plein de pouvoir* to make the picture as the author might have wanted it"; and he complained that these terms of artistic freedom soon changed. As it turned out, Louis Mayer and Irving Thalberg of Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer "did not care a hoop about what the author or I . . . had wanted."⁸

A properly credited epigraph from Norris's essay, "The True Reward of the Novelist," opens the film, stating the credo von Stroheim embraced:

I never truckled; I never took off the hat to fashion and held it out for pennies. By God, I told them the truth. They liked it or they didn't like it. What had that to do with me? I told them the truth. I knew it for the truth then, an I know it for the truth now.⁹

The same passage appears in von Stroheim's foreword to Peter Noble's 1972 *Hollywood Scapegoat: The Biography of Erich von Stroheim*, with minor alterations and no credit to Norris.¹⁰ The impression created, that it is von Stroheim's own statement, blurs the influence in a way that suggests at once utter fidelity to Norris—in the sense that von Stroheim speaks Norris's words without declaring a difference between the two voices—and plain theft. The simultaneous acts of love and violation in this citation are symptomatic of the necessarily playful fidelity that operates throughout the adaptation, a quality that renders it, in Harold Bloom's sense, "strong." And yet, von Stroheim eventually found that a commercially viable film would not allow the telling of the whole "truth" as perceived by Norris and himself.

Koszarski tells us that the bulky screenplay which guided the painstaking adaptation of the novel resulted, after nearly seven months of shooting, in 446,103 feet of negative. Von Stroheim had completed a rough edit by early 1924 which was shown in Hollywood to a small group of critics and journalists. It was, according to viewers, somewhere between forty-two and forty-five reels long, which took about nine hours to screen. The exhausted audience appreciated the director's artistry but was baffled about prospects for distribution and marketing. The film had to be drastically cut, but the hypersensitive von Stroheim would have to be convinced of this.¹¹ Finally, he was.

By March of 1924, von Stroheim had cut it nearly in half, to twenty-two reels. In the following month, the Goldwyn Company that produced the film merged with Metro Pictures, and Irving Thalberg, a young manager who had crossed swords with von Stroheim at Universal Studios, assumed control of operations. In 1921 Thalberg had given von Stroheim's footage of *Foolish Wives* to studio cutters to edit, after the director had reduced it to twenty-one reels. In anticipation of such a transaction with *Greed*, von Stroheim sent the film to a friend in New York who managed to have it further edited to fifteen reels—which would

still have to be shown in two separate screenings. The negative was finally handed over to studio editors anyway, just as von Stroheim had feared; and it was reduced to the ten-reel version available today. Koszarski writes that the cutter, Joseph Farnham, was one of the studio's most important title writers, and his skill in this respect was mightily exercised: "As von Stroheim had feared, he lopped out huge chunks of action and tried to plug the gaps with titles."¹²

Thus the film we see is only a series of fragments from von Stroheim's composition. Given the many awkward titles added by the studio cutter, it is something of a hybrid, what would later be called in film studies a consequence of *auterism* and a Hollywood studio sensibility. These facts overshadow many studies of *Greed*; and indeed the missing parts, once one knows of them, do have a way of mystifying what we see, rendering it a series of the remnants, coated in nostalgia, of a once grand, excessive work. Rumors of the lost negative periodically circulate. Herman Weinberg's foreword to *The Complete Greed* lists a few of them, like the curious story of a group of cineastes who meet somewhere in the jungles of South America each New Year's Eve to watch a well-guarded print of the original. Concerning this and similarly extravagant reports, Weinberg writes:

One thing these rumors all had in common, of course, was the exasperating fact that attempts to track them down invariably ended in a *cul de sac*, a blind alley . . . [they were] no more than chimeras, wishful fillments, impossible and wonderfully foolish fancies.¹³

On the other hand, these fans of *Greed* have much in common with its creator and with scholars. The lurking wish implicit in much von Stroheim criticism is to recover the now-lost original negative, if only via comparison of the patchwork studio version against the fuller version suggested by the shooting script and surviving stills related to out-takes. The quest recalls von Stroheim's own impulse to reconstitute Norris's novel, in the cinematic medium. Further, this director's work—like that performed by those in search of the *Ur-Greed*—appropriately restates Norris's desire to get at and infuse into *McTeague* as elusive an entity: "life" itself, a quantity and quality conceived of by Norris and von Stroheim as the mark of truth and aesthetic merit.

