Journal of American Studies of Turkey
45 (2016): 33-108

Determinism as a Defining Element in Fitzgerald's Oeuvre, 1920-1940: Literary Naturalism and "The Cut-Glass Bowl," "The Ice Palace," *The Great Gatsby*, *Tender is the Night*, *The Last Tycoon*, *The Crack-Up*, and Other Texts

Kim Moreland

Abstract

It is widely accepted that Fitzgerald's apprentice work is marked by determinism while his mature work abandons that philosophy, with victims transformed into agents when he grows into modernism. Yet the impact of the philosophy of determinism on Fitzgerald's works of fiction and non-fiction alike is so powerful that to ignore it is to miss a central element in his oeuvre, and thereby to miss the opportunity to provide a richer interpretation of these works than has heretofore been accomplished. To this end, this article analyzes many of Fitzgerald's works through the lens of literary naturalism, emphasizing the interconnections among them.

Keywords

F. Scott Fitzgerald, Literary Naturalism, Determinism, Fitzgerald the Naturalist, Social Darwinism

Özet

Fitzgerald'ın erken dönem eserlerinin determinizm etkisi altında olduğuna ancak olgunluk dönemi eserlerinin bu felsefeden uzaklaşarak, karakterlerin daha aktif olduğu modernizmin etkisi altına girdiğine dair genel bir kanı vardır. Ancak Fitzgerald'ın hem kurmaca olan hem de kurmaca olmayan eserleri üzerinde determinizmin etkisi o kadar güçlüdür ki, bu unsurun göz ardı edilmesi eserlerindeki çok önemli noktaların kaçırılması ve bu eserlerin bugüne kadarkinden

daha farklı açılardan incelenememesi ile sonuçlanacaktır. Bu amaçla, bu makale Fitzgerald'ın birçok eserini, aralarındaki bağlantıları vurgulayarak edebi natüralizm açısından incelemeyi hedeflemektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler

F. Scott Fitzgerald, Edebi Natüralizm, Determinizm, Natüralist Fitzgerald, Sosyal Darwinizm

"The Cut-Glass Bowl" is one of Fitzgerald's least-known stories, while "The Ice Palace" is among his most famous. Both were published in May 1920, in *Scribner's Magazine* and the *Saturday Evening Post*, respectively, and both were among the eight stories that Fitzgerald chose to comprise his 1920 collection *Flappers and Philosophers*. "The Cut-Glass Bowl" and "The Ice Palace" are among the four in the collection that Fitzgerald recommended to his mentor H. L. Mencken as worth reading, the others being "Dalyrimple Goes Wrong" and "Benediction."

Literary critics disagree with Fitzgerald's overall evaluation. Their negative judgment of "The Cut-Glass Bowl" is signaled by its absence from edited volumes, notably Matthew Bruccoli's expansive collection, *The Short Stories of F. Scott Fitzgerald*, and even Patricia Hampl and Dave Page's collection, *The St. Paul Stories of F. Scott Fitzgerald*. This negative judgment is also signaled by an almost complete lack of critical attention. For example, Jackson Bryer's edited volume, *New Essays on F. Scott Fitzgerald's Neglected Short Fiction*, includes no essay on "The Cut-Glass Bowl," though there are essays on "Dalyrimple Goes Wrong" and "Benediction" (see Merrrill, Gillin). These two factors render "The Cut-Glass Bowl" essentially invisible in Fitzgerald's canon. In contrast, "The Ice Palace" is widely regarded as one of Fitzgerald's best stories. It appears in both Bruccoli's and Hampl and Page's collections, and it is otherwise widely anthologized. It is also the subject of frequent critical analysis.

Both stories are set in St. Paul and have female protagonists. Most important, the titles of both stories name objects, human constructions that effect critical plot action and embody symbolic significance grounded to a greater or lesser degree in determinism, the philosophy that undergirds the specific school of literary naturalism. Preeminent

literary and cultural critic Mencken was the most powerful proponent of literary naturalism. Tellingly, literary critics dismiss "The Cut-Glass Bowl" as a minor story because of its determinism, while "The Ice Palace" is celebrated as a major story read from the realist perspective.

I have selected Michal Nowlin as the representative literary critic who addresses literary naturalism in Fitzgerald's work since he directly discusses this subject at length in his "Naturalism and High Modernism," an essay from *F. Scott Fitzgerald in Context* (2015). Nowlin's overall argument is that naturalism operates only in a limited number of Fitzgerald's texts, most substantively in *The Beautiful and Damned*, and that it operates only in Fitzgerald's very earliest texts, that is, those published between 1920 and 1922. Moreover, Nowlin focuses exclusively on Fitzgerald's novels, not taking into consideration Fitzgerald's short stories or his many and important non-fiction essays.

In point of fact, however, naturalism actually inflects a much greater number of Fitzgerald's texts than Nowlin recognizes. Moreover, naturalism is a critically important element in Fitzgerald's texts throughout all the 1920s and the 1930s, operating even in his unfinished and posthumously published last novel, *The Last Tycoon* (1941). The impact of the philosophy of determinism on Fitzgerald's works of fiction and non-fiction alike is so powerful that to ignore it is to miss a central element in his oeuvre, and thereby to miss the opportunity to provide a richer interpretation of these works than has heretofore been accomplished.

In the sections of this essay immediately below, I will first focus on Fitzgerald's texts of the very early 1920s, providing a discussion of many more of these texts than Nowlin addresses. In these first sections, however, I will also discuss some of Fitzgerald's post-1922 texts – that is, those published in the mid- to late-1920s and the 1930s. In the next sections of this essay, I will reverse my focus, providing a discussion largely, though again not exclusively, of Fitzgerald's texts written after 1922 through the 1930s. Notably I will discuss the impact of determinism on *The Great Gatsby*, the novel that Nowlin identifies as a quintessential example of high modernism, and *Tender is the Night*, the novel that Nowlin identifies as a quintessential example of high realism. Moreover, in both sections of this essay, I will address a number of Fitzgerald's non-fiction works, notably *The Crack-Up* essays but not limited to them.

Heredity, Environment, and the Survival of the Fittest: "Dalyrimple Goes Wrong," "Bernice Bobs Her Hair," *This Side of Paradise*, and *The Beautiful and Damned*

Michael Nowlin argues that Fitzgerald engaged in a "flirtation with [naturalism]" in his first two novels when under the sway of Mencken (180). This perspective is shared by many literary critics, notably Matthew Bruccoli, who asserts that "Fitzgerald was then [specifically 1920] under the influnce of naturalism [...] that he had found in Frank Norris and Theodore Dreiser" (*Epic* 139). Indeed, in his final proof of *This Side of Paradise*, Fitzgerald inserted Mencken's name, identifying him as the critic who had influenced Amory Blaine to read "several excellent American novels: 'Vandover and the Brute' [by Frank Norris], 'The Damnation of Theron Ware' [by Harold Frederic], and 'Jennie Gerhardt' [by Dreiser]" (156) – three important novels of literary naturalism.

Nowlin begins his article, however, by asserting that "Fitzgerald's fiction was infused with the spirit of modernism from the outset" (179). He then asserts that it was Fitzgerald's ultimate "repudiation of naturalism" (180) that led him to the high modernism of *The Great Gatsby* (1925), where modernist experimentation resulted in intricate patterns, narrative complexity, shifts between registers, and a focus on the power of imagination in place of a documentary realism. Nowlin notes that "the high modernist canon has been in good part defined by the devaluation of naturalism" (180).

However, Nowlin's discussion of Mencken's characterization of naturalism and Fitzgerald's adoption of it is exceedingly narrow. For example, Nowlin asserts that "neither [Mencken] nor Fitzgerald was committed to literary naturalism's first article of faith, that human behavior was radically determined by the forces of heredity and environment" (181). However, this assertion is undermined in a complex fashion in "Dalyrimple Goes Wrong," a story that Bruccoli identifies as "Fitzgerald's earliest ironic treatment of the Horatio Alger success story" (*Epic* 101). Indeed, "Dalyrimple Goes Wrong" is a repudiation of the defining American myth that hard work will inevitably result in success, specifically financial success.

Dalyrimple returns from World War I as a celebrated hero, but he can find work only as a warehouse stock boy. Receiving low wages, he comes to realize that all talk of potential promotion is a lie and that "the

ways and means of economy [are] a closed book to him" (155). Desperate to escape his circumstances, he eventually decides that "evil is only a manner of hardluck, or heredity-and-environment" (158), rather than a manifestation of immorality. He concludes that "it isn't worth worrying over what's evil and what isn't," indeed that "good and evil aren't any standard" (158). This moral vacuum, characteristic of naturalism, frees him to engage in a profitable robbery scheme while seeming to accept placidly the conditions of his socioeconomic position. Ironically, this last causes the politically connected Fraser to select Dalyrimple for the State Senate. Fraser reassures himself that Dalyrimple is tractable, and Dalyrimple reassures Fraser that he will follow his advice. But each plans to use the other, Dalyrimple having already decided to act in his own best interests, no longer to be a "pawn" in the system (156) – a system whose expressed morality is actually a means of oppression. Dalyrimple's rejection of this system leads to the upward trajectory of his life, hence the wonderful ambiguity of the story's title.

This trajectory is the opposite of the downward movement more typical of naturalist plots. But Dalrymple's success is an example of the "survival of the fittest," a term coined not by Charles Darwin as is typically assumed, but by Herbert Spencer, whose philosophy was popularly appropriated as Social Darwinism. Fitzgerald directly references Herbert Spencer in "Head and Shoulders," published in the same month as "Dalyrimple" (February 1920). The male protagonist of "Head and Shoulders," Horace Tarbox, is the most promising American philosopher of his generation. When claims are made on Horace's time, he deflects them by referring to his "standing date with Herb Spencer" (78). Fitzgerald's story "The Four Fists" appeared only four months later, in the June 1920 issue of *Scribner's Magazine* (the story then included in *Flappers and Philosophers*), the same issue where a long celebratory appraisal of Herbert Spencer appeared on the occasion of the centenary of his birth.

In *This Side of Paradise* (1920), the dance-floor becomes the brutal proving ground where the so-called "Popular Daughter" – an iconic figure – is "selected by the cut-in system at dances, which favors the survival of the fittest" (43). Bernice learns this painful lesson in "Bernice Bobs Her Hair" (May 1920), when she is mocked and shunned because of her tedious conversation and physical clumsiness on the dance-floor. Bernice's cousin Marjorie asserts, "These days it's every girl for herself" (114), and she attributes Bernice's lack of clever

conversation to her "crazy Indian blood," suggesting that "she's a reversion to type [since] Indian women all just sat round and never said anything" (115). "Reversion to type" gained its cultural currency from Social Darwinism, where it was synonymous with "throwback" and "atavism." Though Marjorie's mother laughs off Marjorie's judgment as "silly" (115), the comic conclusion of the story has it both ways, since Bernice repays Marjorie for her social sabotage by cutting off her braids while she sleeps: "'Huh!' she giggled wildly. 'Scalp the selfish thing!'" (133).

Thirteen years later Fitzgerald employs the same Social Darwinist concept, this time not in the comic mode of "Bernice" but in the elegiac mode of "More than Just a House" (1933). Fitzgerald's appreciation for this story is indicated in his 15 May 1934 letter to his editor, Maxwell Perkins, where he specifies that either "More than Just a House" or his ultimately canonical "Babylon Revisited" (1931) should represent his stories of a particular time period in the collection that was ultimately published in 1935 as *Taps at Reveille* (*Dear Scott* 195-98). Perkins's 4 June 1934 letter in response actually specifies Perkins's own preference for "More Than a House" (sic), although "Babylon Revisited" was, appropriately, the final choice (*Dear Scott* 200).

In "More than Just a House," it is not a character as in "Bernice Bobs Her Hair" but the omniscient narrator who describes a "stout, colored butler […] [behaving] with racial guile" (723) and manifesting "dark and atavistic suspicions" (726). Here the racism of Social Darwinism is straightforward, not qualified by comedy as in "Bernice," nor by satire as in the case of *The Great Gatsby*'s Tom Buchanan. Jeanne Campbell Reesman notes that pompous Tom "parrots racist writers like Madison Grant in *The Passing of the Great Race* (1916), speaking of peoples and places he has never and will never encounter," and she describes Tom as being "an armchair observer" who has "smug, untested convictions" (19). In this regard, she contrasts Tom with the widely traveled characters of Jack London's fiction, whose "anxious relocations of personal and racial identities among nonwhite Others" (19) result in a multiplicity of responses.

Nowlin, however, denies the impact of Social Darwinism, asserting for example that "neither [Mencken] nor Fitzgerald was committed to literary naturalism's […] social Darwinist premise that civilized human beings were but thinly veiled beasts" (181). Yet Nowlin undermines

his own argument about this specific premise in his discussion of *The Beautiful and Damned* (1922) – granted, the work he identifies as most inflected by naturalism. But he provides many examples there of humans who are indeed frequently imaged as animals, among them the hawk, the ape, the baboon, the monkey, the ant, and even the louse. This last recalls the striking parallel description in Stephen Crane's much-admired naturalist story "The Blue Hotel" (1899), where humans are imaged not "as conquering and elate humanity, but [as] […] lice which were caused to cling to a whirling, fire-smote, ice-locked, disease-stricken, space-lost bulb" (224).

John Berryman, one of Crane's biographers, notes "the influence [that Crane] exerted [on] […] Fitzgerald" (8). Fitzgerald surely showed remarkable critical acuity in an April 1922 letter to his publisher, Charles Scribner II, written only a month after the publication of *The Beautiful and Damned*. He noted with approval that Boni and Liveright had published volumes by Crane and also Frank Norris five years earlier in its Modern Library Series, which Fitzgerald praised as "keep[ing] before the public such books as have once been popular and have since been forgotten" (*Letters* 56). Some thirty years later, Berryman confirmed that "Crane's position sank for a generation nearly to zero" (9), and he attributed Crane's renewed critical attention to Thomas Beer's 1923 biography, published one year *after* Fitzgerald's letter. Tellingly, Mencken reviewed the biography, taking the opportunity to assert that Crane "left behind him one superlatively excellent book [and] four or five magnificent short stories" ("Review" Crane 497) – among which he included "The Blue Hotel." The twelve-volume *Works of Stephen Crane* (1925-1927) includes Mencken's Introduction to the volume focusing on "The Blue Hotel" as well as "George's Mother" and *Maggie: A Girl of the Streets*.

Another troubling aspect of Nowlin's discussion is his teleological approach to Fitzgerald's work: "Fitzgerald became the great writer he is because he followed an artistic trajectory [from naturalism] toward […] high modernism […] [and] naturalism looks in hindsight to have been a crucial step along the way" (179-80). But Nowlin's teleology is undermined by his discussion of realism, which he divides into two types. He asserts that one type of realism is the "aggressively pessimistic mode" (181) that is a defining characteristic of naturalism and that he identifies in Fitzgerald's *This Side of Paradise* and especially *The Beautiful and Damned*. He asserts that the other type of realism is the

"stylized [and] carefully focused [mode]" (190) that he identifies in Fitzgerald's last completed novel, *Tender is the Night* (1934), and with which he associates "the highest manner of realism, in the end, that the nineteenth century produced, and with which the modernist novel for the most part remained continuous" (188-89). His teleology is rendered yet more opaque by his assertion that "naturalism, like realism, is an early and persistent mode of modernism" (180).

Nowlin's discussion is narrow not only in terms of Fitzgerald's naturalism but also in terms of Fitzgerald's texts. He addresses Fitzgerald's stories not at all, except for one phrase about "May Day" (1920) – oddly, a mere reference to the story that Bruccoli identifies as Fitzgerald's "only fully developed naturalistic story" (*Epic* 139). Nowlin otherwise focuses exclusively on Fitzgerald's novels. Even here, his focus is narrow, as he only briefly discusses *This Side of Paradise* (1920) and *Tender is the Night* (1934).

In contrast, David W. Ullrich offers an extensive and expansive essay, "Free Will versus Determinism in *This Side of Paradise*: Bodily Signifiers, Heredity, and Altruism in Fitzgerald's First Novel." Ullrich argues that "*This Side of Paradise* records Fitzgerald's participation in his contemporary culture's debate between a humanist tradition that champions free will and an autonomous self and emerging speculations in genetics and psychology that challenge these notions by positing a more deterministic understanding of the individual" (41). Ullrich goes on to assert that in *This Side of Paradise* "inheritance severely constrains free will, personal choice, and autonomous identity; that the individual is always already in danger of repeating past mistakes; and that genetic inheritance never offers promise in Fitzgerald's world" (60).

In Nowlin's essay, there is an extensive discussion of only *The Beautiful and Damned* (see also his "Mencken's Defense") and *The Great Gatsby*, the first as an example of the deficiencies of a naturalist approach, and the second as an example of the brilliance of Fitzgerald's attempt to "write something *new*" (*Correspondence* 112), which results, Nowlin argues, in the high modernism of *The Great Gatsby*. Bryant Mangum similarly notes of *The Beautiful and Damned* that it "represents, at best, a minor progress toward the creation of his masterpiece, *The Great Gatsby*" (416). However, Fitzgerald's assertion about "writ[ing] something *new*" appears in a July 1922 letter to Perkins, just four months after he had completed *The Beautiful and Damned* and some

three years before he had completed Gatsby – a period during which he wrote many stories that were not in this "*new*" modernist manner.

"The Cut-Glass Bowl" as Exemplary Naturalist Text

"The Cut-Glass Bowl" is a notable early example of Fitzgerald's naturalism, though its unfamiliarity requires a somewhat extended discussion. The story begins in 1899, seven years into the marriage of Evylyn and Harold Piper. One of their gifts had been a cut-glass punch bowl – a typical wedding present during what Fitzgerald facetiously calls "the cut-glass age" (87), thereby identifying it in the nomenclature of geologist Charles Lyell, whose theory of geological change propounded in *The Principles of Geology* (1830-33) profoundly influenced Darwin's development of the biological theory of evolution. Fitzgerald notes that the fragility of cut-glass items leads to their "struggle for existence" (87). "Struggle for existence" and "struggle for life" are key terms in Darwin's *On the Origin of Species* (1859), so critical that the first term is the title of the third chapter of the book, and the second term is part of the book's subtitle.

As time goes by, the crystal items lose their Darwinian "struggle for existence," becoming chipped and fractured, "scarred and maimed" (87). The fragility of such wedding presents leads to their breakage, an image that suggests the breakdown of marriage itself. Notably, Scott and Zelda Fitzgerald reference just such physical breakage and marital breakdown in their essay, "Auction – Model 1934" (July 1934), written when Fitzgerald was suffering from years of alcohol abuse, Zelda was hospitalized for increasingly profound psychiatric illness, and their marriage was irreparably broken. They note that they had "inherited the cut-glass bowls" (61) they seldom used and that they had a barrel "full of tops" to broken bowls, notably "the top of the delicate Tiffany urn that was [their] first wedding present" (60). Having gathered the symbolically significant and parallel fifteen packing cases that contained "all that remained from fifteen years of buying" during their fifteen years of marriage (56), the Fitzgeralds discover only useless items, essentially trash – "the tangible remnant of the four hundred thousand we made from hard words and spent with easy ones these fifteen years" (62). However profligate, the Fitzgeralds, like the vast majority of others, did not anticipate the economic disaster of 1929 – the crash of the financial market and the length and depth of the subsequent Great Depression. "Crash" and "depression" have not only literal but also metaphorical

significance that points to the psychological effects of this economic disaster not only generally but specifically on the Fitzgeralds.