* * *

It should be noted that however much he may have been, *circa* 1923, Norris's disciple regarding truth in art, von Stroheim had his own way of doing things from his own perspective. Indeed, one of the major differences between the film's structure and that of the novel lies in point of view. The pressure of *McTeague's* angle of vision in the novel's perspective emphasizes the limited and especially selective interest—the desire and the paranoia—of the hero's personality. This, in turn, eventuates in a theme emphasizing the incomplete or fictional nature of any human understanding, in accord with the prototypical naturalist agenda. There is something solipsistic and degenerate in the narrow channel of *McTeague's* point of view; and the psychology of Norris's work in

a sense lies in this narrative structure: the angling and paced repetitions that function with the rhythm of obsession.

Von Stroheim's camera, on the other hand, relieves the pressure of McTeague's perspective in the novel and distributes it among the various characters. His technique results in a more traditionally omniscient perspective, where the camera, as narrator, records all of their actions like an all-seeing witness to their foolishness. The absence in the film of McTeague's narrow-scope vision deflates the obsessive looking that expresses the hero's desire in the novel; the film replaces it with a general desire on the part of the camera to look, and to see *everything* in the physical environment and *everything* in the corners of character normally hidden in early cinema—and not rendered so visible in *McTeague*.

As Barbara Hochman suggests in *The Art of Frank Norris, Story-Teller*,¹⁴ Norris's narrator speaks in an explanatory voice at points, discursively accounting for present conditions by reference to the chemistries of the genetic inheritances and the past environmental shapings of the characters; but in a larger sense, the novel's movement can be understood as experimental in its resistance to overt, logical explanations of character and event in terms of cause and effect. Its design appears in this way to match the sluggish rhythm of McTeague's understanding.

Von Stroheim's glosses of such determinants, like his massive collages of detail in the camera's generous scan, are elaborated in a full visual drama. From the opening at the Big Dipper Mine on, we witness the behavior of figures clearly presented as sources of McTeague's own character: Norris only briefly relates that McTeague's largely undescribed mother had dreams for her son; von Stroheim fully visualizes the perfectly self-sacrificing mother whose only delight in a hard life is her sole offspring, and he even provides footage in which her success-fantasy for her boy is enacted. The repeated visualization of Marcus's rage over the loss of the money won by Trina magnifies extravagantly the representation of the same in the novel. Also, as Leger Grindon has observed, von Stroheim amplifies the sexual investment of objects and the displacement of their social functions for psychic ones;¹⁵ the 1920s, Freudian significations so generally available in *Greed* thus contribute to the film's willingness to account for things in a manner that the novel rather resists.

The barn doors and irises that serve as editorial devices in the movement from sequence to sequence in the film again emphasize von Stroheim's more traditional story-telling logic; like a series of doors or apertures that open and close, they announce the flow of time in the endings and beginnings of things, eliminating the considerably more abrupt transitions of the novel. *Greed*, while more "modern" than *McTeague*, ironically appears to proceed in its narration by an older, nineteenth century style. We might hypothesize that von Stroheim's lengthy exposure to fictions of Prussian gallantry, and the very lively way he moved as director among the tangible dimensions of these sentimental stories, infected his narratology with the explanatory habits that we find in *Greed*. As with Norris in his idiosyncratic blending of the traditional and the innovative in his fiction, von Stroheim takes

us back in time as he takes us forward to the modernist sensibility, establishing his own signature after first acknowledging Norris's. Like the miner searching for the mother lode, and Norris for the nuggets of truth and their faithful depiction, von Stroheim's plays in his film between receptivity to "what is there" and interpretive projection, between fidelity to the real and violation of the same in his desire to be naturalistic and true to his sources.

Notes:

¹Herman Weinberg, *Saint Cinema: Writings on Film 1929-1970*, rev. ed. (New York: F. Ungar, 1980), p. 114.

²Richard Koszarski, *The Man You Loved to Hate: The Biography of Erich von Stroheim* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1983), p. 117.

³Finler, Joel, ed. *Greed: A Film by Erich von Stroheim* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1972), p. 7.

⁴Koszarski, p. 62.

⁵Koszarski, p. 7.

⁶Finler, p. 29.

⁷Koszarski, pp. 138-40.

⁸Finler, p. 28.

⁹*World's Work*, 2 (October, 1901), 1337-39.

¹⁰(New York: Arno Press, 1972), p. xiii.

¹¹Koszarski, pp. 140-41.

¹²Koszarski, p. 144.

¹³Weinberg, *The Complete Greed of Erich von Stroheim* (New York: E.P. Dutton, 1973), pp. i-ii.

¹⁴(Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1988).

¹⁵"From Word to Image: Displacement and Meaning in *Greed*," paper delivered at the Florida State University Comparative Literature and Film Conference, January, 1988.

The Norris Divorce Suit: Another Newspaper Account James Stronks University of Illinois at Chicago

As with the *Chicago Tribune* and the *Morning Call* treatments of the Norris divorce proceedings, so with the *Chicago Daily News*. To Richard Allan Davison's record of such pieces in *FNS*, No. 6 (Autumn, 1988), pp. 3-4, can be added the following account of B.F. Norris's exasperation in the face of the public attention given to his private life. Amidst accounts of bigamy, amputations resulting from an electric car accident, and the arrest of a Max Reix for firing four bullets at the house of a Mrs. Hylander while shouting "Happy New Year" to her, the story that B.F. gave to the *News* reporter appeared on p. [1] of the 4 January 1894 issue:

OFFERED HIS WIFE \$100,000.

Mr. Norris Says Allegations
Made in San Francisco
Are False.

"There is not a word of truth in my wife's allegations, as telegraphed from San Francisco," said B.F. Norris of the firm of B.F. Norris, Allister & Co., wholesale jewelers, at 113 and 115 State street, this morning.

"I don't care to go into details in the matter, but my wife deserted me and, wishing a quiet and peaceable separation, I offered to give her all my property in San Francisco, which is worth over \$100,000. I received a telegram yesterday saying that Mrs. Norris had obtained an injunction restraining me from disposing of my property in San Francisco. That is all I know of the present status of the case, except what has been published in the papers.

"Mrs. Norris had better have accepted my offer, for she will hardly secure as much through the courts. My attorney, Mr. Hardy, is now in California, looking after the case."

Reflexive Revision in Frank Norris's
McTeague and *A Man's Woman*
Craig S. Abbott
Northern Illinois University

After being used for one or more printings, the plates for Frank Norris's *McTeague* (1899) and *A Man's Woman* (1900) were altered to excise passages offensive to genteel sensibility and to substitute for them passages less offensive. In each case, Norris's revisions are reflexive. They allude to the physical constraints within which they were made and, in the case of *McTeague*, to the sense of offended gentility with which the novel had been received.

Joseph Katz and John Manning have pointed out Norris's skill in executing the revisions.¹ For both novels, Norris had to produce substitute passages that could be fitted precisely within the already existing plates. The fit had to be not only thematic but physical. Norris's success in accomplishing the revision, according to Katz and Manning, "should increase still more respect for Norris's professional abilities." What has not been noted is that Norris, himself working within a confined bibliotextual space, devised substitute passages that refer to characters at work in limited space.