Unlike the Fitzgeralds' wedding presents, the Pipers' cut-glass bowl remains atypically pristine until the end of the increasingly disturbing story. This wedding present was given to Evylyn by Carleton Canby, a rejected beau who makes no actual appearance in the story. He is represented only by the cut-glass bowl and a related proclamation to Evylyn that he would give her "a present that's as hard as you are and as beautiful and as empty and as easy to see through" (88). Of course, Canby's judgment of Evylyn must be called into question given its context. However, his words and the punch bowl itself prove to be a curse, as suggested by his suddenly sinister appearance before Evylyn: "He frightened me a little – his eyes were so black" (88). Only Evylyn knows the malignant meaning of the gift, and she compartmentalizes it from the object itself until the end of the story. Thus she is able to say playfully: "I thought he was going to deed me a haunted house or something that would explode when you opened it. [But] that bowl came, and of course it's beautiful" (88). However, Evylyn's initial inference is correct, since the bowl will indeed "explode," although not for many years, and long after Canby has moved on with his life, his romantic disappointment doubtless assuaged by his curse.

The Pipers' cut-glass bowl is inappropriately oversized, suggesting the unexpectedly large role it will play in Evylyn's life. The "massive [and] brooding" bowl is disproportionate to the scale of the dining room (105), but Evylyn has expectations of a larger house because her husband's business is prospering. Instead, the story recounts the downward trajectory of the Piper family over the course of nineteen years, critical incidents, always associated with the bowl, occurring in 1899, 1907, and 1918.

The first manifestation of the bowl's power is appropriately identified with another beau, Freddy Gedney, with whom Evylyn has developed a sentimentally romantic attachment seven years into her marriage. When her husband insists on her ending this "imprudent friendship" (91), she writes Freddy a letter doing so. However, he unexpectedly comes to her house one last time. And just as Evylyn is sending Freddy away, Harold returns home early.

The result is a dramatic irony that would be comic were it not so desperate. Evylyn pushes Freddy into the dining room to hide him

from Harold and then tries every possible maneuver to persuade Harold to go upstairs. But Freddy's presence is revealed by "a hollow ringing note like a gong [that] echoed and re-echoed through the house [when his] arm […] struck the big cut-glass bowl" (91). When Harold goes to investigate, "the room seemed to crash about her ears" (91), though the bowl itself remains intact. Harold's renewed trust in Evylyn is destroyed forever even though, ironically, she has acted in good faith. Had Freddy not arrived uninvited or had Harold not arrived early, or indeed had neither arrived when the other was there, then Evylyn and Harold's marriage would have survived undamaged.

The story shifts forward eight years, the Pipers' marriage now loveless and Evylyn's beauty in the process of "vanish[ing]" (92). In this regard Evylyn is like Judy Jones of "Winter Dreams" (1922), one of the Gatsby-cluster stories. Notably, however, Dexter Green is unlike Canby, Dexter's depth brought into relief by comparison to Canby's personal triviality. The omniscient narrator asserts that Dexter does not "bear any malice" toward Judy (233), even after she abruptly ends the second of their two seeming-engagements. Dexter continues to love this beautiful and idealized girl even though "he could not have her" (233). Seven years later, the now financially successful Dexter continues satisfied by only the dream of Judy. He thus becomes distraught while attempting to process new information provided by Devlin, a man who knows the now-married Judy: "You say she was a 'pretty girl' and now you say she's 'all right.' I don't understand what you mean – Judy Jones wasn't a 'pretty girl' at all. She was a great beauty" (235). Devlin responds increasingly damningly: "I think Judy's a nice girl […] [but] I can't understand how a man like Lud Simms could fall madly in love with her" (235). He adds that Judy's husband now "drinks and runs around […] [while] she stays home with her kids" (234), and he then offers an explanation to the still-uncomprehending Dexter: "Lots of women fade just like *that* […] You must have seen it happen" (235). Only at this point does Dexter despair, having survived the loss of Judy herself surprisingly well, but now devastated that the "the dream [of Judy] was gone" (235) – the disappearing dream a constant in Fitzgerald's oeuvre.

In "The Cut-Glass Bowl," the omniscient narrator similarly addresses the changing appearance of Evylyn. Like Judy, the youthful Evylyn had "revelled in her own beauty" (92). However, the passage of time and the unhappiness of her marriage bear a heavy cost, men finding Evylyn "pretty no longer" (92). The narrator details how Evylyn's beauty

has “faded out” (92), specifically critiquing her eyes, her eyebrows, and her smile. Just as the dream of Judy has disappeared, so too has “the mystery of Evelyn” (92), these two qualities closely related.

In the fifteenth year of the Pipers’ marriage, Evylyn is shocked to learn that Harold’s business is failing, that they are moving down the socioeconomic ladder rather than up, as she had been led to expect when they first married. Harold explains that while the town could support two wholesale hardware houses, Piper and Brothers and one other, the arrival of successful businessman Clarence Ahearn tipped the balance and the two small businesses are suffering from the new competition. But Harold has cultivated Ahearn, and the Pipers give a dinner party to cement the new business relationship that will result in a merger.

While preparing for the dinner party, Evylyn resists Harold’s suggestion that the punch be made in the large cut-glass bowl because she fears he will drink too much. Harold rejects the use of a smaller bowl, however, and Evylyn’s fears are realized. A drunken argument results in an embarrassing scene. The potential partnership is vacated, and Ahearn instead goes into partnership with the other businessman who is named, ironically, Marx. Fitzgerald thereby points to the powerful economic forces determining that only one of the small businesses could now thrive. Earlier, when Harold had been confident about the merger, he offered an economic explanation to Evylyn: “If those two had combined we’d have been the little fellow, struggling along, picking up smaller orders, hanging back on risks. It’s a question of capital” (94-95). Of course, while the external economic forces are in one sense determinative, Harold is responsible for the drunken party that repels Ahearn. In another sense, however, Harold is the victim of alcoholism, an internal force over which he has lost control.

As the Pipers grow increasingly hostile toward each other, Evylyn directs her passionate feelings toward their children, young Julie and Donald. When the dining room is being readied for the party for the Ahearns, the cut-glass bowl is briefly placed on the floor and Julie accidentally scratches her thumb on it. This virtually invisible cut results in blood-poisoning in a matter of hours, an incomprehensible result. Attempting to get help, Evylyn moves through the dining room and “catch[es] sight, with a burst of horror, of the big punch-bowl still on the table, the liquid from melted ice in its bottom” (101). She

realizes that the party had become a drunken debacle, the melted ice signaling the party's dying fall. And she is also horrified because she now associates the bowl with Julie's blood-poisoning, the result of a tiny accident with enormous consequences. To save Julie's life, her hand must be amputated – an unlikely outcome that results in another loss, indeed another absence that manifests Canby's simultaneous absence and presence in the Piper family's life. And Julie is now the human incarnation of the last surviving crystal dinner-glass, "scarred and maimed" (87).

Over the subsequent years, Evylyn's "beauty […] completely [leaves] her" (102), an effect in part of the increasingly serious troubles that, to her despair, she has no power to fix. Her marriage to Harold has "drifted into a colorless antagonism," and at best they tolerate each other as they would "broken old chairs" (102). Evylyn's occasional wifely attempts to cheer her husband lead to nothing except her own "wearying depression" (102). She continues to worry about her husband's failing business in the economy of their town, which creates financial pressures that she cannot relieve. Despite her various attempts to enable her daughter to live normally, she worries about Julie's continuing inability to function in the world because of the physical and psychological traumas of the amputation. She also worries about her son, who is fighting in World War I: "She had attempted vainly to keep him near her […] [but he] had been snatched out of her hands; his division had been abroad for three months" (103). Evylyn has no power to protect her son from this geopolitical and military disaster of epic proportions.

When Evylyn learns from her housekeeper that a letter had been delivered but misplaced, she suddenly knows without thinking that it is lying in the cut-glass bowl and that it is an official announcement of her son's death. Completely devastated, Evylyn finally recognizes the bowl as the force that has cursed her adult life, a "cold, malignant thing of beauty […] throwing out […] ice-like beams, […] [the] perverse glitterings merging each into each, never aging, never changing" (105). The beautiful bowl has remained always as it was in contrast to the changing Evylyn, now distraught, indeed broken.

Finally Evylyn listens to the voice that seems to emanate from the bowl, a voice that recalls the words proclaimed by her rejected beau some twenty-six years earlier: "You know it was I who took your son

away. You know how cold I am and how hard and how beautiful, because once you were just as cold and hard and beautiful" (105). At last she faces a problem that she can fix. She grasps the heavy bowl and takes it outside to destroy it and thereby its power. But in the act of crashing the bowl to the ground, she is herself destroyed when she accidentally slips and comes crashing down with it. Not after all an agent, she is revealed yet again to be a victim. Canby's curse is fulfilled, Evylyn lying dead among the "hundreds of prisms and cubes and splinters of glass" (107).

The Fantastic and the Supernatural: "The Diamond as Big as the Ritz" and "A Short Trip Home"

This synopsis of "The Cut-Glass Bowl" inevitably exaggerates the melodrama of the story. The bowl is the embodiment of a curse imposed on Evylyn for rejecting one man for another, and it is represented as an active force that destroys her after first destroying everything she loves. The story invites certain questions: What right did her rejected beau have to curse her? Didn't he love her for the same qualities that he then excoriates? If not, then why *did* he love her? If Evylyn has indeed done wrong by choosing Harold over Canby, to what degree is the punishment appropriate to the crime? Would not marriage to the wrong man be punishment enough? And where does narrative sympathy lie? With Evylyn, whose expectations of a loving marriage, happy children, financial stability, and social prominence are all destroyed? With Harold, whose life is poisoned by his faulty belief that Evylyn has betrayed his trust? With her innocent children, one of whom loses her hand and the other his life? The curse imposed on Evylyn is passed on to her husband and down to her children – an overwhelming and excessive punishment for Evylyn's choosing to marry Harold rather than Canby.

These questions direct attention to the fantastic qualities of the curse in "The Cut-Glass Bowl," thus linking it to stories like "The Curious Case of Benjamin Button" (1922) and especially "The Diamond as Big as the Ritz" (1922). Fitzgerald included these two stories in his 1922 collection *Tales of the Jazz Age*, specifically categorizing them as "Fantasies."

In the latter story, Braddock Washington, his family, and his servants live on a completely isolated mountain that is "a solid diamond […] without a flaw" (190). The occasional aviators who come upon the mountain are imprisoned in "a large hollow in the earth shaped like the

interior of a bowl [whose] sides [are] steep and apparently of polished glass" (199). The prisoners sometimes run up "the glass sides of the bowl as far as they [can but always slide] back to the bottom" (200) – a Sisyphian effort. Furthermore, they are left in darkness because the bowl is "covered by a strong iron grating" (198). The "Hell" of this imprisoning glass bowl (199), so identified by one of the prisoners, is a miniaturized version of the hell within the bowels of the diamond mountain itself, which is revealed in the story's climax.

Not "El Dorado" after all (199), the seeming utopia of the diamond mountain is revealed to be a dystopia, itself a prison from which only the visitor John Unger and the Washington daughters escape. When a convoy of planes successfully attacks the mountain, Braddock Washington chooses not to surrender but instead to sacrifice himself, his family, and his servants, first leading them into the mountain by a trap-door, and then setting off the dynamite with which he had wired the mountain long before, thereby sacrificing the flawless diamond mountain too. First it explodes and then implodes, collapsing into itself, "revealing a black waste from which blue smoke arose slowly, carrying off with it what remained of vegetation and of human flesh" (214). These disgusting details reveal that the diamond mountain has become a "waste" land, one akin to the "waste land" of *Gatsby*'s infamous valley of ashes (24), where Myrtle is killed by the hit-and-run car which inflicts grotesque injuries upon her "human flesh."

Among the fantastic elements of "The Diamond as Big as the Ritz" is the way in which the enclosure of the glass bowl imprisoning the aviators ultimately becomes one with the glass bowl formed by the explosion of the diamond mountain. The trope of the imprisoning and destructive glass bowl clearly links this story to "The Cut-Glass Bowl," written two years earlier.

In addition to being associated with the fantastic, "The Cut-Glass Bowl" is associated with the supernatural. Indeed, the curse's supernatural elements link it to the more lurid episodes of *This Side of* Paradise – the scenes where Amory Blaine at times senses the presence of the devil and at other times actually sees the devil. Notably, the entire plot of Fitzgerald's post-*Gatsby* story "A Short Trip Home" (1927) recounts a young woman's seductive haunting by an evil man already dead, a satanic ghost. Happily if unsurprisingly, the devil's prey Ellen Baker is ultimately saved by the man who loves her. Eddy

Stinson successfully engages in a day-long battle of wills with the devil, here incarnated as the low-life Joe Varland – "varlet" an archaic form meaning base, unprincipled, dishonest, indeed a knave or rogue. Varland had wanted "to make a sort of walking hell of [Ellen]" (387). In saving Ellen from possession by the devil, Eddy comes to possess her himself: "She belongs to me in a way – even if I lose her she belongs to me. Who knows? Anyhow, I'll always be there" (389). This happy ending has its own creepy subtext.

Fitzgerald was particularly attached to this story. In an October 1927 letter to his agent, Harold Ober, he identified "A Short Trip Home" as "the first real ghost story I ever wrote" (*As Ever* 102); notably, however, there are references to ghosts throughout *This Side of Paradise* (see for example 100, 114), as well as implicitly in *The Ice Palace* (see 41-42, 59). Seven years after writing "A Short Trip Home," Fitzgerald repeatedly and ultimately successfully recommended its inclusion in *Taps at Reveille*. In a 15 May 1934 letter to Perkins, written while they were determining which of Fitzgerald's more than one hundred stories should be included in the collection, Fitzgerald suggested various possibilities, including "'Outside the Cabinet Makers' [sic] or else 'A short [sic] Trip Home'" (*Dear Scott* 196). When Perkins in a 4 June 1934 letter omitted any reference to "A Short Trip Home," Fitzgerald returned almost immediately to the subject in an 8 June 1934 letter. This time he came at it from a different angle, suggesting that the jacket copy for the book be "a set of figures typifying eight or ten of the principle characters […] [including] a sinister ghostly man as in 'A Short Trip Home'" (*Dear Scott* 201).

Fitzgerald's judgment was shared by some contemporaneous and also relatively contemporary reviewers. For example, Edith H. Walton's March 1935 review of *Taps at Reveille* in *The New York Times* includes this positive response: "Far better [than many of the stories in the collection is] 'A Short Trip Home,' a ghost story." She adds, however, the contradictory view that this "ghost story" can be "considered as definitely realistic" (see Walton). Jay McInerney's August 1991 review of Bruccoli's edition of *The Stories of F. Scott Fitzgerald*, published in *The New York Times Book Review*, offers a thoughtful analysis of the place of "A Short Trip Home" in Fitzgerald's canon:

The standard collection of Fitzgerald's stories to date has been Malcolm Cowley's 1951 edition with twenty-eight stories. Cowley's

Fitzgerald is a realist in method if not in sensibility (with the stunning exception of the fabulist "Diamond as Big as the Ritz"), and very much the author of *The Great Gatsby* and *Tender Is the Night*. Cowley included the indisputable jewels. "Diamond […]," "The Ice Palace," "Winter Dreams," "May Day," "Absolution," "The Rich Boy," "Babylon Revisited," and "The Bridal Party." Bruccoli's huge collection, on the other hand, with almost twice as many stories, complicates, and lightens, Cowley's picture. Bruccoli's Fitzgerald is more fanciful […]. He's more consciously an entertainer, to the point of turning tricks with the supernatural, as in "A Short Trip Home." (See McInerney)

Michael Cox, the editor of *The Oxford Book of Twentieth-Century Ghost Stories* (1996), notably includes "A Short Trip Home" among the mere thirty-three stories comprising the anthology.

Like these other texts, "The Cut-Glass Bowl" certainly invites interpretation as a supernatural story, the negative space of the bowl signifying the simultaneous absence of Canby and his continuing presence in Evylyn's life. The bowl is the trace of the absent beau that resides in the family's home as a malignant presence, secretly effecting destruction out of all proportion to the original cause.

The Philosophy of Determinism in "Two for a Cent"

While "The Cut-Glass Bowl" has aspects of the fantastic and the supernatural, it explicitly directs attention toward a deterministic interpretation:

> "You see, I am fate," [the bowl] shouted, "and stronger than your puny plans; and I am how-things-turn-out and I am different from your little dreams, and I am the flight of time and the end of beauty and unfulfilled desire; all the accidents and imperceptions and the little minutes that shape the crucial hours are mine. I am the exception that proves no rules, the limits of your control, the condiment in the dish of life." (106)

Only the first of these assertions – "I am fate" – is predictable because it may be read within the context of a supernatural story about a curse. And only the last of these assertions – "[I am] the condiment in

the dish of life" – is regrettable, manifesting a loss of authorial control by its unintentional humor and symbolic inappropriateness. But the rest of the declamation rings true to the philosophy of determinism, which asserts that external and internal forces, often figuring forth as mere accidents, determine the course of one's life.

This is the same lesson that Abercrombie and Hemmick learn upon their accidental meeting in Fitzgerald's "Two for a Cent" (1922). Though this story is not well known, Fitzgerald valued it so highly as to suggest to Perkins its inclusion in *Taps at Reveille*. It is especially notable that he named this story independently rather than presenting it in the form of one of two alternative possibilities, an either-or strategy that he otherwise largely used, as in his identification of either "More than Just a House" or "Babylon Revisited" as the story to be included in *Taps at Reveille* as representative of his stories of a particular time period (*Dear Scott* 195-98).

In "Two for a Cent," Abercrombie learns that his financial and social success depended on his having found a penny twenty-five years earlier that enabled him to buy a ticket to leave town, while the loss of that same penny had plunged Hemmick into scandal and poverty in the town he could no longer leave. The self-satisfied Abercrombie comes to a disturbing realization: "It was entirely an accident that I left here, an utterly blind chance […] I was the sort of boy who'd have lived and died here happily […] It worries me to think that […] what's happened to me can be ascribed to chance" (315-16). He admits, more so to himself than to Hemmick, "I didn't start off with the Dick Whittington idea – I started off by accident" (316). More an American Horatio Alger than an English Dick Whittington, Abercrombie manifested however no pluck, prospering by luck alone: "The very train that took me away was full of luck for me [because] the man I sat beside on the train gave me my start in life" (315).

Abercrombie also recognizes the irony that Hemmick, in contrast to himself, had "hated […] this town, and all [he] wanted was to get out and go North" (318). Twenty-five years of disappointment have rendered Hemmick's words mild, but the repetition of his phrases and his use of negative forms point to their significance: "Never have got up there myself' (312), "Never did get to go" (312), and "Things didn't work out and I didn't get to go" (316). Indeed, his subjectivity disappears from all but the second clause of his last sentence.