In *McTeague* Norris revised the Orpheum Theatre episode to replace August Sieppe's pants-wetting and two passages in which squirming and complaint herald the incontinence. In place of the pants-wetting, Norris substituted *McTeague's* embarrassed search for his hat among the theatre rows. Norris's efforts to fit precisely the new material within the limited bibliotextual space of the plates has its reflexive parallel in *McTeague's* "effort of bending his great body in so contracted a space."² The parallel points to the contrast between *McTeague's* awkwardness in fitting his great bulk between the theatre rows and Norris's skill in fitting his revision within the plates. In *A Man's Woman* the offending passage to be revised was a graphic description of a surgical operation. In the revision the stark details of the surgery are replaced by an emphasis on the surgeon's skill in his contest with "the Enemy," death. Again, Norris's textual surgery seems indirectly referred to in the revised passage. In "exsecting the joint" of a little girl, the surgeon

Street ("a master of his profession") can make no slip that would leave an "opened chink or cranny" into which death could "thrust his lean finger." As he was revising, Norris himself had to be concerned that no chink appear between revised and unrevised portions of the plates. If in *McTeague* Norris implicitly contrasts *McTeague's* awkwardness in working within a limited space to his own skill, in *A Man's Woman* he identifies his skill with that of the surgeon. And this identification is further strengthened by the sentences that coincidentally mark the beginning and ending of both the surgical and textual operation: "Promptly the operation was begun" and "Then abruptly the operation was over."

The revision in *McTeague* may also allude to its own purpose: restoring an appearance of gentility. Joseph R. McElrath, Jr., and Jesse S. Crisler have recently established that the immediate cause for the revision was a request by Norris's London publisher, Grant Richards, who asked that the plates be altered before he used them to manufacture the English printing of the novel. Thus, they conclude, "it was English 'skittishness,' not American prudery, that resulted in one of the most famous examples of bowdlerization in the late nineteenth century."³ Yet Norris could not have been unaware of the sense of outraged gentility with which American reviewers received the novel.⁴ In this reception as well as in the English publisher's request for revision, there is already an irony, since large chunks of the novel, including the Orpheum Theatre episode, satirize the lower-classes' aspirations to gentility. In accomplishing his revision, Norris compounded the irony by having *McTeague* engage in an activity analogous to his own. Just as both *McTeague* and Norris are working in a confined space, so are they both seeking to recover gentility. *McTeague* is, in the passage substituted for the pants-wetting, searching for his hat, which the novel establishes as one of the signs of *McTeague's* aspirations to the genteel. In the course of the novel, *McTeague's* rise and fall of fortune is signified by his progress from hat to high silk hat to woolen cap. The loss of the hat in the revised theatre episode suggests a loss of the "respectability" for which the narrator says "the people of the small world of Polk Street" yearned. *McTeague* became "scarlet with embarrassment." Furthermore, his loss is equivalent to the earlier splitting of Trina's genteel gloves when she incontinently applauds a Society Contralto's performance and to the soiling of August's Little Lord Fauntleroy outfit. In all three instances, the beast within cannot be contained by the trappings of gentility.⁵ And *McTeague's* fumbling attempt to rise above his vulgarity provides an ironic parallel to Norris's own need to lessen the vulgarity that offended his audience and publisher.

Notes:

¹"Notes on Frank Norris's Revision of Two Novels," *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*, 62 (1968), 256-59.

²*McTeague: A Story of San Francisco* (Norton Critical Edition), ed. Donald Pizer (New York and London: W. W. Norton & Company, 1977), p. 61. This edition adopts the earlier version and supplies the revised

passages in footnotes (pp. 59-61).

³"The Bowdlerization of *McTeague*," *American Literature*, 61 (1989), 101.

⁴In "A Story of San Francisco," *New York Times Saturday Review of Books and Art*, 11 March 1899, p. 150, one reviewer complained that the theatre episode introduces "details that are purely vulgar." For the reception of the novel, see also Jesse S. Crisler and Joseph R. McElrath, Jr., *Frank Norris: A Reference Guide* (Boston: G. K. Hall & Co., 1974) and *Frank Norris: The Critical Reception*, ed. McElrath and Katherine Knight (New York: Burt Franklin & Co., Inc., 1981).

⁵In "A Trace of Scandal in Norris's Revision of *McTeague*," *English Language Notes*, 25 (1988), 68-72, Hugh J. Dawson suggests that Norris's failure to remove one passage in which August's pants-wetting is foreshadowed may represent "a defiant taunt directed at those who had insisted the book be purged." It could also be viewed as Norris's authorial incontinence, a bit of vulgarity that could not be restrained.

Current Publications: Update

Thomas K. Dean
University of Iowa

Presented here is a fifth installment designed to complement *Frank Norris: A Reference Guide* (1974). The arrangement of items is chronological and alphabetical within years. Please forward new and omitted items to Thomas K. Dean.

Filler, Louis. *The Unknown Edwin Markham: His Mystery and Its Significance*. Yellow Springs, Ohio: Antioch Press, 1966, pp. 127-28. Filler relates that Markham was impressed by Norris's *The Octopus*—not surprisingly since he had been the model for the poet Presley. Filler also gives a brief description of a poetry contest won by Markham's friend, John Vance Cheney. Collis P. Huntington had established a competition for the best poetical response to "The Man with a Hoe."

Woodress, James. "Norris." In *American Literature to 1900*. Ed. James Vinson and D.L. Kirkpatrick. London: The Macmillan Press Limited, 1980, pp. 247-249. Provides a biographical sketch, a list of works by Norris, and a brief critical assessment.

Dover, Linda A. "Frank Norris' *A Man's Woman*: The Textual Changes," *Resources for American Literary Study*, 13 (1983), 165-183. Describes the textual variants between the newspaper serializations of *A Man's Woman* and the first book edition. Concludes that Norris did not significantly alter the novel, thus suggesting his satisfaction with it.

Baender, Paul. "Megarus ad lunam: Flawed Texts and Verbal Icons," *Philological Quarterly*, 64 (1985), 439-457. Focusing on the concept of "authorial intention" in light of editorial/authorial revision, Baender discusses the alteration of Orpheum Theater scene in *McTeague*, arguing that the revised text in which McTeague searches for his hat is consistent with the aims of the novel (see 449-51).

Graham, Don. "Remembering the Alamo: The Story of the Texas Revolution in Popular Culture," *Southwestern Historical Quarterly*, 89 (1985), 35-66. Negates Norris's claim in "A Neglected Epic" that the story of the Alamo had been neglected in literature (see 42-43).

Meldrum, Barbara Howard. *Under the Sun: Myth and Realism in Western American Literature*. Troy, N.Y.: Whitton Publishing Company, 1985, p. 26, *passim*. "In his portrayal of the artist Presley in *The Octopus*, Norris caught the immensity of the western imagination and mythical consciousness."

Dijkstra, Bram. *Idols of Perversity*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1986, pp. 367-69. In this extensively illustrated study of late 19th-century images of women as sometimes predatory creatures, "Dracula's daughters" derive from the male a power they do not naturally possess. The material symbol of male potency is gold—and thus Norris's characterizations and thematic exposition in *McTeague*. Rather than perform inspirational and nurturing roles, Trina becomes the cause of McTeague's downfall as she attempts to absorb his male force and then turns to gold as the more fully obtainable manifestation of maleness; McTeague recovers manhood and power when he kills Trina and steals her gold. The Maria-Zerkow relationship is interpreted in like terms. Cited are several paintings in which gold, rather than a male, is a stimulus of sexual ecstasy.

Wyatt, David. *The Fall into Eden: Landscape and Imagination in California*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986, pp. 96-123. In a chapter entitled "Norris and the Vertical," Wyatt discusses Norris's use of landscape as symbol rather than document. The images of an isolated vertical figure and a vast, empty, horizontal space recur in Norris's work. (Originally published in *Southern Review*, 19 (1983), 749-64.)

Abadinagy, Z. "The Art of Fiction CI: William Gaddis," *The Paris Review*, 105 (1987), 54-89. In an interview, Gaddis illustrates the danger of "source" hunting, citing the coincidental appearance of a similar development in his own work, Joyce's *Ulysses*, and *McTeague* (see 62-63).