In response to Abercrombie's questions, this "poor and busy and tired [man]" then articulates for the very first time his long and depressing tale of bad luck and unhappy accident that had rendered his escape impossible (315) – a tale that comprises the bulk of the story. And just as Abercrombie comes to realize the accidental nature of his own success, so too does Hemmick come to the similar but opposite realization: "He saw dimly now that what had seemed to him only a fragment, a grotesque interlude, was really significant, complete [...] It was the story upon which turned the failure of his life" (323). Abercrombie notes, "It was an accident that you stayed – and it was an accident that I went away" (323), and he acknowledges, "You deserve more [...] actual credit, if there is such a thing in the world, for your intention of getting out and getting on" (323). However, "credit" is irrelevant in this deterministic world, as is personal responsibility. As Dalyrimple learned in Fitzgerald's 1920 story, "Success [does not necessarily come] from faithfulness to duty," and "Evil [is not] necessarily punished or virtue necessarily rewarded," and "Honest poverty [is not] happier than corrupt riches" (158). Hemmick's accidental loss of the penny and Abercrombie's accidental discovery of it are more powerful than Hemmick's ambitious intention and Abercrombie's lack of ambition.

Fitzgerald continued to be fascinated by the possibility of a minor accident changing the trajectory of a life, providing two such accidents in *Tender is the Night*, written twelve years after "Two for a Cent." Both of these events contribute to determining Dick Diver's profession as a psychiatrist.

The first accident is Dick's selection by Yale's elite secret society Skull and Bones, which taps only fifteen juniors for membership each year. Dick reflects on the circumstances of the selection that proved fortunate for him at the expense of a worthier candidate: "Could I help it that Pete Livingstone sat in the locker-room Tap Day when everybody looked all over hell for him? And I got an election when otherwise I wouldn't have [...] He was good and right and I ought to have sat in the locker-room instead" (117). Dick secretly acknowledges the appropriateness of the nickname "Lucky Dick" (116), and for good reason, given that membership in this society famously confers power and influence, which are indeed soon manifested in his own life. After graduating from Yale, he wins a Rhodes Scholarship to Oxford, he takes his medical degree at Johns Hopkins, he takes the opportunity to study in Vienna because of Freud's presence, he earns his degree

in neuropathology at the university in Zurich, and he is assigned to a neurological unit toward the end of the war, with no risk of injury or death. The impact of the accident of Dick's being selected for Skull and Bones is less direct and absolute than that of Hemmick's losing the penny and Abercrombie's finding it, but the subtle effect of this deterministic event on Dick's life renders it more complex and compelling.

The second accident is the means by which Dick came to study psychology, which he contrasts with the means by which his friend and later co-partner in their clinic, Dr. Franz Gregorovius, came to the same study. Franz was "the third of the Gregoroviuses – his grandfather had instructed Krapaelin when psychiatry was just emerging from the darkness of all time" (119), and both his grandfather and his father had written important books on psychology. Dick references this family history when he observes to Franz, "Fate selected you for your profession" (138). Dick notes that, in contrast, his study of psychology was determined by a more immediate and less profound, indeed trivial circumstance: "I got to be a psychiatrist because there was a girl at St. Hilda's in Oxford that went to the same lectures" (138). Here he indicates that had this girl, in whom he was romantically interested, attended different lectures in a different discipline, he would have attended those lectures instead. This different course of study would have likely resulted in his not discovering his own interest in psychology, indeed his own "'bent'" for it (138). In other words, Dick's initial interest in psychology was accidental, and this accident determined the direction of his entire adult life.

The Golden Bowls of Henry James and F. Scott Fitzgerald

In contrast to literary naturalists, realists employ various other techniques to emphasize their contrasting assumptions about the nature of reality and the role of humans within it. Their psychologically rounded characters are represented as having free will and thus as being largely in control of their lives. As agents, they bear responsibility for their actions and must deal with the consequences as best they can. The word "credit" is relevant indeed in the realist world.

One particularly apposite example of literary realism is Henry James's major novel, *The Golden Bowl* (1904). Nowlin notes that "[Fitzgerald's] estimate of James's importance seems to have risen steadily between 1921 and 1925 [and] both Carl Van Vechten and

Gilbert Seldes affiliated Fitzgerald with James in their favorable reviews of *The Great Gatsby*" (185). When T. S. Eliot noted in a 1925 letter to Fitzgerald that he had read *The Great Gatsby* three times and then compared Fitzgerald to Henry James, Fitzgerald was giddy with excitement, writing a letter in turn to Perkins: "[Eliot] thought [*The Great Gatsby*] was *the 1st step forward American fiction had taken since Henry James*" (*Dear Scott* 134). Fitzgerald was so gratified by Eliot's praise that he recounted it again, seemingly from memory and with some exaggeration, in a 1933 letter also to Perkins (*Dear Scott* 186).

Henry James's *The Golden Bowl* focuses on four characters and their inter-relationships: Maggie Verver, who is a young American woman with a great fortune; Amerigo, who is an impoverished Italian prince, Maggie's fiancé, and then her husband; Adam Verver, who is Maggie's fantastically wealthy and doting father; and Charlotte Stant, who is Maggie's beautiful friend, Amerigo's lover, and Adam's eventual wife.

Charlotte, accompanied by Amerigo, considers buying a gilded crystal bowl as a wedding present for Maggie. However, Amerigo rejects the bowl because he alone perceives its hidden flaw, a nearly invisible crack in the crystal: "A crack's a crack – and an omen's an omen" (123). When Charlotte teases him, he freely acknowledges, "Per Dio I'm superstitious!" (123). He shares his fear that this wedding present would threaten his "happiness," his "safety," his "marriage," indeed "everything" (123), and so he follows his "instinct" in rejecting the bowl (124). Amerigo's superstitions and instincts are notable in this realistic novel. But the other characters – pragmatic Americans all – accept his responses as typical of a European, specifically an exotic Italian originally from Southern Europe.

In contrast to James's Amerigo, Evylyn Piper in "The Cut-Glass Bowl" shows herself, ironically, to be a realist, at least insofar as she appreciates the intrinsic beauty of her own wedding present without superstition about the sentiment behind it. But this fatal mistake, unrecognized for twenty-five years, reveals itself only when the curse becomes undeniable and her "happiness," her "safety," "her marriage," indeed "everything," including she herself, is destroyed.

Because Amerigo has rejected the wedding present of the gilded crystal bowl, he thinks he has escaped its curse. He is thus horrified when, against all odds, it reappears four years later in his and Maggie's

home. The language of James's realistic novel shifts toward the naturalistic in a move easily overlooked. Maggie says, "It was shown you [and Charlotte], but you didn't take it; you left it for me, and I came upon it, extraordinarily, through happening to go into the same shop" (455). She later adds, "It comes round after all to your having got me the bowl [in a sense]. I myself was to come upon it, the other day, by so wonderful a chance; was to find it in the same place and to have it pressed upon me by the same little man" (459). Unknowingly repeating Amerigo's words while having reversed his action, she asserts, "[I] must have believed in it somehow instinctively; for I took it as soon as I saw it" (459). Amerigo responds that "the coincidence is extraordinary," and Maggie readily acknowledges "the strangeness of the coincidence" (459), the "marvel" and the "miracle" and "the oddity of [her] chance" (460).

By means of the bowl, Maggie's suspicions are confirmed that Amerigo and Charlotte were once lovers and are so now again, a realization that her friend Fanny Assingham disingenuously tries to dismiss. Fanny follows her words with action, "dash[ing the gilded crystal bowl] boldly to the ground, where she had the thrill of seeing it lie shattered with the violence of the crash" (448) – exactly like the cut-glass bowl of Fitzgerald's story. Fanny thereby means to destroy Maggie's suspicions, though she does not succeed.

Instead, the seemingly fragile Maggie is unexpectedly not broken by the recognition of the adulterous relationship between her husband and her friend. Having placed the three nearly equal pieces of crystal on the mantel – the bowl not shattered after all – she implicitly signals to her husband that she is aware of the affair, indeed the love triangle in which she has heretofore played an unknowing part. Maggie ultimately outmaneuvers everyone, not explicitly referencing the adultery but engineering the departure to America of her father and his wife Charlotte – a marriage that she herself has brought about. Witnessing Maggie's actions, Amerigo realizes that his seeming child-bride, for whom he had felt a contempt of sorts, has actually grown into a strong and resourceful woman. Maggie willingly sacrifices her infantilizing relationship with her father for the sake of her marriage. She thereby incites in her husband an unexpectedly deep and passionate love.

The Golden Bowl manifests the defining elements of realism, its psychologically round characters acting with free will, agents in their

lives with freedom to choose and responsibility for their choices and actions. Even so, Amerigo's superstition about the dangers the bowl would pose to his marriage is borne out, though in various complex ways he could not foresee.

And what of Charlotte, whose departure with her husband to a place she will hate causes Maggie to acknowledge that she has manipulated Charlotte, indeed sacrificed Charlotte for her own marital happiness: "Her unhappiness [has] been necessary to us [. . .] We [have] needed her, at her own cost, to build us up" (564). While Maggie admits, "It's terrible," Amerigo dismisses Charlotte by asserting, "She's making her life" (566).

In making this assertion, Amerigo refuses any responsibility on his and Maggie's part for Charlotte's situation. And throughout most of the novel, Charlotte does indeed seem to be an agent in control of her life, engaging in machinations of her own, as does Amerigo, in order to disguise from Maggie and Adam the renewal of their love affair. However, this love affair is made both possible and desirable because neither Maggie nor Adam loves their respective spouses as much as they love each other, despite the efforts of Charlotte in particular to gain the greater part of her husband's love and attention for herself as his wife. And over the four years of their respective marriages, Maggie and her father increasingly neglect their spouses in order to spend increasing amounts of time together, thereby rendering both Charlotte and Amerigo lonely and thus increasingly dependent on each other for companionship.

Yet to her own surprise and confusion, early in the novel Charlotte is revealed to be a victim of economic, biological, and psychological drives, as well as prey to the forces of her social environment. To what degree is Charlotte actually "making her life," and to what degree is her life being made for her? She is clearly a victim of her own meager financial means, which had made it impossible for her and the equally poor Amerigo to marry so many years before, despite their powerful sexual attraction, and which makes Adam Verver's marriage proposal an unexpected economic opportunity, given that she has no other prospects in the marriage market. Moreover, Charlotte is acutely aware that her worth as a product essentially for sale in this market is being reduced every day as she ages (in this regard very like Lily Bart in *The House of Mirth*, the 1905 novel written by James's good friend Edith Wharton).

Charlotte freely acknowledges to Adam her reasons for considering marriage to him, thereby behaving according to her own value system in this regard: “I won’t pretend I don’t think it would be good for me to marry. Good for me, I mean […] because I’m so awfully unattached. I should like to be a little less adrift. I should like to have a home. I should like to have an existence […] In fact, you know, I want to *be* married […] It’s – well, it’s the condition […] It’s the state, I mean. I don’t like my own. ‘Miss,’ among us all, is too dreadful – except for a shopgirl. I don’t want to be a horrible English old-maid” (194). Charlotte’s social situation restricts her to marriage as her only possible more-or-less independent future, ironically, and the only future that will be approved within her social circle. To what degree, then, is she the victim of her social class, which renders unmarried women dependent on family and friends for temporary residences? She is looking at a future where she will become a burden to those others who will, perhaps grudgingly, accept at least occasional responsibility for her living situation. Being a wife or “a horrible English old-maid” are her only viable options. She is incapable of entering the world of work, neither having been trained for it nor, despite her diminishing financial resources, being a member of the social class where work is considered appropriate. She is looking at a future where she will be pitied by those others with whom she had been on terms of relative equality when young and desirable. Has Charlotte then actually made her own decision freely to marry Adam, thus bearing responsibility for her ultimate unhappy future in provincial American City with a man whom she respects but does not love? James in all his subtlety and ambiguity offers us either possibility, or indeed both.

The image of the golden bowl had great resonance for Fitzgerald, as evidenced by his response when the two teen-aged sons of his great friends Gerald and Sara Murphy died one after the other, Baoth’s 1935 death from spinal meningitis ironically a complete surprise and Patrick’s 1937 death from tuberculosis long expected. The day after Patrick’s death, Fitzgerald wrote a poignantly beautiful letter to the Murphys, ending with this resonant sentence: “The golden bowl is broken indeed but it *was* golden; nothing can ever take those boys away from you now” (*Letters* 184).

Almost exactly a year after Baoth’s death and a year before Patrick’s, Murphy wrote a letter in 1935 to Fitzgerald that implicitly compared the Murphys’ family tragedy with Fitzgerald’s marital tragedy

because of Zelda's devastating mental illness: "Of all our friends, it seems to me that you alone knew how we felt these days – how we still feel […] How ugly and blasting [life] can be, – and how idly ruthless" (quoted in Miller 151). Indeed, in 1930 while Patrick was a patient at the tuberculosis sanatorium in Montana-Vermala on the Plaine Morte glacier in Switzerland, and Zelda was a psychiatric patient at Les Rives de Prangins Clinic, also in Switzerland, Fitzgerald traveled between Zelda's clinic and Patrick's sanatorium on visits to each of them. As the omniscient narrator of *Tender is the Night* notes, "Routes cross here [in Switzerland] – people bound for private sanitariums or tuberculosis resorts in the mountains" (248).

Despite the wealth, contacts, and influence of the Murphys, who made heroic efforts to find cures for their sons, they were unable to do so. Gerald Murphy was particularly broken by this outcome, one over which he had no control, as the naturalists would predict. In a psychologically meaningful if ironic tactic, he recaptured a sense of control by blaming himself for having caused Patrick's eight-year long, painful, and ultimately fatal illness. His misplaced guilt derived from the discovery that Patrick had become infected while in Hollywood, where Murphy had taken his family in order to help movie producer King Vidor with the music and photography for a film. Close friend and first-hand observer Dorothy Parker wrote in a 1929 letter to Robert Benchley that Murphy committed himself to caring for Patrick in an act of "absolute immolation," that he was "simply pouring his vitality into Patrick, in the endeavor to make him not sick" (quoted in Miller 50).

In addition to committing himself to Patrick's care, Murphy absolutely and forever renounced his artistic life immediately upon Patrick's diagnosis. Murphy was no dilettante though his abandonment of his art after less than a decade and his relatively small output of paintings – some of which were lost and others simply abandoned by Murphy – have resulted in his reputation as such. However, his renunciation had not only personal but also larger artistic ramifications:

> Gerald Murphy had painted some fourteen or more canvases that had attracted great attention in Paris […] Murphy's art was on the cutting edge, seeming to French critics to represent not only a Modernist sensibility but a peculiarly American one as well. He

> was thus invited to exhibit in "L'Art d'aujourd'hui" of 1925-26 in Paris – along with Mondrian, Picasso, Léger, and others. His painting *Razor* […] earned from Léger the observation that Murphy was "the only *American* painter in Paris." (Moreland, "Gerald Murphy" 362)

Poet Archibald MacLeish explained that Murphy had abandoned his art upon Patrick's diagnosis because "he did not feel that he deserved the pleasure of painting" (qtd. in Moreland, "Gerald Murphy" 359). Indeed, he chose to punish himself in this most profound way both as an expiation of his own misplaced guilt and as an unconscious attempt to shift Patrick's pain onto himself. Murphy refused for the rest of his life any discussion of his art, which became the first taboo subject in their household; the second emerged later, when any reference to the boys' deaths was forbidden.

Murphy moved his family from Europe to New York City in 1932 and became a business executive from that time forward, taking over Mark Cross, the family business he had fled more than a decade before. Murphy's guilt and self-punishment were overwhelmingly painful, but they returned to him the illusion of control in circumstances that were the effect of unhappy accident, bad luck, chance. He wrote knowingly to Fitzgerald in a 1935 letter, "'Trade' has proven an efficient drug, – harmful but efficient" (qtd. in Miller 151). It somewhat dulled his pain at Baoth's death, Patrick's increasingly hopeless illness, and his own renunciation of painting.

Murphy's response to Patrick's illness served as a critically important cautionary example to Fitzgerald. It became a powerful "warning to himself of what would happen if he did not cling to his artistic vocation despite compelling personal obligations [to Zelda's care and their daughter Scottie's education] that he was unwilling to ignore and about which he felt a sense of guilty responsibility" (Moreland, "Gerald Murphy" 365). Therefore, Fitzgerald "rededicated himself to his art rather than renouncing it in the face of his own family tragedy" (Moreland, "Gerald Murphy" 365). It was Murphy's abandonment of his art that was "the tragedy from which Fitzgerald learned and which he [imaginatively] enacted in the plot of *Tender is the Night* so as not to enact it in his [actual] life" (Moreland, "Gerald Murphy" 365).

Scarred by Life: Cracking Up

Only two months after Fitzgerald received Murphy's despairing 1935 letter, he published in February 1936 "The Crack-Up" essay in *Esquire*, following it in March with "Pasting It Together," and in April with "Handle with Care" – these deeply troubling autobiographical essays revealing with visceral power his discovery that he had "cracked like an old plate" ("Crack-Up" 72). This metaphor recalls the chipped and fractured crystal items of "The Cut-Glass Bowl" that have been "scarred" by life (87), just as "life itself [...] [had] scarred" Murphy (qtd. in Miller 151). As Dorothy Parker presciently observed in a 1929 letter resonant of the 1930s, Murphy was "already cracking up" (qtd. in Miller 50).

In *The Crack-Up* essays, Fitzgerald explores his own adult life with painful honesty, to the horror of his friends who found his personal confessions embarrassing rather than courageous. At only one point does he clearly take personal credit for his actions and their effects, that is, in the very beginning of the first essay where he operates in the realist mode though inflecting it with irony: "This philosophy fitted on to my early adult life, when I saw the improbable, the implausible, often the 'impossible,' come true. Life was something you dominated if you were any good. Life yielded easily to intelligence and effort, or to what proportion could be mustered of both" ("Crack-Up" 69).

In a letter to Fitzgerald, Sara Murphy responded with impatience, anger, and a kind of disbelief that emanated from her own tragic experiences: "Do you *really* mean to say you honestly thought 'life was something you dominated if you were any good –?' Even if you meant your *own* life it is arrogant enough, – but life! [...] Rebelling, dragging one's feet & fighting every inch of the way, one must admit one can't *control* it–one has to *take* it, –& as well as possible–that is all I know" (qtd. in Vaill 272-73).

While Sara Murphy focuses exclusively on Fitzgerald's initial assertion of dominance, in much the rest of these three essays Fitzgerald seems not to understand how and why various terrible events have happened to him in later life. He sees himself as a victim in the naturalist mode, a man who is broken down and cracked up by powerful forces. The first type of force is external, "the big sudden blows that come, or seem to come, from outside," and the second type is internal, the "blow that comes from within–that you don't feel until it's too late to do

anything about it" ("Crack-Up" 69). Fitzgerald asserts that these forces are "realized" only after their impact ("Crack-Up" 69). His use of this word simultaneously suggests two meanings, that is, "recognized" and "made real" – both of which point to a naturalist interpretation, the former indicating that he has recognized something that has happened to him, and the latter indicating that something has been made real not by him but, again, to him.

In "Head and Shoulders," published sixteen years before *The Crack-Up* essays, Fitzgerald explored life's "varying offensive" ("Crack-Up" 71), here in a comic mode that has its own desperate quality. The omniscient narrator asserts that "life reached in, seized [Horace], handled him, stretched him, and unrolled him like a piece of Irish lace on a Saturday afternoon bargain counter" (61-62). Indeed, while Horace's intention is to write a series of philosophical books in order, ironically, "to popularize the new realism," he finally recognizes that "life hadn't come that way," indeed that "life took hold of people and forced them into [unexpected paths]" (83).

Alabama Beggs, the protagonist of Zelda Fitzgerald's 1932 novel *Save Me the Waltz*, similarly, if more philosophically, observes that "by the time a person has achieved years adequate for choosing a direction, the die is cast and the moment has long since passed which determined the future" (195).

"The Cut-Glass Bowl" as "The Ice Palace" and "The Ice Palace" as "The Cut-Glass Bowl"

My exploration of the explicit role of determinism in Fitzgerald's stories and essays leads me back to Evylyn's perception of the cut-glass bowl as a type of ice palace. She comes to this perception immediately before her death, having finally realized the bowl's unrecognized power over her life:

> The bowl seemed suddenly to turn itself over and then to distend and swell until it became a great canopy that glittered and trembled over the room, over the house, […] shutting off far horizons and suns and moons and stars except as inky blots seen faintly through it […] The light that came through […] was

> refracted and twisted until shadow seemed light and light seemed shadow–until the whole panorama of the world became changed and distorted under the twinkling heaven of the bowl [...] Then the great walls began slowly to bear down upon her, growing smaller and smaller, coming closer and closer as if to crush her. (105-06)

The cut-glass bowl in effect becomes the ice palace – a "cold, malignant thing of beauty [...] throwing out the ice-like beams" (105). The adjective "cold," absent from earlier descriptions of the bowl, appears several times in this passage, just as the evening into which Evylyn had stepped moments earlier for "a breath of fresh air" (103) is suddenly transformed by a "cold wind" (106). This supernatural, hallucinatory ice palace is an image of oppressiveness, the oppressiveness of a life gone wrong despite good intentions and actions. Less in control of her life than she had thought, Evylyn dies as a result of a grotesque accident that ends the curse. But is the curse supernatural, or is it simply the curse of a life determined by external and internal forces of which she is only dimly aware, individual choices with unintended consequences, small accidents with large implications?

Sally Carrol Happer emerges more happily from her confrontation with the ice palace – a literalized version of the symbolically freighted cut-glass bowl, just as "The Ice Palace" itself is read as realistic rather than fantastic or supernatural, though even here "ice was a ghost" (55). A "glittering" construction, the ice palace is "a hundred and seventy feet tall," with walls made of blocks of ice "twenty to forty inches thick" (56). Sally Carrol's fiancé Harry is excited that this is the first ice palace built in decades, but "the notion of there not having been one since eighty-five oppressed her" (55). Sally Carrol associates the ice palace with death: "This mansion of [ice] was surely peopled by those shades of the eighties, with pale faces and blurred snow-filled hair" (55). When Harry races ahead of her down one of the many labyrinthine passages, she tries to follow but becomes lost. Feeling an "icy terror," she tries to return to the main hall via a passageway but discovers that "it was only another glittering passage with darkness at the end" (58). Falling to the ice, she feels herself "alone with this presence that came out of the North, the dreary loneliness that rose from ice-bound whalers in the Arctic seas, from smokeless trackless wastes where were strewn the

whitened bones of adventure" (58) – a vision strangely reminiscent of literary naturalist Jack London's stories of the Yukon. Also reminiscent is the scene in *Tender is the Night* where "the wide snow" and the "high and limitless" mountains of the ski resort of Gstaad create the sense that "they were all listening atavistically for wolves" in the dark night (177).

In a compelling coincidence, Harold Ober served as Jack London's literary agent from 1908 until London's death in 1916, and he became Fitzgerald's agent a scant three years later, a position he held until Fitzgerald broke with him in 1939. Fitzgerald must have been familiar with London's work, even if only at second hand. London was arguably the most famous American writer of his generation, both nationally and internationally, as well as the most highly paid, and his death was widely reported throughout the United States and elsewhere. Mencken included an essay on London in his *Prejudices: First Series*, published in the same year Ober first represented Fitzgerald. Mencken describes London in high, if idiosyncratic, terms, indeed in terms that could also be applied to Fitzgerald: "There was in [London] a vast delicacy of perception, a high feeling, a sensitiveness to beauty, [and] there was in him, too, under all his blatancies, a poignant sense of the infinite romance and history of human life" ("Jack London" 239). Mencken claimed that "no other popular writer of his time did any better writing than you will find in *The Call of the Wild*" ("Jack London" 236), a novel inflected by the Social Darwinism of Herbert Spencer who, along with Darwin (and to a lesser degree Marx), was London's major intellectual influence. Notably, in *The Great Gatsby* Fitzgerald creates a past for Dan Cody that could come directly from a London story: "[Cody was] a product of the Nevada silver fields [and] of the Yukon" (100).

However, Sally Carrol is not to be a "sacrifice […] to the grey pagan God of Snow" after all (57). This Southern girl who has come North in preparation for her marriage is rescued from death by a search party, and she decides as a result of her experience to return to the South rather than marrying Harry. The story ends as it began, its structure circular, with a scene of Sally Carol once again lazing in the "comforting heat" of her house (60), then accepting an invitation to go swimming with Clark Darrow – one of the young men of Tarleton, Georgia whom she "couldn't ever marry" because of his characteristic lack of energy and material success (39). The ending of the story suggests at least the possibility that Sally Carrol will change her mind – that her rejection of Harry and the energizing cold of the North will lead to her acceptance of marriage with a Southern boy. But the other stories in the "Tarleton

Group" do not reward such an interpretation. Never again a lead character, Sally Carrol makes appearances in "The Jelly-Bean" (October 1920) and "The Last of the Belles" (March 1929) – still beautiful, still pursued by young men from both the South and the North, still unable to choose, still unmarried.

But what if Sally Carrol had not quite literally made the wrong turn in the ice palace? Or what if Harry had not lost his grip on her hand when he darted down the icy passageway? Though Sally Carrol has concerns and doubts about life in the North and marriage to Harry, she continues with her plans. Indeed, after an argument about the relative merits of the North and the South, she begs Harry to move their wedding date forward in a faulty attempt at forestalling such arguments. It is only the small accident of taking the wrong turn that results in life-changing consequences for Sally Carroll. And it is the natural and social environment, an accident of birth, that determines the constitutive differences between Southerner Sally Carrol and Northerner Harry Bellamy, which dooms their engagement as it would have doomed their marriage.

The symbolic ice palace of "The Cut-Glass Bowl" and the seemingly realistic one of "The Ice Palace" both suggest powerful forces that overwhelm the female protagonists' expressed intentions. Both women fall to the icy ground of St. Paul, having thought they were in control of the directions their lives took until accidents proved them wrong.

George and Jonquil, Scott and Zelda, and "'The Sensible Thing'"

One cannot help but think of the young Scott Fitzgerald living in St. Paul during a miserable summer in 1919. Rejected by both Scribner's and Zelda, he was desperately rewriting "The Romantic Egoist" into *This Side of Paradise*. Though his self-willed actions resulted in both literary and romantic success, thereby seeming to give the lie to the philosophical determinism of literary naturalism, Fitzgerald felt just how tenuous individual intention is, how likely are "the end of beauty and unfulfilled desire" in a world characterized by accidents and "the limits of [human] control," as described in "The Cut-Glass Bowl" (107).

However happy the outcome of Fitzgerald's efforts, at least initially, he continued to brood on the conditions of his marriage, for

example in his essay "Pasting It Together," written sixteen years after he married Zelda.

> It was one of those tragic loves doomed for lack of money, and one day the girl closed it out on the basis of common sense. During a long summer of despair I wrote a novel instead of letters, so it came out all right […] [But] the man with the jingle of money in his pocket who married the girl a year later would always cherish an abiding distrust, an animosity, toward the leisure class […] In the years since then I have never been able to stop wondering where my friends' money came from, nor to stop thinking that at one time a sort of *droit de seigneur* might have been exercised to give one of them my girl. (77)

Much earlier, Fitzgerald had given fictional form to his searing personal experience in his four-part story "'The Sensible Thing'" (1924), a *Gatsby*-cluster story that he wrote four years after his marriage to Zelda, and that he described in a 1925 letter to Perkins as follows: "Story about Zelda & me. All true" (*Dear Scott* 113). In this story, which Fitzgerald included in his 1926 collection *All the Sad Young Men*, also including "Winter Dreams" therein, George O'Kelly and Jonquil Cary have an understanding that they will marry. However, George's attempt to make money in New York at the insurance business is a failure, like Fitzgerald's own attempt at the advertising business in New York. Jonquil determines that it is not "the sensible thing" for them to marry (295), since George does not have the financial resources to take care of her, just as Zelda ended her relationship with the unsuccessful Fitzgerald "on the basis of common sense" ("Pasting" 77). The first three parts of the story lead inexorably to a break-up, providing a portrait of George's desperate hope and ultimate despair. Mrs. Cary advises George "to go back home" (295), as Fitzgerald did after Zelda ended their engagement. But George is an engineer, not a writer, and in the white space between the third and fourth parts of the story, he becomes the lead engineer on a project in Peru, attaining great professional and financial success – as Fitzgerald did when he rewrote his rejected "Romantic Egoist" into *This Side of Paradise*, where his protagonist Amory Blaine is similarly

rejected by Rosalind Connage because of his failure at the advertising business and lack of financial resources – a rejection rendered absolute by her marriage to the wealthy Dawson Ryder.

In "'The Sensible Thing,'" however, Fitzgerald emphasizes the role of chance and accident in George's success. For example, "[George] had stumbled into two opportunities" (297), the first in Peru and the second, notably, in New York, where he had failed at his first job. Initially, his position on the Peru expedition "had not seemed an extraordinary opportunity [since] he was to be [only] the third assistant engineer" (300). However, a series of lucky accidents provided him with "his chance, [...] a marvelous chance" (300). Ironically, these accidents were not lucky for others on the expedition, a number of men dying during the voyage itself, and then the chief of the expedition dying of yellow fever once at their destination. By necessity George was put in charge. He makes the most of his opportunity, "ris[ing] from poverty into a position of unlimited opportunity" (297). His success is reminiscent of Abercrombie's in "Two for a Cent," whose lucky accident of finding the penny is predicated on Hemmick's unlucky accident of losing it.

Just as George is able to re-establish with Jonquil their understanding about marriage in the fourth and last part of the story, so, too, did Fitzgerald re-establish with Zelda their understanding upon Scribner's acceptance of *This Side of Paradise*. But George finds the renewal of their relationship bittersweet, coming to a surprising realization: "As he kissed her he knew that though he search through eternity he could never recapture those lost April hours [...] She was something desirable and rare that he had fought for and made his own – but never again an intangible whisper in the dusk, or on the breeze of night [...] Let it pass, he thought; April is over, April is over. There are all kinds of love in the world, but never the same love twice" (301). George realizes that their love has changed, no longer innocent and inexpressibly fresh; that the girl has changed simply because he can now offer her financial security; and that he himself has changed as a result of his lonely struggle, having lost "a trust, a warmth, that was gone forever" (300) – the same realization as Fitzgerald's that "it came out all right [...] but for a different person" ("Pasting" 77). Both George and Fitzgerald come to recognize that their original dreams are unrealizable despite their best efforts. Anthony Patch in *The Beautiful and Damned* comes to a more devastating recognition: "Things are sweeter when they're lost. I know – because once I wanted something [Gloria] and

got it. It was the only thing I ever wanted badly […] and when I got it it turned to dust in my hands" (341). In other words, the marriage of Anthony and Gloria Patch becomes a valley of ashes.

The Idealized Dream or the Actualized Material? The Essential or the Accidental? The Nature of Reality in *The Great Gatsby*

Like George O'Kelly and Scott Fitzgerald, Jay Gatsby knows that "he had lost that part of [his dream of Daisy], the freshest and the best, forever" (153). But unlike George and Fitzgerald, Gatsby comes to this realization not after winning the girl but only after having first lost her. As such, Gatsby must repress his knowledge of having lost "the freshest and the best" part of his dream in order to commit himself to achieving it, a dream that he cherishes for five years.

The major characters in *The Great Gatsby* – Tom, Jordan, Nick, Daisy, Gatsby – function usually as agents, though sometimes as victims. These largely wealthy and socially prominent characters choose their actions for the purpose of increasing their pleasure and avoiding pain. In his 1925 review of *Gatsby*, Mencken notes, "The thing that chiefly interests […] [Fitzgerald is] the florid show of modern American life – and especially the devil's dance that goes on at the top […] What engrosses him is the high carnival of those who have too much money to spend and too much time for the spending of it" (198).

Gatsby's upper-class characters ignore their moral responsibility for the effects of their actions, in contrast, for example, to most of James's characters in *The Golden Bowl*. Literary naturalists typically choose not to focus on wealthy and successful characters because, although not completely immune to the effects of their choices and others', nor to the forces of nature and society, these upper-class characters are significantly buffered from negative deterministic forces. These forces do not make themselves felt so immediately and devastatingly because of the protection provided, at least for some time, by money and contacts and social position.

Tom Buchanan provides one of many illustrative examples. He has multiple extramarital affairs, the first with a chambermaid at the same hotel where he and Daisy reside upon their return from their honeymoon, another while they were living in Chicago before moving East, and still another with Myrtle who lives in the nearby valley of

ashes. Daisy knows of all three affairs, but she does not leave Tom. She learns of his first affair because of an automobile accident in which Tom was driving, having run "into a wagon on the Ventura road one night, and rip[ping] a front wheel off his car, [while] the girl who was with him got into the papers, too, because her arm was broken" (78). This is one of the truly extraordinary number of automobile accidents that occur in the novel, all of which are caused by the carelessness of the rich people driving – for example, the many accidents caused by guests at Gatsby's parties who, amazingly, never suffer any ill effects. In contrast, the lower-class chambermaid is injured by one bad driver and, later, the lower-class Myrtle is killed by another.

According to Nick, Jordan is a "rotten driver," for example when she "passed so close to some workman [sic] that our fender flicked a button on one man's coat" (59). Jordan agrees with Nick's judgment while taking no responsibility for the potential effects of her bad driving, instead depending on "other people […] keep[ing] out of [her] way," since "it takes two to make an accident" (69). Jordan's carelessness as a driver is underscored by her carelessness with "a borrowed car [that she left] out in the rain with the top down, and then lied about it" (58). Her self-protective lies even extend to her position as a golf champion: "At her first big golf tournament there was a row that nearly reached the newspapers – a suggestion that she had moved her ball from a bad lie in the semi-final round. The thing approached the proportions of a scandal – then died away [because] a caddy retracted his statement" (58). It is the lower-class caddy who is pressured to lie, even though it is Jordan who actually tells the "bad lie," as is suggested by the pun in the description of her action. However, she experiences no consequences, not even on the part of Nick, who prides himself on his honesty yet is not deterred from pursuing the fundamentally dishonest Jordan: "It made no difference to me. Dishonesty in a woman is a thing you never blame deeply – I was casually sorry, and then I forgot" (59). Although Nick, by contrast, is a careful driver on the literal level, Jordan describes him differently on the metaphoric level: "You said a bad driver was only safe until she met another bad driver? Well, I met another bad driver, didn't I?" (179).

Nick has earlier declared, "I am one of the few honest people I have ever known" (60). Readers often accept this assertion, not recognizing that its supercilious self-congratulation renders it suspect. Indeed, Nick makes this declaration after announcing a decision that

actually demonstrates the opposite of honesty, when he decides to pursue a romantic relationship with Jordan: "I knew that first I had to get myself definitely out of that tangle back home. I'd been writing letters once a week and signing them: 'Love, Nick' […] There was a vague understanding that had to be tactfully broken off before I was free" (59-60). Here Nick implicitly reveals that, weeks earlier, he had misrepresented this "understanding" to Daisy and Tom, and indeed to the reader, having denied that he is engaged to this girl, playfully proclaiming it "a libel" (20). It turns out, however, that he does indeed have an understanding with the girl back home, "vague" on his part though presumably not so on hers. Distancing himself from this understanding by his move East yet maintaining it by means of his letters signed with love, Nick is acting in bad faith.

Later Nick has "a short affair with a girl who lived in Jersey City and worked in the accounting department" (57). He has no serious intentions about this lower-class girl, and when he realizes that her brother is about to confront him for taking advantage of her, Nick simply "let[s] it blow quietly away" (57). His passive rejection of this girl is a different form of his treatment of the girl back home, whom he also leads on and then presumably rejects, though Nick only speaks of his intention, never specifying how he had actually "broken off" their understanding about marriage.

In addition to his relationships with women, it would seem that Nick has a homosexual encounter with Mr. McKee, a "pale, feminine man" (30) who is one of the people with whom Myrtle and Tom socialize at the New York apartment that Tom has rented for their trysts. Shortly after midnight, Nick "follow[s]" McKee out of the apartment, they "groan down in the elevator" together, the elevator boy snaps at McKee to "keep [his] hands off the lever," McKee says, "I didn't know I was touching it," and Nick responds, "I'll be glad to" (38). After this conversation, there is an ellipsis, followed by Nick's description of himself standing beside McKee's bed while McKee is "sitting up between the sheets, clad in his underwear" (38), showing Nick samples of his photographic work. After this scene, there is another ellipsis, followed by Nick's description of himself at Pennsylvania Station "waiting for the four o'clock train" (38). Nick chooses never to reference this episode again, much less to describe what happened during the intervening four hours – a telling omission indeed.

Only at the end of the novel does Nick finally address directly the complications of a relationship with the person affected. He brings an end to his relationship with Jordan personally and decisively, despite it being "an awkward, unpleasant thing" (178). For the first time, Nick "wants to leave things in order and not just trust that obliging and indifferent sea to sweep my refuse away" (178). By finally taking responsibility for his action, Nick refuses identification with Daisy and Tom, demonstrating that he, if no one else, has learned and grown from his experience with the Buchanans, especially in regard to their treatment of Gatsby.

The most spectacular of the automobile accidents in the novel, and the one with the greatest impact, both literal and metaphorical, is of course the climactic hit-and-run accident that kills Myrtle. When Nick suddenly guesses that Daisy, not Gatsby, was driving, Gatsby explains that "first Daisy turned away from the woman toward the other car, and then she lost her nerve and turned back," hitting Myrtle and then "step[ping] on it" to escape responsibility for her action (145). Gatsby participates in "shield[ing Daisy] from responsibility for Myrtle Wilson's death – first taking the blame upon himself [and] later saying of the hit-and-run accident, in a revealing locution, 'I tried to make her stop but she couldn't,' rather than that she 'wouldn't'" (Moreland, *Medievalist* 137). Gatsby thereby protects Daisy not only legally but also even psychologically from responsibility for her behavior, and he concurrently protects himself from knowledge of her callousness.

Daisy twice "vanishe[s] into her rich house, into her rich full life, leaving Gatsby – nothing" (149). The first such occasion is during their brief love affair before Gatsby leaves for the war, and the second and parallel occasion is when "Daisy retreats with Tom to her mansion [after the accident], where they hold hands [...] while they plot their escape from a messy scene" (Moreland, *Medievalist* 144). They do indeed escape all consequences of their actions, as Nick observes: "They were careless people, Tom and Daisy – they smashed up things and creatures and then retreated back into their money [...] and let other people clean up the mess they had made" (181).