Bucco, Martin. "Epilogue: The Development of Western Literary Criticism." In *A Literary History of the American West*. Ed. J. Golden Taylor, et al. Fort Worth: Texas Christian University Press, 1987, pp. 1283-1316. Summarizes many of Norris's critical ideas as they appeared in his essays, with the focus on those concerning the West in literature (see pp. 1295-98).

Graham, Don. "Frank Norris." In *A Literary History of the American West*. Ed. J. Golden Taylor, et al. Fort Worth: Texas Christian University Press, 1987, pp. 370-380. Discusses Norris's relationship to the West, both personal and literary. Recognizes Norris's advancement of Western literature through his inclusion of urban experience in his writing.

Gumina, Deanna Paoli. "The Apprenticeship of Kathleen Norris," *California History*, 66, No. 1 (March, 1987), 40-48, 72-73. Biographical article on Kathleen Norris's

early writing career. Includes some details of her engagement and marriage to Charles Norris, but only brief mentions of Frank.

Houston, James D. "The Far West: Introduction." In *A Literary History of the American West*. Ed. J. Golden Taylor, et al. Fort Worth: Texas Christian University Press, 1987, pp. 326-338. Briefly describes *The Octopus* in terms of its portrayal of historical events and its relationship to other Western literature (see pp. 330-331).

LaPresto, Brigitte Loos. "Agricultural Promise and Disillusionment in the California Novel: Frank Norris, John Steinbeck, Raymond Barrio." *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 48 (1987), 1455-A. In *The Octopus*, both the ranchers and the railroad derive only wealth from the land, not spiritual nourishment which is possible only in a romantic, illusionary world. Thus the California Dream of the Land (rich harvests, self-sufficiency, and landownership) is only partially fulfilled.

Lee, Brian. "Realism and Naturalism: Howells, Crane, Norris, Dreiser." *American Fiction: 1865-1940*. Longman's Literature in English Series. London and New York: Longman, 1987, pp. 43-48, 287-88, *passim*. Appreciative description of Norris's major novels, citing examples of Norris's strengths as a descriptive writer and his weaknesses in logic and sentimentality. The "Norris" interpretive summary is followed by a brief biographical sketch and list of books about Norris.

Coolidge, John S. "Lewis E. Gates." In *American Literary Critics and Scholars, 1880-1900*, volume 71 of *Dictionary of Literary Biography*. Ed. John W. Rathbun and Monica M. Greco. Detroit: Gale Research Company, 1988, 82-86. Calling for a "renovating imaginative realism," the mentor of Norris and chief American apologist for the impressionist school of criticism as associated with Pater "must have recognized *McTeague* as exemplifying the kind of romantic realism he was calling for."

Crisler, Jesse S. "Norris's 'Library,'" *Frank Norris Studies*, No. 5 (Spring, 1988), pp. 1-11. An annotated list of books that belonged to Frank, Jeannette, and other Norris family members.

Crow, Charles L. "Frank Norris's San Joaquin," *The Californians*, 6, No. 4 (July-August, 1988), 54-56. Though Norris was not native to the San Joaquin as were later Valley writers, *The Octopus* is nevertheless the beginning of the Valley's literary tradition. Also explores the historical background of the novel and its epic scope.

Davison, Richard Allan. "Some Light on Gertrude Doggett Norris's 1894 Divorce Suit," *Frank Norris Studies*, No. 6 (Autumn, 1988), pp. 3-4. Reprints three newspaper items from *The San Francisco Morning Call* and *The Chicago Tribune* regarding Norris's parents' divorce.

Dawson, Hugh J. "A Trace of Scandal in Norris' Revision of *McTeague*," *English Language Notes*, 25 (1988), 68-72. Recounts the history of the editorial changes in *McTeague* regarding "Owgooste's" accident and describes the specific alterations. Notes that Norris did

not eliminate all indications of the pants-wetting situation.

Hochman, Barbara. *The Art of Frank Norris, Storyteller*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1988. Norris is concerned with the vulnerability of a self "struggling for a measure of equilibrium within the relentless flow of internal and external pressures." Characters helpless in the face of change, loss, and human contact try to respond constructively to experience through "the stabilizing power of memory, language, and art."

Lawson, Benjamin S. "The Presence of Joaquin Miller in *The Octopus*," *Frank Norris Studies*, No. 6 (Autumn, 1988), pp. 1-3. Miller is not only a character in *The Octopus*; rather, "the novel itself is partly a commentary on his career." In the characterization of Presley, Norris portrays a Miller given to literary romanticism "who may some day mature into a Frank Norris."

Massa, Ann. "Walter Hines Page." In *American Literary Critics and Scholars, 1880-1900*, volume 71 of *Dictionary of Literary Biography*. Ed. John W. Rathbun and Monica M. Greco. Detroit: Gale Research Company, 1988, 180-86. Several times refers to the probable positive effect of Page's literary values upon progressive writers such as Norris. "He felt that Norris covered the panorama of American life more fully and more accurately than anyone else and that, importantly, Norris gave due weight to economic matters."

McElrath, Joseph R., Jr. *Frank Norris and The Wave: A Bibliography*. New York and London: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1988. Defines the canon of Norris's *Wave* publications, listing 165 pieces as his and deattributing over five hundred items previously identified as by Norris.

—. "Frank Norris's 'Metropolitan Noises,'" *Frank Norris Studies*, No. 6 (Autumn, 1988), pp. 5-6. Reprints for the first time the 1897 *Wave* article.

Frank Norris Studies is a publication of the Norris Society and is issued twice per year for the members. Membership for individuals and institutions requires the payment of dues of ten dollars per year to The Frank Norris Society Inc., Dept. of English, Florida State University, Tallahassee FL 32306-1036. Manuscripts should be addressed to either of the editors: Jesse S. Crisler, Communications, Brigham Young University—Hawaii Campus, Laie, Hawaii 96762; or Robert C. Leitz, III, English, Louisiana State University in Shreveport, Shreveport LA 71115. Members of the Editorial Advisory Board include: Don L. Cook, Indiana University; Charles L. Crow, Bowling Green State University; William B. Dillingham, Emory University; James D. Hart, The Bancroft Library; Donald Pizer, Tulane University; and Barbara Hochman, Tel Aviv University. Joseph R. McElrath, Jr., Florida State University, is the managing editor.

sation. The only sounds were an occasional sigh from the patient, a direction given in a low tone, and, at intervals, the click of the knives and scalpel. From outside the window came the persistent chirping of a band of sparrows.

Street located the head of the thigh-bone with his fingers and abruptly thrust in the knife, describing Sayre's cut, going down to the bone itself. Farnham turned back the flap made by the semicircular incision, and with a large, broad-bladed, blunt-edged knife, slightly curved upon the flat, pulled the soft tissues to one side. Street, without looking away from the incision, held the knife from him, and Lloyd took it and laid it on the table with her left hand, at the same time passing the bistoury to him with her right. With the bistoury the surgeon, in half a dozen strokes, separated the surrounding integuments from the diseased head of the bone. But by this time the wound was full of blood. Street drew back, and Lloyd washed it clear with one of the gauze sponges, throwing the sponge in the pail under the table immediately afterward. When the operation was resumed the surgeon went into the incision again, but this time with the instrument called the periosteal elevator, peeling off the periosteum, and all the muscles with it, from the bone itself. Meanwhile Lloyd had gone to the foot of the table and had laid hold of the patient's leg just above the knee, clasping it with both her hands. Dr. Street nodded to her, signifying that he was ready, and Lloyd, exerting her strength, pulled down upon the leg, at the same time turning it outward. The hip-joint dislocated easily, the head of the bone pro-

64

truding. While Lloyd held the leg in place Farnham put a towel under this protruding head, and the surgeon, with a chain-saw, cut it away in a few strokes. And that was all—the joint was excised.

The nurse and surgeons eased their positions immediately, drawing long breaths. They began to talk, commenting upon the operation, and Lloyd, intensely interested, asked Street why he had, contrary to her expectations, removed the bone above the lesser trochanter. He smiled, delighted at her intelligence.