In Gatsby's first encounter with Daisy, he knows that he is in her house "by a colossal accident [...] [since he is] at present a penniless young man without a past, and at any moment the invisible cloak of his uniform [which disguises his social status while identifying him as an

officer] might slip from his shoulders" (149). In the single month that they are together, he lets Daisy "believe that he [is] a person from much the same stratum as herself – that he [is] fully able to take care of her" (149), and they come to an understanding about marrying after the war. However, Gatsby's contacts with members of the upper class have always been characterized by "indiscernible barbed wire between [him and them]" (148) – a military image resonant of World War I. Gatsby's discomfort is inevitably an effect of being raised by "parents [who] were shiftless and unsuccessful farm people" (99) – an accident of birth.

After having waited a year-and-a-half for Gatsby to return – from October 1917 until April 1919 – Daisy finally falls victim to an emotional crisis that is resolved by the arrival of Tom, a powerful external force: "All the time something within her was crying for a decision. She wanted her life shaped now, immediately – and the decision must be made by some force – of love, of money, of unquestionable practicality – that was close at hand. That force took shape in […] the arrival of Tom Buchanan, [whose] wholesome bulkiness about his person and his position [flattered Daisy]. Doubtless there was a certain struggle and a certain relief. The letter reached Gatsby while he was still at Oxford" (151-52).

In Gatsby's second encounter with Daisy, five years later, he flaunts the material goods purchased with his new money to demonstrate that he can indeed take care of her material needs and desires, and he describes his recent past in grandiose terms that are to some degree but not completely accurate. In the climactic scene between Tom and Gatsby where both are fighting for Daisy, Tom challenges the veracity of Gatsby's past with limited success, but he destroys Gatsby in Daisy's eyes by contemptuously revealing in detail the source of Gatsby's new money – illegal activities undertaken in partnership with the immensely powerful and ruthless gangster Meyer Wolfsheim.

Surely Daisy knows about Gatsby's current life, however, given his notoriety, the widespread rumors, the "contemporary legends" (98), and, most immediately, the dubious people with "villainous face[s]" (113) with whom he replaces his real servants so as to ensure his and Daisy's privacy while they pursue their affair. Yet Daisy represses this knowledge, indeed chooses not to know it in an act of bad faith. It is only when Tom confronts Gatsby in her presence and that of Nick and Jordan, only when he insists upon Gatsby's illegal activities, only when he provides specific details, only when he and Gatsby are "out in the

open at last" (130) that she must acknowledge the truth, and even then she tries to avoid it by twice asking to leave the scene of the argument.

Gatsby's choice to go into partnership with Wolfsheim is morally reprehensible, and he expresses no remorse for the cost borne by the untold number of his material and accidental victims – certainly many bankrupted, others jailed, and still others murdered – since his dream of the idealized Daisy alone matters to him, justifying his every choice and action. Immediately upon his return after the war, while Daisy and Tom are still on their honeymoon, he agrees to Wolfsheim's offer because he realizes that becoming a powerful gangster is the only way he can gain enough money fast enough to achieve his dream of taking Daisy from Tom. He complains, bizarrely, that Tom "made it look [to Daisy] as if I was some kind of cheap sharper" (152). Gatsby's meaning is ambiguous or perhaps dual: He resents that Tom minimizes his importance as a gangster (some kind of *cheap* sharper), and he resents that Tom ignores the idealizing motivation that, to him, justifies his illegal activities (some kind of cheap *sharper*).

When Daisy must choose between Tom and Gatsby, the latter having been faithful to her for five years even while absent, while her husband has engaged in repeated affairs, her response manifests her previous search for pleasure and now especially her avoidance of pain. According to Freudian psychoanalytic theory, her choice – indeed her very life – is determined by the "pleasure principle" (3-9, 13-17, 21-25, 67, 75-77): "She hesitated […] as though she realized at last what she was doing – and as though she had never, all along, intended doing anything at all" (133). Having chosen to ignore the consequences of her affair with Gatsby, she is now compelled to recognize that there will indeed be consequences – a realization that paralyzes her.

Daisy expresses revulsion at Tom's justification of his behavior: "Once in a while I go off on a spree and make a fool of myself, but I always come back, and in my heart I love her all the time" (132). But having been afforded the extraordinary opportunity to make the opposite decision this time, to choose Gatsby who idealizes her over Tom who betrays her, Daisy nonetheless makes the same choice as she had five years before. She chooses the security of Tom's old money and irreproachable social position over Gatsby's new money, dubious social position, and parlous legal situation. Wanting always to be "safe and proud above the hot struggles of the poor" (150), Daisy decides that

it is too risky to choose "Mr. Nobody from Nowhere" (130), in Tom's contemptuous phrase.

In a powerful sense, Gatsby becomes Daisy's victim and also Tom's. Daisy's choice once again of the upper-class Tom renders meaningless the enormous efforts of the lower-class Gatsby, who has first made himself into a gangster in order to then make himself into an approximation of the wealthy upper-class gentleman that Daisy will marry "just as if it were five years ago" (111). Her rejection of Gatsby for the second time is "a rejection that destroys his dream and therefore his very self" (Moreland, *Medievalist* 147).

Though Gatsby continues to fight against this rejection, he finally recognizes that his dream is indeed unrealizable despite his best efforts and extraordinary achievements, as I describe in *The Medievalist Impulse in American Literature: Twain, Adams, Fitzgerald, and Hemingway*:

> Gatsby's dream [...] dies when Daisy, loving Gatsby, is unwilling to eradicate the past by denying her love for Tom. Though "the dead dream [fights] on" in the face of the complexities of life in the materially real world, it is from this moment doomed: "[Gatsby and Daisy] were gone, without a word, snapped out, made accidental, isolated, like ghosts." And Gatsby cannot be "Gatsby" without his dream. When he must confront "a new world, material without being real," he necessarily and inevitably dies. George Wilson is merely the accidental (in both senses of that word) agent of a death that has already occurred. When Nick discovers Gatsby's body in the swimming pool, he notices only a pneumatic mattress on "its accidental course with its accidental burden," since the ideal and essential "'Jay Gatsby' had [already] broken up like glass against Tom's hard malice" during Tom's confrontation with Gatsby in Daisy's presence. (Moreland, *Medievalist* 142)

Gatsby is simultaneously the victim of Daisy and the agent of his own destruction, in significant part because his idealization of Daisy is a falsification of the materially real woman:

> When he locates Daisy after five years, he locates the vestiges of the ideal for which he has lived, whose intensity casts into the shadows his materially real life […] Because Daisy embodies a transcendent ideal, Gatsby does not so much love her as what she represents […] Relishing his passion for the "idea" of Daisy, he is disconcerted when the materially real woman threatens to supplant his idealization by "tumbl[ing] short of his dreams," […] [thereby also calling into question his own] "idea of himself." (Moreland, *Medievalist* 140-41)

In *The Great Gatsby*, Fitzgerald asks the age-old question: Which is truly real – the dream, the ideal, the essential, or the material, the actual, the accidental? Gatsby's "desire for mystical transcendence is manifested in his desire to escape the constraints of time" (Moreland, *Medievalist* 139), as when he absolutely rejects Nick's assertion, "I wouldn't ask too much of her […] You can't repeat the past" (111). Gatsby, however, plans to "fix everything just the way it was before" (111). The verb "fix," here, is particularly revealing because "it suggests Gatsby's [impossible] desire both to perfect the imperfect and to arrest time" (Moreland, *Medievalist* 139).

Victims in the Valley of Ashes

The upper-class characters in *The Great Gatsby* are generally though not exclusively represented as agents; Gatsby straddles both the upper and lower classes, and he is both agent and victim; and the lower-class characters, Myrtle and even more so George, are represented as victims. Myrtle and George are prey specifically to the forces of other characters' actions, and prey generally to the forces of economics, biology, and psychology – Marx, Darwin, and Freud of course providing the intellectual foundation of the philosophy of determinism. Fitzgerald referred to these transformative figures in his fiction, essays, and correspondence.

While Mencken correctly noted in his review of *Gatsby* that Fitzgerald was intensely interested in "the high carnival of those who

have too much money to spend," he incorrectly judged that Fitzgerald was "unconcerned about the sweatings and sufferings of the nether herd" (198). This judgment is undermined by a careful reading of *Gatsby* that is not so dazzled by the exploits of the rich as to be blinded, like Dr. T. J. Eckleburg, to the precarious and largely hopeless lives of the poor.

Myrtle desperately wants to escape the impoverished and hellish environment of the valley of ashes – a singularly surreal place in contrast to the realism of East and West Egg and New York City, though they too have their surreal aspects. Myrtle believes that her husband had deceived her into marriage by pretending to have financial resources that he lacked, as evidenced notably by the suit he had secretly borrowed, not bought, for their wedding. Her seduction by Tom on the train into New York acts as a kind of hypnotic force that she cannot resist – recollecting the introductory scene of Sister Carrie's initial seduction on the train into Chicago by Charles Drouet in Theodore Dreiser's eponymous novel.

It is generally assumed by literary critics that Fitzgerald outgrew Dreiser once he supposedly shifted away from Mencken's influence after *The Beautiful and Damned*. However, Mencken remained an important figure in Fitzgerald's life. Indeed, Fitzgerald so trusted Mencken's opinion that in 1932 he asked for his recommendation of a psychiatric hospital for Zelda, and Mencken recommended the Phipps Clinic at Johns Hopkins University, a recommendation that Fitzgerald followed. Mencken was of course Fitzgerald's first editor, famously publishing "Babes in the Woods" in 1919 in *The Smart Set*, but he also published "Crazy Sunday" some thirteen years later in *The American Mercury*, along with other stories in the intervening years. Of particular interest to Fitzgerald was Mencken's afore-mentioned review of *The Great Gatsby*, published on 2 May 1925 in the *Baltimore Evening Sun*. Mencken dismisses *Gatsby* as "no more than a glorified anecdote" (195), and he adds that the characters are "mere marionettes" except for Gatsby, who "himself genuinely lives and breathes" (196). Mencken then discusses *The Great Gatsby* at length, identifying it as a major step forward from *This Side of Paradise* and, notably, *The Beautiful and Damned*, this last of which is the novel that literary critics regard as the one most influenced by Mencken, and the last one so influenced.

> What gives the story distinction is […] the charm and beauty of the writing. In Fitzgerald's first days […] he could see people clearly, and he could devise capital situations, but as writer qua writer he was apparently little more than a bright college boy. It is vastly to Fitzgerald's credit that he appears to have taken [the] caveats [of reviewers of *This Side of Paradise* and *The Beautiful and Damned*] seriously […] In *The Great Gatsby* the highly agreeable fruits of that pondering are visible. The story . . . has a fine texture, a careful and brilliant finish […] The sentences roll along smoothly, sparklingly, variously […] It is a quite new Fitzgerald who emerges from this little book […] His [earlier] books showed brilliancy in conception, but they were crude and even ignorant in detail […] These are the defects that he has now got rid of. There are pages so artfully contrived that one can[not] imagine improvising them. (196-97)

Mencken, however, did not regard *Tender is the Night* highly, even though he provided a blurb for the front jacket cover. Because Fitzgerald so valued Mencken's good opinion, he wrote an explanatory letter to him in 1934 after the publication of the novel. He there specified that "the motif of the 'dying fall' [in the novel's conclusion] was absolutely deliberate and did not come from any diminution of vitality [on his own part] but from a definite plan" (*Letters* 529).

Mencken clearly remained an important figure to Fitzgerald not just until 1922 but throughout his professional life. Notably, Mencken was widely recognized as the foremost proponent of Dreiser, arguably the archetypal literary naturalist. Indeed, Mencken's lengthy chapter on Dreiser in his *Book of Prefaces* appeared only two years before he published Fitzgerald's "Babes in the Woods" in *The Smart Set*.

Dreiser is typically associated with the generation of writers previous to Fitzgerald's. For example, his first novel, *Sister Carrie*, was published in 1900. But Dreiser's literary career was long, indeed outlasting Fitzgerald's own. For example, *Jennie Gerhardt* was published in 1911, *The Financier* in 1912, *The Titan* in 1914, and *The American*

Tragedy – his first commercial success – in 1925, the same year that *Gatsby* was published, however to little popular success. Dreiser's *The Stoic* was published posthumously in 1947, two years after his death, just as Fitzgerald's *The Last Tycoon* was published posthumously in 1941, one year after his death.

Though Dreiser was born in 1871 and Fitzgerald more than two decades later, in 1896, in one sense Dreiser was Fitzgerald's literary forebear but in another sense his peer, a presence on the contemporary literary scene. Indeed, Mark Lawson makes the following fascinating argument:

> [It is] significant that the other major novel published in 1925 [besides *Gatsby*] should have been Theodore Dreiser's *An American Tragedy*, a book in which a poor boy achieves great social wealth and power through the beautiful democracy of the American economy, but is eventually executed for murdering a pregnant mistress to preserve his glamorous existence. Dreiser's book is eerily close in theme to *The Great* Gatsby – a book which might itself well have been titled *An American Tragedy* – and there is no doubt that it was these two novels that first identified a perception of the so-called "American Dream" as fatuous and ruinous and illusory. (See Lawson)

Fitzgerald maintained a life-long admiration for Dreiser as represented in his texts subsequent to *The Beautiful and Damned*. Intriguingly, Fitzgerald noted in a 1924 letter to Perkins: "[Tom Buchanan] is the best character I've ever done – I think he and the brother in [Charles Norris's] 'Salt' & Hurstwood in 'Sister Carrie' are the three best characters in American fiction in the last twenty years" (*Dear Scott* 90). Very early in Fitzgerald's writing of *Tender is the Night*, he noted in a 1926 letter to Perkins: "In a certain sense my plot is not unlike Driesers [sic] in the American Tragedy [sic]" (*Dear Scott* 133).

Much later, while Fitzgerald was convalescing in 1936 in Asheville, North Carolina from a broken shoulder and the effects of

alcoholism, he gave his nurse, Dorothy Richardson, a list of twenty-two books that he regarded as essential reading. Notably, the first book on the list was *Sister Carrie* (see Springer).

On the much longer reading list that he created in 1938 for his lover Sheilah Graham as part of their "College of One" (see especially Ring 58-65; Brucolli *Epic* 442; Graham and Frank 189-200; Graham Westbrook; Robert Westbrook 276-86), Fitzgerald included three novels by Dreiser – *Sister Carrie*, *The Financier*, and *The Titan*. Notably, most of the writers on this list are represented by only a single novel; a number of writers are represented by two novels; only two are represented by three novels, specifically Dreiser and Dostoyevsky, and one is represented by three plays, specifically Shaw; and only three are represented by four novels, specifically Thackeray, James, and Balzac. Dreiser clearly looms large on this list, and Fitzgerald also included novels by two other naturalists, specifically Norris (*The Octopus*) and Sinclair (*The Jungle*).

Dreiser's innocent and provincial Sister Carrie is no match for the "daring and magnetism" of Drouet (5), whose appearance particularly attracts her: "His clothes were of an impressive character, the suit being cut of a striped and crossed pattern of brown wool […] The vest revealed a stiff shirt bosom of white and pink stripes, surmounted by a high white collar. From his coat sleeves protruded a pair of linen cuffs […] [The suit] was finished off with broad-soled tan shoes, highly polished, and the grey felt hat" (6).

Just as Carrie is mesmerized by Drouet's appearance, so too is Myrtle by Tom's: "He had on a dress suit and patent leather shoes, and I couldn't keep my eyes off him. When we came into the station he was next to me, and his white shirt front pressed against my arm, and so I told him I'd have to call a policeman, but he knew I lied. I was so excited that when I got into a taxi with him I didn't hardly know I wasn't getting into a subway train" (36). Myrtle's self-justification – "You can't live forever" – ironically leads to her early and violent death (36).

Carrie's clothes are too light to keep her warm in the Chicago winter, and she also "feels ashamed in the face of the better-dressed girls" (41). These powerful forces of nature and society determine her acceptance of Drouet's compromising purchase of new clothing for her – a jacket, skirt, shoes, purse, gloves, and even stockings. Her transformation into Drouet's mistress is thereby effected. Tom similarly

purchases clothing and other items for Myrtle, including "an elaborate afternoon dress of cream-colored chiffon" (30) that she wears in the apartment he has rented for their trysts, and she plans his purchase of another dress for her the following day.

As Tom's mistress, Myrtle plays at being his wife, but when she makes an insulting remark about Daisy, she is brutally reminded of her insignificance in his life when he "br[eaks] her nose with his open hand" (37). Myrtle is a part of Tom's life only to the degree that she pleases him, sexually and otherwise, whatever her illusions. And these illusions result in her horrific death when she runs after what she mistakenly believes to be Tom driving though the valley of ashes. Her mistake is fatal, Daisy killing her in the hit-and-run accident. Myrtle's body is horribly mutilated, "her left breast […] swinging loose like a flap," her "mouth […] wide open and ripped at the corners," and "her thick dark blood mingl[ing] with the dust" (138). Her body lies in the road where she was struck – ashes to ashes, indeed.

George is rendered incoherent, crazed by Myrtle's death, giving out "incessantly his high, horrible call: 'Oh, my Ga-od'" (140). But there is no comfort to be had, no God in the naturalist world of the valley of ashes, where the poor substitute is the infamous Doctor T. J. Eckleburg, whose services as an oculist are advertised on a billboard. Ironically, the billboard presents only his "blue and gigantic eyes […] dimmed a little by many paintless days under sun and rain," and "a pair of enormous yellow spectacles" (23). The evidence of the billboard is confirmed by the oculist himself having metaphorically "s[un]k down […] into eternal blindness" (23).

Suspecting that Myrtle is involved with another man, George locks her in the building where they live over the garage, and he asserts, "She's going to stay there till the day after to-morrow, and then we're going to move away" (137). This direct and decisive action by the "worn-out" and "colorless" George, who was "his wife's man and not his own" (137), astonishes Michaelis, who runs a neighboring business. But George is engaging in a pipe-dream since his impoverished economic situation would make this departure impossible, unless Tom sells George his car so that he can resell it at a profit – an action that Tom will never take, as recent history attests. Dramatic irony results, George seeing Tom as his potential benefactor, not realizing that Tom is actually Myrtle's lover. Just as Myrtle services Tom sexually, George services Tom's car at his

gas station. Tom cruelly toys with George about selling him the car, and this toying has its ultimately fatal outcome when he tells George that Gatsby killed Myrtle in the hit-and-run accident – an incorrect assumption on Tom's part, though a convenient one as it promises to remove Gatsby from Daisy's life absolutely.

George is thus incited to action, but action while functioning psychologically in a dissociative fugue state that also recalls the supernatural: He is a "poor ghost […] drift[ing] fortuitously about, […] an ashen, fantastic figure gliding toward [Gatsby], shooting him and then himself" (162), this murder-suicide rendering "the holocaust […] complete" (163).

Broken Shells in a Broken Universe: *Tender is the Night*

In *Tender is the Night*, Fitzgerald shifts his focus, exploring the ways in which members of the powerful upper class, however buffered initially, are ultimately prey to the same forces that affect members of the vulnerable lower class. The psychological forces are most prominent in this novel, which specifically identifies the foundational figures in the new field of psychiatry, notably Kraepinger, who is considered the founding father of psychiatry as a science and also a proponent of the theory that psychiatric illness has its basis in biology and genetics. Also identified are other foundational figures, specifically Freud, Jung, Adler, Bleuler, and Forel.

Next most prominent are the economic forces. Indeed, Fitzgerald references Marx directly in the novel (198). Finances and social class determine the degree of one's power, though they do not protect one absolutely from other deterministic and destructive forces. Indeed, several years later, in 1939, Fitzgerald wrote a letter to Scottie about Marx: "You can neither cut through, nor challenge nor beat the fact that there is an organized movement over the world before which you and I as individuals are less that the dust […] read the terrible chapter in *Das Kapital* on the Working Day and see if you are ever quite the same" (qtd. by Ring 71-72).

Biological forces are also significant, especially insofar as physical illness and the physical impact of aging, along with psychological stress, diminish one's vitality, which is always a critical element for Fitzgerald, who regarded it as a fixed quantity; indeed, he insists to Mencken

that he had not yet used up his own store of vitality by the end of his writing of *Tender is the Night*, though in *The Crack-Up* he later claims that he has done so. Two other biological forces are also significant. The first is alcoholism, the disease theory of which was propounded controversially in the mid-19th century, brought to significant public attention with the founding of Alcoholics Anonymous in 1935, and finally so categorized by the American Medical Association in 1956. The second is homosexuality, which continued to be identified as an illness until after the mid-point of the twentieth-century. The psychological, economic, and biological forces often function together and reciprocally rather than independently.

With regard to the impact of these various forces, the devastating post-1928 experiences of Gerald and Sarah Murphy informed to a degree the representation and experiences of Dick and Nicole Diver. The Murphys were the golden couple from 1921 to 1928 at their home in the south of France. Around the Murphys revolved an exceptional and storied social circle of artists, including Scott and Zelda Fitzgerald, Ernest Hemingway, John dos Passos, Fernand Léger, Jean Cocteau, Pablo Picasso, John O'Hara, Cole Porter, Dorothy Parker, Philip Barry, Robert Benchley, and Archibald MacLeish. Indeed, the Murphys created the "French Riviera" as a summer resort, Gerald actually raking stones from the sand at Antibes in order to form a beach, just as Dick Diver does at the beginning of *Tender is the Night*.

Of course, the Murphys' golden life ended with shocking immediacy upon the accidental infection of Patrick with tuberculosis. And so too ended the golden time for this extraordinary social circle, its chosen members attracted by the Murphys' hospitality, warmth, sense of fun, creativity, artistic activity and appreciation, amazing entertainments – in short, their ability to make of life an art. Their social circle atomized with a speed that left the participants feeling bewildered, even abandoned. The Murphys' tragedy nonetheless remained fresh for their friends, a horrifying example of how quickly tragedy may strike, no matter all one's wealth and talents and contacts and efforts, and a horrifying example also of how unremittingly painful and indeed traumatic such losses remain. In 1958, Archibald MacLeish published *J. B.: A Play in Verse*, which is a modern retelling of the story of Job. MacLeish's *New York Times* essay concerning his play, "About a Trespass on a Monument," was published on the resonant date of 7 December in 1958. In this essay MacLeish describes the horrors of

modern life, especially twentieth-century wars, which destroy both the innocent and guilty alike, often seemingly without cause. But behind the global tragedy that he describes as the occasion for his play lies, unexpressed, the personal tragedy of the Murphys; the character J. B. is based on Gerald, as signaled not least of all by the name of J. B.'s wife, Sarah.

Dick and Nicole Diver's particular tragedies are different from those suffered by Gerald and Sarah Murphy and different also from those suffered by J. B. and Sarah, though clearly based on Fitzgerald and Zelda's tragedies – notably his alcoholism and her mental illness. The Divers initially seem to be the golden couple, akin to the Murphys in the early years. Book One of *Tender is the Night* begins the novel *in medias res*, during a summer at the Villa Diana, the Divers' beautiful home on the French Riviera, which their new friend, the young actress Rosemary Hoyt, regards as "the centre [sic] of the world" (29). Dick is a psychiatrist not currently practicing, and Nicole is his beautiful and gracious wife, whose large income derives from the Warren family fortune.

The first part of Book One culminates with a dinner party to mark the departure of the Divers' to Paris. Dick perversely announces to Nicole: "I want to give a really *bad* party [...] where there's a brawl and seductions and people going home with their feelings hurt and women passed out in the cabinet de toilette. You wait and see" (27). Dick is confident in his ability to produce and direct this event, as is apt in a novel that focuses in part on the movie industry, and that also explores the various ways in which people act their lives, perform them rather than live them authentically, at great cost to themselves and others. But Dick overestimates his ability to determine the outcome of the forces that he sets in motion at this party. The melodramatic possibilities that he hyperbolically specifies turn out, ironically, to be variations on the yet worse actualities.

While Dick and Nicole at the height of their party create a transcendent moment of beauty and harmony, it is followed by a series of disastrous events beyond anything Dick would have predicted or could have controlled. For example, the virginal Rosemary Hoyt, a beautiful young actress, tells Dick at this party that she has fallen in love with him in a matter of days, which leads to her repeatedly insisting that he make love to her. His equivocal responses to her demands create

increasing complications for his marriage to Nicole and also for his own sense of himself, notably when he and Rosemary finally do engage in a sexual consummation that is ultimately and inevitably unsatisfactory.

Immediately most critical, however, is a "scene" that Violet McKisco observes when she goes to find the villa's bathroom (36), Nicole and then Dick having already disappeared. Violet returns with dramatic news that she wants desperately to share with the other guests, but she is effectively shut down by Tommy Barban, a mercenary soldier who is in love with Nicole: "It's inadvisable to comment on what goes on in this house" (36). After the guests depart the villa, Dick and Nicole graciously waving good-by, a fierce argument develops between Tommy and the McKiscos, as Violet again attempts to describe what she has seen. Tommy brutally demands that McKisco silence his wife, McKisco calls Tommy a bully and foolishly mentions "the code duello" (44), and Tommy then challenges McKisco to an actual duel to be held the next morning. McKisco quite reasonably assumes that he will be killed by Tommy, but he knows that if he reneges then his wife will never "respect [him] again […] [since] she is very hard when she gets an advantage over you" (46).

Rosemary learns of the upcoming duel from Luis Campion, another guest at the party, whom she approaches despite her distaste at his homosexuality when she sees that he is "weeping hard and quietly and shaking" (40). Campion alludes to his rejection the previous evening by Royal Dumphry, another party guest, telling her that "people who love suffer […] agony," and noting that "it's happened to me before, but never like this – so accidental" (41), this last term bearing particular significance for Fitzgerald. Campion adds that this rejection occurred "just when [he thought] everything was going well" (41). Having perceived himself as an agent in this romantic relationship, Campion discovers himself to be the victim instead – notably, much in the way that Dick discovers himself to be so when he and Rosemary consummate their relationship.

The duel is fought and neither man is wounded. McKisco was "pretty drunk" as party guest Abe North notes, but "not yellow," as McKisco retorts (50). Dick and Nicole never learn about the duel provoked by the event at their party, as Tommy insists upon silence. But the duel leads to a set of unintended consequences – happy accidents, in this case. Notably, when Dick meets McKisco by chance much later,

he quickly realizes "the change, […] the disappearance of the man's annoying sense of inferiority" (206), though he does not know why it has occurred. McKisco knows, however, that "his success was founded psychologically upon his duel with Tommy Barban, upon the basis of which, as it withered in his memory, he had created, afresh, a new self-respect" (206). McKisco's off-hand reference to the code duello in heated circumstances with the absolutely wrong man leads first to an actual duel – a completely unexpected outcome that he wishes desperately to avoid. But his fighting the duel despite his terrible fear leads to a changed perception of himself, which ultimately results in his new success as a writer, where before he had been a bitter failure. It also leads to a shift in the power structure of his marriage, Violet "happy" now not to have an advantage over her husband (206), instead taking advantage of his new wealth and fame, enjoying the buying power of the first and the reflected glory of the second.

The scene that Violet McKisco viewed in the Villa Diana bathroom is finally revealed in the middle of Book Two: "[Dick] had found [Nicole] in her bedroom dissolved in crazy laughter telling Mrs. McKisco she could not go in the bathroom because the key was thrown down the well" (168). But the significance of that scene is revealed far more powerfully by a yet more intense scene in yet another bathroom, this time in the Paris hotel where Dick and Nicole have a room as does Rosemary. In the startling scene that ends Book One, Nicole responds to a powerful and bizarre psychological stimulus – "an [anonymous] dead Negro [man who] was stretched upon [Rosemary's] bed" – by suffering a psychotic break (109).

Nicole's resultant "verbal inhumanity […] penetrated the keyholes and the cracks in the doors, swept into the suite and in the shape of horror took form again" (112) – the psychosis represented in supernatural terms reminiscent of scenes in *This Side of Paradise*, "The Cut-Glass Bowl," and "A Short Trip Home." Nicole's inhuman cries resolve themselves into cries not about the dead man but instead about bloody bedspreads, about shame, about intrusions on her privacy, about her inability to "fix" the bedspread, and about it being "too late" for Dick to love her (112). In the face of Nicole's profound psychological decompensation, Dick's command, "Control yourself, Nicole!" seems remarkably unconstructive (112), and Book One ends on this desperate and despairing note.

Book Two first provides an extended flash-back, introducing Dick as a prominent young psychiatrist whose first book, *A Psychology for Psychiatrists*, is being prepared for publication, and whose goal is "to be the greatest [psychiatrist] that ever lived" (132). Franz Gregorovius, who is working with the renowned Dr. Dohmler at his psychiatric clinic, tells Dick about some patients who are "shell shocks who merely heard an air read in the distance [...] [or] merely read [about them in] newspapers" (119). When Dick pronounces this diagnosis "nonsense," Franz reproves him in a telling fashion, noting, "We're a rich person's clinic – we don't use the word nonsense" (119).

Dick first encounters Nicole at Dohmler's clinic without realizing that she is a patient, noting only that "the girl was about the prettiest thing I ever saw" (120). Nicole begins an extended correspondence with him, and as her psychiatric illness recedes in part by means of her writing the letters and his responding to them, resulting in "a transference of the most fortuitous kind" (120), Dick becomes increasingly charmed by her. He visits Nicole upon his return from the neurological unit once the war ends, and he admits to Franz and Dohmler that he is "half in love with her" (140), but he accedes to their advice to "kind[ly] [...] eliminate himself" from her life (141), so that she may continue to improve but now independently, without having to lean on him for her psychological health and stability. Dick experiences, however, "a vast dissatisfaction [at] the pathological origin and mechanistic defeat of the affair," feeling that "Nicole's emotions had been used unfairly – [and] what if they turned out to have been his own [also]?" (145).

It is only by accident that Dick comes upon Nicole again, when he is on a bike holiday and riding a funicular up the mountain, and she climbs aboard with a handsome young man while on a holiday with her protective and distasteful older sister, Baby Warren. They all meet for dinner and Baby shares her concerns with Dick, noting that her plan is "to buy Nicole a doctor" for a husband (152). Dick ironically envisions Baby's purchase from "the intellectual stockyards of the South Side of Chicago" (154). He thereby alludes simultaneously to the Warrens' enormous wealth and to the vast number of lower-class workers whose wage-slavery, poverty, and terrible working conditions in the Chicago stockyards are one basis of that wealth. Behind this reference lies Upton Sinclair's enormously influential best-selling novel *The Jungle* (1906), which describes in great and sympathetic detail the dreadful and dangerous lives of the stockyard workers, and describes in tones of

outrage the disgusting working conditions at the stockyards and also the physical danger to consumers resulting from the often tainted meat produced in these conditions. Notably, Sinclair was the most famous of the muck-raking journalists, who were closely associated with the school of literary naturalism.

Fitzgerald directly identifies the considerable demands on the lower class that provide the foundation of the wealth enjoyed by members of the upper class such as Nicole, who then use their extraordinary financial resources to engage in bouts of conspicuous consumption:

> Nicole was the product of much ingenuity and toil. For her sake trains began their run at Chicago and traversed the round belly of the continent to California; chicle factories fumed and link belts grew link by link in factories; men mixed toothpaste in vats and drew mouthwash out of copper hogsheads;. . . half-breed Indians toiled on Brazilian coffee plantations and dreamers were muscled out of patent rights in new tractors—these were some of the people who gave a tithe to Nicole, and as the whole system swayed and thundered onward it lent a feverish bloom to such processes of hers as wholesale buying. (55)

Fitzgerald later recounts the events leading to Dick and Nicole's marriage, Dick choosing to believe that she has been cured of "schizophrénie," or "divided personality" (128), despite being warned against this wishful diagnosis by her treating psychiatrists Franz and Dohmler, who had asked Dick to consult on her case. Franz presciently notes: "What! And devote half your life to being doctor and nurse and all – never! I know what these cases are. One time in twenty it's finished in the first push – better never see her again!"(140). But Dick "want[s] above all to be loved" (302), and he falls in love with Nicole, who has fallen in love with him: "Dick had made his choice [willfully], chosen Ophelia, chosen the sweet poison and drunk it" (302). Dick is responsible for abandoning his professional ethics to marry Nicole. His initial decision results in a series of unexpected and destructive

consequences, ultimately much more so for himself than for Nicole.

The early years of their marriage, including the births of their two children, create challenges to which Nicole repeatedly succumbs, resulting in repeated "cycles, […] new pousse[s] of [her psychological] malady" (168).One of Dick's therapeutic responses is to serve unremittingly as the stable figure in her life: "Before her he must keep up a perfect front, now and to-morrow, next week and next year" (166). Maintaining this front, acting as if it were always true—indeed, acting rather than being – creates a psychological strain on Dick that he finds increasingly hard to tolerate. Whenever Nicole experiences another "pousse" of her mental illness, Dick repeatedly "restat[es] the universe for her" so as to bring her back to reality (196), a task that grows increasingly burdensome and exhausting, each time diminishing his store of vitality yet more. To reduce the possibility of new psychotic episodes, Dick carefully constructs as stable and predictable a life as possible, an existence that increasingly enervates him. But the result of his deviation from this stability in Antibes— his creation of a "really *bad* party" – is Nicole's breakdown, which Violet McKisco witnesses.

Dick's actions with regard to Nicole, heretofore attributed to his role as her husband, are revealed increasingly frequently to be a function of his role as her psychiatrist. He has willingly placed himself in a compromising position, not initially realizing—indeed perhaps choosing not to realize – that this position will cause him increasing difficulty with regard to his reactions to Nicole's behavior: "[It was] difficult now to distinguish between his self-protective professional detachment and some new coldness in his heart [toward Nicole]" (168).

Dick's dual role also creates increasing confusion for Nicole in her responses to Dick's reactions. Dick's initial abrogation of his professional ethics, which would require that he maintain a clear therapeutic boundary while encouraging her transference, leads ultimately to his "desperation [at having] long felt the ethics of his profession dissolving into a lifeless mass" throughout the course of their marriage (256).

Book Two next picks up where Book One ended, recounting in great detail the devastating downward spiral of Dick and Nicole's marriage. Nicole's mental health deteriorates increasingly frequently and severely because its cause derives from a traumatic incident that occurred when she was only fifteen years old, a year before her almost two-year hospitalization in Dohmler's renowned psychiatric clinic,

which was "a refuge for the broken" (120) – at least "the broken" with considerable financial resources. This traumatic event is rendered still more destructive because it was caused by the profound betrayal of her father, Devereux Warren, whose appropriate role was to protect his daughter, indeed yet more so because of the traumatizing death of her mother when Nicole was only eleven years old. Under pressure from Dohmler, Warren finally admits the following:

> After her mother died when she was little she used to come into my bed every morning, sometimes she'd sleep in my bed. I was sorry for the little thing. Oh, after that, whenever we went places in an automobile or a train, we used to hold hands [...] People used to say what a wonderful father and daughter we were – they used to wipe their eyes. We were just like lovers – and then all at once we were lovers. (129)

As a teenager the victim of her father's incestuous demands, Nicole suffers profound psychological damage. Her actions throughout the novel relate back to this primal violation, as is manifested so powerfully in her psychotic break when confronted with the bloody bedspread.

Less obviously, this primal violation causes Nicole to attempt to replace her "bad father" with a "good father," a man who will take care of her rather than demanding that she take care of his needs – hence her immediate attraction to Dick and her ultimately successful attempt to make him love her. But because the "good father" may always already turn out to be the "bad father," she frequently puts his love to the test, requiring him to demonstrate it again and again, no matter how badly she behaves, especially when in the throes of her mental illness. While Dick eventually becomes "annoyed with Nicole, who, after all these years, should recognize symptoms of strain in herself and guard against them" (168), in fact she has no motivation to do so because she deeply needs Dick to take care of her, no matter how bad her behavior, as evidence that he is indeed the "good father."

Nicole's frequent suspicions of Dick's interest in other women derive from over-determined motivations. On the one hand, her

consequent attacks on Dick demonstrate her need to be able to attack him and indeed punish him without negative consequences, as she never could attack and punish her own father, inappropriately feeling "complicity" for his incestuous rape of her (130), and therefore feeling that she must reassure him by excusing his behavior: "Never mind, never mind, Daddy. It doesn't matter. Never mind" (129). On the other hand, Nicole's suspicions about Dick's interest in other women, which are sometimes indeed accurate, serve to put her on the alert as a defense mechanism, since the possibility of Dick's leaving her is deeply terrifying.

Nicole's primal violation inevitably inflects her relationship with her husband and also her children, family relationships necessarily being psychologically dangerous terrain for her to traverse. Indeed, the Divers' marriage is increasingly an objective correlative for World War I. Late in Book Two, Dick realizes that he and Nicole and their children are no longer a family but "a perilous accident" (190), and a literal car accident involving all four of them follows almost immediately upon his realization (this car accident inevitably recalling the many such accidents in *Gatsby*). In an act both suicidal and homicidal, Nicole grabs at the steering wheel while Dick is driving and the children are in the back seat, "the car swerv[ing] violently left, swerv[ing] right, […] swerv[ing] once more and sho[oting] off the road, […] settl[ing] slowly at an angle of ninety degrees against a tree" (192).

After this accident, Dick chooses to leave Nicole in Franz's care at their psychiatric clinic while he takes a long break—time to recuperate from his need to observe Nicole's behavior ever more closely in order to decide when to intervene and how best to do so. These are tasks that he no longer wants to perform or can accomplish successfully:

> Dick, whose professional and personal task is to fix broken people, [has become] himself a broken man: an alcoholic in need of a "leave of abstinence"; perhaps a latent homosexual given his "pansy trick[s]" […]; a man who has gradually suffered a "lesion of his own vitality" and whose "morale [has] crack[ed];" […] no longer Dick but "Dicole," one half of the Dick-Nicole pairing who can no longer "watch her disintegrations without participating in

> them." Though Dick initially exempts himself from his judgment that the psychiatric profession attracts "the man a little crippled and broken," he is revealed to be mutilated in exactly this fashion. While initially able to create for others the illusion of a coherent world by "restating the universe," Dick ultimately exhausts his store of energy [...] Though he protests against the notion that "everybody is so tender that they have to be handled with gloves," the evidence of the novel reveals that individuals living in the modernist world are just that tender, "Doctor Diver's profession of sorting the broken shells of [...] eggs having given him a dread of breakage. (Moreland, *Medievalist* 131) Broken shells in a broken universe perfectly describe the world of *Tender is the Night*.