"It's better than cutting through the neck, Miss Searight," he told her. "If I had gone through the neck, don't you see, the trochanter major would come over the hole and prevent the discharges."

"Yes, yes, I see, of course," assented Lloyd.

The incision was sewn up, and when all was over Lloyd carried Hattie back to the bed in the next room. Slowly the little girl regained consciousness, and Lloyd began to regard her once more as a human being. During the operation she had forgotten the very existence of Hattie Campbell, a little girl she knew. She had only seen a bit of mechanism out of order and in the hands of a repairer. It was always so with Lloyd. Her charges were not infrequently persons whom she knew, often intimately, but during the time of their sickness their personalities vanished for the trained nurse; she saw only the "case," only the mechanism, only the deranged clockwork in imminent danger of running down.

But the danger was by no means over. The operation had been near the trunk. There had been

5

65

sation. The only sounds were an occasional sigh from the patient, a direction given in a low tone, and, at intervals, the click of the knives and scalpel. From outside the window came the persistent chirping of a band of sparrows.

Promptly the operation was begun; there was no delay, no hesitation; what there was to be done had been carefully planned beforehand, even to the minutest details. Street, a master of his profession, thoroughly familiar with every difficulty that might present itself during the course of the work in hand, foreseeing every contingency, prepared for every emergency, calm, watchful, self-contained, set about the excising of the joint with no trace of compunction, no embarrassment, no misgiving. His assistants, as well as he himself, knew that life or death hung upon the issue of the next ten minutes. Upon Street alone devolved the life of the little girl. A second's hesitation at the wrong stage of the operation, a slip of bistoury or scalpel, a tremor of the wrist, a single instant's clumsiness of the fingers, and the Enemy—watching for every chance, intent for every momentarily opened chink or cranny wherein he could thrust his lean fingers—entered the frail tenement with a leap, a rushing, headlong spring that jarred the house of life to its foundations. Lowering close over her head Lloyd felt the shadow of his approach. He had arrived there in that commonplace little room, with its commonplace accessories, its ornaments, that suddenly seemed so trivial, so impertinent—the stopped French clock, with its simpering, gilded cupids, on the mantelpiece; the photograph of a number of picnickers "grouped"

64

on a hotel piazza gazing with monolithic cheerfulness at this grim business, this struggle of the two world forces, this crisis in a life.

Then abruptly the operation was over.

The nurse and surgeons eased their positions immediately, drawing long breaths. They began to talk, commenting upon the operation, and Lloyd, intensely interested, asked Street why he had, contrary to her expectations, removed the bone above the lesser trochanter. He smiled, delighted at her intelligence.

"It's better than cutting through the neck, Miss Searight," he told her. "If I had gone through the neck, don't you see, the trochanter major would come over the hole and prevent the discharges."

"Yes, yes, I see, of course," assented Lloyd.

The incision was sewn up, and when all was over Lloyd carried Hattie back to the bed in the next room. Slowly the little girl regained consciousness, and Lloyd began to regard her once more as a human being. During the operation she had forgotten the very existence of Hattie Campbell, a little girl she knew. She had only seen a bit of mechanism out of order and in the hands of a repairer. It was always so with Lloyd. Her charges were not infrequently persons whom she knew, often intimately, but during the time of their sickness their personalities vanished for the trained nurse; she saw only the "case," only the mechanism, only the deranged clockwork in imminent danger of running down.

But the danger was by no means over. The operation had been near the trunk. There had been

5

65

The Alteration of *A Man's Woman*

At left are the unrevised pages of the first American edition, first printing, of *A Man's Woman*. At right are the pages printed from the revised American plates. Unlike *McTeague*, however, *A Man's Woman* was not subjected to censorial influence in England. When Grant Richards set type and created new plates for the first English edition in 1900, the original description of the surgical procedure was reproduced. With this novel, then, American squeamishness appears to have effected the alteration of the text. From the Collection of Joseph R. McElrath, Jr.