Moreover, Dick is disturbed at finding himself increasingly acceding to the use of Nicole's money to finance their increasingly expensive lifestyle. Though he had originally insisted on maintaining financial independence, it becomes increasingly difficult to do so: "Again and again it was necessary to decide together as to the use to which Nicole's money should be put. Naturally Nicole, wanting to own him, [...] encouraged any slackness on his part, and in multiplying ways he was constantly inundated by a trickling of goods and money" (170). The economic power of the Warren money becomes a force to which he gradually succumbs, a response for which he feels self-contempt.

Because Dick's attention must be irrevocably focused on Nicole throughout their marriage, he ceases to write the psychological treatises that had originally marked him as likely one of the most important psychiatrists of his generation. Although he continues to look over his notes and to revise his unfinished documents and to jot down ideas and finally just to shuffle his papers about, he can bring nothing to completion – a terrible cost to pay. His inability to do so undermines his sense of himself as he realizes whom he has actually become, which contrasts absolutely with whom he had planned and expected to be – "the theoretician [and] the brilliant consultant" (175), in Franz's words.

In addition to abandoning his research and writing, Dick largely abandons his clinical practice, treating increasingly few patients. And he has no success with those he does treat, notably the woman artist who is

a "living agonizing sore" from nervous eczema (183), the neurotic girl with no impulse control and an inability to adjust "to life's inevitable surprises," the three sisters "who [are] sliding almost imperceptibly toward paresis," the "collapsed psychiatrist" (186), the young man who is an alcoholic and kleptomaniac, and the young man whose "abnormality" – that is, homosexuality – is increasingly paired with bouts of drinking (244). Not only does Dick fail to cure his patients, but he also fails even to improve their conditions. And he makes himself ill in the process.

When Dick takes temporary leave from both Nicole and his psychiatric practice, he ultimately ends up in Rome, despite his contempt for the city. Now drinking to the point of having frequent blackouts, Dick engages in a verbal argument with a group of taxi drivers that becomes physical when he strikes one of them and then trips and falls badly – an encounter that would be ridiculous if not for its devastating consequences. Carried off to the police station, he punches an officer "with a smashing left beside the jaw" (226), and he is then beaten so badly that his nose, ribs, and fingers are fractured and his eye badly hurt. After sobering up in jail, Dick is horrified by his "vast criminal irresponsibility," which renders him humiliated and hopeless, and he realizes that "he would be a different person henceforward" (233). He actualizes this difference by his claim of guilt for the crime of "rap[ing] a five-year-old girl" (235) – a false confession that is psychologically telling insofar as it unconsciously associates him with Nicole's "bad father," Devereux Warren.

Baby Warren, also visiting Rome at this time, spends five futile hours attempting to get help for the injured and jailed Dick, beginning shortly after 4:00 in the morning and not ending until about 9:30. She demands help first at the American embassy where she is turned away decisively. She then demands help at the American consulate where she is told to return when it opens as usual at 9:00. Baby discovers to her disbelief that the Warren family fortune and social position do not provide the expected results, and she becomes "hysterical with impotence" upon learning that, however buffered heretofore, she too is ultimately prey to the forces of her social and political environment (232). However, Baby represses this realization by pushing her way into the Consul's office by about 9:30, after several other people are first admitted, and then finally gaining the Consul's help when she announces, "We're people of considerable standing in America […]

[and] I shall see that your indifference to this matter is reported in the proper quarter" (232). Although it seems as though "Baby ha[s] won" (232), in fact she is accorded only somewhat more help than the typical American citizen would be afforded. Her real power is that which she now wields over Dick: "It had been a hard night but she had the satisfaction of feeling that, whatever Dick's previous record was, [she] now possessed a moral superiority over him for as long as he proved of any use" (235).

In Book Three, Dick's "use" is revealed to be increasingly and ultimately unnecessary as the Divers' marriage undergoes its complete breakdown. Dick uses up almost the very last vestiges of his vitality in curing Nicole, if no other of his patients, as demonstrated by her no longer needing to lean on him for her psychological health and stability – ironically, the very outcome that Franz and Dr. Dohmler had attempted to achieve so many years before. However, even Nicole's cure is questionable given that she simply shifts her allegiance from Dick to Tommy Barban. And Tommy directs Nicole's behavior just as Dick had directed it for so many years, though to different purpose. Notably, when Nicole witnesses Dick in the process of taking leave of the "French Riviera" that he himself had created, she tells Tommy, "I'm going to him," but Tommy commands, "No, you're not," and he "pull[s] her down firmly" next to him (314).

Dick's life becomes a study in entropy as he drifts down the professional and social hierarchy upon moving back to New York. He first practices psychiatry in Buffalo, then general medicine in Batavia, then the same in Lockport, then the same again in Geneva, then moves to the "very small town of Hornell," and finally presumably still lives "in that section of the country, in one town or another" (315). *Tender is the Night* ends with these words, suggesting Dick's dying fall as he uses up the last traces of his store of vitality until he disappears, symbolically and in a sense even literally. He is no longer the agent he had seemed to be upon his first appearance as the leader of a circle of friends on the beach at Antibes, though even that is revealed, after all, to have been a "performance" (6).

Concluding with *The Last Tycoon*

Fitzgerald's last novel, *The Last Tycoon*, is a novel about the Hollywood movie industry that Fitzgerald was writing while living outside of Hollywood, from 1937 through 1940, writing screenplays

when such work was offered, as he had done for a two-month stint in 1927and a six-week stint in 1931. *The Last Tycoon* was incomplete when he died on 21 December 1940. He had worked steadily on the draft since the fall of 1939, according to Francis Kroll Ring, his young secretary for the last twenty months of his life. Indeed, Fitzgerald was working on the novel the very day before he died. He was deeply committed to *The Last Tycoon*, regarding it as a most serious endeavor akin to *Tender is the Night* and especially *The Great Gatsby*.

In 1941, Edmund Wilson published a posthumous edition of Fitzgerald's much revised but incomplete draft of *The Last Tycoon*. In addition, Wilson included Fitzgerald's various notes to himself delineating the rest of the novel's plot and describing the major characters. Also included was Fitzgerald's complete outline of the novel, which was broken down into "Episodes" side by side with the relevant "Chapters" and then "Acts," these last two specifying the layout of the novel itself and an overview of the novel translated into a movie scenario of sorts. Finally, it included Fitzgerald's adjurements to himself, lessons about writing largely drawn from his final stint as a Hollywood screenwriter. One of these notes asserted, "This chapter must not develop into merely a piece of character analysis. Each statement that I make about [the protagonist Stahr] must contain at the end of every few hundred words some pointed anecdote or story to keep it alive […] I want it to have […] drama throughout the story" (173). Fitzgerald's last words to himself at the end of his notes were, "ACTION IS CHARACTER" (190).

The Last Tycoon reveals Fitzgerald's ultimately profound interest in the Hollywood movie industry, especially in the person of the head of a movie studio, here represented by Monroe Stahr, who was himself based on noted producer Irving Thalberg, as is clear from many direct references. Jeffrey Meyers notes that one of the reasons that Fitzgerald accepted the 1931 screenwriting offer was in order "to work under the producer Irving Thalberg, who had a genius for developing stars and scripts" (214). In Wilson's Foreword to the edited volume, he notes that Stahr is "the one of Fitzgerald's central figures which he had thought out most completely and which he had most deeply come to understand" (6). Wilson further notes that Stahr is "inextricably involved […] with the moving-picture business in America," and that Fitzgerald "observed [this business] at a close range, studied [it] with a careful attention and dramatized [it] with a sharp wit" (6). Wilson judges *The Last Tycoon* as "far and away the best novel we have had about Hollywood, and […] the only one which takes us inside" (7).

Fitzgerald's interest in the movies was manifested throughout most of his professional life, not least of all because he sold a number of his novels and short stories to the movies, beginning as early as 1920. When he and Zelda rented a house in Great Neck, New York from 1922 through 1924, they met a number of celebrities from the movie industry, most notably the pioneering director D. W. Griffith, since Long Island was the center of movie production then. Fitzgerald even sold a screenplay of *This Side of Paradise*, though the movie was not made.

In *The Beautiful and Damned*, Joseph Bloeckman—who later renames himself Joseph Black—is the head of the "Films Par Excellence" movie studio. Attracted to Gloria Patch, he appears at various points throughout the novel, asking her as the novel progresses to star in his movies. Gloria does not simply dismiss his request but also mocks it. When she finally goes to him to ask for a movie part out of financial desperation, he arranges a screen test for her. Only when she swallows her pride and calls him does she learn that she looks too old on film to play the role of the younger sister but might be given a character part, that of the "haughty rich widow" (403)—an offer that so humiliates her that she cannot accept it. At one level Bloeckman/Black seems to be wreaking a measure of revenge on Gloria for not taking him seriously as either a romantic partner or a film executive. Indeed, throughout the novel Gloria is associated with the traditional medium of the play rather than the revolutionary medium of the movie.

In *The Great Gatsby*, the movie denizens of Long Island make their way to Gatsby's parties. Though they appear in only two scenes, two such figures are particularly notable, the moving-picture director and his Star:

> "Perhaps you know that lady," Gatsby indicated a gorgeous, scarcely human orchid of a woman who sat in state under a white-plum tree. Tom and Daisy stared, with that peculiarly unreal feeling that accompanies the recognition of a hitherto ghostly celebrity of the movies […] [Nick notes,] Almost the last thing I remember was standing with Daisy and watching the moving-picture director and his Star. They were still under the white-plum tree and

> their faces were touching except for a pale, thin ray of moonlight between. It occurred to me that he had been very slowly bending toward her all evening to attain this proximity, and even while I watched I saw him stoop one ultimate degree and kiss at her cheek. (106, 108)

The scene that Nick describes is surreal, the white-plum tree, the white faces, the white moonlight all seeming to glow. However, the pronoun "at" is critical here, indicating that the director "chooses to forego consummation of an ideal love in the materially real world, [thereby] enabl[ing] his dream, the dream that he *directs*, to continue" (Moreland, *Medievalist*, 142). The director's decision is consistent with the way movies simultaneously direct and reflect the dreams of the movie audience.

Tender is the Night is permeated by the movie industry, now located in Hollywood. The young movie actress Rosemary Hoyt grows increasingly famous as she takes on more adult roles. She runs off her first movie, entitled *Daddy's Girl*, for the Divers and their friends, an ironic subject given Nicole's traumatic experience of incest. In love with Dick, Rosemary arranges a screen test for him, to his embarrassment. It is an offer that he refuses – the refusal itself ironic given that he performs his life rather than lives it authentically, which is a function of his attempt always to create a stable environment for Nicole. When Dick visits the more mature Rosemary on the set of *The Grandeur that Was Rome*, they engage in a sexual consummation that is unfulfilling for Dick, the reality less compelling than his dream of it.

Fitzgerald was sufficiently fascinated by the movie industry to include multiple and increasing references to it in his novels. But he also manifested deep misgivings, as he recorded in his 1936 essay "Pasting It Together":

> I saw that the novel, which at my maturity was the strongest and supplest medium for conveying thought and emotion from one human being to another, was becoming subordinated to a mechanical and communal art that […] in the hands of

> Hollywood merchants […] was capable of reflecting only the tritest thought, the most obvious emotion. It was an art in which words were subordinate to images […] As long past as 1930, I had a hunch that the talkies would make even the best selling [sic] novelist as archaic as silent pictures […] The power of the written word [was being] subordinated to another power, [the visual image,] a more glittering, a grosser power. (78)

The misgivings that Fitzgerald articulates in this essay are expressed in fictional form in the seventeen "Pat Hobby" stories that he wrote for monthly magazine publication in Arnold Gingrich's *Esquire* during the same period as he was writing *The Last Tycoon*. The first story appeared in January 1940 and the last stories some months after his death. The protagonist of this story sequence is an alcoholic hanger-on in Hollywood, a down-on-his-luck screenwriter who has not been able to make the transition from silent films to the talkies. Fitzgerald's purpose in writing the Pat Hobby stories was to create an income flow, much of which he used to pay for Zelda's continued stay at the Asheville, North Carolina psychiatric institution and their daughter Scottie's Vassar tuition. But these stories also performed a psychological function, providing Fitzgerald with the occasion to excoriate Hollywood, where neither his talents nor his products – screenplays and dialogues –were appreciated. To similar purpose, he served as a mentor to Nathanael West and provided a blurb for the dust jacket of West's *Day of the Locust* (1939) – a profoundly disturbing novel that presents a nightmarish set of characters living on the fringes of Hollywood who are ultimately swept up into West's apocalyptic vision.

However, Fitzgerald's critical attitude toward Hollywood was joined by a new fascination, ironically enabled by the distance effected as his screenwriting jobs diminished. *The Last Tycoon* reveals Fitzgerald's new-found respect for the movie industry as incarnated in Monroe Stahr. Ruth Prigozy notes that Fitzgerald had planned that *The Last Tycoon* would be "based on the recently deceased Irving Thalberg […] and on the changes [Fitzgerald] had observed in the business of the film industry […] The Hollywood story of Monroe Stahr would depict, through its depiction of that industry, the changes taking place in the nation" (133).

Fitzgerald's depiction of Stahr focuses in significant part on his powerful influence with regard, on the one hand, to the process of making movies and, on the other hand, to the movies as produced, indeed as products in themselves. Perhaps most importantly, Stahr brought his studio "through the beginnings [that is, the silent movies,] and the great upset, when sound came, and the three years of depression, [and] he had seen that no harm came to the [workers]" – the result of which is that "he was their man, the last of the princes" (37). This identifier, like the title of the novel itself, indicates that this Hollywood figure, however admired, is becoming outmoded even as he continues his work.

Stahr had introduced a number of innovations to the process of making movies. Notably, he originated the system of putting two writers into a pair to work on a script, then putting another pair behind the first if there was a slowdown in the writing, then putting yet another pair behind the second if necessary to maintain progress. He thereby radically diminished the independence and personal vision of individual writers. Similarly, he diminished the power of the director, who was "King Pin in pictures since Griffith made *The Birth of a Nation*," but whose position was now reduced "from one of complete king to being simply one element in a combine" (171-72), in part because Stahr created the position of the stage director as a response to the demands of sound in film. Once the power was removed from the writers and directors, among others, it was Stahr himself – the "production genius" (59), the studio head – who provided the "unity" (72) and thereby held all the power, however benevolently he may continue to choose to use it.

Stahr has a craftsman's sense of the movie as product. He recognizes that "pictures have a private grammar" (185) which he understands, and he knows that talkies require a "new formula" different in kind from that which worked for silent pictures (187). Stahr chooses sometimes to make a particularly high-quality movie even though it will lose money. The result of his focus on quality, in addition to profits, is "a sort of golden age" (38) of the movies: "Almost single-handed he had moved pictures sharply forward through a decade to a point where the content of the 'A productions' was wider and richer than that of the stage" (125).

Stahr consciously recognizes, "[We] take people's own favorite

folklore and dress it up and give it back to them" (125), indicating the primacy of the audience's own reality, its own beliefs, as the source material for the movies. However, "the pictures which Stahr himself conceive[s]" also have a profound shaping influence on the people who view them (26). Thus, the relationship between the movie-viewers and the movie-makers is reciprocal. On the one hand, audiences indicate their psychological needs and desires – some conscious and others unconscious – which they want the movies to fulfill. On the other hand, the movies that are produced serve to transform and sometimes even create the audiences' conscious and unconscious needs and desires. The movie-viewers shape the movies just as the movies shape the movie-viewers, in a reciprocal act of psychological determinism.

As such, Stahr is the "producer" in both title and action. But Stahr's power is revealed finally to be limited. In particular, it is the powerful force of the economy that determines the shift downward in the trajectory of his career. And the economic force must be considered in conjunction with the political and social forces also at work at the time.

Stahr is an "old-fashioned paternalistic employer, who likes to feel that the people who work for him are contented, and that he and they are on friendly terms" (152). But the era of the paternalistic employer is passing, a shift that Stahr finds difficult to fathom and that he resists mightily when detecting that "the old loyalties [are] trembling now" (37). It is a time of economic unrest, when "the studios fear mob rule" (31). In an act of nostalgia more so than protest, Stahr requires changes in a movie to indicate that the female lead "has never heard the word labor troubles [...] She might be living in 1929" (53).

Stahr is caught between two powerful economic forces as personified in two characters. The first is Stahr's business partner Brady, a corrupt monopolist, and the second is Brimmer, a Communist union organizer whom Stahr meets to gain information: "Stahr [feels himself] now being pushed into the past by Brady and by the unions alike. The split between the [monopolistic] controllers of the movie industry, on the one hand, and the various groups of [unionizing] employees, on the other, is widening and leaving no place" for paternalistic employers like Stahr (154).

Brady, the corrupt monopolist, chooses to reduce wages in order to increase profits. He waits until Stahr is in Washington to meet with

stockholders before taking action. He then elicits an agreement from the writers for a fifty percent pay cut that he claims the studio executives will match, in order to preserve the wages of low-paid workers. Once the writers accept the pay cut, however, Brady slashes the wages of the workers while retaining the original salaries of the executives. Stahr is outraged but unableto effect a corrective course of action.

In this regard, Stahr's response is largely determined by the force of biology. Suffering from terminal heart disease, Stahr is frail and weak, rendered frequently dizzy and faint, and he requires benzedrine in order to function. While in Washington he "comes down with a summer grippe and goes around the city in a daze of fever and heat" (151). When he returns to Hollywood, he "'l[ies] low' [...] [and for a time] cease[s] to make pictures altogether" (154).

Brimmer, the Communist organizer, parries Stahr's comment that "writers are like children"(142), and that the Communists are wasting their time by trying to organize them into a union. Brimmer asserts that the writers are instead "the farmers in the business . . . who grow the grain but [...] are not in at the feast, [so] their feeling toward the producer is like the farmer's resentment of the city fellow" (142); in a related sense, they are part of the "combine" that Stahr himself has created. Stahr dislikes Brimmer's analogy, which hits too close to home, since it undermines his sense of himself as a benevolent employer whose employees like and trust him. He therefore modifies his earlier patronizing observation, noting, "I like writers—I think I understand them, [and] I don't want to kick anybody out if they do their work" (147). Later, Stahr is "hurt that the writer [Wylie White] should not feel toward him the same kind of personal loyalty [as he has manifested toward Wylie] – which is the only solidarity that Stahr understands in the field of business relations" (152), not recognizing the fraternal solidarity of workers that is effected by unions. When Stahr accuses the Communist organizers of wanting to break up the studio, Brimmer asserts, "We'd like to take you over as a going concern" (147).

Stahr's response to Brimmer, like his response to Brady, is largely determined by the force of biology. During their long meeting, Stahr compounds the enervating effects of his terminal heart disease by drinking a great deal of alcohol, seeming unable to stop once having started: "He was pale – he was so transparent that you could almost watch the alcohol mingle with the poison of his exhaustion" (148). The

very drunk Stahr announces to Brimmer that he is going to beat him up – an extraordinarily unlikely outcome. Indeed, Brimmer at first holds off "this frail half-sick person" (149) before finally knocking him out with a single punch, then apologizes for having done so.

Stahr's self-destructive action is of a piece with various symptoms that his doctor has diagnosed:"What it added up to was the definite urge toward total exhaustion [...] Fatigue was a drug as well as a poison, and Stahr apparently derived some rare almost physical pleasure from working lightheaded with weariness. It was a perversion of the life force" (128).According to Freudian psychoanalytic theory, Stahr's life is being determined by the "death drive" (45-50, 52-69, 72).Cecelia Brady, who is present at the encounter between Stahr and Brimmer, describes Stahr as "carrying on a losing battle with his instinct toward schizophrenia" (148). Her lay diagnosis is incorrect but her reference to mental illness is certainly apt.

However, Stahr does not ultimately die of heart disease, despite having only six months to live according to his doctor. He is instead killed in a plane crash, the downward trajectory of the plane mirroring the downward trajectory of his life – economic and sociopolitical, psychological, and biological.

It is the quite odd intended conclusion of this novel that most explicitly enacts the philosophy of determinism, and that does so perhaps more explicitly than does any other text in Fitzgerald's oeuvre. Fitzgerald had sketched out this conclusion in detail, then decided to discard it in favor of a description of Stahr's funeral, and then turned back to it again. The conclusion concerns three young teenagers – Frances, Dan, and Jim – who discover the crash site and rifle the plane's contents. Notably, the specific items that they find will explicitly determine who they will become as adults.

Frances finds "a purse and an open travelling case which belonged to [an] actress [and which] contains the things that to her represent undreamt of luxuries" (182), including a jewel box, flasks of perfume, and "perhaps a negligee" (183).Dan is "especially proud of his find," choosing "some rather disreputable [unidentified] possessions of Ronciman" (183) – a character who does not appear elsewhere in the novel or notes but who is clearly intended to be unsavory. Jim finds "Stahr's briefcase – a briefcase is what he has always wanted, and Stahr's briefcase is an excellent piece of leather" (183).

Dan persuades Frances and Jim not to reveal the plane's whereabouts but instead to make additional trips to scavenge for other items and cash. His motives are revealed to be corrupt as indicated by the following comparison: "Dan bears, in some form of speech, a faint resemblance to Bradogue" (183) – the name Fitzgerald sometimes uses instead of "Brady" in his notes.Frances, who is "malleable and amoral" (183), willingly goes along with Dan's plan. Jim, however, manifests "a definite doubt […] even from the first, as to whether this is fair dealing even towards the dead" (183).

Ultimately, Jim chooses to confess to a judge what he and Dan and Frances have done – a decision with which Frances agrees because of her increasing fear of being caught, and to which Dan objects to the degree that he even threatens Jim physically. Jim, who is in "an absolutely wretched mood about the whole affair" (183), acts upon principle, which has been reinforced by the admiration he has gained for Stahr by "read[ing] the contents of Stahr's briefcase […] late at night" (184).

Jim's confession has the following result: "We leave the children there with the idea that they are in good hands, that they are not going to be punished, [and] that they have made full restoration" (184). Fitzgerald repeats that "there will be no punishment of any kind for any of the three children" (184).

This, then, would seem to be the end of the unfortunate adventure for these three young people. However, it turns out that their adventure is instead a beginning rather than an end because of its powerful impact on them. Their felt experiences and the specific items they find determine their subsequent lives, as sketched out by Fitzgerald:"Dan has been completely corrupted and will spend the rest of his life looking for a chance to get something for nothing" (184);"Frances is faintly corrupted and may possibly go off in a year or so in search of adventure and may turn into anything from a gold digger to a prostitute" (184); "Jim is all right," and Fitzgerald repeats shortly thereafter, "I should [show] very pointedly that Jim is all right" (184).

Fitzgerald emphasizes in his notes that this representation "must be subtly done and not look too much like a parable or moral lesson" (183), that "I cannot be too careful not to rub this in or give it the substance or feeling of a moral tale" (184), and that "[I must give] a bitter and acrid finish to the incident to take away any possible sentimental and moral stuff that may have crept into it" (184). So if not

a parable, a moral, or a sentimental conclusion, it would seem to be a deterministic conclusion.

The determinism works in two ways, however. On the one hand, the young people's lives are determined by the actual objects they find by chance alone. On the other hand, their finding the objects in particular is determined by their already formed characters, that is, their very natures. As such, Fitzgerald represents their lives as determined by both external and internal forces.

When Fitzgerald was writing *The Last Tycoon* he knew that his health was in a parlous state. Indeed, some four years earlier he had written presciently of his death in "The Crack-Up": "I was living hard […] 'Up to forty-nine it'll be all right,' I said. 'I can count on that. For a man who's lived as I have, that's all you could ask.' – And then, ten years this side of forty-nine, I suddenly realized that I had prematurely cracked" (70). He actually lived until the age of forty-four but much of that time he was in a state of ill health, largely an effect of his alcoholism. Notably, in 1939 he had Frances Kroll Ring help him design a "bed desk" so that he need not get up to write: "We set it up on the bed and it fit perfectly. He went into a small, adjacent workroom, rarely used, where he kept his papers and notebooks. He removed charts and notes that were tacked on the walls and laid them out on the new desk in piles. That small effort sapped his energy. He went back to bed […] I left him to rest" (34). She also reports that "early in 1940, Scott suffered his first mild heart seizure […] [and] he now looked more frail than usual" (94-95). Later that year he had bouts of dizziness and then, on 21 December 1940, he died of a heart attack.

The frailty, the sleeplessness, the heart disease of Monroe Stahr reflect not only the illness of Irving Thalberg, who died at the age of thirty-seven on 14 September 1936, but also that of Fitzgerald himself. In her memoir of her time as his personal secretary, Ring hauntingly describes Fitzgerald during the last twenty months of his life: "Remembrance of the courage with which he moved himself out of his suffering into a final burst of activity that secured his literary image is woven into the web of my days, even as that time of my life recedes" (151).

Fitzgerald knew that *The Last Tycoon* was the last novel he would ever write, and he tried courageously though unsuccessfully to complete it. It is profoundly significant that he chose in this novel to

represent the ways that the powerful forces of economics, psychology, and biology determine so much of his protagonist's life, even in the face of his individual genius and extraordinary will power and enormous professional success. Indeed, Fitzgerald even represents Stahr as dying in a plane crash rather than dying of his terminal heart disease, an acknowledgment of the role that accidents play in life.

And how to read the odd little story of Frances and Dan and Jim that is designed to conclude this last of Fitzgerald's novels? It is certainly no moral parable, as he insisted in his notes. Instead, it is a parable of determinism, an acknowledgement of the powerful internal and external forces that Fitzgerald represented in his short stories and novels and essays from 1920 until 1940, indeed from first to last.

Works Cited

Beer, Thomas. *Stephen Crane: A Study in American Letters*. Introd. Joseph Conrad. New York: Knopf, 1923. Print.

Berryman, John. "Crane's Art." 1962. *Stephen Crane*. Updated ed. Ed. Harold Bloom. Bloom's Modern Critical Views Series. New York: Inphase Publishing, 2007. 7-28. Print.

Bruccoli, Matthew, ed. *The Short Stories of F. Scott Fitzgerald*, by F. Scott Fitzgerald. New

York: Scribner's, 1989. Print.

---. *Some Sort of Epic Grandeur: The Life of F. Scott Fitzgerald*. 2nd Rev. ed. Columbia, South

Carolina: U of South Carolina P, 2002. Print.

Bryer, Jackson, ed. *New Essays on F. Scott Fitzgerald's Neglected Short Fiction*. Columbia, MO: Columbia UP, 1996. Print.

Cox, Michael, ed. *The Oxford Book of Twentieth-Century Ghost Stories*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1996. Print.

Crane, Stephen. *"The Blue Hotel," The Red Badge of Courage, and Other Stories.* Ed. Anthony Mellors and Fiona Robertson. Oxford's World Classics. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1998. 202-29. Print.

Darwin, Charles. *On the Origin of Species: By Means of Natural Selection,*

On the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life. 1859. 1st ed. and 150th Anniversary ed. New York: Signet, 2003. Print.

Dreiser, Theodore. *An American Tragedy*. 1925. New York: Penguin, 2010. Print.

---. *The Financier*. 1912. Introd. Larzer Ziff. New York: Penguin, 2008. Print.

---. *Jennie Gerhardt*. 1911. New York: Penguin, 1994. Print.

---. *Sister Carrie*. 1900. Introd. Alfred Kazin. Unexpurgated ed. New York: Penguin, 1981. Print.

---. *The Stoic*. New York: Doubleday, 1947. Print.

---. *The Titan*. 1914. Introd. Larzer Ziff. New York: Penguin, 2008. Print.

Fitzgerald, F. Scott. *All the Sad Young Men*. 1926. Ed. James L. W. West III. Cambridge Edition of the Works of F. Scott Fitzgerald. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2007. Print.

---. *As Ever, Scott Fitz--: Letters Between F. Scott Fitzgerald and His Literary Agent Harold*

---. *1919-1940*. Ed. Matthew Bruccoli and Jennifer M. Atkinson. Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1972. Print.

---. "Bernice Bobs Her Hair." *Flappers and Philosophers*. Ed. West. 108-33.

---. *The Correspondence of F. Scott Fitzgerald*. Ed. Matthew Bruccoli and Margaret M. Duggan. New York: Random House, 1980. Print.

---. "The Crack-Up." *The Crack-Up*. Ed. Wilson. 69-74.

---. "The Cut-Glass Bowl." *Flappers and Philosophers*. Ed. West. 87-107.

---. *Dear Scott / Dear Max: The Fitzgerald-Perkins Correspondence*. Ed. John Kuehl and Jackson Bryer. New York: Scribner's, 1971. Print.

---. "Dalyrimple Goes Wrong." *Flappers and Philosophers*. Ed. West. 151-68.

---. *F. Scott Fitzgerald: A Life in Letters*. Ed. Matthew Bruccoli. New York: Touchstone, 1995. Print.

---. *Flappers and Philosophers*. 1920. Ed. James L. W. West III. Cambridge Edition of the

Works of F. Scott Fitzgerald. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2012. Print.

---. "The Four Fists." *Flappers and Philosophers*. Ed. West. 169-85.

---. *The Great Gatsby*. New York: Scribner's, 1925. Print.

---. "Handle with Care." *The Crack-Up*. Ed. Wilson. 75-80.

---. "Head and Shoulders." *Flappers and Philosophers.* Ed. West. 61-86.

---. "The Ice Palace." *Flappers and Philosophers.* Ed. West. 36-60.

---. "The Jelly-Bean." *The Short Stories of F. Scott Fitzgerald*. Ed. Bruccoli. 142-58.

---. "The Last of the Belles." *The Short Stories of F. Scott Fitzgerald*. Ed. Bruccoli. 449-63.

---. *The Last Tycoon*. Ed. and Foreword Edmund Wilson. New York: Scribner's, 1941.

---. "More than Just a House." *The Short Stories of F. Scott Fitzgerald*. Ed. Bruccoli. 714-33.

---. "Pasting It Together." *The Crack-Up*. Ed. Wilson. 80-84.

---. "A Short Trip Home." *The Short Stories of F. Scott Fitzgerald*. Ed. Bruccoli. 372-89.

---. "The Sensible Thing." *The Short Stories of F. Scott Fitzgerald*. Ed. Bruccoli. 288-301.

---. *This Side of Paradise*. New York: Scribner's, 1920. Print.

---. "Sleeping and Waking." *The Crack-Up*. Ed. Wilson. 63-68.

---. *Tales of the Jazz Age.* 1922. Ed. James L. W. West III. Cambridge Edition of the Works of F. Scott Fitzgerald. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2012. Print.

---. *Taps at Reveille*. 1935. Ed. James L. W. West III. Cambridge Edition of the Works of F. Scott Fitzgerald. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2014. Print.

---. *Tender is the Night*. New York: Scribner's, 1934. Print.

---. "Two for a Cent." *Flappers and Philosophers*. Ed. West. 309-24.

---. "Winter Dreams." *The Short Stories of F. Scott Fitzgerald*. Ed. Bruccoli. 217-36.

Fitzgerald, F. Scott, and Zelda Fitzgerald. "Auction—Model 1934." *The Crack-Up*. Ed. Wilson. 56-62.

Fitzgerald, Zelda. *Save Me the Waltz*. 1932. *The Collected Writings of Zelda*

Fitzgerald. Ed. Matthew Bruccoli. Tuscaloosa, AL: U of Alabama P, 1991. 9-196. Print.

Freud, Sigmund. *Beyond the Pleasure Principle*. 1920. Ed. and Trans. James Strachey. Introd.

Gregory Zilboorg. Biographical Introd. Peter Gay. The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud. New York: Norton, 1961.

Gillin, Edward. "The Grace of 'Benediction.'" *New Essays on F. Scott Fitzgerald's Neglected Short Fiction*. Ed. Bryer. 35-49.

Graham, Sheilah. *College of One: The Story of How F. Scott Fitzgerald Educated the Woman He Loved*. New York: Viking, 1967. Print.

Graham, Sheilah, and Gerold Frank. *Beloved Infidel: The Education of a Woman*. 1958. New York: Bantam, 1959. 189-200, 214-15, 234-41. Print.

Hampl, Patricia, and Dave Page, eds. *The St. Paul Stories of F. Scott Fitzgerald*. St. Paul, MN: Borealis Books, 2004. Print.

James, Henry. *The Golden Bowl*. 1904. Introd. Gore Vidal. New York: Penguin, 1987. Print.

Lawson, Mark. "Beautiful and Damned." *The Guardian*, Book Classics, 26 June 1995 theguardian.com/us. Web. 12 June 2016.

MacLeish, Archibald. "About a Trespass on a Monument." *The New York Times* 7 December 1958. nytimes.com. Web. 24 May 2016.

---. *J. B.: A Play in Verse*. 1958. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 1989. Print.

Mangum, Bryant. "Fitzgerald, F. Scott (1896-1940)." *Encyclopedia of the Novel*. Ed. Paul Schellinger. London and Chicago: Fitzroy Dearborn, 1998. 416-17. Print.

Marx, Karl. *Capital*. 1867.Vol. 1. Trans. Ben Fowkes. Introd. Ernest Mandel. London: Penguin, 1992. Print.

McInerney, Jay. Rev. of *The Short Stories of F. Scott Fitzgerald*, by F. Scott Fitzgerald. *The New York Times Book Review* 15 August 1991. nytimes.com. Web. 1 April 2016.

Mencken, H. L. Introduction.*"George's Mother," "The Blue Hotel," Maggie*. 1926. Vol. 10 of *The Works of Stephen Crane*. Ed. Wilson Follett. Reno, NV: James Russell, 1963. Print.

---. "Jack London." *Prejudices: First Series*. New York: Knopf, 1919. *Documenting the American South*. 1998. University Library, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 236-39. Web. 29 March 2016.

---. "Fitzgerald, the Stylist, Challenges Fitzgerald, the Social Historian." Rev. of *The Great Gatsby*, by F. Scott Fitzgerald. *Baltimore Evening Sun*. 2 May 1925: 9. In *The Great Gatsby*. Ed. Michael Nowlin. Appendix B: "Contemporary Reviews." Toronto: Broadview, 2007. 195-98. Print.

---. Rev. of *Stephen Crane*, by Thomas Beer. *Baltimore Evening Sun*, 19 January 1924. *A Mencken Chrestomathy: His Own Selection of the Choicest of His Writings.*1949. Ed. H. L. Mencken. New York: Vintage, 1982. 496-97. Print.

---. "Theodore Dreiser." 1917. *A Book of Prefaces*, by H. L. Mencken. 2nded. New York: Knopf, 2015. 67-150. Print.

Merrill, Robert. "'Dalyrimple Goes Wrong': The Best of the Neglected Short Stories." *New Essays on F. Scott Fitzgerald's Neglected Short Fiction*. Ed. West. 24-34.

Meyers, Jeffrey. *Scott Fitzgerald: A Biography*. New York: HarperCollins, 1994. Print.

Miller, Linda Patterson, ed. *Letters from the Lost Generation: Gerald and Sara Murphy and Friends*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers UP, 1991. Print.

Moreland, Kim. "Gerald Murphy, F. Scott Fitzgerald, and Dick Diver: The Artist's Vocation." *Journal of Modern Literature* 23.2 (1999-2000). 359-65. Print.

---. *The Medievalist Impulse in American Literature: Twain, Adams, Fitzgerald, and Hemingway*. Charlottesville: UP of Virginia, 1996. Print.

Norris, Charles G. *Salt, or, The Education of Griffith Adams*. 1918. New York: E. P. Dutton, 2007. Library, University of California. Web. 11 May 2016.

Nowlin, Michael. "Mencken's Defense of Women and the Marriage Plot of *The Beautiful and Damned*." *F. Scott Fitzgerald in the Twenty-First Century*. Ed Jackson Bryer, Ruth Prigozy, and Milton Stern. Tuscaloosa, AL: U of Alabama Press, 2003. 104-20. Print.

---. "Naturalism and High Modernism." *F. Scott Fitzgerald in Context*. Ed.

Bryant Mangum. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2015. 179-90. Print.

Prigozy, Ruth. *F. Scott Fitzgerald*. Overlook Illustrated Lives Series. Woodstock, NY: Overlook Press, 2001. Print.

Reesman, Jeanne Campbell. *Jack London's Racial Lives: A Critical Biography*. Athens, GA: U of Georgia Press, 2009. Print.

Ring, Frances Kroll. *Against the Current: As I Remember F. Scott Fitzgerald*. Los Angeles: Figueroa Press, 1985. Print.

Springer, Mike. "F. Scott Fitzgerald Creates A List of 22 Essential Books, 1936." *Open Culture*. Via University of South Carolina. 1 August 2013. Web. 21 March 2016.

Ullrich, David W. "Free Will versus Determinism in *This Side of Paradise*: Bodily Signifiers, Heredity, and Altruism in Fitzgerald's First Novel." *F. Scott Fitzgerald Review* 9 (2011): 41-67. Print.

Vaill, Amanda. *Everybody Was So Young*. New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1998. Print.

Walton, Edith H. Rev. of *Taps at Reveille*, by F. Scott Fitzgerald. *The New York Times* 31 March 1935. *The New York Times on the Web*. Web. 31 March 2016.

West, James L. W. III, ed. *Flappers and Philosophers*. Cambridge Edition of the Works of F. Scott Fitzgerald. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2000. Print.

West, Nathanael. *The Day of the Locust*. 1939. *"Miss Lonelyhearts" & "The Day of the Locust."* New York: New Directions, 2009. Print.

Westbrook, Sheilah Graham. *College of One: The Story of How F. Scott Fitzgerald Educated the Woman He Loved*. Afterword Wendy Fairey. New York: Vintage, 1967. Print.

Westbrook, Robert. *Intimate Lies: F. Scott Fitzgerald and Sheilah Graham, Her Son's Story*. New York: HarperCollins, 1995. 276-86. Print.

Wharton, Edith. *The House of Mirth*. 1905. New York: Vintage Books/ Library of America, 1990. Print.

Wilson, Edmund, ed. *The Crack-Up*. New York: New Directions, 1945. Print.

---, ed. Foreword. *The Last Tycoon*, by F. Scott Fitzgerald. New York: Scribner's, 1941. 5-7. Print.